A

See ALEPH; ALPHABET.

AALAR

<a’-a-lar>.

See ALTAR.

AARON

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

1. FAMILY:

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

When Moses fled from Egypt, Aaron remained to share the hardships of his people, and possibly to render them some service; for we are told that Moses entreated of God his brother’s cooperation in his mission to Pharaoh and to Israel, and that Aaron went out to meet his returning brother, as the time of deliverance drew near (Exodus 4:27). While Moses, whose great gifts lay along other lines, was slow of speech (Exodus 4:10), Aaron was a ready spokesman, and became his brother’s representative, being called his “mouth” (Exodus 4:16) and his “prophet” (Exodus 7:1). After their meeting in the wilderness the two brothers returned together to Egypt on the hazardous mission to which Yahweh had called them (Exodus 4:27-31). At first they appealed to their own nation, recalling the ancient promises and declaring the imminent deliverance, Aaron being the spokesman. But the heart of the people, hopeless by reason of the hard bondage and heavy with the care of material things, did not incline to them. The two brothers then forced the issue by appealing directly to Pharaoh himself, Aaron still speaking for his brother (Exodus 6:10-13). He also performed, at Moses’ direction, the miracles which confounded Pharaoh and his magicians. With Hur, he held up Moses hands, in order that the `rod of God might be lifted up,’ during the fight with Amalek (Exodus 17:10,12).

3. AN ELDER:

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

4. HIGH PRIEST:

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

5. REBELS AGAINST MOSES:

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

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

7. PRIESTLY SUCCESSION:

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

Edward Mack

AARONITES

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

AARON’S ROD

(Numbers 17 and Hebrews 9:4): Immediately after the incidents connected with the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram against the leadership of Moses and the priestly primacy of Aaron (Numbers 16), it became necessary to indicate and emphasize the Divine appointment of Aaron. Therefore, at the command of Yahweh, Moses directs that twelve almond rods, one for each tribe with the prince’s name engraved thereon, be placed within the Tent of the Testimony. When Moses entered the tent the following day, he found that Aaron’s rod had budded, blossomed and borne fruit, “the three stages of vegetable life being thus simultaneously visible.” When the miraculous sign was seen by the people, they accepted it as final; nor was there ever again any question of Aaron’s priestly right. The rod was kept “before the testimony” in the sanctuary ever after as a token of the Divine will (Numbers 17:10). The writer of Hebrews, probably following a later Jewish tradition, mentions the rod as kept in the Holy of Holies within the ark (Hebrews 9:4; compare 1 Kings 8:9).

See PRIEST, III.

Edward Mack
AB (1)

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

See ABI.

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

See also ABBA.

Willis J. Beecher

AB (2)

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

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

ABADDON

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

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

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

In a slight degree the Old Testament presentations personalize Abaddon. It is a synonym for insatiableness (<Proverbs 27:20). It has possibilities of information mediate between those of “all living” and those of God (<Job 28:22).
In the New Testament the word occurs once (Revelation 9:11), the personalization becoming sharp. Abaddon is here not the world of the dead, but the angel who reigns over it. The Greek equivalent of his name is given as Apollyon. Under this name Bunyan presents him in the Pilgrim’s Progress, and Christendom has doubtless been more interested in this presentation of the matter than in any other.

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

See APOLLYON.

Willis J. Beecher

ABADIAS

<ab-a-di’-as> (Greek [Αβαδίας Abadias]): Mentioned in 1 Esdras 8:35 as the son of Jezelus, of the sons of Joab, returned with Ezra from the captivity; and in Ezra 8:9 called “Obadiah the son of Jehiel.”

ABAGARUS

<ab-a-rous>.

See ABGARUS.

ABAGTHA

<ab-a-tha> (אָבַגְתָּה [’abhaghetha’], perhaps meaning “fortunate one”): One of the seven eunuchs, or “chamberlains,” of Xerxes mentioned in Est 1:10. The name is Persian, and is one of the many Persian marks in the Book of Esther.

ABANAH

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

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

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

_C. H. Thomson_

**Abarim**

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

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABASE

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

Frank E. Hirsch

ABATE

<a-bat’>: Used six times in Old Testament for five different Hebrew words, signifying “to diminish,” “reduce,” “assuage”; of the Flood (Genesis 8:8); of strength (Deuteronomy 34:7); of pecuniary value (Leviticus 27:18); of wrath (Judges 8:3); of fire (Numbers 11:2).

ABBA

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

J. E. Harry

ABDA

<ab’-da> (לֵבַד `abhda’], perhaps, by abbreviation, “servant of Yahweh”): (1) The father of Adoniram, King Solomon’s superintendent of forced labor (1 Kings 4:6).
(2) A Levite mentioned in the statistical note in Nehemiah (11:17). This “Abda the son of Shammua” is in the partly duplicate passage in 1 Chronicles (9:16) called “Obadiah the son of Shemaiah.”

**ABDEEL**

<ab’-de-el> ([abhdeel], “servant of God”): The father of Shelemiah, one of the officers whom King Jehoiakim commanded to arrest Baruch, the scribe, and Jeremiah the prophet (Jeremiah 36:26).

**ABDI**

<ab’-di> ([abhdi], probably by abbreviation “servant of Yahweh”):

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

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

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

**ABDIAS**

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

**ABDIEL**

<ab’-di-el> ([abhdi’el], “servant of God”): A Gadite who lived in Gilead or in Bashan, and whose name was reckoned in genealogies of the time of Jotham, king of Judah, or of Jeroboam II, king of Israel (1 Chronicles 5:15-17).
ABDON (1)

<ab’-don> ([’abhdon], perhaps “service”; [Ἄβδων Abdon]):

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

An effort has been made to identify Abdon with the Bedan mentioned in 1 Samuel 12:11, but the identification is precarious.

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

See SAMSON.

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

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

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABDON (2)

<ab’don> ([`abhdon], perhaps “service”): One of the four Levitical cities in the tribe of Asher (Joshua 21:30, 1 Chronicles 6:74). Probably the same with Ebron (in the King James Version “Hebron”) in Joshua 19:28, where some copies have the reading Abdon. Now called Abdeh, a few miles from the Mediterranean and about fifteen miles south of Tyre.

ABED-NEGO

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

Abednego was one of the three companions of Daniel, and was the name imposed upon the Hebrew Azariah by Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 1:7). Having refused, along with his friends, to eat the provisions of the king’s table, he was fed and flourished upon pulse and water. Having successfully passed his examinations and escaped the death with which the wise men of Babylon were threatened, he was appointed at the request of Daniel along with his companions over the affairs of the province of Babylon (Daniel 2). Having refused to bow down to the image which Nebuchadnezzar had set up, he was cast into the burning fiery furnace, and after his triumphant delivery he was caused by the king to prosper in the province of Babylon (Daniel 3). The three friends are referred to by name in 1 Macc 2:59, and by implication in Hebrews 11:33,34.

R. Dick Wilson

ABEL (1)

 Abel (1)  

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

1. A SHEPHERD:

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

2. A WORSHIPPER:

“In process of time,” the two brothers came in a solemn manner to sacrifice unto Yahweh, in order to express their gratitude to Him whose tenants they were in the land (Genesis 4:3,4. See SACRIFICE). How Yahweh signified His acceptance of the one offering and rejection of the other, we are not told. That it was due to the difference in the material of the sacrifice or in their manner of offering was probably the belief among the early Israelites, who regarded animal offerings as superior to cereal offerings. Both kinds, however, were fully in accord with Hebrew law and custom. It has been suggested that the Septuagint rendering of Genesis 4:7 makes Cain’s offense a ritual one, the offering not being “correctly” made or rightly divided, and hence rejected as irregular. “If thou makest a proper offering, but dost not cut in pieces rightly, art thou not in fault? Be still!” The Septuagint evidently took the rebuke to turn upon Cain’s neglect to prepare his offering according to strict ceremonial requirements. [δἰλας διελθείσα] (Septuagint in the place cited.), however, implies [nathach] (Exodus 29:17; Leviticus 8:20; Judges 19:29; 1 Kings 18:23; and see COUCH).

3. A RIGHTEOUS MAN:

The true reason for the Divine preference is doubtless to be found in the disposition of the brothers (see CAIN). Well-doing consisted not in the outward offering (Genesis 4:7) but in the right state of mind and feeling. The acceptability depends on the inner motives and moral characters of the offerers. “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent (abundant, pleion) sacrifice than Cain” (Hebrews 11:4). The “more abundant sacrifice,” Westcott thinks, “suggests the deeper gratitude of Abel, and shows a fuller sense of the claims of God” to the best. Cain’s “works (the collective expression of his inner life) were evil, and his brother’s righteous” (1 John 3:12). “It would be an outrage if the gods looked to gifts and sacrifices and not to the soul” (Alcibiades II.149E.150A). Cain’s
heart was no longer pure; it had a criminal propensity, springing from envy and jealousy, which rendered both his offering and person unacceptable. His evil works and hatred of his brother culminated in the act of murder, specifically evoked by the opposite character of Abel’s works and the acceptance of his offering. The evil man cannot endure the sight of goodness in another.

**4. A MARTYR:**

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

**5. A TYPE:**

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

*M. O. Evans*

**ABEL (2)**

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

**ABEL-BETH-MAACAH**

<ə-bel-beth-ma’-a-ka> (אֵבֶל יִתָּה דְמַעְכָּה [‘abhel beth ma’akhah], “the meadow of the house of Maacah”): The name appears in this form in 1 Kings 15:20 and 2 Kings 15:29. In 2 Samuel 20:15 (Hebrew) it is
Abel-beth-hammaacah (Maacah with the article). In 20:14 it appears as Beth-maacah, and in 20:14 and 18 as Abel.

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

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

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

_Willis J. Beecher_

**ABEL-CHERAMIM**

<\'a-bel-ker\'a-im> (אֵבֶל-כְּרָמִים ['ahbel keramim], “meadow of vineyards”): A city mentioned in the Revised Version (British and American) in Judges 11:33, along with Aroer, Minnith, and “twenty cities,” in summarizing Jephthah’s campaign against the Ammonites. The King James Version translates “the plain of the vineyards.” The site has not been identified, though Eusebius and Jerome speak of it as in their time a village about seven Roman miles from the Ammonite city of Rabbah.

**ABEL-MAIM**

<\'a-bel-ma\'im> (אֵבֶל-מַיִם ['ahbel mayim], “meadow of water”).

_See ABEL-BETH-MAACAH._
ABEL-MEHOLAH

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

Abel-meholah is also mentioned in connection with the jurisdiction of Baana, one of Solomon’s twelve commissary officers (1 Kings 4:12) as below Jezreel, with Beth-shean and Zarethan in the same list.

Jerome and Eusebius speak of Abel-meholah as a tract of country and a town in the Jordan valley, about ten Roman miles South of Beth-shean. At just that point the name seems to be perpetuated in that of the Wady Malib, and Abel-meholah is commonly located near that Wady, or the neighboring Wady Helweh, comes down into the Jordan valley.

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABEL-MIZRAIM

<α’-bel-mi-z’-ra-im> (אֱֱבֱלְ-מִצְרַיִם) [’abhel mitsrayim], “meadow of Egypt”): A name given to “the threshing floor of Atad,” East of the Jordan and North of the Dead Sea, because Joseph and his funeral party from Egypt there held their mourning over Jacob (Genesis 50:11). The name is a pun. The Canaanite residents saw the [’ebhel], “the mourning,” and therefore that place was called [’abhel mitsrayim].

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

*Willis J. Beecher*

**ABEL-SHITTIM**

<\(\text{A}^\prime\text{B}^\prime\text{L}^\prime\text{S}^\prime\text{H}^\prime\text{T}^\prime\text{T}^\prime\text{I}^\prime\text{M}\)>

\(\text{[} \text{’} \text{a} \text{b} \text{h} \text{e} \text{l} \text{h} \text{a} \text{–} \text{S} \text{h} \text{i} \text{T} \text{T} \text{I} \text{m}] \), “the meadow of the Acacias”): The name appears only in Numbers 33:49; but the name Shittim is used to denote the same locality (Numbers 25:1; Joshua 2:1; 3:1; Joshua 3:1; Micah 6:5). The name always has the article, and the best expression of it in English would be “the Acacias.” `The valley of the Acacias’ (Joel 3:18 (4:18)) is, apparently, a different locality.

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

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

<\textit{a’-bez}>: Used in the King James Version (Joshua 19:20) for &EBEZ, which see.

ABGAR; ABGARUS; ABAGARUS

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

A. L. Breslich

ABHOR

<\textit{ab-hor’}>: “To cast away,” “reject,” “despise,” “defy,” “contemn,” “loathe,” etc. (1) Translated in the Old Testament from the following Hebrew words amongst others: (זָאש [ba’ash]), “to be or to become stinking” (1 Samuel 27:12; 2 Samuel 16:21); (גַּע [ga’al]), “to cast away as unclean,” “to loathe”; compare Ezekiel 16:5 the King James Version; (כַּע [quts]), “to loathe,” “to fear” (Exodus 1:12 m; Kings 11:25; Isaiah 7:16); (שַׁע [shaqats]), “to detest” (Psalm 22:24); (תַּע [ta’abh]), (תַּע [ta’abh]), “to contemn” (Deuteronomy 23:7); (דִּר [dera’on]), “an object of contempt,” “an abhorring” (Isaiah 66:24; Daniel 12:2 margin). (2) Translated in the New Testament from the following Greek words: \textit{bdelussomai}, which is
derived from *bdeo*, “to stink” (<sup> Rd </sup>Romans 2:22); *apostugeo*, derived from *stugeo*, “to hate,” “to shrink from” (<sup> Rd </sup>Romans 12:9).

**A. L. Breslich**

**ABI (1)**

<sup>a’-bi</sup> (אָ֫בִי [*’abhi*]): The name of the mother of King Hezekiah, as given in <sup>2</sup> Kings 18:2. Most naturally explained as a contraction of Abijah (“Yahweh is a father,” or “is my father”), found in the parallel passage in <sup>2</sup> Chronicles 29:1. The spelling in the oldest translations seems to indicate that [*’abhi*] is not a copyist’s error, but a genuine contracted form. She is spoken of as the daughter of Zechariah, and was of course the wife of Ahaz.

**ABI (2)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

A satisfactory discussion of this is possible only under a comprehensive study of Bible names. The argument is more or less complicated by the fact that each scholar looks to see what bearing it may have on the critical theories he holds. In the Hebrew Lexicon of Dr. Francis Brown the explanations exclude the construct theory; in most of the instances they treat a name as a sentence with “my father” as the subject; when the second part of the name is a designation of Deity they commonly make that the subject, and either exclude the pronoun or give it as an alternative.
For most persons the safe method is to remember that the final decision is not yet reached, and to consider each name by itself, counting the explanation of it an open question.

See NAMES, PROPER.

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABIA; ABIAH

<ab-i’-a>, <ab-i’-ah>: Variants for &ABIJAH; which see.

ABI-ALBON

<ab-i-al’-bon>, <abi-al’-bon> (אֶבֶּיָלֶבּוֹן) [’abhi `alebhon], meaning not known. Gesenius infers from the Arabic a stem which would give the meaning “father of strength,” and this is at worst not quite so groundless as the conjectures which explain [’alebhon] as a textual misreading for [’el] or [ba`al]): Abi-albon the Arbethite was one of David’s listed heroes (1 Samuel 23:31), called Abiel the Arbethite in 1 Chronicles 11:32. Presumably he was from Beth-arabah (Joshua 15:6,61; 18:22).
ABIASAPH

<\textit{a-bi\textquotesingle-a-saf}>, <\textit{ab-i-a\textquotesingle-saf}> (אַבְיָסָף [\textquoteleft abhi\textquotesingle acaph], “my father has gathered’’): A descendant of Kohath the son of Levi (\textit{Exodus} 6:24; \textit{1 Chronicles} 6:23, 37 (8,22); \textit{1 Chronicles} 9:19). In Chronicles the name is אַבְיָסָף [\textquoteleft ebh-yacaph], which seems to be a mere variant spelling. The Samaritan version has the same form in Exodus. The list in Exodus terminates with Abiasaph, who is to be regarded as the contemporary of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron. The two lists in \textit{1 Chronicles} 6 lead up to the prophet Samuel and the singing companies which David is said to have organized. The list in \textit{1 Chronicles} 9 leads up to the Korahite porters of the time of Nehemiah. Apparently all the lists intentionally omit names, just names enough being given in each to indicate the line.

\textit{Willis J. Beecher}

ABIATHAR

<\textit{a-bi\textquotesingle-a-thar}>, <\textit{ab-i-a\textquotesingle-thar}> (אַבִיתָר [\textquoteleft ebhyathar], “father of super-excellence,” or, “the super-excellent one is father.” With changed phraseology these are the explanations commonly given, though “a father remains” would be more in accord with the ordinary use of the stem [yathar]. The pious Abiathar was still conscious that he had a Father, even after the butchery of his human relatives):

1. THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT:

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

\textit{See AHIMELECH; AHITUB.}

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABIB

<\'bib [(‘abhibh], young ear of barley or other grain, Exodus 9:31; Leviticus 2:14): The first month of the Israelite year, called Nisan in Nehemiah 2:1; Est 3:7, is Abib in Exodus 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; compare Deuteronomy 16:1. Abib is not properly a name of a month, but part of a descriptive phrase, “the month of young ears of grain.” This may indicate the Israelite way of determining the new year (Exodus 12:2), the year beginning with the new moon nearest or next preceding this stage of the growth of the barley. The year thus indicated was practically the same with the old Babylonian year, and presumably came in with Abraham. The Pentateuchal laws do not introduce it, though they define it, perhaps to distinguish it from the Egyptian wandering year.

See CALENDAR.

Willis J. Beecher

ABIDA

<\'ida [(‘abhidha`], “father of knowledge,” or “my father knows”): A son of Midian and grandson of Abraham and Keturah (Genesis 25:4; 1 Chronicles 1:33). Abidah in the King James Version in Genesis.

ABIDAH

<\‘ida>: Used in the King James Version in Genesis 25:4 for &ABIDA, which see.
ABIDAN

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

ABIDE

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

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

Dwight M. Pratt

ABIEL

< a’-bi-el>, <ab’-yel>, <a-bi’-el> ( [‘ḥi’el], “my father is God,” or “God is father”):
(1) A descendant of Benjamin the son of Jacob. Father of Kish the father of King Saul, and also, apparently, the father of Ner the father of Saul’s general, Abner (1 Samuel 9:1; 14:51).

(2) One of David’s mighty men (1 Chronicles 11:32), called Abi-Albon, which see, in 2 Samuel 23:31.

ABIEZER

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

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

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

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

Willis J. Beecher
ABIEZRITE

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

ABIGAIL; ABIGAL

<ab’-i-gal>, <ab’-i-gal> (אֶבֶּיגהֶל  [’abhhighayil], or אֶבֶּיגהֶל  [’abhghayil], three times, or אֶבֶּיגהֶל  [’abhghayil], once; or אֶבֶּיבה  [’abhghayil], once; “father,” or “cause of joy”):

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

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

1. That Nahash was another name of Jesse, as in Isaiah 14:29, [mish-shoresh nachash yetse’] (Qimchi);
2. That Nahash was the wife of Jesse and by him mother of Abigail, which is least probable;
3. That Nahash, the father of Abigail and Zeruiah, having died, his widow became the wife of Jesse, and bore sons to him;
4. That the text of 2 Samuel 17:25 has been corrupted, “daughter of Nahash” having crept into the text. At all events she was the sister of David by the same mother.

Edward Mack

ABIHAIL

<ab’-i-hal> (אֹבִּיהַל, [’abhichayil]; in some manuscripts אֹבִּיָּהל [’abhihayil], when feminine, but best reading is the former: “father, or cause, of strength”): Five persons in the Old Testament are called by this name:

1. A Levite and the father of Zuriel, who in the Wilderness was head of the house of Merari, Levi’s youngest son (Numbers 3:35);
2. The wife of Abishur, a man of the tribe of Judah, in the line of Hazron and Jerahmeel (1 Chronicles 2:29);
3. One of the heads of the tribe of Gad, who dwelt in Gilead of Bashan (1 Chronicles 5:14);
4. Either a wife of Rehoboam, king of Judah, or mother of his wife Mahalath, according to the interpretation of the text (2 Chronicles 11:18); probably the latter view is correct, since there is no conjunction in the text, and since (2 Chronicles 11:19) contemplates only one wife as already mentioned. This being true, she was the wife of
Jerimath, a son of David, and daughter of Eliab, David’s eldest brother. It is interesting to note this frequent intermarriage in the Davidic house; (5) Father of Queen Esther, who became wife of Xerxes (Biblical Ahasuerus) king of Persia, after the removal of the former queen, Vashti, (Est 2:15; 9:29). He was uncle of Mordecai.

Edward Mack

ABIHU

< a-bi’-hu > (אֶבְיִחוּ [’abhihu‘], “father he is,” or “my father he is”): Second son of Aaron, the high priest (<Exodus 6:23>). With his older brother Nadab he “died before Yahweh,” when the two “offered strange fire” (<Leviticus 10:1,2>). It may be inferred from the emphatic prohibition of wine or strong drink, laid upon the priests immediately after this tragedy, that the two brothers were going to their priestly functions in an intoxicated condition (<Leviticus 10:8-11). Their death is mentioned three times in subsequent records (<Numbers 3:4; Numbers 26:61; 1 Chronicles 24:2>).

ABIHUD

< a-bi’-hud אֶבְיָהוֹד > ([’abhihudh], “father of majesty,” or “my father is majesty,” though some regard the second part as the proper name Judah): The son of Bela the oldest son of Benjamin (<1 Chronicles 8:3>).

ABIJAH

< a-bi’-ja > (אֶבְיִיחַ [’abiyah] or אֶבְיִיחַ [’abiyahu] <2 Chronicles 13:20,21), “my father is Yahweh,” or “Yahweh is father”): The name of six or more men and two women in the Old Testament.

(1) The seventh son of Becher the son of Benjamin (<1 Chronicles 7:8>.

(2) The second son of the prophet Samuel (<1 Samuel 8:2; 1 Chronicles 6:28 (6:13)).
(3) The eighth among “the holy captains and captains of God” appointed by lot by David in connection with the priestly courses (1 Chronicles 24:10). Compare “Zacharias of the course of Abijah” (Luke 1:5).

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

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

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

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

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

(6) A priest of Nehemiah’s time, who sealed the covenant (Nehemiah 10:7). Conjecturally the same with the one mentioned in Nehemiah 12:4,17.

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

(8) The mother of King Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 29:1), called Abi in 2 Kings.

See ABI.

Willis J. Beecher
ABIJAM

<ab-i’-jam> (אֲבִיָּם [’abhiyam], “father of sea,” or, “father of west”). The name given in Kings (1 Kings 14:31; 15:1,7,8) to the son of Rehoboam who succeeded him as king of Judah.

See ABIJAH.

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

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABILA

<ab’-i-la>.

See ABILENE.

ABILENE

<a-bi-le’-ne> ([Ἀβιλήνη, Abilene], Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus; [Ἄβιληνη, Abilene], Codex Sinaiticus): Mentioned in Luke
3:1 as the tetrarchy of Lysanias at the time when John the Baptist began his ministry. The district derived its name from Abila, its chief town, which was situated, according to the Itinerarium Antonini, 18 Roman miles from Damascus on the way to Heliopolis (Baalbec). This places it in the neighborhood of the village of Suk Wady Barada (see ABANA), near which there are considerable ancient remains, with an inscription in Greek stating that a “freedman of Lysanias the tetrarch” made wall and built a temple, and another in Latin recording the repair of the road “at the expense of the Abilenians.” The memory of the ancient name probably survives in the Moslem legend which places the tomb of Abel in a neighboring height where there are ruins of a temple. Josephus calls this Abila, he Lusaniou, literally, “the Abilene of Lysanius,” thus distinguishing it from other towns of the same name, and as late as the time of Ptolemy (circa 170 AD) the name of Lysanias was associated with it.

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

See LYSANIAS.

C. H. Thomson

ABILITY

<abiliti> ([δύναμις, dunamis], or [ischus]): Variously used of resources, material, mental and spiritual; e.g. of wealth, “gave after their ability” ([Ezra 2:69]); of mental endowment, “ability to stand in the king’s palace” ([Daniel 1:4]); of talents and character, “several ability” ([Matthew 25:15]); of spiritual strength, “minister, as of the ability which God giveth” (the King James Version 1 Peter 4:11). It thus may signify either possessions, native capacity, or gifts of the Holy Spirit.
**ABIMAEL**

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

**Willis J. Beecher**

**ABIMELECH**

\[\text{<a-bim’-e-lek> \text{[‘abhimelekh], “father of a king”): A name borne by five Old Testament persons.}\]

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

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

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

(4) A son of Gideon (Judges 9) who aspired to be king after the death of his father, and did rule three years (\textsuperscript{Judges 9:22}). He first won the support of the members of his mother’s family and their recommendation of himself to all Israel (\textsuperscript{Judges 9:3,4}). He then murdered all the sons of his father, seventy in number, at Ophrah, the family home in the tribe of Manasseh, Jotham the youngest son alone escaping (\textsuperscript{Judges 9:5}). After this Abimelech was made ruler by an assembly of the people at Shechem. An insurrection led by Gaal the son of Ebed having broken out in Shechem, Abimelech, although he succeeded in capturing that city, was wounded to death by a mill-stone, which a woman dropped from the wall upon his
head, while he was storming the citadel of Thebez, into which the defeated rebels had retreated, after that city also had been taken (Judges 9:50-53). Finding that he was mortally wounded and in order to avoid the shame of death at a woman’s hand, he required his armor-bearer to kill him with his sword (Judges 9:54). His cruel treatment of the Shechemites (Judges 9:46-49), when they took refuge from him in their strong tower, was a just judgment for their acquiescence in his crimes (Judges 9:20,57); while his own miserable death was retribution for his bloody deeds (Judges 9:56).

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

Edward Mack

ABINADAB

<\textit{a-bin’-a-dab}> (אֵבִּינָדָב [’abhinadhabh], “father of willingness,” or, “my father is willing.” This is according to the ordinary usage of the second word in the name — ”willing” rather than “munificent” or “noble”):

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

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

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

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

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABINOAM

<ab-i-no’am>, <a-bin’o-am> (עבניאמא [’abhino`am], “father of pleasantness,” or, “my father is pleasantness”): A man of Kedesh-naphtali, the father of Barak who defeated the army of Jabin and Sisera ( Judges 4:6,12; 5:1,12).

ABIRAM

<ab-i’ram> (עבירם [’abhiram], “exalted father,” or, “my father is an exalted one”):

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

See KORAH.

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

Willis J. Beecher

ABIRON

<abi’-ron> (ʿAbîrôn, Abeiron): (1) The Septuagint form (Ecclesiasticus 45:18 the King James Version) of Abiram, one of the sons of Eliab, who, with his brother Dathan, and with one of the same tribe, joined the conspiracy against Moses and Aaron
The eldest son of Hiel, the Bethelite, who died prematurely, thus fulfilling the doom pronounced on the posterity of him who should undertake to rebuild Jericho (1 Kings 16:34).

See ABIRAM.

ABISEI

<ab-i-se’-i>.

See ABISSEI.

ABISHAG

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

Willis J. Beecher
ABISHAI

<ab’-i-shi>, <a-bi’-shi> (אָבִישָׁי) [’abhishai]; in Chronicles עִבִּישָׁי [’abhishai]; meaning is doubtful, probably “my father is Jesse,” BDB): Son of Zeruiah, David’s sister, and one of the three famous brothers, of whom Joab and Asahel were the other two (2 Samuel 2:18). He was chief of the second group of three among David’s “mighty men” (2 Samuel 23:18). He first appears with David, who was in the Wilderness of Ziph, to escape Saul. When David called for a volunteer to go down into Saul’s camp by night, Abishai responded, and counseled the killing of Saul when they came upon the sleeping king (1 Samuel 26:6-9). In the skirmish between the men of Ishbosheth and the men of David at Gibeon, in which Asahel was killed by Abner, Abishai was present (2 Samuel 2:18,24). He was with and aided Joab in the cruel and indefensible murder of Abner, in revenge for their brother Asahel (2 Samuel 3:30). In David’s campaign against the allied Ammonites and Syrians, Abishai led the attack upon the Ammonites, while Joab met the Syrians; the battle was a great victory for Israel (2 Samuel 10:10-14). He was always faithful to David, and remained with him, as he fled from Absalom. When Shimei, of the house of Saul, cursed the fleeing king, Abishai characteristically wished to kill him at once (2 Samuel 16:8,9); and when the king returned victorious Abishai advised the rejection of Shimei’s penitence, and his immediate execution (2 Samuel 19:21). In the battle with Absalom’s army at Mahanaim Abishai led one division of David’s army, Joab and Ittai commanding the other two (2 Samuel 18:2). With Joab he put down the revolt against David of Sheba, a man of Benjamin (2 Samuel 20:6,10), at which Joab treacherously slew Amasa his cousin and rival, as he had likewise murdered Abner, Abishai no doubt being party to the crime. In a battle with the Philistines late in his life, David was faint, being now an old man, and was in danger of death at the hands of the Philistine giant Ishbihenob when Abishai came to his rescue and killed the giant (2 Samuel 21:17). In the list of David’s heroes (2 Samuel 23) Abishai’s right to leadership of the “second three” is based upon his overthrowing three hundred men with his spear (2 Samuel 23:18). He does not appear in the struggle of Adonijah against Solomon, in which Joab was the leader, and therefore is supposed to have died before that time.
He was an impetuous, courageous man, but less cunning than his more famous brother Joab, although just as cruel and relentless toward rival or foe. David understood and feared their hardness and cruelty. Abishai’s best trait was his unswerving loyalty to his kinsman, David.

Edward Mack

ABISHALOM

<\textit{a-bish’-a-lom}>: Variant of ABSALOM, which see.

ABISHUA

<\textit{a-bish’-u-a}>, <\textit{abi-shoo’-a}> (אבישוא [’abhishua‘], uncertain, perhaps “father of wealth,” or “my father is wealth”):

(1) A son of Bela the son of Benjamin (\textsuperscript{1} Chronicles 8:4).

(2) The son of Phinehas, who was grandson to Aaron (\textsuperscript{1} Chronicles 6:4,5,50; \textsuperscript{2} Ezra 7:5).

ABISHUR

<\textit{a-bi’-shur}> (אבישור [’abhishur], “my father is a wall”): Great-grandson of Jerahmeel and Atarah, Jerahmeel being great-grandson of Judah. Abishur was son of Shammai, and was the husband of Abihail, and the father of sons (\textsuperscript{1} Chronicles 2:28,29).

ABISSEI

<\textit{a-bis’-e-i}> (King James Version Abisei): An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2) = Abisue (1 Esdras 8:2) and Abishua (\textsuperscript{1} Chronicles 6:4 ff, \textsuperscript{2} Ezra 7:5).

ABISUE

<\textit{a-bis’-u-e}> (Codex Vaticanus, [’A\betaisai, Abisai]; Codex Alexandrinus, Abisouai; the King James Version Abisum = Abishua (\textsuperscript{1} Chronicles 6:4 ff, \textsuperscript{2} Ezra 7:5) and Abissei (2 Esdras 1:2)): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2).
ABISUM

<ab’-i-sum>.

See ABISUE (Apocrypha).

ABITAL

<ab’-i-tal>, <a-bi’-tal> (‘.abhiTel, “my father is dew”): One of the wives of King David. In the duplicated list (<130303>2 Samuel 3:4; <130301>1 Chronicles 3:3) in which the sons born to David in Hebron are mentioned and numbered, the fifth is said to be Shephatiah the son of Abital.

ABITUB

<ab’-i-tub>, <a-bi’-tub> (‘abhiTubh, “father of goodness,” or, “my father is goodness”): In the King James Version Ahitub. A descendant of Benjamin and son of Shaharaim and Hushim, born in the field of Moab (<130811>1 Chronicles 8:11).

ABIUD

<a-bi’-ud> (’Aβιουδ, ‘Abioud], perhaps “my father is majesty”; see &ABIHUD): Mentioned in the genealogy of Jesus (<400113>Matthew 1:13 and not elsewhere) as the son of Zerubbabel.

See GENEALOGY.

ABJECT

<ab’-jekt>: Only as a noun, and but once (<193515>Psalm 35:15) for [nekheh], literally, “smitten ones,” i.e. “men of the lowest grade” (Hengstenberg, Delitzsch), “the rabble,” defined by the succeeding clause as those of such inferior station that they were unknown.

ABLE

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

**ABLUTION**

<ab-lu’-shun>: The rite of ablution for religious purification seems to have 
been practiced in some form in all lands and at all times. The priests of 
Egypt punctiliously practiced it (Herodotus ii.37). The Greeks were 
warned “never with unwashed hands to pour out the black wine at morn to 
Zeus” (Hesiod, Opera et Dies v.722; compare Homer, Iliad vi.266; Od. 
iv.759). The Romans also observed it (Virgil, Aeneid ii.217); as did and do 
Orientals in general (compare Koran, Sura 5:8, etc.).

Ablutions for actual or ritual purification form quite a feature of the Jewish 
life and ceremonial. No one was allowed to enter a holy place or to 
approach God by prayer or sacrifice without having first performed the 
rite of ablution, or “sanctification,” as it was sometimes called (Exodus 
19:10; 1 Samuel 16:5; 2 Chronicles 29:5; compare Josephus, Ant, 
XIV, xi, 5).

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

(1) washing of the hands,

(2) washing of the hands and feet, and

(3) immersion of the whole body in water. (1 and 2 = Greek [νίπτω, 
nipto]; 3 = Greek [λουω, louo]).

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

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

Bathing in the modern and non-religious sense is rarely mentioned in the Scriptures (Exodus 2:5 Pharaoh’s daughter; 2 Samuel 11:2 the Revised Version (British and American) Bathsheba, and the interesting case 1 Kings 22:38). Public baths are first met with in the Greek period — included in the “place of exercise” (1 Macc 1:14), and remains of such buildings from the Roman period are numerous. Recently a remarkable series of bath-chambers have been discovered at Gezer, in Palestine, in connection with a building which is supposed to be the palace built by Simon Maccabeus (Kennedy (illust. in PEFS, 1905, 294 f)).

The rite of ablution was observed among early Christians also. Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, X, 4.40) tells of Christian churches being supplied with fountains or basins of water, after the Jewish custom of providing the laver for the use of the priests. The Apostolical Constitutions (VIII.32) have the rule: “Let all the faithful .... when they rise from sleep, before they go to work, pray, after having washed themselves” nipsamenoi.

The attitude of Jesus toward the rabbinical law of ablution is significant. Mark (7:3) prepares the way for his record of it by explaining, `The Pharisees and all the Jews eat not except they wash their hands to the wrist (pugme). (See LTJM, II, 11). According to Matthew 15:1-20 and Mark 7:1-23 Pharisees and Scribes that had come from Jerusalem (i.e. the strictest) had seen some of Jesus’ disciples eat bread with unwashed hands, and they asked Him: “Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.” Jesus’ answer was to the Jews, even to His own disciples, in the highest degree surprising, paradoxical, revolutionary (compare Matthew 12:8). They could not but see that it applied not merely to hand-washing, but to the whole matter of clean and unclean food; and this to them was one of the most vital parts of the Law (compare Acts 10:14). Jesus saw that the masses of the Jews, no less than the Pharisees, while scrupulous about ceremonial purity, were careless of inward purity. So here, as in the
Sermon on the Mount, and with reference to the Sabbath (Matthew 12:1 ff), He would lead them into the deeper and truer significance of the Law, and thus prepare the way for setting aside not only the traditions of the elders that made void the commandments of God, but even the prescribed ceremonies of the Law themselves, if need be, that the Law in its higher principles and meanings might be “fulfilled.” Here He proclaims a principle that goes to the heart of the whole matter of true religion in saying: “Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites” (Mark 7:6-13) — you who make great pretense of devotion to God, and insist strenuously on the externals of His service, while at heart you do not love Him, making the word of God of none effect for the sake of your tradition!

**LITERATURE.**

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

*George B. Eager*

**ABNER**

<ab'-ner> ([‘abhner]; in Samuel 14:50 the Hebrew has the fuller form, [‘abhinir], Abiner; compare Abiram by the side of Abram; meaning, “my father is a lamp”): Captain of the host under Saul and Ishbosheth (Eshbaal). He was Saul’s cousin; Ner the father of Abner and Kish the father of Saul being brothers, the sons of Abiel (1 Samuel 14:50 f). In 1 Chronicles 8:33; 9:39 the text appears to be faulty; read: And Ner begat Abner, and Kish begat Saul. According to 1 Chronicles 27:21 Abner had a son by the name of Jaasil.

Abner was to Saul what Joab was to David. Despite the many wars waged by Saul, we hear little of Abner during Saul’s lifetime. Not even in the account’ of the battle of Gilboa is mention made of him. Yet both his high office and his kinship to the king must have brought the two men in close contact. On festive occasions it was the custom of Abner to sit at table by the king’s side (1 Samuel 20:25). It was Abner who introduced the young David fresh from his triumph over Goliath to the king’s court (so
according to the account in 1 Samuel 17:57). We find Abner accompanying the king in his pursuit of David (1 Samuel 26:5 ff). Abner is rebuked by David for his negligence in keeping watch over his master (ibid., 15).

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

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

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

Max L. Margolis
ABODE

*a-bod’*.

*See ABIDE.*

ABOLISH

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

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

*M. O. Evans*
ABOMINATION

\(<\text{a-bom-i-na'-shun}>\) (אבום [piggul], אֲבִימה [to`ebhah], שֵׁקֵטס [sheqets]): Three distinct Hebrew words are rendered in the English Bible by “abomination,” or “abominable thing,” referring (except in Genesis 43:32; 46:34) to things or practices abhorrent to Yahweh, and opposed to the ritual or moral requirements of His religion. It would be well if these words could be distinguished in translation, as they denote different degrees of abhorrence or loathsomeness.

The word most used for this idea by the Hebrews and indicating the highest degree of abomination is אֲבִימה [to`ebhah], meaning primarily that which offends the religious sense of a people. When it is said, for example, “The Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians,” this is the word used; the significance being that the Hebrews were repugnant to the Egyptians as foreigners, as of an inferior caste, and especially as shepherds (Genesis 46:34).

The feeling of the Egyptians for the Greeks was likewise one of repugnance. Herodotus (ii.41) says the Egyptians would not kiss a Greek on the mouth, or use his dish, or taste meat cut with the knife of a Greek.

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

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

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

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

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

See also ABHOR.

LITERATURE.

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

George B. Eager

ABOMINATION, BIRDS OF

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

Deuteronomy 14:12-18 gives the glede in addition.

Each of these birds is treated in order in this work. There are two reasons why Moses pronounced them an abomination for food. Either they had rank, offensive, tough flesh, or they were connected with religious superstition. The eagle, gier-eagle, osprey, kite, glede, falcon, raven, night-hawk, sea-mew, hawk, little owl, cormorant, great owl, horned owl, pelican and vulture were offensive because they were birds of prey or ate carrion or fish until their flesh partook of the odor of their food. Young ostriches have sweet, tender flesh and the eggs are edible also. In putting these birds among the abominations Moses must have been thinking of grown specimens. (Ostriches live to a remarkable age and on account of the distances they cover, and their speed in locomotion, their muscles become almost as hard as bone.) There is a trace of his early Egyptian training when he placed the stork and the heron on this list. These birds, and the crane as well, abounded in all countries known at that time and were used for food according to the superstitions of different nations. These three were closely related to the ibis which was sacred in Egypt and it is probable that they were protected by Moses for this reason, since they were eaten by other nations at that time and cranes are used for food today by natives of our southeastern coast states and are to be found in the markets of our western coast. The veneration for the stork that exists throughout the civilized world today had its origin in Palestine. Noting the devotion of mated pairs and their tender care for the young the Hebrews named the bird [chacidhah], which means kindness. Carried down the history of ages with additions by other nations, this undoubtedly accounts for the story now universal, that the stork delivers newly-born children to their homes; so the bird is loved and protected. One ancient Roman writer, Cornelius Nepos, recorded that in his time both crane and storks were eaten; storks were liked the better. Later, Pliny wrote that no one would touch a stork, but everyone was fond of crane. In Thessaly it was a capital crime to kill a stork. This change from regarding the stork as a delicacy to its protection by a death penalty merely indicates the hold the characteristics of the bird had taken on people as it became better known, and also the spread of the regard in which it was held throughout Palestine. The hoopoe (which see) was offensive to Moses on account of extremely
filthy nesting habits, but was considered a great delicacy when captured in migration by residents of southern Europe.

See also ABOMINATION; BIRDS, UNCLEAN.

Gene Stratton-Porter

ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION

<des-o-la’-shun>: The Hebrew root for abomination is יָנָּה [shaqats], “to be filthy,” “to loathe,” “to abhor,” from which is derived יָנָּהַשָּׁה [shiqquts] is יָנָּהַוָּ, “filthy,” especially “idolatrous.” This word is used to describe specific forms of idolatrous worship that were specially abhorrent, as of the Ammonites (1 Kings 11:5,7); of the Moabites (1 Kings 11:7; 2 Kings 23:13). When Daniel undertook to specify an abomination so surpassingly disgusting to the sense of morality and decency, and so aggressive against everything that was godly as to drive all from its presence and leave its abode desolate, he chose this as the strongest among the several synonyms, adding the qualification “that maketh desolate” (Daniel 11:31; 12:11), Septuagint [βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, bdel-ug-ma er-e-mo-se-os]. The same noun, though in the plural, occurs in Deuteronomy 29:17; 2 Kings 23:24; Isaiah 66:3; Jeremiah 4:1; 7:30; 13:27; 32:34; Ezekiel 20:7,8,30; Daniel 9:27; Hosea 9:10; Zechariah 9:7. The New Testament equivalent of the noun is [βδέλυγμα, bdel-ug-ma] = “detestable,” i.e. (specially) “idolatrous.” Alluding to Daniel, Christ spoke of the “abomination of desolation” (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14).

1. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

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

2. ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES:

Antiochus IV, son of Antiochus the Great, became the successor of his brother, Seleucus IV, who had been murdered by his minister, Heliodorus, as king of Syria (175-164 BC). He was by nature a despot; eccentric and unreliable; sometimes a spendthrift in his liberality, fraternizing in an affected manner with those of lower station; sometimes cruel and tyrannical, as witness his aggressions against Judea. Polybius (26 10) tells us that his eccentric ideas caused some to speak of him as a man of pure motive and humble character, while others hinted at insanity. The epithet Epiphanes is an abbreviation of theos epiphanes, which is the designation given himself by Antiochus on his coins, and means “the god who appears or reveals himself.” Egyptian writers translate the inscription, “God which comes forth,” namely, like the burning sun, Horos, on the horizon, thus identifying the king with the triumphal, appearing god. When Antiochus Epiphanes arose to the throne, Onias III, as high priest, was the leader of
the old orthodox party in Judea; the head of the Hellenists was his own brother Jesus, or, as he preferred to designate himself, Jason, this being the Greek form of his name and indicating the trend of his mind. Jason promised the king large sums of money for the transfer of the office of high priest from his brother to himself and the privilege of erecting a gymnasium and a temple to Phallus, and for the granting of the privilege “to enroll the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch.” Antiochus gladly agreed to everything. Onias was removed, Jason became high priest, and henceforth the process of Hellenizing Judea was pushed energetically. The Jewish cult was not attacked, but the “legal institutions were set aside, and illegal practices were introduced” (2 Macc 4:11). A gymnasium was erected outside the castle; the youth of Jerusalem exercised themselves in the gymnastic art of the Greeks, and even priests left their services at the altar to take part in the contest of the palaestra. The disregard of Jewish custom went so far that many artificially removed the traces of circumcision from their bodies, and with characteristic liberality, Jason even sent a contribution to the sacrifices in honor of Heracles on the occasion of the quadrennial festivities in Tyre.

3. THE SUPPRESSION OF THE JEWISH CULT:

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

Frank E. Hirsch

**ABOUND; ABUNDANCE; ABUNDANT; ABUNDANTLY**

*a-bound’*, *a-bun’-dans*, *a-bun’-dant*, *a-bun’-dant-li*: These words represent in the English Versions of the Bible a considerable variety of different words in the Hebrew and Greek original. In the Old Testament they most frequently stand for some form of the stem [rabh], signifying “to cast together,” “to increase.” In Proverbs 8:24 the primary idea is “to be heavy” (root: [kabhadh]); in Deuteronomy 33:19 and Job 22:11 it is “to overflow” [shapha’]; in Job 36:31 it is “to plait together,” “to augment,” “to multiply” ([makhbir] from [ka-bhar]); in Isaiah 47:9 it is “strength” [`otsmah]; in I Kings 18:41 it is “tumult,” “crowd” [hamon]; in Ecclesiastes 5:12 it is “to fill to satiety” (Revised Version (British and American) “fulness”); in Isaiah 15:7 it is “excellence” [yithrah] and in 66:11 “a full breast” [ziz]; in Jeremiah 33:6 it is “copiousness” ( [`athereth] from [`athar]). In several passages (e.g. Ezekiel 16:49, Psalm 105:30, Isaiah 56:12) the Revised Version (British and American) gives other and better renderings than the King James Version. In the New Testament *perissos*, *perisseuo*, *perisseia*, etc., are the usual words for “abundant,” “abound,” “abundance,” etc. (the adjective signifies “exceeding some number or measure”). A slight formal difference of conception may be noted in *pleonazo*, which suggests that the abundance has resulted from augmentation. In Romans 5:20 the two words stand in the closest connection: ‘Where sin abounded (by its increase) grace abounded more exceedingly (was rich beyond measure).’ In Mark 12:44; Luke 21:4; 2 Corinthians 8:20; 12:7; Revelation 18:3 the Revised Version (British and American) gives improved renderings instead of “abundance,” and in Titus 3:6 and 2 Peter 1:11 instead of “abundantly.”
ABOUT

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

ABRAHAM

\textit{\textless a\text{-}bra\text{-}ham\textgreater}:

1. NAME.

1. Various Forms:

In the Old Testament, when applied, to the patriarch, the name appears as \textit{\textgreek{abram}}, up to \textit{Genesis 17:5}; thereafter always as \textit{\textgreek{abraham}}. Two other persons are named \textit{\textgreek{abiram}}. The identity of this name with \textit{\textgreek{abram}} cannot be doubted in view of the variation between \textit{\textgreek{abhiner}} and \textit{\textgreek{abhner}}, \textit{\textgreek{abhishalom}} and \textit{\textgreek{abhshalom}}, etc. Abraham also appears in the list at Karnak of places conquered by Sheshonk I: ‘brm (no. 72) represents \textit{\textgreek{abram}}, with which Spiegelberg (Aegypt. Randglossen zum Altes Testament, 14) proposes to connect the preceding name (so that the whole would read “the field of Abram.” Outside of Palestine this name (Abiram) has come to light just where from the Biblical tradition we should expect to find it, namely, in Babylonia (e.g. in a contract of the reign of Apil-Sin, second predecessor of Hammurabi; also for the aunt (!) of Esarhaddon 680-669 BC). Ungnad has recently found it, among documents from Dilbat dating from the Hammurabi dynasty, in the forms A-ba-am-ra-ma, A-ba-am-ra-ram, as well as A-ba-ra-ma.
2. Etymology:

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

3. Association:

While the name is thus not “Hebrew” in origin, it made itself thoroughly at home among the Hebrews, and to their ears conveyed associations quite different from its etymological signification. “Popular etymology” here as so often doubtless led the Hebrew to hear in [’abh-ram], “exalted father,” a designation consonant with the patriarch’s national and religious significance. In the form ‘abh-raham his ear caught the echo of some root (perhaps r-h-m; compare Arabic ruham, “multitude”) still more suggestive of the patriarch’s extensive progeny, the reason (“for”) that accompanies the change of name ⁸Genesis 17:5 being intended only as a verbal echo of the sense in the sound. This longer and commoner form is possibly a dialectical variation of the shorter form, a variation for which there are analogies in comparative Semitic grammar. It is, however, possible also that the two forms are different names, and that [’abh-raham] is etymologically, and not merely by association of sound, “father of a multitude” (as above). (Another theory, based on South-Arabic orthography, in Hommel, Altsisraelitische Ueberlieferung, 177.)
2. KINDRED.

Genesis 11:27, which introduces Abraham, contains the heading, “These are the generations of Terah.” All the story of Abraham is contained within the section of Genesis so entitled. Through Terah Abraham’s ancestry is traced back to Shem, and he is thus related to Mesopotamian and Arabian families that belonged to the “Semitic” race. He is further connected with this race geographically by his birthplace, which is given as [’ur-kasdim] (see UR), and by the place of his pre-Canaanitish residence, Haran in the Aramean region. The purely Semitic ancestry of his descendants through Isaac is indicated by his marriage with his own half-sister (Genesis 20:12), and still further emphasized by the choice for his daughter-in-law of Rebekah, descended from both of his brothers, Nahor and Haran (Genesis 11:29; 22:22 f). Both the beginning and the end of the residence in Haran are left chronologically undetermined, for the new beginning of the narrative at Genesis 12:1 is not intended by the writer to indicate chronological sequence, though it has been so understood, e.g. by Stephen (Acts 7:4). All that is definite in point of time is that an Aramean period of residence intervened between the Babylonian origin and the Palestinian career of Abraham. It is left to a comparison of the Biblical data with one another and with the data of archaeology, to fix the opening of Abraham’s career in Palestine not far from the middle of the 20th century BC.

3. CAREER.

Briefly summed up, that career was as follows.

1. Period of Wandering:

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

2. Period of Residence at Hebron:

Affiliation between Abraham and the local chieftains is strengthened by a brief campaign, in which all unite their available forces for the rescue of Lot from an Elamite king and his confederates from Babylonia. The pursuit leads them as far as the Lebanon region. On the return they are met by Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of [‘el `elyon], and blessed by him in his priestly capacity, which Abraham recognizes by presenting him with a tithe of the spoils. Abraham’s anxiety for a son to be the bearer of the divine promises conferred upon a “seed” yet unborn should have been relieved by the solemn renewal thereof in a formal covenant, with precise specifications of God’s gracious purpose. But human desire cannot wait upon divine wisdom, and the Egyptian woman Hagar bears to Abraham a son, Ishmael, whose existence from its inception proves a source of moral evil within the patriarchal household. The sign of circumcision and the change of names are given in confirmation of the covenant still unrealized, together with specification of the time and the person that should begin its realization. The theophany that symbolized outwardly this climax of the Divine favor serves also for an intercessory colloquy, in which Abraham is granted the deliverance of Lot in the impending overthrow of Sodom. Lot and his family, saved thus by human fidelity and Divine clemency, exhibit in the moral traits shown in their escape and subsequent life the degeneration naturally to be expected from their corrupt environment. Moabites and Ammonites are traced in their origin to these cousins of Jacob and Esau.

3. Period of Residence in the Negeb:

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

4. CONDITIONS OF LIFE.

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

1. Economic Conditions:

Abraham’s manner of life may best be described by the adjective “seminomadic,” and illustrated by the somewhat similar conditions prevailing today in those border-communities of the East that fringe the Syrian and Arabian deserts. Residence is in tents, wealth consists of flocks, herds and slaves, and there is no ownership of ground, only at most a proprietorship in well or tomb. All this in common with the nomad. But there is a relative, or rather, intermittent fixity of habitation, unlike the pure Bedouin, a limited amount of agriculture, and finally a sense of divergence from the Ishmael type — all of which tend to assimilate the seminomadic Abraham to the fixed Canaanitish population about him. As might naturally be expected, such a condition is an unstable equilibrium, which tends, in the
family of Abraham as in the history of all border-tribes of the desert, to settle back one way or the other, now into the city-life of Lot, now into the desert-life of Ishmael.

2. **Social Conditions:**

The head of a family, under these conditions, becomes at the same time the chief of a tribe, that live together under patriarchal rule though they by no means share without exception the tie of kinship. The family relations depicted in Genesis conform to and are illuminated by the social features of Code of Hammurabi. (See K. D. Macmillan, article “Marriage among the Early Babylonians and Hebrews,” Princeton Theological Review, April, 1908.) There is one legal wife, Sarah, who, because persistently childless, obtains the coveted offspring by giving her own maid to Abraham for that purpose (compare Code of Hammurabi, sections 144, 146). The son thus borne, Ishmael, is Abraham’s legal son and heir. When Isaac is later borne by Sarah, the elder son is disinherited by divine command (Genesis 21:10-12) against Abraham’s wish which represented the prevailing law and custom (Code of Hammurabi, sections 168 f). The “maid-servants” mentioned in the inventories of Abraham’s wealth (Genesis 12:16; 24:35) doubtless furnished the “concubines” mentioned in Genesis 25:6 as having borne sons to him. Both mothers and children were slaves, but had the right to freedom, though not to inheritance, on the death of the father (Code of Hammurabi, section 171). After Sarah’s death another woman seems to have succeeded to the position of legal wife, though if so the sons she bore were disinherited like Ishmael (Genesis 25:5). In addition to the children so begotten by Abraham the “men of his house” (Genesis 17:27) consisted of two classes, the “home-born” slaves (Genesis 14:14; 17:12 f,23,27) and the “purchased” slaves (ibid.). The extent of the patriarchal tribe may be surmised from the number (318) of men among them capable of bearing arms, near the beginning of Abraham’s career, yet after his separation from Lot, and recruited seemingly from the “home-born” class exclusively (Genesis 14:14). Over this entire establishment Abraham ruled with a power more, rather than less, absolute than that exhibited in detail in the Code of Hammurabi: more absolute, because Abraham was independent of any permanent superior authority, and so combined in his own person the powers of the Babylonian
paterfamilias and of the Canaanite city-king. Social relations outside of the family-tribe may best be considered under the next heading.

3. Political Conditions:

It is natural that the chieftain of so considerable an organism should appear an attractive ally and a formidable foe to any of the smaller political units of his environment. That Canaan was at the time composed of just such inconsiderable units, namely, city-states with petty kings, and scattered fragments of older populations, is abundantly clear from the Biblical tradition and verified from other sources. Egypt was the only great power with which Abraham came into political contact after leaving the East. In the section of Genesis which describes this contact with the Pharaoh Abraham is suitably represented as playing no political role, but as profiting by his stay in Egypt only through an incidental social relation: when this terminates he is promptly ejected. The role of conqueror of Chedorlaomer, the Elamite invader, would be quite out of keeping with Abraham’s political status elsewhere, if we were compelled by the narrative in Genesis 14 to suppose a pitched battle between the forces of Abraham and those of the united Babylonian armies. What that chapter requires is in fact no more than a midnight surprise, by Abraham’s band (including the forces of confederate chieftains), of a rear-guard or baggage-train of the Babylonians inadequately manned and picketed (“Slaughter” is quite too strong a rendering of the original hakkoth, “smiting,” 14:17) Respect shown Abraham by the kings of Salem (14:18), of Sodom (14:21) and of Gerar (Genesis 20:14-16) was no more than might be expected from their relative degrees of political importance, although a moral precedence, assumed in the tradition, may well have contributed to this respect.

4. Cultural Conditions:

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

5. CHARACTER.

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

1. Religious Beliefs:

The religion of Abraham centered in his faith in one God, who, because believed by him to be possessor of heaven and earth (Genesis 14:22; 24:3), sovereign judge of the nations (Genesis 15:14) of all the earth (Genesis 18:25), disposer of the forces of Nature (Genesis 18:14; 19:24; 20:17 f), exalted and eternal (Genesis 21:33), was for Abraham at least the only God. So far as the Biblical tradition goes, Abraham’s monotheism was not aggressive (otherwise in later Jewish tradition), and it is theoretically possible to attribute to him a merely “monarchical” or “henotheistic” type of monotheism, which would admit the coexistence with his deity, say, of the “gods which (his) fathers served” (Joshua 24:14), or the identity with his deity of the supreme god of some Canaanite neighbor (Genesis 14:18). Yet this distinction of types of monotheism does not really belong to the sphere of religion as such, but rather to that of speculative philosophical thought. As religion, monotheism is just monotheism, and it asserts itself in corollaries drawn by the intellect only so far as the scope of themonotheist’s intellectual life applies it. For Abraham Yahweh not only was alone God; He was also his personal God in a closeness of fellowship (Genesis 24:40; 48:15) that has made him for three religions the type of the pious man (2 Chronicles 20:7; Isaiah 41:8, James 2:23, note the Arabic name of Hebron El-Khalil, i.e. the friend (viz of God)) To Yahweh Abraham attributed the moral attributes of Justice (Genesis 18:25), righteousness (Genesis 18:19), faithfulness (Genesis 24:27), wisdom (Genesis 20:6).
goodness (Genesis 19:19), mercy (Genesis 20:6). These qualities were
expected of men, and their contraries in men were punished by Yahweh
(Genesis 18:19; 20:11). He manifested Himself in dreams (Genesis
20:3), visions (Genesis 15:1) and theophanies (Genesis 18:1),
including the voice or apparition of the Divine mal’akh or messenger
(“angel”) (Genesis 16:7; 22:11) On man’s part, in addition to obedience
to Yahweh’s moral requirements and special commands, the expression of
his religious nature was expected in sacrifice. This bringing of offerings to
the deity was diligently practiced by Abraham, as indicated by the
mention of his erection of an altar at each successive residence. Alongside
of this act of sacrifice there is sometimes mention of a “calling upon the
name” of Yahweh (compare 1 Kings 18:24; Psalm 116:13 f). This
publication of his faith, doubtless in the presence of Canaanites, had its
counterpart also in the public regard in which he was held as a “prophet”
or spokesman for God (Genesis 20:7). His mediation showed itself also
in intercessory prayer (Genesis 17:20 for Ishmael; 18:23-32; compare
19:29 for Lot; 20:17 for Abimelech), which was but a phase of his general
practice of prayer. The usual accompaniment of sacrifice, a professional
priesthood, does not occur in Abraham’s family, yet he recognizes priestly
prerogative in the person of Melchizedek, priest-king of Salem (Genesis
14:20). Religious sanction of course surrounds the taking of oaths
(Genesis 14:22; 24:3) and the sealing of covenants (Genesis 21:23).
Other customs associated with religion are circumcision (Genesis 17:10-
14), given to Abraham as the sign of the perpetual covenant; tithing
(Genesis 14:20), recognized as the priest’s due; and child-sacrifice
(Genesis 22:2,12), enjoined upon Abraham only to be expressly
forbidden, approved for its spirit but interdicted in its practice.

2. Morality:

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

3. Personal Traits:

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

6. SIGNIFICANCE IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.

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

1. In the Old Testament:

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

2. In the New Testament:

When we pass to the New Testament we are astonished at the wealth and variety of allusion to Abraham. As in the Old Testament, his position of ancestor lends him much of his significance, not only as ancestor of Israel (Acts 13:26), but specifically as ancestor, now of the Levitical priesthood (Hebrews 7:5), now of the Messiah (Matthew 1:1), now, by the peculiarly Christian doctrine of the unity of believers in Christ, of Christian believers (Galatians 3:16,29). All that Abraham the ancestor received through Divine election, by the covenant made with him, is inherited by his seed and passes under the collective names of the promise (Romans 4:13), the blessing (Galatians 3:14), mercy (Luke 1:54), the oath (Luke 1:73), the covenant (Acts 3:25). The way in which Abraham responded to this peculiar goodness of God makes him the type of the Christian believer. Though so far in the past that he was used as a measure of antiquity (John 8:58), he is declared to have “seen” Messiah’s “day” (John 8:56). It is his faith in the Divine promise, which, just because it was for him peculiarly unsupported by any evidence of the senses, becomes the type of the faith that leads to justification (Romans 4:3), and therefore in this sense again he is the “father” of
Christians, as believers (Romans 4:11). For that promise to Abraham was, after all, a “preaching beforehand” of the Christian gospel, in that it embraced “all the families of the earth” (Galatians 3:8). Of this exalted honor, James reminds us, Abraham proved himself worthy, not by an inoperative faith, but by “works” that evidenced his righteousness (James 2:21; compare John 8:39). The obedience that faith wrought in him is what is especially praised by the author of Hebrews (Hebrews 11:8,17). In accordance with this high estimate of the patriarch’s piety, we read of his eternal felicity, not only in the current conceptions of the Jews (parable, Luke 16), but also in the express assertion of our Lord (Matthew 8:11; Luke 13:28). Incidental historical allusions to the events of Abraham’s life are frequent in the New Testament, but do not add anything to this estimate of his religious significance.

3. In Jewish Tradition:

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

4. In the Koran:

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

7. INTERPRETATIONS OF THE STORY OTHER THAN THE HISTORICAL.

There are writers in both ancient and modern times who have, from various standpoints, interpreted the person and career of Abraham otherwise than as what it purports to be, namely, the real experiences of a human person named Abraham. These various views may be classified according to the motive or impulse which they believe to have led to the creation of this story in the mind of its author or authors.

1. The Allegorical Interpretation:

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

2. The Personification Theory:

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

3. The Mythical Theory:

Urged popularly by Noldeke (Im neuen Reich (1871), I, 508 ff) and taken up by other scholars, especially in the case of Abraham, the view gained general currency among those who denied the historicity of Genesis, that the patriarchs were old deities. From this relatively high estate, it was held, they had fallen to the plane of mere mortals (though with remnants of the hero or even demigod here and there visible) on which they appear in Genesis. A new phase of this mythical theory has been developed in the elaboration by Winckler and others of their astral-theology of the Babylonian world, in which the worship of Abraham as the moon-god by the Semites of Palestine plays a part. Abraham’s traditional origin connects him with Ur and Haran, leading centers of the moon-cult. Apart from this fact the arguments relied upon to establish this identification of Abraham with Sin may be judged by the following samples: “When further the consort of Abraham bears the name Sarah, and one of the women among his closest relations the name Milcah, this gives food for thought, since these names correspond precisely with the titles of the female deities worshipped at Haran alongside the moongod Sin. Above all, however, the number 318, that appears in \textit{Genesis 14:14} in connection with the figure of Abraham, is convincing because this number, which surely has no historical value, can only be satisfactorily explained from the circle of ideas.
of the moon-religion, since in the lunar year of 354 days there are just 318 days on which the moon is visible — deducting 36 days, or three for each of the twelve months, on which the moon is invisible” (Baentsch, Monotheismus, 60 f). In spite of this assurance, however, nothing could exceed the scorn with which these combinations and conjectures of Winckler, A. Jeremias and others of this school are received by those who in fact differ from them with respect to Abraham in little save the answer to the question, what deity was Abraham (see e.g. Meyer, op. cit., 252 f, 256 f).

4. The “Saga” Theory:

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

J. Oscar Boyd

ABRAHAM, BOOK OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.
ABRAHAM’S BOSOM

<booz’-um> ([κόλπος ’Αβραάμ, kolpos Abraam]; [κόλποι kolpoi Abraam]): Figurative. The expression occurs in Luke 16:22,23, in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, to denote the place of repose to which Lazarus was carried after his death. The figure is suggested by the practice of the guest at a feast reclining on the breast of his neighbor. Thus, John leaned on the breast of Jesus at supper (John 21:20). The rabbis divided the state after death ([Sheol]) into a place for the righteous and a place for the wicked (see ESCHATOLOGY OF OLD TESTAMENT; SHEOL); but it is doubtful whether the figure of Jesus quite corresponds with this idea. “Abraham’s bosom” is not spoken of as in “Hades,” but rather as distinguished from it (Luke 16:23) — a place of blessedness by itself. There Abraham receives, as at a feast, the truly faithful, and admits them to closest intimacy. It may be regarded as equivalent to the “Paradise” of Luke 23:43.

See HADES; PARADISE.

James Orr

ABRAM

<a’-bram>.

See ABRAHAM.

ABRECH

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

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

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

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

Edward Mack

ABROAD

<a-brod>: An idiomatic rendering of [ἀφίκετο aphiketo] (literally, “arrived”), “come abroad” is used in Romans 16:19 to indicate a report that has been most widely diffused (literally, “did reach unto all”). Similar idiomatic translations of the King James Version have been replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by those more literal, as in Mark 4:22; Luke 8:17; Mark 6:14; 1 Thessalonians 1:8. Used also in other idiomatic renderings, as “spread abroad” diaphemizo, Mark 1:45; “noised abroad” dialaleo, Luke 1:65; “scattered abroad,” John 11:52; Acts 8:1, etc.; in all these cases for the pervasive meaning of the Greek preposition in composition. In Genesis 15:5, [chuts] means “outside.”

H. E. Jacobs

ABROAD, SCATTERED

See DISPERSION.
ABRONAH

<\textit{a-bro’-na}>, the King James Version Ebronah (אֲבִרֹנָה [’abhronah]): One of the stations of Israel in the wilderness on the march from Sinai to Kadesh — the station next before that at Ezion-geber on the eastern arm of the Red Sea (Numbers 33:34,35).

ABSALOM (1)

<\textit{ab’-sa-lom}> (אֶבֶּשֶׁלום [’abhshalom], “father is peace,” written also Abishalom, 1 Kings 15:2,10): David’s third son by Maacah, daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur, a small territory between Hermon and Bashan.

1. A GENERAL FAVORITE:

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

2. IN EXILE:

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

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

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

5. ABSALOM’S DEATH AND BURIAL:

When at length Absalom’s forces under the generalship of Amasa (2 Samuel 17:25) reached Gilead, ample time had been given to David to organize his army, which he divided into three divisions under the efficient command of three veteran generals: Joab, Abishai and Ittai (2 Samuel 18:1 ff). A great battle was fought in the forests of Ephraim. Here the rebel army was utterly routed. No fewer than 20,000 were killed outright, and a still greater number becoming entangled in the thick forest, perished that day (2 Samuel 18:7 f). Among the latter was Absalom himself, for while riding upon his mule, his head was caught in the boughs of a great oak or terebinth, probably in a forked branch. “He was taken up between heaven and earth; and the mule that was under him went on” (2 Samuel 18:9). In this position he was found by a soldier who at once ran to inform Joab. The latter without a moment’s hesitation, notwithstanding David’s positive orders, thrust three darts into the heart of Absalom. To make his death certain and encouraged by the action of their general, ten of Joab’s young men “compassed about and smote Absalom, and slew him” (2 Samuel 18:15). He was buried in a great pit, close to the spot where he was killed. A great pile of stones was heaped over his body (2 Samuel 18:17), in accordance with the custom of dishonoring rebels and great
criminals by burying them under great piles of stone (Joshua 7:26; 8:29). Thomson reforms us that Syrian people to this day cast stones upon the graves of murderers and outlaws (LB, II, 61).

6. DAVID’S LAMENT:

The death of Absalom was a source of great grief to the fond and aged father, who forgot the ruler and the king in the tenderhearted parent. His lament at the gate of Mahanaim, though very brief, is a classic, and expresses in tender language the feelings of parents for wayward children in all ages of the world (2 Samuel 18:33). Little is known of Absalom’s family life, but we read in 2 Samuel 14:27 that he had three sons and one daughter. From the language of 18:18, it is inferred that the sons died at an early age.

7. ABSALOM’S TOMB:

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

W. W. Davies

ABSALOM (2)

(Apocrypha) (Codex Vaticanus, [Ἀβεσσάλωμος, Abessalamos] and Abessalom; Codex Alexandrinus, Absalomos, the King James Version Absalon):

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

(2) Father of Jonathan who was sent by Simon Maccabee to take possession of Joppa; perhaps identical with Absalom (1) (1 Macc 13:11; Ant, XIII, vi, 4).
(3) One of two envoys of the Jews, mentioned in a letter sent by Lysias to the Jewish nation (2 Macc 11:17).

**ABSALON**

*<ab’-sa-lon>*.

*See ABSALOM (in the Apocrypha).*

**ABSOLUTION**

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

*See also FORGIVENESS.*

*H. E. Jacobs*

**ABSTINENCE**

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

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

1. PUBLIC FASTS:

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

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

See FASTS.

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

These fasts later fell into utter disuse, but they were revived after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

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

2. PRIVATE FASTS:

In addition to these public solemnities, individuals were in the habit of imposing extra fasts upon themselves (e.g. Judith 8:6; Luke 2:37); and there were some among the Pharisees who fasted on the second and fifth days of the week all the year round (Luke 18:12; see Lightfoot, at the place).

Tacitus alludes to the “frequent fasts” of the Jews (History, V, 4), and Josephus tells of the spread of fasting among the Gentiles (Against Apion, II, 40; compare Tertullian, ad Nat, i.13). There is abundant evidence that many religious teachers laid down rules concerning fasting for their disciples (compare Mark 2:18; Matthew 9:14; Luke 5:33).
3. DEGREES OF STRICTNESS IN ABSTINENCE:

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

4. ABSTINENCE AMONG DIFFERENT KINDS OF ASCETICS:

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

(1) The Essenes.

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

See ESSENES.

(2) The Hermit Ascetics.

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

(3) The Moderate Ascetics.

There were many pious Jews, men and women, who practiced asceticism of a less formal kind. The asceticism of the Pharisees was of a kind which naturally resulted from their legal and ceremonial conception of religion. It expressed itself chiefly, as we have seen, in ostentatious fasting and externalism. But there were not a few humble, devout souls in Israel who, like Anna, the prophetess, served God “with fastings and supplications night and day” (Luke 2:37), seeking by a true self-discipline to draw near unto God (of Acts 13:2,3; 14:23; I Timothy 5:5).

5. ABSTINENCE AS VIEWED IN THE TALMUD:

Some of the rabbis roundly condemned abstinence, or asceticism in any form, as a principle of life. “Why must the Nazirite bring a sin offering at the end of his term?” (Numbers 6:13,14) asks Eliezer ha-Kappar (Siphra’, at the place); and gives answer, “Because he sinned against his own person by his vow of abstaining from wine”; and he concludes, “Whoever undergoes fasting or other penances for no special reason commits a wrong.” “Man in the life to come will have to account for every enjoyment offered him that was refused without sufficient cause” (Rabh, in Yer. Kid., 4). In Maimonides (Ha-Yadh ha-Chazaqah, De’oth 3 1) the monastic principle of abstinence in regard to marriage, eating meat, or drinking wine, or in regard to any other personal enjoyment or comfort, is condemned as “contrary to the spirit of Judaism,” and “the golden middle-way of moderation” is advocated.

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

6. THE ATTITUDE OF JESUS TO FASTING:

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

(1) His Practice.

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

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

(2) His Teaching.

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

According to the record, Jesus alluded to fasting only twice in His teaching. In Matthew 6:16-18, where voluntary fasting is presupposed as a religious exercise of His disciples, He warns them against making it the occasion of a parade of piety: “Thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face; that thou be not seen of men to fast, but of thy Father who is in secret.” In short, He sanctions fasting only as a genuine expression of a devout and contrite frame of mind.
In Matthew 9:14-17 (parallel Mark 2:18-22; Luke 5:33-39) in reply to the question of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees, Jesus refuses to enjoin fasting. He says fasting, as a recognized sign of mourning, would be inconsistent with the joy which “the sons of the bridechamber” naturally feel while “the bridegroom is with them.” But, he adds, suggesting the true reason for fasting, that the days of bereavement will come, and then the outward expression of sorrow will be appropriate. Here, as in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus sanctions fasting, without enjoining it, as a form through which emotion may spontaneously seek expression. His teaching on the subject may be summarized in the one word, subordination (DCG).

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

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

7. THE PRACTICE AND TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES:

On the whole, unquestionably, the practice and teachings of the apostles and early Christians were in harmony with the example and teaching of the Master. But a tendency, partly innate, partly transmitted from Jewish legalism, and partly pagan, showed itself among their successors and gave rise to the Vita Religiosa and Dualism which found their fullest expression in Monasticism.
It is worthy of note that the alleged words of Jesus: `But this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting’ (Mark 9:29; Matthew 17:21 the King James Version), are corruptions of the text. (Compare Tobit 12:8; Sirach 34:26; Luke 2:37). The Oxyrhynchus fragment (disc. 1897) contains a logion with the words legei Iesous, ean me nesteuete ton kosmon, ou me heurete ten basileian tou theou: “Jesus saith, Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the Kingdom of God,” but the “fasting” here is clearly metaphorical.
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ABUBUS

<abubus> (["Ιβοβος, Aboubos]): The father of Ptolemy, who deceitfully slew Simon Maccabee and his sons at Dok near Jericho (1 Macc 16:11,15).

ABUNDANCE; ABUNDANT

<abundance>, <abundant>.

See ABOUND.

ABUSE

<abuse>: “To dishonor,” “to make mock of,” “to insult,” etc.

(1) Translated in the Old Testament from לְלָל [alal], “to do harm,” “to defile” (Judges 19:25), “to make mock of” (I Samuel 31:4).
(2) Translated in the New Testament from [ἀρσενοκοίτης, arsenokoites], literally, “one who lies with a male,” “a sodomite” (1 Corinthians 6:9; 1 Timothy 1:10; the King James Version “for them that defile themselves with mankind”).

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

See USE.

ABYSS, THE

<\textit{a-bis’}>, ([ἡ ἄβυσσος, he abussos]): In classical Greek the word is always an adjective, and is used

(1) literally, “very deep,” “bottomless”;

(2) figuratively, “unfathomable,” “boundless.”

“Abbyss” does not occur in the King James Version but the Revised Version (British and American) so transliterates [ἄβυσσος abussos] in each case. The the King James Version renders the Greek by “the deep” in two passages (<Luke 8:31; Romans 10:7). In Revelation the King James Version renders by “the bottomless pit” (<Revelation 9:1,2,11; 11:7; 17:8; 20:1,3). In the Septuagint abussos is the rendering of the Hebrew word [ tehom]. According to primitive Semitic cosmogony the earth was supposed to rest on a vast body of water which was the source of all springs of water and rivers (<Genesis 1:2; Deuteronomy 8:7; Psalm 24:2; 136:6). This subterranean ocean is sometimes described as “the water under the earth” (<Exodus 20:4; Deuteronomy 5:8). According to <Job 41:32 tehom is the home of the leviathan in which he plows his hoary path of foam. The Septuagint never uses abussos as a rendering of [sheol] (= Sheol = Hades) and probably tehom never meant the “abode of the dead” which was the ordinary meaning of Sheol. In <Psalms 71:20 [tehom] is used figuratively, and denotes “many and sore troubles” through which the psalmist has passed (compare Jonah 2:5). But in the New Testament the word abussos
means the “abode of demons.” In Luke 8:31 the King James Version renders “into the deep” (Weymouth and The Twentieth Century New Testament = “into the bottomless pit”). The demons do not wish to be sent to their place of punishment before their destined time. Mark simply says “out of the country” (5:10). In Romans 10:7 the word is equivalent to Hades, the abode of the dead. In Revelation (where the King James Version renders invariably “the bottomless pit”) abussos denotes the abode of evil spirits, but not the place of final punishment; it is therefore to be distinguished from the “lake of fire and brimstone” where the beast and the false prophet are, and into which the Devil is to be finally cast (Revelation 19:20; 20:10).

See also ASTRONOMY, III, 7.

Thomas Lewis

ABYSSINIA

<ab-i-sin’-i-a>.

See ETHIOPIA.

ACACIA

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

E. W. G. Masterman

**ACATAN**

<ak’-a-tan>.

*See AKATAN (Apocrypha).*

**ACCABA**

<ak’-a-ba>, <ak-a’-ba> (B, [ʾAkkαβά, Akkaba]; A, [Γαβά, Gaba]; the King James Version Agaba) = Hagab (ʾEzra 2:46); *see also HAGABA* (ʾNehemiah 7:48): The descendants of Accaba (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:30).

**ACCAD; ACCADIANS**

<ak’-ad>, <ak-a’-di-ans>.

*See BABYLONIA.*

**ACCARON**

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

*See EKRON.*

**ACCEPT; ACCEPTABLE; ACCEPTATION**

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

Accept, used
(1) of sacrifice, “accept thy burnt-sacrifice” ([_dashen], “accept as fat,” i.e. receive favorably; Psalm 20:3);

(2) of persons, “Yahweh accept Job” ([_nasa’], “to lift up,” “take,” “receive”);

(3) of works, “a the work of his hands” (Deuteronomy 33:11 [ratsah], “to delight in”).

In New Testament

(1) of favors, “We accept .... with all thankfulness” ([_apodechomai], Acts 24:3);

(2) of personal appeal, “He accept our exhortation” (2 Corinthians 8:17);

(3) of God’s Impartiality ([_lambano], lambano], “to take,” “receive”); “accepteth not man’s person” (Galatians 2:6).

Acceptable, used

(1) of justice ([_bachar], “choose select”), “more accept .... than sacrifice” (Proverbs 21:3);

(2) of words ([_chephets], “delight in,” “sought .... accept words” (Ecclesiastes 12:10);

(3) of times ([_ratson], “delight,” “approbation”; [_dektos], “receivable”) “acceptable year of the Lord” (Isaiah 61:2 (King James Version); Luke 4:19);

(4) of spiritual sacrifice ([_euprosdektos], euprosdektos], “well received””), “acceptable to God” (1 Peter 2:5);

(5) of patient endurance ([_charis], “grace,” “favor”) “This is acceptable with God” (1 Peter 2:20).

Acceptation, used twice to indicate the trustworthiness of the gospel of Christ’s saving grace: “worthy of all acceptation.” (1 Timothy 1:15; 4:9).
These words are full of the abundant grace of God and are rich in comfort to believers. That which makes man, in word, work and character, acceptable to God; and renders it possible for God to accept him, his service and sacrifice, is the fullness of the Divine mercy and grace and forgiveness. He “chose us” and made us, as adopted sons, the heirs of His grace “which he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved” (Ephesians 1:6; compare the King James Version).

Dwight M. Pratt

ACCEPTANCE

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

ACCESS

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

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

\(<ak’-o>\) (אֲקַכָּו [‘akko]; [‘אֲקַכָּו, ‘Akcho]; [‘אֲקַכָּו Πτολεμαίς, Ake Ptolemais]; Modern Arabic ‘Akka, English Acre; the King James Version Accho): A town on the Syrian coast a few miles north of Carmel, on a small promontory on the north side of a broad bay that lies between it and the modern town of Haifa. This bay furnishes the best anchorage for ships of any on this coast except that of George, at Beirut, and Alexandretta at the extreme north. As the situation commanded the approach from the sea to the rich plateau of Esdraelon and also the coast route from the north, the city was regarded in ancient times of great importance and at various periods of history was the scene of severe struggles for its possession. It fell within the bounds assigned to the Israelites, particularly to the tribe of Asher, but they were never able to take it (Joshua 19:24-31; Judges 1:31). It was, like Tyre and Sidon, too strong for them to attack and it became indeed a fortress of unusual strength, so that it many a siege, often baffling its assailants. In the period of the Crusades it was the most famous stronghold on the coast, and in very early times it was a place of importance and appears in the Tell el-Amarna Letters as a possession of the Egyptian kings. Its governor wrote to his suzerain professing loyalty when the northern towns were falling away (Amos Tab 17 BM, 95 B). The Egyptian suzerainty over the coast, which was established by Thothmes III about 1480 BC, was apparently lost in the 14th century, as is indicated in Tell el-Amarna Letters, but was regained under Seti I and his more famous son Rameses II in the 13th, to be again lost in the 12th when the Phoenician towns seem to have established their independence. Sidon however surpassed her sisters in power and exercised a sort of hegemony over the Phoenician towns, at least in the south, and Acco was included in it (Rawl. Phoenica, 407-8). But when Assyria came upon the scene it had to submit to this power, although it revolted whenever Assyria became weak, as appears from the mention of its subjugation by Sennacherib (ib 449), and by Ashurbanipal (ib 458). The latter “quieted” it by a wholesale massacre and then carried into captivity the remaining inhabitants. Upon the downfall of Assyria it passed, together with other Phoenician towns, under the dominion of Babylon and then of Persia, but we have no records
of its annals during that period; but it followed the fortunes of the more important cities, Tyre and Sidon. In the Seleucid period (BC 312-65) the town became of importance in the contests between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. The latter occupied it during the struggles that succeeded the death of Alexander and made it their stronghold on the coast and changed the name to PTOLEMAIS, by which it was known in the Greek and Roman period as we see in the accounts of the Greek and Roman writers and in Josephus, as well as in New Testament (1 Macc 5:22; 10:39; 12:48; Acts 21:7). The old name still continued locally and reasserted itself in later times. The Ptolemies held undisputed possession of the place for about 70 years but it was wrested from them by Antiochus III, of Syria, in 219 BC and went into the permanent possession of the Seleucids after the decisive victory of Antiochus over Scopas in that year, the result of which was the expulsion of the Ptolemies from Syria, Palestine and Phoenicia (Ant., XII, iii, 3). In the dynastic struggles of the Seleucids it fell into the hands of Alexander Bala, who there received the hand of Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, as a pledge of alliance between them (ib XIII, iv, 1). Tigranes, king of Armenia, besieged it on his invasion of Syria, but was obliged to relinquish it on the approach of the Romans toward his own dominions (BJ, I, v, 3). Under the Romans Ptolemais became a colony and a metropolis, as is known from coins, and was of importance, as is attested by Strabo. But the events that followed the conquests of the Saracens, leading to the Crusades, brought it into great prominence. It was captured by the Crusaders in 1110 AD, and remained in their hands until 1187, when it was taken from them by Saladin and its fortifications so strengthened as to render it almost impregnable. The importance of this fortress as a key to the Holy Land was considered so great by the Crusaders that they put forth every effort during two years to recapture it, but all in vain until the arrival of Richard Coeur de Lion and Philip Augustus with reinforcements, and it was only after the most strenuous efforts on their part that the place fell into their hands, but it cost them 100,000 men. The fortifications were repaired and it was afterward committed to the charge of the knights of John, by whom it was held for 100 years and received the name of Jean d’Acre. It was finally taken by the Saracens in 1291, being the last place held by the Crusaders in Palestine
It declined after this and fell into the hands of the Ottomans under Selim I in 1516, and remained mostly in ruins until the 18th century, when it came into the possession of Jezzar Pasha, who usurped the authority over it and the neighboring district and became practically independent of the Sultan and defied his authority. In 1799 it was attacked by Napoleon but was bravely and successfully defended by the Turks with the help of the English fleet, and Napoleon had to abandon the siege after he had spent two months before it and gained a victory over the Turkish army at Tabor. It enjoyed a considerable degree of prosperity after this until 1831 when it was besieged by Ibrahim Pasha, of Egypt, and taken, but only after a siege of more than five months in which it suffered the destruction of its walls and many of its buildings. It continued in the hands of the Egyptians until 1840 when it was restored to the Ottomans by the English whose fleet nearly reduced it to ruins in the bombardment. It has recovered somewhat since then and is now a town of some 10,000 inhabitants and the seat of a Mutasarrifiyet, or subdivision of the Vilayet of Beirut. It contains one of the state prisons of the Vilayet, where long-term prisoners are incarcerated. Its former commerce has been almost wholly lost to the town of Haifa, on the south side of the bay, since the latter has a fairly good roadstead, while Acre has none, and the former being the terminus of the railway which connects with the interior and the Damascus-Mecca line, it has naturally supplanted Acre as a center of trade.

H. Porter

ACCOMMODATION

<a-kom-mo-da'-shun>:

1. INTRODUCTORY.

1. Three Uses of the Term:

The term “accommodation” is used in three senses which demand careful discrimination and are worthy of separate treatment:

(1) the use or application of a Scripture reference in a sense other than the obvious and literal one which lay in the mind and intent of the writer;
(2) theory that a passage, according to its original intent, may have more than one meaning or application;

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

2. The Importance of the Subject:

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

2. ACCOMMODATED APPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES.

1. Interpretation a Science:

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

2. Scientific Accommodation:

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

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

(2) the extension of that meaning through the establishment of a broader context identical in principle with the original one. In the article on QUOTATIONS IN New Testament (which see) this use of the term accommodation, here treated in the most general terms, is dealt with in detail.

See also INTERPRETATION.

3. DOUBLE REFERENCE IN SCRIPTURE.

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

1. Allegory in Scripture:

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

See ALLEGORY.

2. Hidden Truths of Scripture:

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

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

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

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

3. Prophecy and Its Fulfillment:

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

(2) (a) The promise made to Abraham (Genesis 12:1-3; compare 13:14-18; 15:1-6, etc.) and repeated in substance at intervals during the history of Israel (see Exodus 6:7; Leviticus 26:12; Deuteronomy 26:17-19; 29:12,13; 2 Samuel 7; 1 Chronicles 17, etc.) is interpreted as having reference to the distant future and as fulfilled in Christ (see Galatians 3 for example of this interpretation, especially 3:14; also QUOTATIONS IN NEW TESTAMENT).
(b) The Old Testament system of sacrifices is looked upon as typical and symbolic, hence, predictive and realized in the death of Christ interpreted as atonement for sin (Hebrews 10, etc.).

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

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

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

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

(b) But this is not to say that its meaning and value are exhausted in that immediate contemporary application. Beyond question the prophet was a man with a message to his own age, but there is nothing incompatible, in that fact, with his having a message, the full significance of which reaches beyond his own age, even into the far distant future. It would serve to clear the air in this whole region if it were only understood that it is precisely upon its grasp of the future that the leverage of a great message for immediate moral uplift rests. The predictive element is a vital part of the contemporary value.
The promise made to Abraham was a living message addressed directly to him in the immediate circumstances of his life upon which the delivery and acceptance of the promise made a permanent impress; but it was of vaster proportions than could be realized within the compass of a single human life; for it included himself, his posterity, and all mankind in a single circle of promised blessing. So far as the patriarch was concerned the immediate, contemporary value of the promise lay in the fact that it concerned him not alone but in relationship to the future and to mankind. A prediction was thus imbedded in the very heart of the word of God which was the object of his faith — a prediction which served to enclose his life in the plan of God for all mankind and to fasten his ambition to the service of that plan. The promise was predictive in its essence and in its contemporary meaning (see Beecher, Prophets and Promise, 213).

So also it is with the Messianic King. The Kingdom as an institution in Israel is described from the beginning as the perpetual mediatorial reign of God upon earth (see Exodus 19:3-6; 2 Samuel
7:8-16, etc.), and the King in whom the Kingdom centers is God’s Son (2 Samuel 7:13,15) and earthly representative. In all this there is much that is immediately contemporaneous. The Kingdom and the Kingship are described in terms of the ideal and that ideal is used in every age as the ground of immediate appeal to loyalty and devotion on the part of the King. None the less the predictive element lies at the center of the representation. The very first recorded expression of the Messianic promise to David involves the prediction of unconditioned perpetuity to his house, and thus grasps the entire future. More than this, the characteristics, the functions, the dignities of the king are so described (Psalm 102; Isaiah 9:6,7) as to make it clear that the conditions of the Kingship could be met only by an uniquely endowed person coming forth from God and exercising divine functions in a worldwide spiritual empire. Such a King being described and such a Kingdom being promised, the recipients of it, of necessity, were set to judge the present and scrutinize the future for its realization. The conception is, in its original meaning and expression, essentially predictive.

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

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

4. Conclusion:

The total outcome of the discussion is this: the interpretation of these representative Old Testament ideas and institutions as referring to Christ and anticipating His advent is no illegitimate use of the principle of accommodation. The future reference which takes in the entire historical process which culminates in Christ lies within the immediate and original application and constitutes an essential element of its contemporary value. The original statement is in its very nature predictive and is one in doctrinal principle and historic continuity with that which forms its fulfillment.
IV. ACCOMMODATION IN REVELATION.

1. General Principles:

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

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

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

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

2. Accommodation a Feature of Progressive Revelation:

(1) The beginnings of revelation. Since man’s experience is organically conditioned he is under the law of growth. His entire mental and spiritual life is related to his part and lot in the kingdom of organisms. The very laws of his mind reveal themselves only upon occasion in experience. While it is true that his tendencies are innate, so that he is compelled to think and to feel in certain definite ways, yet it is true that he can neither think nor feel at all except as experience presents material for thought and applies stimulus to feeling. Man must bye in order to learn. He must, therefore, learn gradually. This fact conditions all revelation. Since it must deal with men it must be progressive, and since it must be progressive it must necessarily involve, in its earlier stages, the principle of accommodation. In order to gain access to man’s mind it must take him where he is and link itself with his natural aptitudes and native modes of thought. Since revelation involves the endeavor to form in the mind of man the idea of God in order that a right relationship with Him may be established, it enters both the intellectual and moral life of the human race and must accommodate itself to the humble beginnings of early human experience. The chief problem of revelation seems to have been to bring these crude beginnings within the scope of a movement the aim and end of which is perfection. The application of the principle of accommodation to early human experience with a view to progress is accomplished by doing what at first thought seems to negate the very principle upon which the mental and moral life of man must permanently rest.

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

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

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

(c) the idea of truth;
(d) the idea of obligation.

(2) It is mainly due to these two factors of human nature that any
progress in truth and conduct is possible to men. What is true or right in
matter of specific fact varies in the judgment of different individuals and of
different ages. But the august and compelling twin convictions of truth and
right, as absolute, eternal, authoritative, are present from the beginning of
human history to the end of it. Scripture seizes upon the fact that these
great ideas may be enforced through crude human conceptions and at very
rudimentary stages of culture, and enforcing them by means of revelation
and imperative law brings man to the test of truth and right and fosters his
advance to larger conceptions and broader applications of both
fundamental principles. Canon Mozley in discussing this principle of
accommodation on its moral side, its necessity and its fruitfulness, says:
“How can the law properly fulfill its object of correcting and improving
the moral standard of men, unless it first maintains in obligation the
standard which already exists? Those crudely delineated conceptions,
which it tends ultimately to purify and raise, it must first impose” (Ruling
Ideas in Early Ages, 183; compare Matthew 5:17 with 21,27,33).

3. The Limits of Revelation:

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

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

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

(c) Revelation must have reference, even in its earliest phases of development, to the organism of truth as a whole. What is actually given at any time must contribute its quota to the ultimate summing up and completion of the entire process.

(d) Revelation must guard against injurious errors which trench upon essential and vital matters. In short, the consistency and integrity of the movement through which truth is brought to disclosure must sacredly be guarded; while, at the same time, since it is God and man who are coming to know each other, revelation must be set in a broad environment of human life and entrusted to the processes of history.

See REVELATION.

4. The Outcome of Revelation:

It is now our task briefly to notice how in Scripture these interests are safeguarded. We must notice

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

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

(c) More than this, Scripture throughout is marked by a certain distract and unmistakable quality of timelessness. It continually urges and suggests the infinite, the eternal, the unchangeable. It is part of the task of revelation to anticipate so as to guide progress. At every stage it keeps the minds of men on the stretch with a truth that they are not able at that stage easily to apprehend. The inexhaustible vastness and the hidden fullness of truth are everywhere implied. Prophets and Apostles are continually in travail with truths brought to their own ages from afar. The great fundamental verities of Scripture are stated with uncompromising fullness and finality. There is no accommodation to human weakness or error. Its ideals, its standards, its conditions are absolute and inviolate.
Not only has Israel certain fundamental ideas which are peculiar to herself, but there has been an organizing spirit, an “unique spirit of inspiration” which has modified and transformed the materials held by her in common with her Semitic kindred. Even her inherited ideas and Institutions are transformed and infused with new meanings. We note the modification of Semitic customs, as for example in blood revenge, by which savagery has been mitigated and evil associations eliminated. We note the paucity of mythological material. If the stories of Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Samson were originally mythological, they have ceased to be such in the Bible. They have been humanized and stripped of superhuman features. (See Fable,” HGLH, 220 ff.)

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

5. The Question as to Christ’s Method:

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

\textbf{LITERATURE.}

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

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

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

\textit{Louis Matthews Sweet}

\textbf{ACCOMPLISH}

\textit{<a-kom’-plish>}: Richly represented in the Old Testament by seven Hebrew synonyms and in the New Testament by five Greek (the King James Version); signifying in Hebrew

\begin{enumerate}
  \item “to complete” (\textit{\textasciitilde 3540\textasciitilde} Lamentations 4:11);
  \item “to fulfill” (\textit{\textasciitilde 2709\textasciitilde} Daniel 9:2);
  \item “to execute” (\textit{\textasciitilde 1105\textasciitilde} 1 Kings 5:9);
  \item “to set apart” i.e. “consecrate” (\textit{\textasciitilde 3222\textasciitilde} Leviticus 22:21);
  \item “to establish” (\textit{\textasciitilde 2444\textasciitilde} Jeremiah 44:25 the King James Version);
  \item “to have pleasure in” (\textit{\textasciitilde 1814\textasciitilde} Job 14:6);
\end{enumerate}
(7) “to perfect” (Psalm 64:6);

in Greek

(1) “to finish” (Acts 21:5);
(2) “to bring to an end” (Hebrews 9:6);
(3) “to be fulfilled” (Luke 2:6);
(4) “to fill out” (Luke 9:31);

ACCORD; ACCORDING; ACCORDINGLY

<\textit{a-kord’}, \textit{a-kord’-ing-li}>: In Old Testament, [peh], “mouth,” “to fight with one accord” (Joshua 9:2) [lephi], “according to the mouth of,” “according to their families” (Genesis 47:12, “acc. to (the number of) their little ones” the Revised Version, margin). In Isaiah 59:18 the same Hebrew word, [ke`al], is rendered “according to” and “accordingly.” In New Testament [\textit{omophumado`n}, homothumadon], indicative of harmony of mind or action, Acts, 1:14; 2:46; 7:57; 18:12) and [\textit{kata`}, kata`], of the same mind .... according to Christ Jesus (Romans 15:5); [\textit{automo`toz}, automatos], “of itself,” “without constraint,” “opened to them of its own accord” (Acts 12:10), i.e. without human agency (compare Leviticus 25:5 the King James Version; Mark 4:28); [\textit{authairetos}, authairetos], “of his own free choice” (2 Corinthians 8:17). God “will render to every man according to his works” (Romans 2:6), that is, agreeably to the nature of his works (1 Corinthians 3:8), but salvation is not according to works (2 Timothy 1:9; Titus 3:5).

\textit{See DEED.}

\textit{M. O. Evans}

ACCOS

<\textit{ak’}-os> ([\textit{Akh\textalpha`z}, Hakchos]): The grandfather of Eupolemus, whom Judas Maccabeus sent with others to Rome in 161 BC, to negotiate a “league of amity and confederacy” (1 Macc 8:17). The name occurs In the
Old Testament as Hakkoz (חֲקָקֹות [haqqots]), who was a priest in the reign of David (1 Chronicles 24:10).

ACCOUNT

*a-kount’*.  

*See* ACCOUNTABILITY.

ACCOUNTABILITY

*a-koun-ta-bil’-i-ti*.

**1. SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES:**

The general teaching of Scripture on this subject is summarized in Romans 14:12: “So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God.” But this implies, on the one hand, the existence of a Moral Ruler of the universe, whose will is revealed, and, on the other the possession by the creature of knowledge and free will. In Romans 4:15 it is expressly laid down that, ‘where no law is, neither is there transgression’; but, lest this might seem to exclude from accountability those to whom the law of Moses was not given, it is shown that even heathen had the law to some extent revealed in conscience; so that they are “without excuse” (Romans 1:20). “For as many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law: and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law” (Romans 2:12). So says Paul in a passage which is one of the profoundest discussions on the subject of accountability, and with his sentiment agrees exactly the word of our Lord on the same subject, in Luke 12:47,48: “And that servant, who knew his lord’s will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more.” There is a gradual development of accountability accompanying the growth of a human being from infancy to maturity; and there is a similar development in the race, as knowledge grows from less to more. In the full light of the gospel human beings are far more responsible than they were in earlier stages of intellectual and spiritual development, and the
doom to which they will be exposed on the day of account will be heavy in proportion to their privileges. This may seem to put too great a premium on ignorance; and a real difficulty arises when we say that, the more of moral sensitiveness there is, the greater is the guilt; because as is well known, moral sensitiveness can be lost through persistent disregard of conscience; from which it might seem to follow that the way to diminish guilt was to silence the voice of conscience. There must, however, be a difference between the responsibility of a conscience that has never been enlightened and that of one which, having once been enlightened, has lost, through neglect or recklessness, the goodness once possessed. In the practice of the law, for example, it is often claimed that a crime committed under the influence of intoxication should be condoned; yet everyone must feel how different this is from innocence, and that, before a higher tribunal, the culprit will be held to be twice guilty — first, of the sin of drunkenness and then of the crime.

2. CONNECTION WITH IMMORTALITY:

Wherever civilization is so advanced that there exists a code of public law, with punishments attached to transgression, there goes on a constant education in the sense of accountability; and even the heathen mind, in classical times, had advanced so far as to believe in a judgment beyond the veil, when the shades had to appear before the tribunal of Rhadamanthus, Minos and AEacus, to have their station and degree in the underworld decided according to the deeds done in the body. How early the Hebrews had made as much progress has to be discussed in connection with the doctrine of immortality; but it is certain that, before the Old Testament canon closed, they believed not only in a judgment after death but in resurrection, by which the sense of accountability was fastened far more firmly on the popular mind. Long before, however, there was awakened by the sacred literature the sense of a judgment of God going on during the present life and expressing itself in everyone’s condition. The history of the world was the Judgment of the world; prosperity attended the steps of the good man, but retribution sooner or later struck down the wicked. It was from the difficulty of reconciling with this belief the facts of life that the skepticism of Hebrew thought arose; but by the same constraint the pious mind was pushed forward in the direction of the full doctrine of
immortality. This came with the advent of Him who brought life and immortality to light by His gospel (2 Timothy 1:10). In the mind of Jesus not only were resurrection, judgment and immortality unquestionable postulates; but He was brought into a special connection with accountability through His consciousness of being the Judge of mankind, and, in His numerous references to the Last Judgment, He developed the principles upon which the conscience will then be tried, and by which accordingly it ought now to try itself. In this connection the Parable of the Talents is of special significance; but it is by the grandiose picture of the scene itself, which follows in the same chapter of the First Gospel, that the mind of Christendom has been most powerfully influenced. Reference has already been made to the discussions at the commencement of the Epistle to the Romans in which our subject finds a place. By some the apostle John has been supposed to revert to the Old Testament notion of a judgment proceeding now in place of coming at the Last Day; but Weiss (Der johanneische Lehrbegriff, II, 9) has proved that this is a mistake.

3. JOINT AND CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY:

Up to this point we have spoken of individual accountability, but the subject becomes more complicated when we think of the joint responsibility of several or many persons. From the first the human mind has been haunted by what is called the guilt of Adam’s first sin. There is a solidarity in the human race, and the inheritance of evil is too obvious to be denied even by the most optimistic. There is far, however, from being agreement of opinion as to the relation of the individual to this evil legacy; some contending fiercely against the idea that the individual can have any personal responsibility for a sin hidden in a past so distant and shadowy, while others maintain that the misery which has certainly been inherited by all can only be justified in a world governed by a God of justice if the guilt of all precedes the misery. The question enters deeply into the Pauline scheme, although at the most critical point it is much disputed what the Apostle’s real position is. While joint responsibility burdens the individual conscience, it may, at the same time, be said to lighten it. Thus, in Ezekiel 18 one of the most weighty ethical discussions to be found in Holy Writ is introduced with the popular proverb, “The fathers have eaten
sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge,” which proves to be a way of saying that the responsibility of children is lightened, if not abolished, through their connection with their parents. In the same way, at the present time, the sense of responsibility is enfeebled in many minds through the control over character and destroy ascribed to heredity and environment. Even criminality is excused on the ground that many have never had a chance of virtue, and it is contended that to know everything is to forgive everything. There can be no doubt that, as the agents of trusts and partnerships, men will allow themselves to do what they would never have thought of in private business; and in a crowd the individual sustains psychological modifications by which he is made to act very differently from his ordinary self. In the actions of nations, such as war, there is a vast and solemn responsibility somewhere; but it is often extremely difficult to locate whether in the ruler, the ministry or the people. So interesting and perplexing are such problems often that a morality for bodies of people, as distinguished from individuals, is felt by many to be the great desideratum of ethics at the present time.

On this subject something will be found in most of the works on either philosophical or Christian ethics; see especially Lemme’s Christliche Ethik, 242 ff.

James Stalker

ACCOZ

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

ACCURSED

<a-kurs’-ed>, <a-kurst’>: In the Book of Joshua (6:17,18; 7:1,11,12,13,15) and 1 Chronicles (2:7) “accursed” (or “accursed thing” or “thing accursed”) is the King James Version rendering of the Hebrew word, מְרָא [cherem]. The the Revised Version (British and American) consistently uses “devoted” or “devoted thing,” which the King James Version also adopts in Leviticus 27:21,28,29 and in Numbers 18:14.
“Cursed thing” is the rendering in two passages (Deuteronomy 7:26; 13:17); and in one passage (Ezekiel 44:29 the King James Version) “dedicated thing” is used. In four places the King James Version renders the word by “curse” (Joshua 6:18; Isaiah 34:5; 43:28; Malachi 3:24; (4:6)) whilst in, another passage (Zechariah 14:11) “utter destruction” is adopted in translation. These various renderings are due to the fact that the word cherem sometimes means the act of devoting or banning (or the condition or state resulting therefrom and sometimes the object devoted or banned. We occasionally find periphrastic renderings, e.g. I Samuel 15:21: “the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed,” the King James Version (literally, “the chief part of the ban”); 1 Kings 20:42: “a man whom I appointed to utter destruction,” the King James Version (literally, “a man of my ban” (or “banning”). The root-word meant “to separate,” “shut off.” The Arabic charim denoted the precincts of the temple at Mecca, and also the women’s apartment (whence the word “harem”). In Hebrew the word always suggested “separating” or “devoting to God.” Just as [qadhosh], meant “holy” or “consecrated to the service” of Yahweh, and so not liable to be used for ordinary or secular purposes, so the stem of [cherem] meant “devoting” to Yahweh anything which would, if spared, corrupt or contaminate the religious life of Israel, with the further idea of destroying (things) or exterminating (persons) as the surest way of avoiding such contamination. Everything that might paganize or affect the unique character of the religion of Israel was banned, e.g. idols (Deuteronomy 7:26); idolatrous persons (Exodus 22:20); idolatrous cities (Deuteronomy 13:13-18). All Canaanite towns — where the cult of Baal flourished — were to be banned (Deuteronomy 20:16-18). The ban did not always apply to the gold and silver of looted cities (Joshua 6:24). Such valuable articles were to be placed in the “treasury of the house of Yahweh.” This probably indicates a slackening of the rigid custom which involved the total destruction of the spoil. According to Numbers 18:14, “everything devoted in Israel” belonged to Aaron, and Ezekiel 44:29 the King James Version ordained that “every dedicated thing” should belong to the priests (compare Ezra 10:8). In the New Testament “accursed” is the King James Version rendering of ANATHHEMA (which see).
ACCUSER

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

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

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

W. W. Davies

ACELDAMA

*a-sel’-da-ma>.

See AKELDAMA.

ACHAIA

*a-ka’-ya* ([Ἀχαία, Achaia]): The smallest country in the Peloponnesus lying along the southern shore of the Corinthian Gulf, north of Arcadia and east of Elis. The original inhabitants were Ionians, but these were crowded out later by the Acheans, who came from the East. According to Herodotus, the former founded twelve cities, many of which retain their original names to this day. These cities were on the coast and formed a confederation of smaller communities, which in the last century of the independent history of Greece attained to great importance (Achaean League). In Roman times the term Achaia was used to include the whole of Greece, exclusive of Thessaly. Today Achaia forms with Elis one district, and contains a population of nearly a quarter of a million. The old Achean League was renewed in 280 BC, but became more important in 251, when
Aratus of Sicyon was chosen commander-in-chief. This great man increased the power of the League and gave it an excellent constitution, which our own great practical politicians, Hamilton and Madison, consulted, adopting many of its prominent devices, when they set about framing the Constitution of the United States. In 146 BC Corinth was destroyed and the League broken up (see 1 Macc 15:23); and the whole of Greece, under the name of Achaia, was transformed into a Roman province, which was divided into two separate provinces, Macedonia and Achaia, in 27 BC.

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

**LITERATURE.**

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

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

J. E. Harry

**ACHAICUS**

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

**ACHAN**

<α’-kan> (אָכָן [’akhan] in 1 Chronicles 2:7 Achar, אֲכָר [’akhar], “troubler”): The descendant of Zerah the son of Judah who was put to death, in Joshua’s time, for stealing some of the “devoted” spoil of the city of Jericho (Joshua 7). The stem [’akhan] is not used in Hebrew except in this name. The stem ‘akhar has sufficient use to define it. It denotes trouble of the most serious kind — Jacob’s trouble when his sons had brought him into blood feud with his Canaanite neighbors, or Jephthah’s trouble when his vow required him to sacrifice his daughter (Genesis 34:30; Judges 11:35). In Proverbs (11:17,29; 15:6,27) the word is used with intensity to describe the results of cruelty, disloyalty, greed, wickedness. The record especially speaks of Achan’s conduct as the troubling of Israel (1 Chronicles 2:7; Joshua 6:18; 7:24). In an outburst of temper Jonathan speaks of Saul as having troubled the land (1 Samuel 14:29). Elijah and Ahab accuse each other of being the troubler of Israel (1 Kings 18:17,18). The stem also appears in the two proper names ACHOR and OCHRAN (which see).

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

The record says that the execution took place in the arable valley of Achor, up from the Jordan valley.

*See ACHOR.

Willis J. Beecher

ACHAR

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

ACHAZ

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

ACHBOR

*ak'-bor* ([`akhbor], “mouse”):

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

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

It may be presumed that this Achbor is also the man mentioned in Jeremiah (26:22; 36:12) as the father of Elnathan, who went to Egypt for King Jehoiakim in order to procure the extradition of Uriah the prophet, and who protested against the burning of Baruch’s roll.

Willis J. Beecher
ACHIACHARUS

<α-κι-ακ’-α-ρυς> (Codex Vaticanus [Ἁχιάχαρος, Achiacharos]; [Ἄχειχαρος, Acheicharos]): Governor of Assyria. Achiacharus is the son of Anael, a brother of Tobit (Tobit 1:21). Sarchedonus (Esarhaddon), the king of Assyria, appointed him over all “accounts of his kingdom” and over all “his affairs” (Tobit 1:21 f; compare Daniel 2:48). At his request Tobit comes to Nineveh (Tobit 1:22). Achiacharus nourishes Tobit, while the latter is afflicted with disease (Tobit 2:10). He attends the wedding-feast of Tobias (Tobit 11:18). Is persecuted by Aman, but saved (Tobit 14:10).

ACHIAS

<α-κι’-ας>: An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2). Omitted in other genealogies.

ACHIM

<α’-κιμ> ([Ἄχείμ, Acheim]): A descendant of Zerubbabel and ancestor of Jesus, mentioned only in Matthew 1:14.

ACHIOR

<α’-κι-ορ> ([Ἄχιώρ, Achior]): General of the Ammonites, who spoke in behalf of Israel before Holofernes, the Assyrian general (Judith 5:5 ff). Holofernes ordered him bound and delivered at Bethulia to the Israelites (Judith 6), who received him gladly and with honor. Afterward he became a proselyte, was circumcised, and joined to Israel (Judith 14). In Numbers 34:27 it is the Septuagint reading for Ahihud, and in the Hebrew would be רוחאיה [’achi’or], “brother of light.”

ACHIPHA

<ακ’-ι-φα>; the King James Version Acipha, <ασ’-ι-φα> ([Αχιφά, Achipha]), in the Apocrypha (1 Esdras 5:31) head of one of the families of the temple-servants, who returned with Zerubbabel, same as the Old Testament HAKUPHA (<Ezra 2:51; Nehemiah 7:53), which see.
ACHISH

<a’-kish> ([’akhish]): King of the city of Gath in the days of David. His father’s name is given as Maoch (1 Samuel 27:2), and Maacah (1 Kings 2:39). David sought the protection of Achish when he first fled from Saul, and just after his visit to Nob (1 Samuel 21:10-15). Fearing rough treatment or betrayal by Achish, he feigned madness. But this made him unwelcome, whereupon he fled to the Cave of Adullam (1 Samuel 22:1). Later in his fugitive period David returned to Gath to be hospitably received by Achish (1 Samuel 27:1 ff), who gave him the town of Ziklag for his home. A year later, when the Philistines invaded the land of Israel, in the campaign which ended so disastrously for Saul (1 Samuel 31), Achish wished David to participate (1 Samuel 28:1-2), but the lords of the Philistines objected so strenuously, when they found him and his men with the forces of Achish, that Achish was compelled to send them back. Achish must have been a young man at this time, for he was still ruling forty years later at the beginning of Solomon’s reign (1 Kings 2:39). He is mentioned as Abimelech in the title of Psalm 34.

See ABIMELECH 3.

Edward Mack

ACHITOB

<ak’-i-tob>: Same as Ahitob. Used in 1 Esdras 8:2; compare 2 Esdras 1:1 the King James Version.

See AHITUB 3.

ACHMETHA

<ak’-me-tha> (Ezra 6:2; [’achmetha’]; Septuagint [’Αμαθά, Amatha]; Peshitta achmathan; in Tigrath Pileser’s inscription circa 1100 BC Amadana: in Darius’ Behistun Inscr., II, 76-78, Hangmatana = “Place of Assembly”; [’Αγβάτανα, Agbatana], in Herodotus; [’Εκβάτανα, Ekbatana], Xenophon, etc.; so 1 Esdras 6:23; Tobit 3:7; 6:5; 7:1; 14:12,14; Judith 1:1,2,14; 2 Macc 9:3; Talmud [hamdan]; now [hamadan]).
1. LOCATION:
This, the ancient capital of Media, stood (lat 34 degrees 50’ North — long. 48 degrees 32’ East) near the modern Hamadan, 160 miles West-Southwest of Tehran, almost 6,000 feet above the sea, circa 1 1/2 miles from the foot of Matthew. Orontes (Alvand).

2. HISTORY:
It was founded or rebuilt by Deiokes (Dayaukku) about 700 BC on the site of Ellippi an ancient city of the Manda, and captured by Cyrus 549 BC who brought Croesus there as captive (Herodotus i.153). It was the capital of the 10th Nome under Darius I. Cyrus and other Persian kings used to spend the two summer months there yearly, owing to the comparative coolness of the climate. Herodotus describes it as a magnificent city fortified with seven concentric walls (i.98). Its citadel ([biretha’], Ezra 6:2, wrongly rendered “palace” in the Revised Version (British and American)) is mentioned by Arrian, who says that, when Alexander took the city in 324 BC, he there stored his enormous booty. In it the royal archives were kept. It stood on a hill, where later was built a temple of Mithra. Polybius (x.27) speaks of the great strength of the citadel. Though the city was unwalled in his time, he can hardly find words to express is admiration for it, especially for the magnificent royal palace, nearly 7 stadia in circumference, built of precious kinds of wood sheathed in plates of gold and silver. In the city was the shrine of Aine (Nanaea, Anahita?). Alexander is said to have destroyed a temple of AEscluspius (Mithra?) there. Diodorus tells us the city was 250 stadia in circumference. On Matthew. Alvand (10,728 feet) there have been found inscriptions of Xerxes. Doubtless Ecbatana was one of the “cities of the Medes” to which Israel was carried captive (Kings 17:6). It should be noted that Greek writers mention several other Ecbatanas. One of these, afterward called Gazaca (Takhti Sulaiman, a little South of Lake Urmi, lat. 36 degrees 28’ North, long. 47 degrees 9’ East) was capital of Atropatene. It was almost destroyed by the Mughuls in the 12th century. Sir H. Rawlinson identifies the Ecbatana of Tobit and Herodotus with this northern city. The southern and far more important Ecbatana which we have described is certainly that of 2 Macc 9:3. It was Cyrus’ Median capital, and is doubtless that of
Ezra 6:2. Classical writers spoke erroneously of Ecbatana (for Ecbatana) as moderns too often do of Hamadan for Hamadan.

3. PRESENT CONDITION:

Hamadan has perhaps never fully recovered from the fearful massacre made there in 1220 AD by the Mongols, but its population is about 50,000, including a considerable number of descendants of the Israelites of the Dispersion (tracing descent from Asher, Naphtali, etc.). They point to the tombs of Esther and Mordecai in the neighborhood. It is a center for the caravan trade between Baghdad and Tehran. There is an American Presbyterian mission at work.

Authorities (besides those quoted above): Ctesias, Curtius, Amm. Marcellinus, Pausanias, Strabo, Diod. Siculus; Ibnu’l Athir, Yaqt, Jahangusha, Jam'i`u’t Tawarikh, and modern travelers.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

ACHO

<ak’-o>.

See ACCO.

ACHOR

<a’-kor> (אַחוֹר וְאֵֽרֶץ, [akhor], “trouble,” the idea of the word being that of trouble which is serious and extreme. See ACHAN): The place where Achan was executed in the time of Joshua (Joshua 7:24,26). In all the five places where it is mentioned it is described as the [‘emek], the arable valley of Achor. There is no ground in the record for the current idea that it must have been a locality with horrid and dismal physical features. It was on a higher level than the camp of Israel in the Jordan valley, and on a lower level than Debir — a different Debir from that of Joshua 15:15. In a general way, as indicated by the points mentioned in the border of Judah, it was north of Betharabah, and south of Debir (Joshua 7:24; 15:7). Many identify it with the Wady Kelt which descends through a deep ravine from the Judean hills and runs between steep banks south of the modern Jericho to Jordan, the stream after rams becoming a foaming
torrent. Possibly the name may have been applied to a region of considerable extent. In Isaiah 65:10 it is a region on the east side of the mountain ridge which is in some sense balanced with Sharon on the west side. By implication the thing depicted seems to be these rich agricultural localities so far recovered from desolation as to be good grounds for cattle and sheep. Hosea recognizes the comforting aspect of the dreadful affair in the valley of Achor; it was a doorway of hope to pardoned Israel (Hosea 2:15 (17)), and he hopes for like acceptance for the Israel of his own day.

Willis J. Beecher

ACHSA

<ak’-sa>: Used in the King James Version in 1 Chronicles 2:49 for Achsah, which see.

ACHSAH

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

Willis J. Beecher

ACHSHAPH

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

**ACHZIB**

<ak’-zib> (אַחְזִיב) [‘akhzibh], “lying” or “disappointing”): The name of two towns in Palestine:

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

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

*Edward Mack*

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

H. Porter

ACIPHA

<as’-i-fa>.

See ACHIPHAH.

ACITHO; ACITHOH

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

ACKNOWLEDGE

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

ACQUAINT; ACQUAINTANCE

<a-kwant’>, <a-kwan’tans> ([γνωστοί, gnostoi]): Terms referring to various degrees of knowledge, but implying more or less detailed information; applied to God’s omniscience (Psalm 139:3), to the grief of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh (Isaiah 53:3), and to the knowledge which man should have of God. The noun in the concrete, unless limited by a qualifying term, means more than one who has been known simply in passing, and implies a degree of intimacy, as may be seen in Luke 2:44; 23:49; 2 Kings 12:5.

H. E. Jacobs
ACRA

\(<\text{ak}'-\text{ra}>\), \(<\text{a}'-\text{kra}>>\) (1 Macc 1:33 the Revised Version (British and American), “citadel”).

*See JERUSALEM.*

ACRABATTENE

\(<\text{ak-ra-ba-te}'-\text{ne}>\).

*See AKRABATTINE (in the Apocrypha).*

ACRABBIM

\(<\text{ak-rab}'-\text{im}>>\): Incorrect transliteration of \(\text{אקרבם} \) \([\text{aqrabbim}]\), of Joshua 15:3 in the King James Version.

*See AKRABBIM.*

ACRE (1)

\(<\text{a}'-\text{ker}>\), \(<\text{a}'-\text{ker}>>\).

*See ACCO.*

ACRE (2)

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

Willis J. Beecher

ACROSTIC

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

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

“Faithful is the Lord in his words
And holy in his works,”

which may represent a Hebrew couplet beginning with nun, it would seem that a verse has dropped out of the Massoretic Text. Proverbs 31:10-31 constitutes a regular alphabetical poem with (except in 31:15) two lines to a letter. Lamentations 1 is regular, with three lines to a letter Lamentations 2; 3; 4, are also regular with a curious exception. In each case pe precedes ‘ayin, a phenomenon which has not yet been explained. In Lamentations 2 there are three or four lines to a letter except in 2:17, where there seem to be five. In Lamentations 3 also there are three lines to a letter and each line begins with that letter. In Lamentations 4 there are two lines to a letter except in 4:22 where there are probably four lines. Lamentations 5 has twice as many lines as the letters of the alphabet but no alphabetical arrangement. In Nab 1:1-10 ff Delitzsch (following Frohmeyer) in 1876, Bickell in 1880 and 1894, Gunkel in 1893 and 1895, G. B. Gray in 1898 (Expos, September) and others have pointed out possible traces of original
alphabetical structure. In the Massoretic text, however, as generally arranged, it is not distinctly discernible. Sirach 51:13-30: As early as 1882 Bickell reconstructed this hymn on the basis of the Greek and Syriac versions as a Hebrew alphabetical poem. In 1897 Schechter (in the judgment of most scholars) discovered the original text in a collection of fragments from the Genizah of Cairo, and this proved the correctness of Bickell’s idea and even the accuracy of some details of his reconstruction. The poem begins with ‘aleph and has tav as the initial letter of the last line but one. In 51:21,22,24,25,26,27 the letters mem, nun, `ayin, pe, tsadhe, qoph and resh can be traced at the beginnings of lines in that order Samekh is absent (compare Schechter-Taylor, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, lxxvi-lxxxvii).

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

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

(1) The chief documents. These are the Primary Uncials (Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, Codex Bezae), Codex Laudianus (E) which is a bilingual Uncial confined to Acts, later Uncials like Codex Modena, Codex Regius, Codex the Priestly Code (P), the Cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshitta and the Harclean Syriac and quotations from the Fathers. We miss the Curetonian and Syriac Sinaiticus, and have only fragmentary testimony from the Old Latin.

(2) The modern editions of Acts present the types of text (Textus Receptus; the Revised Version (British and American); the critical text like that of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek or Nestle or Weiss or von Soden). These three types do not correspond with the four classes of text (Syrian, Western, Alexandrian, Neutral) outlined by Hort in his Introduction to the New Testament in Greek (1882). These four classes are broadly represented in the documents which give us Acts. But no modern editor of the Greek New Testament has given us the Western or the Alexandrian type of text, though Bornemann, as will presently be shown, argues for the originality of the Western type in Acts. But the Textus Receptus of the New Testament (Stephanus’ 3rd edition in 1550) was the basis of the King James Version of 1611. This edition of the Greek New Testament made use of a very few manuscripts, and all of them late, except Codex Bezae, which was considered too eccentric to follow. Practically, then, the King James Version represents the Syriac type of text which may have been edited in Antioch in the 4th century. Various minor errors may have crept in since that date, but substantially the Syriac recension is the text of the King James Version today. Where this text stands alone, it is held by nearly all modern scholars to be in error, though Dean Burgon fought hard for the originality of the Syriac text (The Revision Revised, 1882). The text of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek is practically that of Codex Vaticanus, which is held to be the Neutral type of text. Nestle, von Soden, Weiss do not differ greatly from the text of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, though von Soden and Weiss attack the problem on independent lines. The text of the Revised Version (British and American) is in a sense a compromise between that of the King James Version and the critical text, though

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

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

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

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

(7) Blass in 1895 created a sensation by arguing in his Commentary on Acts (Acta Apostolorum, 24 ff) that Luke had issued two editions of the Acts, as he later urged about the Gospel of Luke (Philology of the Gospels, 1898). In 1896 Blass published this Roman form of the text of
Acts (Acta Apostolorum, secundum Formam quae videtur Romanam). Blass calls this first, rough, unabridged copy of Acts (beta) and considers that it was issued at Rome. The later edition, abridged and revised, he calls alpha. Curiously enough, in Acts 11:28, Codex Bezae has “when we had gathered together,” making Luke present at Antioch. The idea of two editions is not wholly original with Blass. Leclerc, a Dutch philologist, had suggested the notion as early as the beginning of the 18th century. Bishop Lightfoot had also mentioned it (On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament, 29). But Blass worked the matter out and challenged the world of scholarship with his array of arguments. He has not carried his point with all, though he has won a respectable following. Zahn (Einl, II, 338 ff, 1899) had already been working toward the same view (348). He accepts in the main Blass’ theory, as do Belser, Nestle, Salmon, Zockler. Blass acknowledges his debt to Corssen (Der cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum, 1892), but Corssen considers the alpha text as the earlier and the beta text as a later revision.

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

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

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

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

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

3. UNITY OF THE BOOK.

It is not easy to discuss this question, apart from that of authorship. But they are not exactly the same. One may be convinced of the unity of the book and yet not credit it to Luke, or, indeed, to anyone in the 1st century. Of course, if Luke is admitted to be the author of the book, the whole matter is simplified. His hand is in it all whatever sources he used. If Luke is not the author, there may still have been a competent historian at work, or the book may be a mere compilation. The first step, therefore, is to attack the problem of unity. Holtzmann (Einl, 383) holds Luke to be the author of the “we” sections only. Schmiedel denies that the Acts is written by a companion of Paul, though it is by the same author as the Gospel bearing Luke’s name. In 1845 Schleiermacher credited the “we” sections to Timothy, not to Luke. For a good sketch of theories of “sources,” see Knowling on Acts, 25 ff. Van Manen (1890) resolved the book into two parts, Acta Petri and Acta Pauli, combined by a redactor. Sorof (1890) ascribes one source to Luke, one to Timothy. Spitta also has two sources (a Pauline-Lukan and a Jewish-Christian) worked over by a redactor. Clemen (1905) has four sources (History of the Hellenists, History of Peter, History of Paul, and a Journey of Paul), all worked over by a series of editors. Hilgenfeld (1895) has three sources (Acts of Peter, Acts of the Seven, Acts of Paul). Jungst (1895) has a Pauline source and a Petrine source. J. Weiss (1893) admits sources, but claims that the book has unity and a definite aim. B. Weiss (1902) conceives an early source for the first
part of the book. Harnack (The Acts of the Apostles, 1909, 41 f) has small patience with all this blind criticism: “With them the book passes as a comparatively late patchwork compilation, in which the part taken by the editor is insignificant yet in all cases detrimental; the `we’ sections are not the property of the author, but an extract from a source, or even a literary fiction.” He charges the critics with “airy conceit and lofty contempt.” Harnack has done a very great service in carefully sifting the matter in his Luke the Physician (1907). He gives detailed proof that the “we” sections are in the same style and by the same author as the rest of the book (26-120). Harnack does not claim originality in this line of argument: “It has been often stated and often proved that the `we’ sections in vocabulary, in syntax, and in style are most intimately bound up with the whole work, and that this work itself including the Gospel, in spite of all diversity in its parts, is distinguished by a grand unity of literary form” (Luke the Physician, 26). He refers to the “splendid demonstration of this unity” by Klostermann (Vindiciae Lucanae, 1866), to B. Weiss, who, in his commentary (1893, 2 Aufl, 1902) “has done the best work in demonstrating the literary unity of the whole work,” to “the admirable contributions” of Vogel (Zur Charakteristik des Lukas, etc., 2 Aufl, 1899) to the “yet more careful and minute investigations” of Hawkins (Horae Synopticae, 1899, 2nd edition, 1909), to the work of Hobart (The Medical Language of Luke, 1882), who “has proved only too much” (Luke the Physician, 175), but “the evidence is of overwhelming force” (198). Harnack only claims for himself that he has done the work in more detail and with more minute accuracy without claiming too much (27). But the conversion of Harnack to this view of Acts is extremely significant. It ought not to be necessary any more to refute the partition theories of the book, or to set forth in detail the proofs for the unity of the book. Perhaps the compilation theory of Acts is nowhere set forth more cogently than in McGiffert’s The Apostolic Age (1897). See a powerful refutation of his argument by Ramsay in Pauline and Other Studies (1906, 302-21). “I think his clever argumentation is sophistical” (305). Harnack is fully aware that he has gone over to the rode of “Ramsay, Weiss and Zahn”: “The results at which I have arrived not only approach very nearly to, but are often coincident with, the results of their research” (The Acts of the Apostles, 302). He is afraid that if these scholars failed to get the ear of critics “there is little prospect of claiming the attention of critics and compelling them to
reconsider their position.” But he has the advantage of coming to this conclusion from the other side. Moreover, if Harnack was won by the force of the facts, others may be. This brief sketch of Harnack’s experience may take the place of detailed presentation of the arguments for the unity of the book. Harnack sets forth in great wealth of detail the characteristic idioms of the “we” sections side by side with parallels in other parts of Acts and the Gospel of Luke. The same man wrote the rest of Acts who wrote the “we” sections. This fact should now be acknowledged as proven. This does not mean that the writer, a personal witness in the “we” sections, had no sources for the other parts of Acts. This aspect of the matter will be considered a little later.

4. THE AUTHOR.

Assuming the unity of the book, the argument runs as follows: The author was a companion of Paul. The “we” sections prove that (Acts 16:10-17; 20:6-16; 21; 27; 28). These sections have the fullness of detail and vivid description natural to an eye-witness. This companion was with Paul in the second missionary journey at Troas and at Philippi, joined Paul’s party again at Philippi on the return to Jerusalem during the third tour, and probably remained with Paul till he went to Rome. Some of Paul’s companions came to him at Rome: others are so described in the book as to preclude authorship. Aristarchus, Aquila and Priscilla, Erastus, Gaius, Mark, Silas, Timothy, Trophimus, Tychicus and others more or less insignificant from the point of view of connection with Paul (like Crescens, Demas, Justus, Linus, Pudens, Sopater, etc.) are easily eliminated. Curiously enough Luke and Titus are not mentioned in Acts by name at all. They are distinct persons as is stated in 2 Timothy 4:10 f. Titus was with Paul in Jerusalem at the conference (Galatians 2:1) and was his special envoy to Corinth during the time of trouble there. (2 Corinthians 2:12 f; 12:18.) He was later with Paul in Crete (Titus 1:5). But the absence of mention of Titus in Acts may be due to the fact that he was a brother of Luke (compare 2 Corinthians 8:18; 12:18). So A. Souter in DCG, article “Luke.” If Luke is the author, it is easy to understand why his name does not appear. If Titus is his brother, the same explanation occurs. As between Luke and Titus the medical language of Acts argues for Luke. The writer was a physician. This fact Hobart (The Medical
Language of Luke (1882) has demonstrated. Compare Zahn, Einl, 2, 435 ff; Harnack’s Luke the Physician, 177 ff. The arguments from the use of medical terms are not all of equal weight. But the style is colored at points by the language of a physician. The writer uses medical terms in a technical sense. This argument involves a minute comparison with the writings of physicians of the time. Thus in Acts 28:3 f *kathapto*, according to Hobart (288), is used in the sense of poisonous matter invading the body, as in Dioscorides, *Animal. Ven. Proem*. So Galen, Deuteronomy Typis 4 (VII, 467), uses it “of fever fixing on parts of the body.” Compare Harnack, Luke the Physician, 177 f. Harnack agrees also that the terms of the diagnosis in Acts 28:8 “are medically exact and can be vouched for from medical literature” (ibid., 176 f). Hobart has overdone his argument and adduced many examples that are not pertinent, but a real residuum remains, according to Harnack. Then *pimprasthai* is a technical term for swelling. Let these serve as examples. The interest of the writer in matters of disease is also another indication, compare Luke 8:43. Now Luke was a companion of Paul during his later ministry and was a physician. (Colossians 4:14). Hence, he fulfils all the requirements of the case. The argument thus far is only probable, it is true; but there is to be added the undoubted fact that the same writer wrote both Gospel and Acts (Acts 1:1). The direct allusion to the Gospel is reinforced by identity of style and method in the two books. The external evidence is clear on the matter. Both Gospel and Acts are credited to Luke the physician. The Muratorian canon ascribes Acts to Luke. By the end of the 2nd century the authority of the Acts is as well established as that of the Gospel (Salmon, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1885, 366). Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, all call Luke the author of the book. The argument is complete. It is still further strengthened by the fact that the point of view of the book is Pauline and by the absence of references to Paul’s epistles. If one not Paul’s companion had written Acts, he would certainly have made some use of them. Incidentally, also, this is an argument for the early date of the Acts. The proof that has won Harnack, the leader of the left in Germany, to the acknowledgment of the Lukan authorship of Acts ought to win all to this position.
5. CANONICITY.

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

6. DATE.


The acceptance of the Lukan authorship settles the question of some of the dates presented by critics. Schmiedel places the date of Acts between 105 and 130 AD (Encyclopedia Biblica). He assumes as proven that Luke made use of the writings of Josephus. It has never been possible to take with much seriousness the claim that the Acts shows acquaintance with Josephus. See Keim, Geschichte Jesu, III, 1872, 134, and Krenkel, Josephus und Lucas, 1894, for the arguments in favor of that position. The words quoted to prove it are in the main untechnical words of common use. The only serious matter is the mention of Theudas and Judas the Galilean in Acts 5:36 f and Josephus (Ant., XX, v, 1 f). In Josephus the names occur some twenty lines apart and the resemblance is only slight indeed. The use of peitho in connection with Theudas and apostesai concerning Judas is all that requires notice. Surely, then, two common words for “persuade” and “revolt” are not enough to carry conviction of the writer’s use of Josephus. The matter is more than offset by the
differences in the two reports of the death of Herod Agrippa (Acts 12:19-23; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, vi, 7, XIX, vii, 2). The argument about Josephus may be definitely dismissed from the field. With that goes all the ground for a 2nd-century date. Other arguments have been adduced (see Holtzmann, Einl, 1892, 405) such as the use of Paul’s epistles, acquaintance with Plutarch, Arrian and Pausanias, because of imitation in method of work (i.e. parallel lives of Peter and Paul, periods of history, etc.), correction of Galatians in Acts (for instance, Galatians 1:17-24 and Acts 9:26-30; Galatians 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-33). The parallel with Plutarch is fanciful, while the use of Paul’s epistles is by no means clear, the absence of such use, indeed, being one of the characteristics of the book. The variation from Galatians is far better explained on the assumption that Luke had not seen the epistles.

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

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

3. Before 70 AD.

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

7. SOURCES USED BY LUKE.

If we now assume that Luke is the author of the Acts, the question remains as to the character of the sources used by him. One is at liberty to appeal to Luke 1:1-4 for the general method of the author. He used both oral and written sources. In the Acts the matter is somewhat simplified by the fact that Luke was the companion of Paul for a considerable part of the narrative (the “we” sections, Acts 16:11-17; 20:5; 21:18; 27 and 28). It is more than probable that Luke was with Paul also during his last stay in Jerusalem and during the imprisonment at Caesarea. There is no reason to think that Luke suddenly left Paul in Jerusalem and returned to Caesarea only when he started to Rome (Acts 27:1). The absence of “we” is natural here, since it is not a narrative of travel, but a sketch of Paul’s arrest and series of defenses. The very abundance of material here, as in Acts 20 and 21, argues for the presence of Luke. But at any rate Luke has access to Paul himself for information concerning this period, as was true.
of the second, from Acts 13 to the end of the book. Luke was either present or he could have learned from Paul the facts used. He may have kept a travel diary, which was drawn upon when necessary. Luke could have taken notes of Paul’s addresses in Jerusalem (Acts 22) and Caesarea (Acts 24 through 26). From these, with Paul’s help, he probably composed the account of Paul’s conversion (Acts 9:1-30). If, as I think is true, the book was written during Paul’s first Roman imprisonment, Luke had the benefit of appeal to Paul at all points. But, if so, he was thoroughly independent in style and assimilated his materials like a true historian. Paul (and also Philip for part of it) was a witness to the events about Stephen in Acts 6:8 through 8:1 and a participant of the work in Antioch (11:19-30). Philip, the host of Paul’s company (21:8) on the last journey to Jerusalem, was probably in Caesarea still during Paul’s confinement there. He could have told Luke the events in Acts 6:1-7 and 8:4-40. In Caesarea also the story of Peter’s work may have been derived, possibly even from Cornelius himself (9:32 through 11:18). Whether Luke ever went to Antioch or not we do not know (Codex Bezae has “we” in Acts 11:28), though he may have had access to the Antiochian traditions. But he did go to Jerusalem. However, the narrative in Acts 12 probably rests on the authority of John Mark (Acts 12:12,25), in whose mother’s house the disciples were assembled. Luke was apparently thrown with Mark in Rome (Colossians 4:10), if not before. For Acts 1 through 5 the matter does not at first seem so clear, but these chapters are not necessarily discredited on that account. It is remarkable, as ancient historians made so little mention of their sources, that we can connect Luke in the Acts with so many probable fountains of evidence. Barnabas (4:36) was able to tell much about the origin of the work in Jerusalem. So could Mnason. Philip also was one of the seven (6:5; 21:8). We do not know that Luke met Peter in Rome, though that is possible. But during the stay in Jerusalem and Caesarea (two years) Luke had abundant opportunity to learn the narrative of the great events told in Acts 1 through 5. He perhaps used both oral and written sources for this section. One cannot, of course, prove by linguistic or historical arguments the precise nature of Luke’s sources in Acts. Only in broad outlines the probable materials may be sketched.
8. THE SPEECHES IN ACTS.

This matter is important enough to receive separate treatment. Are the numerous speeches reported in Acts free compositions of Luke made to order a la Thucydides? Are they verbatim reports from notes taken at the times and literally copied into the narrative? Are they substantial reports incorporated with more or less freedom with marks of Luke’s own style? In the abstract either of these methods was possible. The example of Thucydides, Xenophon, Livy and Josephus shows that ancient historians did not scruple to invent speeches of which no report was available. There are not wanting those who accuse Luke of this very thing in Acts. The matter can only be settled by an appeal to the facts so far as they can be determined. It cannot be denied that to a certain extent the hand of Luke is apparent in the addresses reported by him in Acts. But this fact must not be pressed too far. It is not true that the addresses are all alike in style. It is possible to distinguish very clearly the speeches of Peter from those of Paul. Not merely is this true, but we are able to compare the addresses of both Paul and Peter with their epistles. It is not probable that Luke had seen these epistles, as will presently be shown. It is crediting remarkable literary skill to Luke to suppose that he made up “Petrine” speeches and “Pauline” speeches with such success that they harmonize beautifully with the teachings and general style of each of these apostles. The address of Stephen differs also sharply from those of Peter and Paul, though we are not able to compare this report with any original work by Stephen himself. Another thing is true also, particularly of Paul’s sermons. They are wonderfully stated to time, place and audience. They all have a distract Pauline flavor, and yet a difference in local color that corresponds, to some extent, with the variations in the style of Paul’s epistles. Professor Percy Gardner (The Speeches of Paul in Acts, in Cambridge Biblical Essays, 1909) recognizes these differences, but seeks to explain them on the ground of varying accuracy in the sources used by Luke, counting the speech at Miletus as the most historic of all. But he admits the use of sources by Luke for these addresses. The theory of pure invention by Luke is quite discredited by appeal to the facts. On the other hand, in view of the apparent presence of Luke’s style to some extent in the speeches, it can hardly be claimed that he has made verbatim reports. Besides, the report of the addresses of Jesus in Luke’s Gospel (as in the other gospels)
shows the same freedom in giving the substance exact reproduction of the words that is found in Acts. Again, it seems clear that some, if not all, the reports in Acts are condensed, mere outlines in the case of some of Peter’s addresses. The ancients knew how to make shorthand reports of such addresses. The oral tradition was probably active in preserving the early speeches of Peter and even of Stephen, though Paul himself heard Stephen. The speeches of Paul all show the marks of an eyewitness (Bethge, Die paulinischen Reden, etc., 174). For the speeches of Peter, Luke may have had documents, or he may have taken down the current oral tradition while he was in Jerusalem and Caesarea. Peter probably spoke in Greek on the day of Pentecost. His other addresses may have been in Aramaic or in Greek. But the oral tradition would certainly carry them in Greek, if also in Aramaic. Luke heard Paul speak at Miletus (Acts 20) and may have taken notes at the time. So also he almost certainly heard Paul’s address on the steps of the Tower of Antonia (Acts 22) and that before Agrippa (Acts 26). There is no reason to think that he was absent when Paul made his defenses before Felix and Festus (Acts 24 through 25) He was present on the ship when Paul spoke (Acts 27), and in Rome when he addressed the Jews (Acts 28) Luke was not on hand when Paul delivered his sermon at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13), or at Lystra (Acts 14), or at Athens (Acts 17). But these discourses differ so greatly in theme and treatment, and are so essentially Pauline that it is natural to think that Paul himself gave Luke the notes which he used. The sermon at Antioch in Pisidia is probably given as a sample of Paul’s missionary discourses. It contains the heart of Paul’s gospel as it appears in his epistles. He accentuates the death and resurrection of Jesus, remission of sins through Christ, justification by faith. It is sometimes objected that at Athens the address shows a breadth of view and sympathy unknown to Paul, and that there is a curious Attic tone to the Greek style. The sermon does go as far as Paul can (compare 1 Corinthians 9:22) toward the standpoint of the Greeks (but compare Colossians and Ephesians). However, Paul does not sacrifice his principle of grace in Christ. He called the Athenians to repentance, preached the judgment for sin and announced the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man here taught did not mean that God yanked at sin and could save all men without repentance and forgiveness of sin. Chase (The Credibility of Acts) gives a collection of Paul’s missionary addresses. The historical reality and value of the
speeches in Acts may be said to be vindicated by modern scholarship. For a sympathetic and scholarly discussion of all of Paul’s addresses see Jones, Paul the Orator (1910). The short speech of Tertullus (Acts 24) was made in public, as was the public statement of Festus in Acts 26. The letter of Claudias Lysias to Felix in Acts 23 was a public document. How Luke got hold of the conversation about Paul between Festus and Agrippa in Acts 26 is more difficult to conjecture.

9. RELATION OF ACTS TO THE EPISTLES.

There is no real evidence that Luke made use of any of Paul’s epistles. He was with Paul in Rome when Colossians was written (4:14), and may, indeed, have been Paul’s amanuensis for this epistle (and for Ephesians and Philem). Some similarities to Luke’s style have been pointed out. But Acts closes without any narrative of the events in Rome during the years there, so that these epistles exerted no influence on the composition of the book. As to the two preceding groups of Paul’s epistles (1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Roman) there is no proof that Luke saw any of them. The Epistle to the Romans was probably accessible to into while in Rome, but he does not seem to have used it. Luke evidently preferred to appeal to Paul directly for information rather than to his epistles. This is all simple enough if he wrote the book or made his data while Paul was alive. But if Acts was written very late, it would be strange for the author not to have made use of some of Paul’s epistles. The book has, therefore, the great advantage of covering some of the same ground as that discussed in the earlier epistles, but from a thoroughly independent stand-point. The gaps in our knowledge from the one source are often supplied incidentally, but most satisfactorily, from the other. The coincidences between Acts and Paul’s epistles have been well traced by Paley in his Horae Paulinae, still a book of much value. Knowling, in his Witness of the Epistles (1892), has made a more recent study of the same problem. But for the apparent conflict between Galatians 2:1-10 and Acts 15 the matter might be dropped at this point. It is argued by some that Acts, written long after Galatians, brushes to one side the account of the Jerusalem conference given by Paul. It is held that Paul is correct in his personal record, and that Acts is therefore unhistorical. Others save the credit of Acts by arguing that Paul is referring to an earlier
private conference some years before the public discussion recorded in Acts 15. This is, of course, possible in itself, but it is by no means required by the variations between the two reports. The contention of Lightfoot has never been really overturned, that in Galatians 2:1-10 Paul gives the personal side of the conference, not a full report of the general meeting. What Paul is doing is to show the Galatians how he is on a par with the Jerusalem apostles, and how his authority and independence were acknowledged by them. This aspect of the matter came out in the private conference. Paul is not in Galatians 2:1-10 setting forth his victory over the Judaizers in behalf of Gentile freedom. But in Acts 15 it is precisely this struggle for Gentile freedom that is under discussion. Paul’s relations with the Jerusalem apostles is not the point at all, though it in plain in Acts that they agree. In Galatians also Paul’s victory for Gentile freedom comes out. Indeed, in Acts 15 it is twice mentioned that the apostles and elders were gathered together (15:4,6), and twice we are told that Paul and Barnabas addressed them (15:4,12). It is therefore natural to suppose that this private conference narrated by Paul in Galatians came in between 2:5 and 6. Luke may not, indeed, have seen the Epistle to the Galatians, and may not have heard from Paul the story of the private conference, though he knew of the two public meetings. If he did know of the private meeting, he thought it not pertinent to his narration. There is, of course, no contradiction between Paul’s going up by revelation and by the appointment of the church in Antioch. In Galatians 2:1 we have the second visit to Jerusalem after his conversion mentioned by Paul, while that in Acts 15 is the third in Acts (9:28; 11:29 f; 15:2). But there was no particular reason for Paul to mention the visit in Acts 11:30, which did not concern his relation to the apostles in Jerusalem. Indeed, only the “elders” are mentioned on this occasion. The same independence between Acts and Galatians occurs in Galatians 1:17-24, and Acts 9:26-30. In Acts there is no allusion to the visit to Arabia, just as there is no mention of the private conference in Acts 15. So also in Acts 15:35-39 there is no mention of the sharp disagreement between Paul and Peter at Antioch recorded in Galatians 2:11 ff. Paul mentions it merely to prove his own authority and independence as an apostle. Luke had no occasion to record the incident, if he was acquainted with the matter. These instances illustrate well how, when the Acts and the epistles vary, they really supplement each other.
10. CHRONOLOGY OF ACTS.

Here we confront one of the most perplexing questions in New Testament criticism. In general, ancient writers were not so careful as modern writers are to give precise dates for historical events. Indeed, it was not easy to do so in view of the absence of a uniform method of reckoning times. Luke does, however, relate his narrative to outward events at various points. In his Gospel he had linked the birth of Jesus with the names of Augustus as emperor and of Quirinius as governor of Syria (Luke 2:1 f), and the entrance of John the Baptist upon his ministry with the names of the chief Roman and Jewish rulers of the time (Luke 3:1 f). So also in the Acts he does not leave us without various notes of times. He does not, indeed, give the date of the Ascension or of the Crucifixion, though he places the Ascension forty days after the Resurrection (Acts 1:3), and the great Day of Pentecost would then come ten days later, “not many days hence” (Acts 1:5). But the other events in the opening chapters of Acts have no clear chronological arrangement. The career of Stephen is merely located “in these days” (6:1). The beginning of the general persecution under Saul is located on the very day of Stephen’s death (8:1), but the year is not even hinted at. The conversion of Saul comes probably in its chronological order in Acts 9, but the year again is not given. We have no hint as to the age of Saul at his conversion. So again the relation of Peter’s work in Caesarea (10) to the preaching to the Greeks in Antioch (11) is not made clear, though probably in this order. It is only when we come to Acts 12 that we reach an event whose date is reasonably certain. This is the death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 AD. But even so, Luke does not correlate the life of Paul with that incident. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 49) places the persecution and death of James in 44, and the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem in 46. About 44, then, we may consider that Saul came to Antioch from Tarsus. The “fourteen years” in Galatians 2:1 as already shown probably point to the visit in Acts 15 some years later. But Saul had been in Tarsus some years and had spent some three years in Arabia and Damascus after his conversion (Galatians 1:18). Beyond this it is not possible to go. We do not know the age of Saul in 44 AD or the year of his conversion. He was probably born not far from 1 AD. But if we locate Paul at Antioch with Barnabas in 44 AD, we can make some headway. Here Paul spent a year (Acts 11:26). The visit to Jerusalem in Acts 11,
the first missionary tour in 13 and 14, the conference at Jerusalem in 15, the second missionary tour in 16 through 18, the third missionary tour and return to Jerusalem in 18 through 21, the arrest in Jerusalem and two years in Caesarea in 21 through 26, all come between 44 AD and the recall of Felix and the coming of Festus. It used to be taken for granted that Festus came in 60 AD. Wieseler figured it out so from Josephus and was followed by Lightfoot. But Eusebius, in his “Chronicle,” placed that event in the second year of Nero. That would be 56, unless Eusebius has a special way of counting those years Mr. C. H Turner (art. “Chronology” in HDB) finds that Eusebius counts an emperor’s regnal year from the September following. If so, the date could be moved forward to 57 (compare Rackham on Acts, lxvi). But Ramsay (chapter xiv, “Pauline Chronology,” in Pauline and Other Studies) cuts the Gordian knot by showing an error in Eusebius due to his disregarding an interregnum with the reign of Mugs Ramsay here follows Erbes (Todestage Pauli und Pertri in this discovery and is able to fix upon 59 as the date of the coming of Festus. Probably 59 will have to answer as a compromise date. Between 44 AD and 59 AD, therefore, we place the bulk of Paul’s active missionary work. Luke has divided this period into minor divisions with relative dates. Thus a year and six months are mentioned at Corinth (Acts 18:11), besides “yet many days” (Acts 18:18). In Ephesus we find mention of “three months” (Acts 19:8) and “two years” (Acts 19:10), the whole story summed up as “three years” (Acts 20:31) Then we have the “two years” of delay in Caesarea (Acts 24:27). We thus have about seven of these fifteen years itemized. Much of the remaining eight was spent in the journeys described by Luke. We are told also the times of year when the voyage to Rome was under way (Acts 27:9), the length of the voyage (Acts 27:27), the duration of the stay in Melita (Acts 28:11), and the times spent in Rome at the close of the book, “two whole years” (Acts 28:30). Thus it is possible to fix upon a relative schedule of dates, though not an absolute one. Harnack (The Acts of the Apostles, chapter i, “Chronological Data”) has worked out a very careful scheme for the whole of Acts. Knowling has a good critical resume of the present state of our knowledge of the chronology of Acts in his Commentary, 38 ff, compare also Clemen, Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe (1893). It is clear, then, that a rational scheme for events of Paul’s career so far as recorded in the Acts can be found. If 57 AD, for instance, should be taken as the year of Festus
coming rather than 59 or 60 AD, the other dates back to 44 AD would, of course, be affected on a sliding scale. Back of 44 AD the dates are largely conjectural.

11. HISTORICAL WORTH OF ACTS.

It was once fashionable to discredit Acts as a book of no real value as history. The Tubingen school regarded Acts as “a late controversial romance, the only historical value of which was to throw light on the thought of the period which produced it” (Chase, The Credibility of Acts, 9). There are not wanting a few writers who still regard Acts as a late eirenicon between the Peter and Paul parties, or as a party pamphlet in the interest of Paul. Somewhat fanciful parallels are found between Luke’s treatment of both Peter and Paul “According to Holtzmann, the strongest argument for the critical position is the correspondence between the acts of Peter and the other apostles on the one rode and those of Paul on the other” (Headlam in HDB). But this matter seems rather far fetched. Peter is the leading figure in the early chapters, as Paul is in the latter half of the book, but the correspondences are not remarkably striking. There exists in some minds a prejudice against the book on the ground of the miracles recorded as genuine events by Luke. But Paul himself claimed to have wrought miracles (2 Corinthians 12:12). It is not scientific to rule a book out beforehand because it narrates miracles (Blass, Acta Apostolorum, 8). Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 8) tells his experience in regard to the trustworthiness of Acts: “I began with a mind unfavorable to it, for the ingenuity and apparent completeness of the Tubingen theory had at one time quite convinced me.” It was by actual verification of Acts in points where it could be tested by inscriptions, Paul’s epistles, or current non-Christian writers, that “it was gradually borne in upon me that in various details the narrative showed marvelous truth.” He concludes by “placing this great writer on the high pedestal that belongs to him” (10). McGiffert (The Apostolic Age) had been compelled by the geographical and historical evidence to abandon in part the older criticism. He also admitted that the Acts “is more trustworthy than previous critics allowed” (Ramsay, Luke the Physician, 5). Schmiedel (Encyclopedia Biblica) still argues that the writer of Acts is inaccurate because he was not in possession of full information. But on the whole Acts has had a triumphant vindicatioin in
modern criticism. Julicher (Einl, 355) admits “a genuine core overgrown with legendary accretions” (Chase, Credibility, 9). The moral honesty of Luke, his fidelity to truth (Rackham on Acts, 46), is clearly shown in both his Gospel and the Acts. This, after all, is the chief trait in the true historian (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 4). Luke writes as a man of serious purpose and is the one New Testament writer who mentions his careful use of his materials (Luke 1:1-4). His attitude and spent are those of the historian. He reveals artistic skill, it is true, but not to the discredit of his record. He does not give a bare chronicle, but he writes a real history, an interpretation of the events recorded. He had adequate resources in the way of materials and endowment and has made conscientious and skillful use of his opportunity. It is not necessary here to give in detail all the points in which Luke has been vindicated (see Knowling on Acts, Ramsay’s books and Harnack’s Luke and Acts). The most obvious are the following: The use of “proconsul” instead of “propraetor” in Acts 13:7 is a striking instance. Curiously enough Cyprus was not a senatorial province very long. An inscription has been found in Cyprus “in the proconsulship of Paulus.” The `first men’ of Antioch in Pisidia is like the (13:50) “First Ten,” a title which “was only given (as here) to a board of magistrates in Greek cities of the East” (MacLean in one-vol HDB). The “priest of Jupiter” at Lystra (14:13) is in accord with the known facts of the worship there. So we have Perga in Pamphylia (13:13), Antioch in Pisidia 13:14), Lystra and Derbe in Lycaonia (14:6), but not Iconium (14:1). In Philippi Luke notes that the magistrates are called *strategoi* or *praetors* (Acts 16:20), and are accompanied by lictors or *rhabdouchoi* (Acts 16:35). In Thessalonica the rulers are “politarchs” (Acts 17:6), a title found nowhere else, but now discovered on an inscription of Thessalonica. He rightly speaks of the Court of the Areopagus at Athens (Acts 17:19) and the proconsul in Achaia (Acts 18:12). Though Athens was a free city, the Court of the Areopagus at the times were the real rulers. Achaia was sometimes associated with Macedonia, though at this time it was a separate senatorial province. In Ephesus Luke knows of the “Asiarchs” (Acts 19:31), “the presidents of the `Common Council’ of the province in cities where there was a temple of Rome and the Emperor; they superintended the worship of the Emperor” (Maclean). Note also the fact that Ephesus is “temple-keeper of the great Diana” (Acts 19:35). Then observe the town clerk (Acts 19:35), and the
assembly (Acts 19:39). Note also the title of Felix, “governor” or procurator (Acts 24:1), Agrippa the king (25:13), Julius the centurion and the Augustan band (Acts 27:1). Acts 27 is a marvel of interest and accuracy for all who wish to know details of ancient seafaring. The matter has been worked over in a masterful way by James Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul. The title “First Man of the Island” (Acts 28:7) is now found on a coin of Melita. These are by no means all the matters of interest, but they will suffice. In most of the items given above Luke’s veracity was once challenged, but now he has been triumphantly vindicated. The force of this vindication is best appreciated when one recalls the incidental nature of the items mentioned. They come from widely scattered districts and are just the points where in strange regions it is so easy to make slips. If space allowed, the matter could be set forth in more detail and with more justice to Luke’s worth as a historian. It is true that in the earlier portions of the Acts we are not able to find so many geographical and historical corroborations. But the nature of the material did not call for the mention of so many places and persons. In the latter part Luke does not hesitate to record miraculous events also. His character as a historian is firmly established by the passages where outside contact has been found. We cannot refuse him a good name in the rest of the book, though the value of the sources used certainly cuts a figure. It has been urged that Luke breaks down as a historian in the double mention of Quirinius in Luke 2:2 and Acts 5:37. But Ramsay (Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?) has shown how the new knowledge of the census system of Augustus derived from the Egypt papyri is about to clear up this difficulty. Luke’s general accuracy at least calls for suspense of judgment, and in the matter of Theudas and Judas the Galilean (Acts 5) Luke as compared with Josephus outclasses his rival. Harnack (The Acts of the Apostles, 203-29) gives in his usual painstaking way a number of examples of “inaccuracy and discrepancy” But the great bulk of them are merely examples of independence in narration (compare Acts 9 with 22 and 26, where we have three reports of Paul’s conversion). Harnack did not, indeed, once place as high a value on Luke as a historian as he now does. It is all the more significant, therefore, to read the following in Harnack’s The Acts of the Apostles (298 f): “The book has now been restored to the position of credit which is its rightful due. It is not only, taken as a whole, a genuinely historical work, but even in the majority of
its details it is trustworthy. Judged from almost every possible standpoint of historical criticism it is a solid, respectable, and in many respects an extraordinary work.” That is, in my opinion, an understatement of the facts (see Ramsay), but it is a remarkable conclusion concerning the trustworthiness of Luke when one considers the distance that Harnack has come. At any rate the prejudice against Luke is rapidly disappearing. The judgment of the future is forecast by Ramsay, who ranks Luke as a historian of the first order.

12. PURPOSE OF THE BOOK.

A great deal of discussion has been given to Luke’s aim in the Acts. Baur’s theory was that this book was written to give a conciliatory view of the conflict between Peter and Paul, and that a minute parallelism exists in the Acts between these two heroes. This tendency theory once held the critical field, but it does not take into view all the facts, and fails to explain the book as a whole. Peter and Paul are the heroes of the book as they undoubtedly were the two chief personalities in apostolic history (compare Wendt, Apostelgeschichte, 17). There is some parallelism between the careers of the two men (compare the worship offered Peter at Caesarea in Acts 10:25, and that to Paul in 14:11; see also the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira and that of Elymas). But Knowling (Acts, 16) well replies that curiously no use is made of the death of both Peter and Paul in Rome, possibly at the same time. If the Acts was written late, this matter would be open to the knowledge of the writer. There is in truth no real effort on Luke’s part to paint Paul like Peter or Peter like Paul. The few similarities in incident are merely natural historical parallels. Others have seen in the Acts a strong purpose to conciliate Gentile(pagan) opinion in the fact that the Roman governors and military officers are so uniformly presented as favorable to Paul, while the Jews are represented as the real aggressors against Christianity (compare Josephus’ attitude toward Rome). Here again the fact is beyond dispute. But the other explanation is the more natural, namely, that Luke brings out this aspect of the matter because it was the truth. Compare B. Weiss, Einl, 569. Luke does have an eye on the world relations of Christianity and rightly reflects Paul’s ambition to win the Roman Empire to Christ (see Romans 15), but that is not to say that he has given the book a political bias or colored it so
as to deprive it of its historical worth. It is probably true (compare Knowling, Acts, 15; J. Weiss, Ueber die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte) that Luke felt, as did Paul, that Judaism realized its world destiny in Christianity, that Christianity was the true Judaism, the spiritual and real Israel. If Luke wrote Acts in Rome, while Paul’s case was still before Nero, it is easy to understand the somewhat long and minute account of the arrest and trials of Paul in Jerusalem, Caesarea and Rome. The point would be that the legal aspect of Christianity before Roman laws was involved. Hitherto Christianity had found shelter as a sect of Judaism, and so was passed by Gallio in Corinth as a religio licita. If Paul was condemned as a Christian, the whole aspect of the matter would be altered. Christianity would at once become religio illicita. The last word in the Acts comments on the fact that Paul, though still a prisoner, was permitted to preach unhindered. The importance of this point is clearly seen as one pushes on to the Neronian persecution in 64. After that date Christianity stood apart from Judaism in the eye of Rome. I have already stated my belief that Luke closed the Acts when he did and as he did because the events with Paul had only gone thus far. Numerous scholars hold that Luke had in mind a third book (Acts 1:1), a possible though by no means necessary inference from “first treatise.” It was a climax to carry the narrative on to Rome with Paul, but it is rather straining the point to find all this in Acts 1:8. Rome was not “the nethermost part of the earth,” Spain more nearly being that. Nor did Paul take the gospel to Rome. Besides, to make the arrival of Paul in Rome the goal in the mind of Christ is too narrowing a purpose. The purpose to go to Rome did dominate Paul’s mind for several years (Acts 19:21), but Paul cuts no figure in the early part of the book. And Paul wished to push on from Rome to Spain (Romans 15:24). It is probably true that Luke means to announce his purpose in Acts 1:1-8. One needs to keep in mind also Luke 1:1-4. There are various ways of writing history. Luke chooses the biographical method in Acts. Thus he conceives that he can best set forth the tremendous task of interpreting the first thirty years of the apostolic history. It is around persons (compare Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles, 117), two great figures (Peter and Paul), that the narrative is focused. Peter is most prominent in Acts 1 through 12, Paul in 13 through 28. Still Paul’s conversion is told in Acts 9 and Peter reappears in Acts 15. But these great personages do not stand alone. John the Apostle is
certainly with Peter in the opening chapters. The other apostles are 
mentioned also by name (Acts 1:13) and a number of times in the first 
twelve chapters (and in Acts 15). But after Acts 15 they drop out of the 
narrative, for Luke follows the fortunes of Paul. The other chief secondary 
figures in Acts are Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, James, Apollos, all 
Hellenists save James (Harnack, 120). The minor characters are numerous 
(John, Mark, Silas, Timothy, Aquila and Priscilla, Aristarchus, etc.). In 
most cases Luke gives a distinct picture of these incidental personages. In 
particular he brings out sharply such men as Gallio, Claudius, Lysias, 
apostolic history is that it is the work of Jesus still carried on by the Holy 
Spirit (Acts 1:1 f). Christ chose the apostles, commanded them to wait 
for power from on high, filled them with the Holy Spirit and then sent 
them on the mission of world conquest. In the Acts Luke records the 
waiting, the coming of the Holy Spirit, the planting of a powerful church in 
Jerusalem and the expansion of the gospel to Samaria and all over the 
Roman Empire. He addresses the book to Theophilus as his patron, a 
Gentile Christian plainly, as he had done with his gospel. The book is 
designed for the enlightenment of Christians generally concerning the 
historic origins of Christianity. It is in truth the first church history. It is in 
reality the Acts of the Holy Spirit as wrought through these men. It is an 
inspiring narration. Luke had no doubt whatever of the future of a gospel 
with such a history and with such heroes of faith as Peter and Paul.

13. ANALYSIS.

1. The connection between the work of the apostles and that of Jesus 

2. The equipment of the early disciples for their task (Acts 1:12 through 
2:47).

   (a) The disciples obeying Christ’s parting command (Acts 1:12-44).

   (b) The place of Judas filled (Acts 1:15-26).

   (c) Miraculous manifestations of the presence of the Holy Spirit 

   (d) Peter’s interpretation of the situation (Acts 2:14-36).
(e) The immediate effect of the sermon (Acts 2:37-41).


3. The development of the work in Jerusalem (Acts 3:1 through 8:1a).

(a) An incident in the work of Peter and John with Peter’s apologetic (Acts 3).

(b) Opposition of the Sadducees aroused by the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 4:1-31).

(c) An internal difficulty, the problem of poverty (Acts 4:32 through 5:11).

(d) Great progress of the cause in the city (Acts 5:12-16).

(e) Renewed hostility of the Sadducees and Gamaliel’s retort to the Pharisees (Acts 5:17-42).


(g) Stephen’s spiritual interpretation of Christianity stirs the antagonism of the Pharisees and leads to his violent death (Acts 6:8 through 8:1a).

4. The compulsory extension of the gospel to Judea, Samaria and the neighboring regions (Acts 8:1b-40).

(a) The great persecution, with Saul as leader (Acts 8:1b-4).

(b) Philip’s work as a notable example of the work of the scattered disciples (Acts 8:5-40).

5. The conversion of Saul changes the whole situation for Christianity (Acts 9:1-31).

(a) Saul’s mission to Damascus (Acts 9:1-3).

(b) Saul stopped in his hostile course and turns Christian himself (Acts 9:4-18).
(c) Saul becomes a powerful exponent of the gospel in Damascus and Jerusalem (Acts 9:19-30).

(d) The church has peace (Acts 9:31).

6. The door opened to the Gentiles, both Roman and Greek (Acts 9:32 through 11:30).

(a) Peter’s activity in this time of peace (Acts 9:32-43).

(b) The appeal from Cornelius in Caesarea and Peter’s response (Acts 10).

(c) Peter’s arraignment before the Pharisaic element in the church in Jerusalem (Acts 11:1-18).

(d) Greeks in Antioch are converted and Barnabas brings Saul to this work (Acts 11:19-26).


7. Persecution from the civil government (Acts 12).

(a) Herod Agrippa I kills James and imprisons Peter (Acts 12:1-19).

(b) Herod pays the penalty for his crimes (Acts 12:20-23).

(c) Christianity prospers (Acts 12:24 f).

8. The Gentile propaganda from Antioch under the leadership of Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13 through 14).

(a) The specific call of the Holy Spirit to this work (Acts 13:1-3).

(b) The province of Cyprus and the leadership of Paul (Acts 13:4-12).

(c) The province of Pamphylia and the desertion of John Mark (Acts 13:13).

(d) The province of Galatia (Pisidia and Lycaonia) and the stronghold of the gospel upon the native population (Acts 13:14 through 14:24).
(e) The return and report to Antioch (Acts 14:25-28).


(a) They meet Paul and Barnabas at Antioch who decide to appeal to Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-3).

(b) The first public meeting in Jerusalem (Acts 15:4 f).

(c) The second and more extended discussion with the decision of the conference (Acts 15:6-29).

(d) The joyful reception (in Antioch) of the victory of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 15:30-35).


(a) The breach between Paul and Barnabas over John Mark (Acts 15:36-39).

(b) From Antioch to Troas with the Macedonian Cry (Acts 15:40 through 16:10).

(c) In Philippi in Macedonia the gospel gains a foothold in Europe, but meets opposition (Acts 16:11-40).

(d) Paul is driven also from Thessalonica and Berea (compare Philippi), cities of Macedonia also (Acts 17:1-15).

(e) Paul’s experience in Athens (Acts 17:16-34).

(f) In Corinth Paul spends nearly two years and the cause of Christ wins legal recognition from the Roman governor (Acts 18:1-17).

(g) The return to Antioch by way of Ephesus, Caesarea and probably Jerusalem (Acts 18:18-22).

11. The third great tour, with Ephesus as headquarters (Acts 18:23 through 20:3).

(a) Paul in Galatia and Phrygia again (Acts 18:23).

(b) Apollos in Ephesus before Paul comes (Acts 18:24-28).
(c) Paul’s three years in Ephesus (Acts 19:1 through 20:1a).

(d) The brief visit to Corinth because of the troubles there (Acts 20:1b-3).


(a) His companions (Acts 20:4).


(c) The story of Troas (Acts 20:7-12).


(e) with the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts 20:17-38).

(f) From Miletus to Tyre (Acts 21:1-6).

(g) From Tyre to Caesarea (Acts 21:7-14).

(h) From Caesarea to Jerusalem (Acts 21:15 f).


(a) Paul’s reception by the brethren (Acts 21:15-17).

(b) Their proposal of a plan by which Paul could undo the work of the Judaizers concerning him in Jerusalem (Acts 21:18-26).

(c) The uproar in the temple courts raised by the Jews from Asia as Paul was carrying out the plan to disarm the Judaizers (Acts 21:27-30).

(d) Paul’s rescue by the Roman captain and Paul’s defense to the Jewish mob (Acts 21:31 through 22:23).

(e) Examination of the chief captain (Acts 22:24-29).

(f) Brought before the Sanhedrin (Acts 22:30 through 23:10).

(g) Cheered by the Lord Jesus (Acts 23:11).

(h) Paul’s escape from the plot of Jewish conspirators (Acts 23:12-30).

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


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


(a) His quarters (Acts 28:16).
(b) His first interview with the Jews (Acts 28:17-22).
(c) His second interview with the Jews (Acts 28:23-28).
(d) Two years afterward still a prisoner, but with freedom to preach the gospel (Acts 28:30 f).
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Belser, Beiträge zur Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte (1897); Benson, Addresses on the Acts of the Apostles (1901); Bethge, Die paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte (1887); Blass, Acta Apostolorum secundum Formam quae videtur Romanam (1896); Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles (1902); Clemen, Die Apostelgeschichte, im Lichte der neueren Forschungen (1905); Fiene, Eine vorkanonische Nebenlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte (1891); Harnack, Luke, the Physician (translation, 1907); The Acts of the Apostles (1909); Hilgenfeld, Acta Apostolorum Graece et Latine (1899); Jungst, Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte (1895); Krenkel, Josephus und Lucas (1894); Luckok, Footprints of the Apostles as Traced by Luke in the Acts (1897); J. Lightfoot, Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations on the Acts of the Apostles (1768); Paley, Horae Paulinae (Birks edition, 1850); Ramsay, Paul the Traveler (1896); Pauline and Other Studies (1906); Cities of Paul (1908), Luke the Physician, and Other Studies (1908); J. Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul (4th edition, 1880); Sorof, Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte (1890); Spitta, Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Quellen und deren geschichtlicher Worth (1891); Stiffler, An
Introduction to the Book of Acts (1892); Vogel, Zur Characteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil (1897); J. Weiss, Ueber die Absicht und die literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte (1897); Zeller, The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles (translation, 1875); Maurice Jones, Paul the Orator (1910).

5. Commentaries:

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

A. T. Robertson

ACTS OF PILATE

<pi’-lat>, <pi’-lat>.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

ACTS OF SOLOMON


ACUA

<ak’-u-a>.

See ACUD.
ACUB

<\textit{a'-kub}> (Codex Vaticanus, [\textit{\'Ako\o\upsilon}, Akouph]; Codex Alexandrinus, [\textit{\'Ako\o\mu}, Akoum]) = Bakbuk (Ezra 2:51; Nehemiah 7:53): The descendants of Acub (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:31).

ACUD

<\textit{a'-kud}> ([\textit{\'Ako\o\delta}, Akoud]; the King James Version Acua) = A\textsubscript{K}KUB (Ezra 2:45) which see; omitted in Nehemiah 7: The descendants of Acud (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:30).

ADADAH

<\textit{a-da'-da}>([\textit{\textbackslash{\textasciitilde}adh\textbackslash{\textasciitilde}adhah}]): A city in the southern part of Judah (Joshua 15:22). The older copies of the Greek text have Arouel, but that is not a sufficient reason for identifying the name with the Aroer of 1 Samuel 30:28. Some scholars adopt the change of text, and identify the site with Ararah, about seven miles Southeast of Beer-sheba. Others identify it with Adadah, eight or nine miles Southeast of Arad.

ADADRIMMON

<\textit{a-dad-rim'-on}>: Shorter and less accurate name of a place in the Valley of Megiddo, which tradition connected with the death of King Josiah (Zechariah 12:11; 2 Chronicles 35:22).

See HADADRIMMON.

ADAH

<\textit{a'-da}>([\textit{\textbackslash{\textasciitilde}adhah}], “adornment”):

(1) One of the two wives of Lamech the descendant of Cain (Genesis 4:19,20,23). The narrative in Genesis assigns to her two sons, Jabal the “father” of tent-dwelling people, and Jubal the “father” of all such as handle the harp and pipe.” Josephus says that Lamech had 77 sons by Ada and Zillah (Ant., I, ii, 2).
(2) According to Genesis 36:2,4,10,12,16, the Hittite wife of Esau, daughter of Elon, and mother of Eliphaz. In this chapter Esau’s other wives are Oholibamah, a Hivite, and Basemath the daughter of Ishmael. The names are differently given elsewhere (Genesis 26:34; 28:9). Basemath is said to be the daughter of Elon. The daughter of Ishmael is called Mahalath. In place of Oholibamah the Hivite we find Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite. Data are lacking for the solution of the problem.

Willis J. Beecher

ADAIAH

<ada’-ya>, <adi’-a> (דֵּבֵּא [adhayah], “Yahweh hath adorned”):

(1) Apparently the seventh of the nine sons of Shimei, who is apparently the same with Shema, who is the fifth of the sons of Elpaal, who is the second of the two sons of Shaharaim and Hushim (1 Chronicles 8:21). Shaharaim and his descendants are listed with the descendants of Benjamin, though his relations to Benjamin are not stated.

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

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

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

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

(6) One of the men of Israel, not a priest or Levite, but “of the sons of Bani,” who promised Ezra that he would part with his foreign wife (Ezra 10:29).
The same man or another, in a different group of the sons of Bani (Ezra 10:39).

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

Willis J. Beecher

ADALIA

<ad'-li'-a> (אדהליה [’adhalya’], probably a Persian name, meaning unknown): One of the ten sons of Haman who were put to death by the Jews (Est 9:8).

ADAM; IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE APOCRYPHA

<ad'-am>, (אדם ['adham]; Septuagint [Αδάμ, Adam]).

1. USAGE AND ETYMOLOGY:

The Hebrew word occurs some 560 times in the Old Testament with the meaning “man,” “mankind.” Outside Genesis 1 through 5 the only case where it is unquestionably a proper name is 1 Chronicles 1:1. Ambiguous are Deuteronomy 32:8, the King James Version “sons of Adam,” the Revised Version (British and American) “children of men”; Job 31:33 the King James Version “as” the Revised Version (British and American) “like Adam,” but margin “after the manner of men”; Hosea 6:7 the King James Version “like men,” the Revised Version (British and American) “like Adam,” and vice versa in the margin. In Genesis 1 the word occurs only twice, 1:26,27. In Genesis 2 through 4 it is found 26 times, and in 5:1,3,4,5. In the last four cases and in 4:25 it is obviously intended as a proper name; but the versions show considerable uncertainty as to the rendering in the other cases. Most modern interpreters would restore a vowel point to the Hebrew text in 2:20; 3:17,21, thus introducing the definite article, and read uniformly “the man” up to 4:25, where the absence of the article may be taken as an indication that “the man” of the previous narrative is to be identified with “Adam,” the head of the genealogy found in 5:1 ff. Several conjectures have been put forth as to the root-meaning of the Hebrew word:
(1) creature;
(2) ruddy one;
(3) earthborn. Less probable are
(4) pleasant — to sight — and
(5) social gregarious.

2. ADAM IN THE NARRATIVE OF GENESIS:

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

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

(2) In the narrative of Genesis 1 the recurrence of identical expressions is almost rigidly uniform, but in the case of man the unique statement occurs (verse 27), “Male and female created he them.” Although Dillmann is here in the minority among interpreters, it would be difficult to show that he is wrong in interpreting this as referring to one male and one female, the first pair. In this case we have a point of contact and of agreement with the narrative of chapter 2. Man, created in God’s image, is given dominion over every animal, is allowed every herb and fruit tree for his sustenance, and is bidden multiply and fill the earth. In Genesis 2:4 through 5:5 the first man is made of the dust, becomes a living creature by the breath of God, is placed in the garden of Eden to till it, gives names to the animals, receives as his counterpart and helper a woman formed from part of his own body, and at the woman’s behest eats of the forbidden fruit of “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” With her he is then driven from the garden, under the curse of brief life and heavy labor, since should he eat — or continue to eat? — of the fruit of the “tree of life,” not previously forbidden, he might go on living forever. He becomes the
father of Cain and of Abel, and of Seth at a time after the murder of Abel. According to 5:3,5 Adam is aged 130 years at the birth of Seth and lives to the age of 930 years.

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

See ADAM IN NEW TESTAMENT; FALL, THE.

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

F. K. Farr

ADAM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT
(Evolutionary Interpretation): (NOTE: It ought to be superfluous to say that the unfolding or development of the human personality here identified with evolution is something far higher, deeper, and other than anything that can be fathered upon Darwin or Herbert Spencer. Evolution
(unfolding) is the great process or movement; natural selection and survival
of the fittest name only guesses at some of its methods.) גן ['adham],
“man,” גא ‘Genesis 1:26, or “a man,” גא ‘Genesis 2:5; הג ['adham],
“the man”; mostly with the article as a generic term, and not used as the
proper name of a patriarch until 5:3, after which the name first given to
both man and woman (5:2) is used of the man alone): The being in whom is
embodied the Scripture idea of the first created man and ancestor of
mankind. The account, which belongs mostly to the oldest stratum of the
Genesis story (Jahwist) merits careful attention, because evolutionary
science, history, and new theology have all quarreled with or rejected it on
various grounds, without providing the smallest approach to a satisfactory
substitute.

1. WHAT THE WRITER MEANT TO DESCRIBE.

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

1. Derivation and Use of the Name:

Scholars have exercised themselves much, but with little arrival at
certainty, over the derivation of the name; a matter which, as it is
concerned with one of the commonest words of the language, is of no great
moment as compared with the writer’s own understanding of it. The most
plausible conjecture, perhaps, is that which connects it with the Assyrian
adamu, “to make,” or “produce,” hence, “the produced one,” “the
creature.” The author of גא ‘Genesis 2:7 seems to associate it, rather by
word-play than derivation, with [ha- ’adhamah], “the ground” or “soil,” as
the source from which man’s body was taken (compare 3:19,23) The name
[ ’adhamah] itself seems to be closely connected with the name Edom (
[ ’edhom], גא ‘Genesis 25:30), meaning “red”; but whether from the
redness of the soil, or the ruddiness of the man, or merely the incident
recorded in גא ‘Genesis 25:30, is uncertain. Without doubt the writer of
Genesis 2; 3 had in mind man’s earthly origin, and understood the name
accordingly.
The account of the creation is twice given, and from two very different points of view. In the first account, Genesis 1:26-31, man is represented as created on the sixth of the day along with the animals, a species in the animal world; but differing from them in bearing the image and likeness of God, in having dominion over all created things, and in having grains and fruits for food, while they have herbs. The writer’s object in all this seems to be as much to identify man with the animal creation as to differentiate him from it. In the second account, 2:4 through 3:24, man’s identity with the animals ignored or at least minimized (compare 2:20), while the object is to determine his status in a spiritual individualized realm wherein he has the companionship of God. Yahweh God “forms” or “shapes” him out of the dust of the ground, breathes into his nostrils the breath of life, and with such special distinction he becomes, like other created things, a “living soul” ([nephesh chayyah]; compare 2:7 with 1:30). He is placed in a garden situated somewhere among the rivers of Babylonia, his primitive occupation being to dress and keep it. In the midst of the garden are two mysterious trees, the tree of life, whose fruit seems to have the potency of conferring immortality (compare 3:22), and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, whose fruit is not to be eaten under penalty of death. Meanwhile, as in naming the animals the man finds no real companion, Yahweh God “builds” one of the man’s ribs into a woman, and the man recognizes her spiritual unity with him, naming her accordingly. The story goes on to relate, without note of time, how the serpent, the subtest of beasts, urged on the woman the desirable qualities of the fruit of the forbidden tree, intimating that God had made the prohibition from envy, and roundly denying that death would be the consequence of eating. Accordingly the woman took and ate, and gave to her husband, who also ate; and the immediate consequence was a sense of shame, which caused them to cover their nakedness with girdles of fig leaves, and a sense of guilt (not differentiated by Adam from shame, 3:10), which made the pair reluctant to meet Yahweh God. He obtains the confession of their disobedience, however; and passes prophetic sentence: on the serpent, of perpetual antipathy between its species and the human; on the woman, of sorrows and pains and subservience to the man; and on the man, of hardship and severe labors, until he returns to the dust from
which he was taken. As the pair have chosen to eat of the tree of
knowledge, lest now they should eat of the tree of life they are expelled
from the garden, and the gate is guarded by flaming sword and Cherubim.

3. History or Exposition?:

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

2. HOW THE STORY LOOKS TODAY.

Scarcely any other Scripture story has so suffered from the changes
wrought by modern thinking as has this story of Adam. On the one hand it
is felt that to refer the fall and inherited guilt of mankind to this experience
of Adam as a cause is to impose too great a burden, dogmatic and historic,
on this primitive story. Yet on the other hand the story, including this implication of the primal fall, refuses to be dismissed as an outworn or fantastic myth. It lays hold so vitally on the roots of human nature that our only course is not to reject it but to re-read it with the best light our age affords. And whether best or not, the evolutionary light in which all modern thought is colored cannot be ignored.

1. In the Light of Evolution:

The divergent assumptions of the traditional and the evolutionary view may be roughly stated thus: of the traditional, that in consequence of this Eden lapse man is a ruined nature, needing redemption and reinstatement, and that therefore the subsequent spiritual dealing with him must be essentially pathological and remedial; of the evolutionary, that by the very terms of his creation, which the lapse from obedience did not annul, man is spiritually a child needing growth and education, and that therefore the subsequent dealing with him must foster the development within him of a nature essentially normal and true. It is evident that these two views, thus stated, merely regard two lines of potency in one nature. Without rejecting the traditional, or stopping to inquire how it and the evolutionary may coexist, we may here consider how the story before us responds to the evolutionary view. Only — it must be premised — the evolution whose beginning it describes is not the evolution of the human species; we can leave natural science and history to take care of that; but, beginning where this leaves off, the evolution of the individual, from the first forth-putting of individual initiative and choice toward the far-off adult and complete personality. This, which in view of its culmination we may call the evolution of personality, is evolution distinctively spiritual, that stage and grade of upward moving being which succeeds to the material and psychical (compare 1 Corinthians 15:45,46). On the material stage of evolution, which the human species shares with the beast and the plant, Scripture is silent. Nor is it greatly concerned with the psychical, or cultural development of the human species, except to reveal in a divinely ordered history and literature its essential inadequacy to the highest manhood potencies. Rather its field is the evolution of the spirit in which alone the highest personal values are realized. In the delimitation of this field it has a consistent origin, course and culmination of its own, as it traces the line of spiritual uprising and growth from the first Adam, who as
a “living soul” was subject to the determinism of the species, to the last Adam, who as a “life-giving spirit” is identified with the supreme Personality in whom Divine and human met and blended. Of this tremendous evolution the story of Adam, with a clearness which the quaint narrative style of exposition does not impair, reveals the primal and directive factors.

2. The Garden Habitat:

Just as the habitat and the nature of created things answer to each other, so the environment in which man is placed when he comes from his Creator’s hand connotes the kind of life he is fitted to live. He is placed not in wild and refractory Nature but in a garden watered and planted with a new to his receiving care and nurture from above. Nature is kindly and responsive, furnishing, fruits ready to his hand, and requiring only that he “dress and keep” the garden. Of all the trees he may freely eat, including the tree of life; save only the most centrally located of all, the tree of “knowledge of good and evil” The being fitted to this habitat is a man adult in stature and intelligence, but still like a child; not yet individualized to determinate character, not yet exerting a will of his own apart from the will of his Creator; in other words, as spiritually considered, not yet detached from the spirit of his personal Source. All this reads like the description of a life essentially negative, or rather neutral, with free communication both downward and upward, but neither that of a domesticated animal nor of a captive god; a being balanced, as it were, between the earthly and the Divine, but not yet aware of the possession of that individual will and choice which alone can give spiritual significance to a committal to either.

3. The Organic Factor:

In the first story of man’s creation, Genesis 1:26-31, describing his creation as a species, the distinction of male and female is explicitly included (Genesis 1:27). In the second story (Genesis 2 through 3), wherein man is contemplated rather as an individual, the description of his nature begins before any distinction of sex exists. If the writer meant this latter to portray a condition of man in time or in natural fact, there is thus a discrepancy in accounts. If we regard it, however, as giving a factor in
spiritual evolution, it not only becomes full of meaning but lays hold profoundly on the ultimate teleology of creation. The naive story relates that the woman was “built” out of the already-shaped material of the man’s body, in order to supply a fellowship which the animals could not; a help “answering to” into ([keneghdo]; compare Genesis 2:18 margin). Then it makes the man recognize this conjugal relation, not at all with reference to sexual passion or the propagation of species but as furnishing man occasion, so to say, for loving and being loved, and making this capacity essential to the integrity of his nature. The value of this for the ultimate creative purpose and revelation is as marvelous as it is profound, it is the organic factor in realizing the far-reaching design of Him who is evolving a being bearing His image and deriving from Him the breath of life. That God is Spirit (John 4:24), that God is love (1 John 4:8,16) and love creation’s final law,” may as an idea be later revelation; but meanwhile from the beginning, in the commonest relation of life, a pulsation of mutual love is implanted, by making man a dual nature, wherein love, which is the antithesis of self-seeking, has the equal and companionable object necessary to its existence. Thus, in the conjugal relation the potency of the highest and broadest spiritual value is made intrinsic. In all the dubious course of his subsequent evolution, this capacity of love, though itself subject to the corruptio optimi pessima, is like a redeeming element at the heart alike of the individual and of society.

4. The Invasion of Subtlety:

Even in this neutral garden existence it is noteworthy that the man’s nature evinces its superiority to the animal in the absence of determinism he is not enslaved to an instinct of blind conformity to an external will In other words, he can cooperate intelligently in his own spiritual evolution. He has the power of choice, ministered by the stimulus of an unmotivated prohibition. He can abstain and live, or eat and die (Genesis 2:16,17). No reasons are given, no train of spiritual consequences, to one whose spirit is not yet awake; in this pre-spiritual stage rather the beginnings of law and prescription must be arbitrary. Yet even in so rudimentary a relation we are aware of the essential contrast between animal and spiritual evolution, in that the latter is not a blind and instinctive imposition from without, but a free course submitted to man’s intelligence and cooperation. And it is a supremely significant feature of the narrative to make the first
self-interested impulse come by the way of subtlety. “The serpent,” the writer premises, “was more subtle than any beast of the field which Yahweh God had made.” It points to a trait which he puts on the border-line between the species and the individual, the disposition, not indeed to rebel against a law of being, but to submit it to refinement and accommodation or perhaps from sheer curiosity to try conclusions with it. The suggestion came first from the lower creation, but not from what is animal in it; and it was eagerly responded to by the woman, the finer and more spiritually awake of the pair. Not to press this too far, it is significant that the first impulse toward individual initiative rises through the free play of intellect and reason. It seems to promise a subtler way of being “like God.” To differentiate more minutely the respective parts of man and wife in the affair, which are portrayed in the light of sex distinction, would be beyond our present scope.

See EVE.

5. The Fateful Venture:

Two trees “in the midst of the garden” (Genesis 2:9) are mentioned at the outset; but the tree of life, the permitted one, seems no more to have been thought of until it was no longer accessible (Genesis 3:22); indeed, when the woman speaks to the serpent of “the tree which is in the midst of the garden” (Genesis 3:3) she has only one tree in mind, and that the prohibited one. The other, as it was counted in with their daily fare and opportunity, seems to have been put by them with those privileges of life which are ignored or postponed, besides, the life it symbolized was the perpetuation of the garden-life they were living, such life as man would live before his spirit was awake to the alternatives of living — a life innocent and blissful, but without the stimulus of spiritual reaction. And it was just this latter that the alternative of the two trees afforded; a reaction fateful for good or evil, needing only the impulse that should set the human spirit in motion. Consider the case. If manhood were ever to rise from a state of childhood, wherein everything was done and prescribed for him, into a life of free choice and self-moved wisdom, it is hard to see how this could have been brought about except by something involving inhibition and prohibition; something that he could not do without incurring a risk. This is what the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil” (Genesis 2:17)
means. The tree by its very name was alike a test and a lure. In a sense we may say the temptation began with God; but it was not a temptation to evil. Symbolized in the two trees, but actual in the opportunity of spiritual committal, two ways of life stood open before him. On the one hand, it was open to him to fortify his strength in obedience and against the lure of perilous knowledge, thus deepening and seasoning his negative innocence into positive holiness. That such a course was feasible was shown centuries later in the Divine Son of Man, who in perfect loyalty of the child yet in perfect wisdom of adulthood fulfilled the primal sinless ideal of the first Adam. On the other hand there was the lure of the forbidden knowledge, to which the serpent gave the false glamor of godlikeness, and which could be had by detaching his individual will from that of God, and incurring the experience of self-seeking, and taking the risk. It was the latter that was chosen, this however not in the spirit of rebellion or temptation, but in the desire for a good beyond what the childlike limitations of Eden afforded (Genesis 3:6). This then was the first motivated uprising of the spirit of manhood, taking the initiative and acting for itself. So far forth, as the self-assertion of the individual, it was as truly a stage of spiritual evolution as if the man had maintained obedience; but there was in it the rupture of his spirit’s union with its personal Source; and the hapless committal to self, which is rightly called a Fall. So strangely mingled were the spiritual elements in this primal manhood initiative.

See FALL, THE.

6. The Fitted Sequel:

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

3. HOW ADAM IS RECOGNIZED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

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

1. In the Old Testament Canonical Books:

Here at Genesis 5:5, in the canonical books of the Old Testament almost all allusion to him ceases, and nothing whatever is made of his fateful relation to the sin and guilt of the race. (See ADAM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.) This latter idea seems to have come to consciousness only when men’s sense of sin and a broken law was more ingrained than it seems to have been in canonical times In the case of the few allusions that, occur, moreover, the fact that the name “Adam” is identical with the word for “man” makes the reference more or less uncertain; one does not know whether the patriarch or the race is meant. In the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32), in the clause Deuteronomy 32:8, “when he separated the children of men” (or “Adam”), the reference, which is to the distribution of races as given in Genesis 10, may or may not have Adam in
mind. In like manner Zophar’s words (Job 20:4), “Knowest thou not this of old time, since man (or Adam) was placed upon earth?” may or may not be recognition by name of the first created man Job’s words (Job 31:33), “if like Adam I have covered my transgressions,” sound rather more definite as an allusion to Adam’s hiding himself after having taken the fruit. When Isaiah says (Isaiah 43:27), “Thy first father sinned,” It is uncertain whom he means; for in Isaiah 51:2 he says, “Look unto Abraham your father,” and Ezekiel has told his people (Ezekiel 16:3), “The Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was a Hittite.” The historical consciousness of the prophets seems to have been confined to the history of the Israelite race.

2. In the Apocrypha:

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

John Franklin Genung

(Editorial Note. — The promoters of the Encyclopedia are not to be understood as endorsing all the views set forth in Dr. Genung’s article. It was thought right, however, that a full and adequate presentation of so suggestive an interpretation should be given.)
ADAM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

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

I. GOSPELS.

In Luke 3:38 the ancestry of Jesus Christ is traced up to Adam, “Adam, the son of God,” thereby testifying to the acceptance of the Old Testament genealogies of Genesis. This is the only place in the Gospels in which Adam is actually named, though there is an allusion to him in Matthew 19:4-6 ( = Mark 10:6-8), referring to Genesis 1:27 and 2:24.

II. EPISTLES.

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

1. Romans 5:12-21:

The passage is the logical center of the epistle, the central point to which everything that precedes has converged, and out of which everything which follows will flow. The great ideas of Sin, Death, and Judgment are here shown to be involved in the connection of the human race with Adam. But over against this there is the blessed fact of union with Christ, and in this union righteousness and life. The double headship of mankind in Adam and Christ shows the significance of the work of redemption for the entire race. Mankind is ranged under two heads, Adam and Christ. There are two men, two acts and two results. In this teaching we have the spiritual and theological illustration of the great modern principle of solidarity. There is a solidarity of evil and a solidarity of good, but the latter far surpasses the former in the quality of the obedience of Christ as compared with Adam, and the facts of the work of Christ for justification and life. The section is thus no mere episode, or illustration, but that which gives organic life to the entire epistle. Although sin and death are ours in Adam righteousness and life are ours in Christ, and these latter two are
infinitely the greater (Romans 5:11); whatever we have lost in Adam we have more than gained in Christ. As all the evils of the race sprang from one man, so all the blessings of redemption come from One Person, and there is such a connection between the Person and the race that all men can possess what the One has done. In Romans 5:12-19 Paul institutes a series of comparisons and contrasts between Adam and Christ; the two persons, the two works and the two consequences. The fullness of the apostle’s meaning must be carefully observed. Not only does he teach that what we have derived from the first Adam is met by what is derived from Christ, but the transcendence of the work of the latter is regarded as almost infinite in extent. “The full meaning of Paul, however, is not grasped until we perceive that the benefits received from Christ, the Second Adam, are in inverse ratio to the disaster entailed by the first Adam. It is the surplus of this grace that in Paul’s presentation is commonly overlooked” (Mabie, The Divine Reason of the Cross 116).

2. 1 Corinthians 15:22:

The contrast instituted here between Adam and Christ refers to death and life, but great difficulty turns on the interpretation of the two “alls.” “As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.” Dods (Expositor’s Bible, 366) interprets it of Adam as the source of physical life that ends in death, and of Christ as the source of spiritual life that never dies. “All who are by physical derivation truly united to Adam incur the death, which by sinning he introduced into human experience; and similarly, all who by spiritual affinity are in Christ enjoy the new life which triumphs over death, and which he won.” So also Edwards, who does not consider that there is any real unfairness in interpreting the former “all” as more extensive than the latter, “if we bear in mind that the conditions of entrance into the one class and the other are totally different. They are not stated here. But we have them in Romans 5:5-11, where the apostle seems as if he anticipated this objection to the analogy which he instituted between Adam and Christ. Both alike are heads of humanity, but they are unlike in this (as also in other things, Romans 5:15), that men are in Adam by nature, in Christ by faith” (Corinthians, 412). Godet considers that “perhaps this Interpretation is really that which corresponds best to the apostle’s view,” and he shows that zoopoieisthai, “to be made alive,” is a more limited idea than egeiresthai, “to be raised,”
the limitation of the subject thus naturally proceeding from the special meaning of the verb itself. “The two *pantes* (all) embrace those only to whom each of the two powers extends.” But Godet favors the view of Meyer and Ellicott that “all” is to be given the same interpretation in each clause, and that the reference is to all who are to rise, whether for life or condemnation, and that this is to be “in Christ”: “Christ will quicken all; all will hear His voice and will come forth from the grave, but not all to the true ‘resurrection of life’: see John 5:29” (Ellicott, Corinthians, 301) Godet argues that “there is nothing to prevent the word `quicken,’ taken alone, from being used to denote restoration to the fullness of spiritual and bodily existence, with a view either to perdition or salvation” (Corinthians, 355). There are two serious difficulties to the latter interpretation:

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

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

3. *Corinthians 15:45:*

“The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit.” The reference to Adam is from Genesis 2:7; the reference to Christ is due to the fact of what He had done and was doing in His manifestation as Divine Redeemer. Behind results the apostle proceeds to nature. Adam was simply a living being, Christ a life-giving Being. Thus Christ is called Adam as expressive of His Headship of a race. In this verse He is called the “last” Adam, while in *Corinthians 15:47* the “second.” In the former verse the apostle deals not so much with Christ’s relation to the first Adam as to the part He takes in relation to humanity, and His work on its behalf. When precisely Christ became life-giving is a matter of difference of opinion. Romans 1:4 associates power with the resurrection as the time when Christ was constituted Son of God for the purpose of bestowing the force of Divine grace. This gift of power was only made available for His church through the Ascension and the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. It is possible that the word “life-giving” may also include a reference to the resurrection of the body hereafter.
4. **1 Timothy 2:13,14:**

Paul uses the creation of man and woman in his argument for the subordination of woman (Genesis 2:7-25). This is no mere Jewish reasoning, but an inspired statement of the typical meaning of the passage in Genesis. The argument is a very similar one to that in 1 Corinthians 11:8,9. When the apostle states that “Adam was not beguiled,” we must apparently understand it as simply based on the text in Genesis to which he refers (Genesis 3:13), in which Eve, not Adam, says, “The serpent beguiled me.” In Galatians 3:16 he reasons similarly from “seed” in the singular number, just as Hebrews 7 reasons from the silence of Genesis 14 in regard to the parentage of Melchizedek. Paul does not deny that Adam was deceived, but only that he was not directly deceived. His point is that Eve’s facility in yielding warrants the rule as to women keeping silence.

5. **Jude 1:14:**

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

3. CONCLUSIONS.

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

W. H. Griffith Thomas

ADAM, BOOKS OF

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

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; APOCRYPHA.

M. O. Evans

ADAM, CITY OF

(µd:a; ['adham], “red” or BDB “made”): A city in the middle of the Jordan valley near ZARETHAN (Joshua 3:16), which see. The name probably survives at the Damieh Ford, near the mouth of the Jabbok twenty miles above Jericho. An Arabian historian asserts that about 1265 AD the Jordan was here blocked by a land slide. The inner gorge of the
Jordan is here narrow with high banks which would facilitate such an obstruction as permitted the waters to “pile up” above to Adam and run out below, permitting Joshua’s host to cross on dry land (SWP, II, 15; Wright, SCOTH, 130-34).

George Frederick Wright

ADAMAH

<ad’-a-ma> (אדמָה [’adhamah]; [Ադամ, Adami]): A fortified city in the territory of Naphtali, named between Chinnereth and Ramah (Joshua 19:36). It is probably identical with the modern ‘Admah, a ruin on the plateau about 10 miles North of Beisan.

ADAMANT

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

See also STONES, PRECIOUS.

Alfred Ely Day
ADAMI

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

ADAMI-NEKEB

<ad’-a-mi ne’-keb> [‘adhami ha-neqebh], “the ground of the piercing,” that is of the pass, or defile): A place mentioned in indicating the border of Naphtali (Joshua 19:33). In the King James Version, Adami and Nekeb are given as separate names, and it is an open question which view of the matter is correct. Most of the Greek texts give the names as two. The Vulgate has “Adami quae est Neceb.” The Jerusalem Talmud gives two names, though instead of Hannekeb or Nekeb it has Siyadathah (Meg 1 1, or Neubauer’s Geog du Talmud, 225). In the list of places conquered by Thothmes III of Egypt occurs the name NQBU (Tomkins, Rec of Past, new series, V, 47), which seems to be the same with Neqeb.

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

Willis J. Beecher

ADAN

<a’-dan>.

See ADDAN.
ADAR (1)

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

ADAR (2)

<\textit{a\textquotesingle{}-dar}>: In the King James Version (Joshua 15:3) for \textit{ADAR}, which see.

ADARSA

<\textit{a-dar\textquotesingle{}-sa}>.

\textit{See ADASA}.

ADASA

<\textit{ad\textquotesingle{}-a-sa}> ([\textquoteleft{}A\textalpha{}\textsigma{}\textacute{}, Adasa]; the King James Version Adarsa): A town less than four miles from Beth-horon (30 furlongs Ant, XII, x, 5; 1 Macc 7:40) and a day’s journey from Gazara (1 Macc 7:45), where Judas Maccabees defeated and killed Nicanor, a general of Demetrius (1 Macc 7:40 ff). The ruin of Adaseh near Gibeon (SWP, III, XVII).

ABDEEL

<\textit{ad\textacute{}-be-el}> ([\textquoteleft{}adhbe\textacute{}el], “God’s discipline,” possibly): The third of the twelve sons of Ishmael (Genesis 25:13; 1 Chronicles 1:29). The name appears in the Assyrian records as that of a north Arabian tribe residing somewhere Southwest of the Dead Sea.

ADD

\textbf{(1)} [\textit{ekpidiastassomai}, epidiatassomai], “to add to,” “to arrange in addition”: Found only in Galatians 3:15, which may thus be paraphrased: “To take a familiar illustration: even a man’s will, when
ratified, no third party may annul or supplement” (Dummelew, in the place cited.).

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

See also IMPART; SUPPLY.

M. O. Evans

ADDAN

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

ADDAR

<ad’-ar> (אדăr, ’adder], “glorious”):

See ARD

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

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

ADDER

<ad’-er> (אכשעב [akhshubh] (Psalm 140:3); אבל [pethen] (Psalm 58:4); ליצינו [tsiph’oni] (Proverbs 23:32); שעמון [shephiphon] (Genesis 49:17); טנט [tsepha`] (King James Version margin; Isaiah 14:29)): This word is used for several Hebrew originals. In each case a poisonous serpent is clearly indicated by the context. It is
impossible to tell in any case just what species is meant, but it must be remembered that the English word adder is used very ambiguously. It is from the Anglo-Saxon noedre, a snake or serpent, and is the common English name for Vipera berus, L, the common viper, which is found throughout Europe and northern Asia, though not in Bible lands; but the word “adder” is also used for various snakes, both poisonous and non-poisonous, found in different parts of the world. In America, for instance, both the poisonous moccasin (Ancistrodon) and the harmless hog-nosed snakes (Heterodon) are called adders.

*See SERPENT.*

**Alfred Ely Day**

**ADDI**

<ad’-i> ([’Aδδί, Addi]; [’Aδδεί, Addei]): An ancestor of Joseph, the husband of Mary, mother of Jesus; fourth from Zerubbabel in the ascending genealogical series (Luke 3:28).

**ADDICT**

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

**ADDO**

<ad’-o> (Codex Alexandrinus, [’Aδδó, Addo]; Codex Vaticanus, [ˇΕδδείν, Eddein]) = Iddo (Ezra 5:1; 6:14): The father (Zechariah 1:1,7 grandfather) of Zechariah the prophet (1 Esdras 6:1).

**ADDON**

<ad’-on>.

*See ADDAN.*
ADDUS

<ad’-us> (‘Αδδούς, Addous): The descendants of Addus (sons of Solomon’s servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:34). Omitted in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7.

ADER

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

ADIABENE

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

Willis J. Beecher

ADIDA

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

See HADID.
ADIEL

<ad’-i-el> (אָדִיֵל [‘adhi’el], “ornament of God”):

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

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

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

ADIN

<a’-din> (אָדִין [‘adin], “adorned”): The name of a family, “the sons of Adin” (Ezra 2:15; 8:6; Nehemiah 7:20; 10:16; 1 Esdras 5:14; 8:32), mentioned among the returning exiles. The list in Ezra 2 is placed in the midst of the narrative concerning Zerubbabel, but its title and its contents show that it also includes the later Jewish immigrants into Palestine. The list in Nehemiah 7 is a duplicate of that in Ezra, but with variations; most of the variations are naturally accounted for by supposing that one copy was made later than the other and was brought up to date. In Ezra and 1 Esdras the number of the sons of Adin is said to be 454; in Nehemiah it is 655. The 50 males, led by Ebed the son of Jonathan, who came with Ezra, may or may not have been included in the numbers just mentioned. Among the names of those who sealed the covenant along with Nehemiah are 44 that are placed under the caption “the chiefs of the people” (Nehemiah 10:14-26), and nearly half of these are the family names of the list in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7. It is natural to infer that in these cases a family sealed the covenant collectively through some representative. In that case the Adin here mentioned is the same that is mentioned in the other places.

See also ADINU.

Willis J. Beecher
ADINA

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

ADINO

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

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

Willis J. Beecher

ADINU; ADIN

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

**ADINUS**

<ad’-i-nus>.

*See IADINUS (Apocrypha).*

**ADITHAIM**

<ad-i-tha’-im> (נְוֵי רוּת [‘adhithayim] “double ornament, passage, or prey”): A city in “the lowland” (Shephelah, not as the King James Version “valley”) of Judah (Joshua 15:36). Site unknown, but possibly same as &ADIDA (which see).

**ADJURATION**

<ad-ju-ra’-shun>: The act of requiring or taking a solemn oath. In a time of military peril Saul adjured the people (הָלַח [‘alah], “to take oath”) and they took oath by saying “Amen” (1 Samuel 14:24). When Joshua pronounced a ban on Jericho (Joshua 6:26) he completed it with an oath (שָבַח [shabha`], “to cause to swear”). Often used in the sense of a solemn charge without the administration of an oath (1 Kings 22:16; 2 Chronicles 18:15; Song 2:7; 5:8,9; 1 Thessalonians 5:27). With reference to the withholding of testimony, see Leviticus 5:1 and Proverbs 29:24. The high priest sought to put Jesus under oath ([ἐξωρκίζω], exorkizo], “to force to an oath,” Matthew 26:63). Adjure also means to solemnly implore ([ὁρκίζω, horkizo]) as when the man with an unclean spirit appealed to Jesus: “I adjure thee by God, torment me not” (Mark 5:7); or seven sons of Sceva, exorcists, sought in the name of Jesus to expel demons (Acts 19:13).

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

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

See also OATH.

Dwight M. Pratt

ADLAI

<ad’-la-i>, <ad’-li> (ֶדְלוֹי [‘adhlay]; Septuagint [‘Αδλί, Adli] and [‘Αδή, Adai], “lax, weary”): The father of Shaphat, an overseer of David’s herds in the lowlands (1 Chronicles 27:29).

ADMAH

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

See VALE OF SIDDIM.
ADMATHA

<ad’-ma-tha>, <ad-ma’-tha> (אָדַם [’adhmatha’]): One of “the seven princes of Persia and Media, who saw the king’s face, and sat first in the kingdom” (Est 1:14); compare 2 Kings 25:19; Ezra 7:14. The Septuagint gives only three names.

ADMIN

<ad’-min>.

See ARNI.

ADMINISTER; ADMINISTRATION

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

Dwight M. Pratt

ADMIRATION

<ad-mi-ra’-shun> ([θαυμά, thauma], “a marvel” or “wonder”; [θαυμάζω, thaumazo], “to wonder”): A term thrice used in the King James Version in the New Testament, to express a wonder that includes approval, high esteem; replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by three renderings better suited to convey the various kinds of surprise, wonder, admiration, expressed, by this fertile word: namely, in 2 Thessalonians 1:10, “to be admired,” reads in the Revised Version (British and American) “to be marveled at”; in Jude 1:16 “having men’s persons in admiration” is rendered “showing respect of persons”; in Revelation 17:6 “wondered with great admiration” is replaced by “with a great wonder.” The Greek
original is used frequently in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels, to express marvel and wonder at the supernatural works of Jesus.

_Dwight M. Pratt_

**ADNA**

<ad’-na> (אֲדָנָא [‘adhna’], “pleasure”; [Aïðανέ, Aidaine]):

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

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

**ADNAH**

<ad’-na> (אֲדָנָּה [‘adhnah], “pleasure”; [Edvá, Edna]):

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

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

**ADO**

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

_George B. Eager_
ADONAI

<ad-o'-ni>, <ad-o-na'-i> (אֲדֹנָי [‘adhonay]): A Divine name, translated “Lord,” and signifying, from its derivation, “sovereignty.” Its vowels are found in the Massoretic Text with the unpronounceable tetragrammaton יְהֹוָה [YHWH]; and when the Hebrew reader came to these letters, he always substituted in pronunciation the word “ [‘adhonay].” Its vowels combined with the tetragrammaton form the word “Yahweh (Yahweh).”

See GOD, NAMES OF.

ADONIBEZEK

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

ADONIJAH

<ad-o-ni'-ja> (אֲדֹנִיָּה [‘adhoniyahu] or אֲדֹנִיָּה [‘adhoniyah], “my lord is Yahweh”):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Willis J. Beecher

ADONIKAM

<ad-o-ni’-kam> (אָדֹּנִיקָם [’adhoniqam], “my lord has risen up”): The name of a family of the returning exiles (Ezra 2:13; Nehemiah 7:18). “The sons of Adonikam,” men and women and children, numbered 666 according to the list as given in Ezra, but 667 according to the copy in Neh. Either included among these or in addition to them was the contingent that came with Ezra, “Ehphalet, Jueel, and Shemaiah, and with them 60 males” (Ezra 8:13).
ADONIRAM

<ad-o-ni’-ram> (אָדוֹנִירָם [’adhoniram], “my lord is exalted”): An official of Solomon (1 Kings 4:6; 5:14). Near the close of the reign of David, and at the opening of the reign of Rehoboam, the same office was held by Adoram (2 Samuel 20:24; 1 Kings 12:18). The name Adoram seems to be a contraction of Adoniram, and doubtless the same person held the office in all the three reigns. The name also appears as Hadoram (2 Chronicles 10:18). In the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) the office is variantly described as “over the tribute,” which is misleading, and “over the levy,” which is correct, though obscure. In the American Standard Revised Version it is uniformly “over the men subject to taskwork.” Adoniram was at the head of the department of forced labor for the government. The record is to the effect that peoples conquered by Israel, except the Canaanites, were to be spared, subject to the obligation to forced labor on the public works (Deuteronomy 20:11); that this law was actually extended to the Canaanites (Joshua 16:10; 17:13; Judges 1:28 ff); that David, in his preparations for the temple, organized and handed over to Solomon a service of forced labor (1 Chronicles 22:2,15, etc.); that under Solomon this service was elaborately maintained (1 Kings 5:13 ff; 9:15 ff; 2 Chronicles 8:7 ff). It was not for the temple only, but for all Solomon’s numerous building enterprises. In theory men of Israelite blood were free from this burden, but practically they found it a burden and a grievance. At the accession of Rehoboam they protested against it (1 Kings 12; 2 Chronicles 10). Nothing in the account is more indicative of Rehoboam’s utter lack of good judgment than his sending his veteran superintendent of the forced labor department to confer with the people. The murder of Adoniram, and the ignominious flight of Rehoboam, were natural consequences.

Willis J. Beecher

ADONIS

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

**ADONI-ZEDEK**

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

**ADOPTION**

<a-do’p’-shun> ([ὑιοθεσία], huiothesia], “placing as a son”):

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

1. **THE GENERAL LEGAL IDEA.**

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

1. **In the Old Testament:**

Three cases of adoption are mentioned: of Moses (Exodus 2:10), Genubath (1 Kings 11:20) and Esther (Est 2:7,15), but it is remarkable that they all occur outside of Palestine — in Egypt and Persia, where the practice of adoption prevailed. Likewise the idea appears in the New Testament only in the epistles of Paul, which were addressed to churches
outside Palestine. The motive and initiative of adoption always lay with the adoptive father, who thus supplied his lack of natural offspring and satisfied the claims of affection and religion, and the desire to exercise paternal authority or to perpetuate his family. The process and conditions of adoption varied with different peoples. Among oriental nations it was extended to slaves (as Moses) who thereby gained their freedom, but in Greece and Rome it was, with rare exceptions, limited to citizens.

2. Greek:

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

3. Roman:

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

2. PAUL’S DOCTRINE.

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

In Galatians, Paul emphasizes especially the liberty enjoyed by those who live by faith, in contrast to the bondage under which men are held, who guide their lives by legal ceremonies and ordinances, as the Galatians were prone to do (Galatians 5:1). The contrast between law and faith is first set forth on the field of history, as a contrast between both the pre-Christian and the Christian economies (Galatians 3:23,24), although in another passage he carries the idea of adoption back into the covenant relation of God with Israel (Romans 9:4). But here the historical antithesis is reproduced in the contrast between men who now choose to live under law and those who live by faith. Three figures seem to commingle in the description of man’s condition under legal bondage — that of a slave, that of a minor under guardians appointed by his father’s will, and that of a Roman son under the patria potestas (Galatians 4:1-3). The process of liberation is first of all one of redemption or buying out (Greek exagorasei) (Galatians 4:5). This term in itself applies equally well to the slave who is redeemed from bondage, and the Roman son whose adoptive father buys him out of the authority of his natural father. But in the latter case the condition of the son is not materially altered by the process: he only exchanges one paternal authority for another. If Paul for a moment thought of the process in terms of ordinary Roman adoption, the resulting condition of the son he conceives in terms of the more free and gracious Greek or Jewish family life. Or he may have thought of the rarer case of adoption from conditions of slavery into the status of sonship. The redemption is only a precondition of adoption, which follows upon faith, and is accompanied by the sending of “the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father,” and then all bondage is done away (Galatians 4:5-7).

2. In Romans as Deliverance from Debt:

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

3. THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE.

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

1. In Relation to Justification:

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

2. In Relation to Sanctification:

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

3. In Relation to Regeneration:

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

4. AS GOD’S ACT.

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

1. Divine Fatherhood:

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

2. Its Cosmic Range:

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

See CHILDREN OF GOD.
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T. Rees

ADOR; ADORA

<\textit{a’-do’-ra}> ([’\textit{A}\textit{δωρά}, Adora]): In Idumaea, mentioned in Ant, XIII, ix, 1 as one of the cities captured by Hyrcanus, and referred to in 1 Macc 13:20.

See ADORAIM.
ADORAIM

<ad-o-ra’-im> (אֵדֹרָאִים [’adhorayim], “a pair of knolls,” perhaps):
One of several cities in Judah that were fortified by Rehoboam (<141109> 2 Chronicles 11:9). The name appears in Josephus and in 1 Macc as Adora or Dora or Dor. Its location is indicated in general by that of the other cities which the record in Chronicles groups with it. Common consent identifies it with Dura, about five miles West by South of Hebron.

ADORAM

<a-do’-ram>.

See ADONIRAM.

ADORATION

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

1. ETYMOLOGY.
The word is derived from Latin adorare =

(1) “to speak to,”

(2) “to beseech,” “entreat,”

(3) “to do homage,” “to worship”; from the Latin, os (oris), mouth. Some have supposed that the root os points to the Roman practice of applying the hand to the mouth, i.e. kissing the hand to (a person or thing), as a token of homage.

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

3. OUTWARD POSTURES.

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

1. Prostration:

Among the Orientals, especially Persians, prostration (i.e. falling upon the knees, then gradually inclining the body, until the forehead touched the ground) was common as an expression of profound reverence and humility before a superior or a benefactor. It was practiced in the worship of Yahweh (Genesis 17:3; Numbers 16:45; Matthew 26:39, Jesus in Gethsemane; Revelation 1:17), and of idols (2 Kings 5:18, Daniel 3:5,6), but was by no means confined to religious exercises. It was the formal method of supplicating or doing obeisance to a superior (e.g. 1 Samuel 25:23 f; 2 Kings 4:37; Est 8:3; Mark 5:22; John 11:32).

2. Kneeling:

A substitute for prostration was kneeling, a common attitude in worship, frequently mentioned in Old Testament and New Testament (e.g. 1 Kings 8:54; Ezra 9:5; Psalm 95:6; Isaiah 45:23; Luke 22:41, Christ in Gethsemane; Acts 7:60; Ephesians 3:14). The same attitude was sometimes adopted in paying homage to a fellow-creature, as in 2 Kings 1:13. “Sitting” as an attitude of prayer (only 2 Samuel 7:18
parallel 1 Chronicles 17:16) was probably a form of kneeling, as in Mahometan worship.

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

4. The Hands:
The above postures were accompanied by various attitudes of the hands, which were either lifted up toward heaven (Psalm 63:4; 1 Timothy 2:8), or outspread (Exodus 9:29; Ezra 9:5; Isaiah 1:15), or both (1 Kings 8:54).

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

See also ATTITUDES.

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

1. Fellow-Creatures:
Yet, as already suggested, the crude beginnings of religious adoration are to be found in the respect paid to created beings regarded as possessing superior claims and powers, especially to kings and rulers. As instances we may mention the woman of Tekoa falling on her face to do obeisance to
king David (2 Samuel 14:4), and the king’s servants bowing down to do reverence to Haman (Est 3:2). Compare Ruth 2:10; 1 Samuel 20:41; 2 Samuel 1:2; 14:22.

2. Material Objects:

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

3. Angels:

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

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

5. Jesus Christ:

How far is Jesus regarded in the New Testament as an object of adoration, seeing that adoration is befitting only to God? During our Lord’s lifetime He was often the object of worship (Matthew 2:11; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:20; 28:9,17; Mark 5:6; John 9:38). Some ambiguity, however, belongs to the Greek word proskunein, for while it is the usual word for “worshipping” God (e.g. John 4:24), in some contexts it means no more than paying homage to a person of superior rank by kneeling or prostration, just as the unmerciful servant is said to have `fallen down and worshipped’ his master the king (Matthew 18:26), and as Josephus speaks of the Jewish high priests as proskunoumenoi (BJ, IV, v, 2). On the other hand, it certainly implies a consciousness, on the part of those who paid this respect to Jesus, and of Jesus Himself, of a very exceptional superiority in His person, for the same homage was refused by Peter, when offered to him by Cornelius, on the ground that he himself also was a man (Acts 10:25 f), and even by the angel before whom John prostrated himself, on the ground that God alone was to be “worshipped” (Revelation 22:8,9). Yet Jesus never repudiated such tokens of respect. But whatever about the “days of His flesh,” there is no doubt that after the ascension Christ became to the church the object of adoration as
Divine, and the homage paid to Him was indistinguishable in character from that paid to God. This is proved not only by isolated passages, but still more by the whole tone of the Acts and epistles in relation to Him. This adoration reaches its highest expression in Revelation 5:9-14, where the Redeemer-Lamb who shares the throne of God is the subject of an outburst of adoring praise on the part of the angelic hosts. In Revelation 4:8-11 the hymn of adoration is addressed to the Lord God Almighty, the Creator; here it is addressed to the Lamb on the ground of His redeeming work. In Revelation the adoration of Him “who sitteth on the throne” and that of “the Lamb” flow together into one stream of ecstatic praise (compare Revelation 7:9-11).

D. Miall Edwards

**ADORN**

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

*See* DRESS.

Figurative: In Matthew 12:44 the King James Version the word is translated “garnish” and is used in a figurative sense. It describes accurately the condition of the Jewish nation. Even though they have swept out idolatry and have adorned the life with much ceremony and endless religious prescriptions yet the evil spirit can say, “I will return to my house.” This same thing has repeatedly been done by individuals and nations when reforms have been instituted, but Christ was not enthroned and the heart or nation was still dominated by evil. It is used also in a figurative sense with reference to the graces of the Christian life. When we remember how very highly Orientals esteem the adornment of the body, its use here becomes very forceful. It is this that makes Psalm 45:13 of special significance as to the beauty and glory of the church as she is presented to God. See also Proverbs 1:9; 4:9; Isaiah 61:10; 1 Peter 3:4,5. Consecration to God, the in-dwelling of His Spirit, righteousness, a meek and quiet spirit — these are the true adornments of the life. All these
passages carry with them the idea of joy, the satisfaction that should be ours in these possessions.

*Jacob W. Kapp*

**ADRA**

<ā’-dra>.

*See* ARAD (city).

**ADRAMELECH AND ANAMMELECH**

<ā-dram’-el-ek> and <ā-nam’-el-ek> ( אדרמאלהק and אנהמלהק, apparently, according to Assyrian usage, “Adar is prince,” “Anu is prince.” By Palestinian usage it would be “Adar is king,” “Anu is king”):

(1) The names given by the Israelite narrator to the god or gods imported into the Samaritan land by the men of Sepharvaim whom the king of Assyria had settled there (2 Kings 17:31). In the Babylonian pantheon Anu, the god of heaven, is one of the three chief gods, and Adar, otherwise known as Ninib, is a solar god. Concerning the statements in this verse in Kings, archaeologists differ in some important points, and it is a case in which a suspended judgment may be becoming in one who is not an expert. But at least a portion of the alleged difficulties have arisen from failures to get the point of view of the Israelite narrator. He is writing from a time considerably later than the establishment of the institutions of which he speaks — late enough to render the phrase “unto this day” suitable (2 Kings 17:34), late enough so that words and usages may have undergone modification. He is describing a mixture of religions which he evidently regards as deserving of contempt and ridicule, even apart from the falsity of the religions included in it. This mixture he describes as containing ingredients of three kinds — first, the imported religions of the imported peoples; second, the local high-place religions (2 Kings 17:32, etc.), and third, the Yahweh religion of Northern Israel (not that of Jerusalem). It is not likely that he thought that they practiced any cult in its purity. They contaminated the religion of Yahweh by introducing Canaanitish usages into it, and they are likely to have done the same with the ancestral
religions which they brought with them. The proper names may be correct as representing Palestine usage, even if they differ somewhat from the proper Babylonian usage. The writer says that they “burnt their children in the fire to Adrammelech,” but this does not necessarily prove that he thought that they brought this practice from Babylonia; his idea may be that they corrupted even their own false cult by introducing into it this horrible Canaanitish rite. In considering the bearings of the evidence of the monuments on the case, considerations of this kind should not be neglected.

(2) The name of a son of Sennacherib king of Assyria — one of the two who slew him and escaped, indirectly leading to the accession of Esarhaddon (2 Kings 19:37; Isaiah 37:38). Mention of the incident is found on the monuments, and traces of the name appear in the writings of Abydenus and Poly-histor.

Willis J. Beecher

ADRAMYTTIUM

<ad-ra-mit’-i-um> ([Ἄδραμύττιον, Adramuttion]; for other forms see Thayer’s lexicon): An ancient city of Mysia in the Roman Province of Asia. The only reference in the New Testament to it is in Acts 27:2 which says that Paul, while being taken a prisoner from Caesarea to Rome, embarked upon a ship belonging to Adramyttium.

The city, with a good harbor, stood at the head of the Gulf of Adramyttium facing the island of Lesbos, and at the base of Matthew. Ida. Its early history is obscure. While some authors fancy that it was the Pedasus of Homer, others suppose that it was founded by Adramys, the brother of the wealthy Croesus; probably a small Athenian colony existed there long before the time of Adramys. When Pergamus became the capital of Asia, Adramyttium grew to be a city of considerable importance, and the metropolis of the Northwest part of the province. There the assizes were held. The coins which the peasants pick up in the surrounding fields, and which are frequently aids in determining the location and history of the cities of Asia Minor, were struck at Adramyttium as late as the 3rd century AD, and sometimes in connection with Ephesus. Upon them the
effigies of Castor and Pollux appear, showing that Adramyttium was the seat of worship of these deities.

The ancient city with its harbor has entirely disappeared, but on a hill, somewhat farther inland, is a village of about one thousand houses bearing the name Edremid, a corruption of the ancient name Adramys. The miserable wooden huts occupied by Greek fishermen and by Turks are surrounded by vineyards and olive trees, hence the chief trade is in olive oil, raisins and timber. In ancient times Adramyttium was noted for a special ointment which was prepared there (Pliny, NH, xiii.2.5).

E. J. Banks

ADRIA

<α’-dri-a> (Westcott-Hort: [ὁ Ἀδριάς, ho Hadrias] or ho Adrias): In Greek Adrias (Polyb. i.2.4), Adriatike Thalassa (Strabo iv.204), and Adriatikon Pelagos (Ptolemy iii.15.2), and in Latin Adriaticum mare (Livy x1.57.7), Adrianum mare (Cicero in Pisonem 38), Adriaticus sinus (Livy x.2.4), and Mare superurn (Cicero ad Att. 9.5.1). The Adriatic Sea is a name derived from the old Etruscan city Atria, situated near the mouth of the Po (Livy v.33.7; Strabo v.214). At first the name Adria was only applied to the most northern part of the sea. But after the development of the Syracusan colonies on the Italian and Illyrian coasts the application of the term was gradually extended southward, so as to reach Mons Garganus (the Abruzzi), and later the Strait of Hydruntum (Ptolemy iii.1.1; Polybios vii.19.2). But finally the name embraced the Ionian Sea as well, and we find it employed to denote the Gulf of Tarentum (Servius Aen xi.540), the Sicilian Sea (Pausania v. 25), and even the waters between Crete and Malta (Orosius i.2.90). Procopius considers Malta as lying at the western extremity of the Adriatic Sea (i.14). After leaving Crete the vessel in which the apostle Paul was sailing under military escort was “driven to and fro in the sea of Adria” fourteen days (Acts 27:27) before it approached the shore of Malta. We may compare this with the shipwreck of Josephus in “the middle of the Adria” where he was picked up by a ship sailing from Cyrene to Puteoli (Josephus, Vita, 3).

George H. Allen
ADRIEL

<\textit{a'-dri-el}> (אדריאל ['adhri’el], “my help is God”): The son of Barzillai the Meholathite, to whom Merab the daughter of King Saul was married when she should have been given to David (\textit{I Samuel} 18:19; \textit{II Samuel} 21:8). “Michal” in \textit{II Samuel} 21:8 is a textual error easily accounted for Adriel and Merab had five sons, whom David handed over to the blood vengeance of the men of Gibeon. The name Adriel seems to be Aramaic, the equivalent of the Hebrew name Azriel.

ADUEL

<\textit{a-du’el}> ([Ἀδουηλ, Adouel]): An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit 1:1).

ADULLAM

<\textit{a-dul’-am}> (אדוולא [adullam]):

1. A city, with dependencies, and in ancient times having a king, mentioned five times in the Old Testament, each time in a list with other cities (\textit{Joshua} 12:15; 15:35; \textit{II Chronicles} 11:7; \textit{Micah} 1:15; \textit{Nehemiah} 11:30). In the list of 31 kings whom Joshua smote, Adullam follows Hormah, Arad, Libnah, and precedes Makkedah. Among the 14 Judahite cities of the first group in “the lowland” Adullam is mentioned between Jarmuth and Socoh. In the list of 15 cities fortified by Rehoboam it appears between Socoh and Gath. Micah gives what may be a list of cities concerned in some Assyrian approach to Jerusalem; it begins with Gath, includes Lachish, and ends with Mareshah and Adullam. And Adullam is still in the same company in the list in Nehemiah of the cities “and their villages” where the men of Judah then dwelt. In the time of the patriarchs it was a place to which men “went down” from the central mountain ridge (\textit{Genesis} 38:1). Judas Maccabeus found it still existing as a city (2 Macc 12:38). Common opinion identifies Adullam with the ruin ‘Aid-el-Ma, 13 miles West-Southwest from Bethlehem (see \textit{HGHL}, 229 ff). This is in spite of the testimony of the Onomasticon, which, it is alleged, confuses Adullam with Eglon. Presumably the city gave its name to the cave of Adullam, the cave being near the city.

(2) The cave of Adullam, David’s headquarters during a part of the time when he was a fugitive from Saul (1 Samuel 22:1; 2 Samuel 23:13; 1 Chronicles 11:15). Sufficient care has not been exercised in reading the Bible statements on this subject. To begin with, Hebrew syntax permits of the use of the word “cave” collectively; it may denote a group or a region of caves; it is not shut up to the meaning that there was one immense cave in which David and his 400 men all found accommodations at once. All reasonings based on this notion are futile.

Further, by the most natural syntax of 2 Samuel 23:13-17 (duplicated with unimportant variations in 1 Chronicles 11:15-19), that passage describes two different events, and does not connect the cave of Adullam with the second of these. “And three of the thirty chief men went down, and came to David in the harvest time unto the cave of Adullam; and the troop of the Philistines was encamped in the valley of Rephaim. And David was then in the stronghold; and the garrison of the Philistines was then in Beth-lehem. And David longed, and said, Oh that one would give me water,” etc. Concerning these three seniors among David’s “mighty men” it is narrated, first, that they were David’s comrades in a certain battle, a battle which the Chronicler identifies with Pas-dammim, where David slew Goliath; second, that they joined David at the cave of Adullam, presumably during the time when he was hiding from Saul; third, that at a later time, when the Philistines were in the valley of Rephaim (compare 2 Samuel 5:18), and David was “in the stronghold” (Josephus says “at Jerusalem,” Ant, VII, xii, 4), these men broke through the Philistine lines and brought him water from the home well of Bethlehem.

The cave of Adullam, like the city, was “down” from the central ridge (1 Samuel 22:1; 2 Samuel 23:13). The city was in Judah; and David and his men were in Judah (1 Samuel 23:3) at a time when, apparently, the cave was their headquarters. Gad’s advice to David to return to Judah (1 Samuel 22:3,5) was given at a time when he had left the cave of Adullam. If the current identification of `Aid-el-Ma as Adullam is correct, the cave of Adullam is probably the cave region which has been found in that vicinity.

It has been objected that this location is too far from Bethlehem for David’s men to have brought the water from there. To this it is replied that thirteen or fourteen miles is not an excessive distance for three
exceptionally vigorous men to go and return; and a yet stronger reply is
found in the consideration just mentioned, that the place from which the
men went for the water was not the cave of Adullam. The one argument
for the tradition to the effect that Chariton’s cave, a few miles Southeast of
Bethlehem, is Adullam, is the larger size of this cave, as compared with
those near ‘Aid-el-Ma We have already seen that this has no force.

In our current speech “cave of Adullam” suggests an aggregation of ill-
assorted and disreputable men. This is not justified by the Bible record.
David’s men included his numerous and respectable kinsmen, and the
representative of the priesthood, and some of David’s military
companions, and some men who afterward held high office in Israel. Even
those who are described as being in distress and debt and bitter of soul
were doubtless, many of them, persons who had suffered at the hands of
Saul on account of their friendship for David. Doubtless they included
mere adventurers in their number; but the Scriptural details and the
circumstances alike indicate that they were mainly homogeneous, and that
most of them were worthy citizens.

Willis J. Beecher

ADULLAMITE

<adul’am-it>: The gentilic adjective of ADULLAM, which see. It is used
only of Judah’s friend Hirah (Gen 38:1,12,20).

ADULTERY

<adul’ter-i>: In Scripture designates sexual intercourse of a man,
whether married or unmarried, with a married woman.

1. ITS PUNISHMENT:

It is categorically prohibited in the Decalogue (seventh commandment,
Exodus 20:14; Deuteronomy 5:18): “Thou shalt not commit
adultery.” In more specific language we read: “And thou shalt not he
carnally with thy neighbor’s wife, to defile thyself with her” (Leviticus
18:20). The penalty is death for both guilty parties: “And the man that
committeth adultery with another man’s wife, even he that committeth
adultery with his neighbor’s wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall
surely be put to death” (Leviticus 20:10). The manner of death is not particularized; according to the rabbis (Siphra’ at the place; Sanhedhrin 52b) it is strangulation. It would seem that in the days of Jesus the manner of death was interpreted to mean stoning (“Now in the law Moses commanded us to stone such,” John 8:5, said of the woman taken in adultery). Nevertheless, it may be said that in the case in question the woman may have been a virgin betrothed unto a husband, the law (in Deuteronomy 22:23 f) providing that such a person together with her paramour be stoned to death (contrast Deuteronomy 22:22, where a woman married to a husband is spoken of and the manner of death is again left general). Ezekiel 16:40 (compare 23:47) equally mentions stoning as the penalty of the adulteress; but it couples to her sin also that of shedding blood; hence, the rabbinic interpretation is not necessarily disputed by the prophet. Of course it may also be assumed that a difference of custom may have obtained at different times and that the progress was in the line of leniency, strangulation being regarded as a more humane form of execution than stoning.

2. TRIAL BY ORDEAL:

The guilty persons become amenable to the death penalty only when taken “in the very act” (John 8:4). The difficulty of obtaining direct legal evidence is adverted to by the rabbis (see Makkoth 7a). In the case of a mere suspicion on the part of the husband, not substantiated by legal evidence, the woman is compelled by the law (Numbers 5:11-30) to submit to an ordeal, or God’s judgment, which consists in her drinking the water of bitterness, that is, water from the holy basin mingled with dust from the floor of the sanctuary and with the washed-off ink of a writing containing the oath which the woman has been made to repeat. The water is named bitter with reference to its effects in the case of the woman’s guilt; on the other hand, when no ill effects follow, the woman is proved innocent and the husband’s jealousy unsubstantiated. According to the Mishna (SoTah 9) this ordeal of the woman suspected of adultery was abolished by Johanan ben Zaccai (after 70 AD), on the ground that the men of his generation were not above the suspicion of impurity.

See article BITTER, BITTERNESS.
3. A HEINOUS CRIME:

Adultery was regarded as a heinous crime (Job 31:11). The prophets and teachers in Israel repeatedly upbraided the men and women of their generations for their looseness in morals which did not shrink from adulterous connections. Naturally where luxurious habits of life were indulged in, particularly in the large cities, a tone of levity set in: in the dark of the evening, men, with their features masked, waited at their neighbors’ doors (Job 24:15; 31:9; compare Proverbs 7), and women forgetful of their God’s covenant broke faith with the husbands of their youth (Proverbs 2:17). The prophet Nathan confronted David after his sin with Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, with his stern rebuke (“Thou art the man,” 2 Samuel 12:7); the penitential psalm (Psalm 51) — ”Miserere” — was sung by the royal bard as a prayer for divine pardon. Promiscuous intercourse with their neighbors’ wives is laid by Jeremiah at the door of the false prophets of his day (Jeremiah 23:10,14; 29:23).

4. PENAL AND MORAL DISTINCTIONS:

While penal law takes only cognizance of adulterous relations, it is needless to say that the moral law discountenances all manner of illicit intercourse and all manner of unchastity in man and woman. While the phrases “harlotry,” “commit harlotry,” in Scripture denote the breach of wedlock (on the part of a woman), in the rabbinical writings a clear distinction is made on the legal side between adultery and fornication. The latter is condemned morally in no uncertain terms; the seventh commandment is made to include all manner of fornication. The eye and the heart are the two intermediaries of sin (Palestinian Talmud, Berakhoth 6b). A sinful thought is as wicked as a sinful act (Niddah 13b and elsewhere). Job makes a covenant with his eyes lest he look upon a virgin (31:1). And so Jesus who came “not to destroy, but to fulfill” (Matthew 5:17), in full agreement with the ethical and religious teaching of Judaism, makes the intent of the seventh commandment explicit when he declares that “every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already In his heart” (Matthew 5:28). And in the spirit of Hosea (4:15) and Johanan ben Zaccai (see above) Jesus has but scorn for those that are ready judicially to condemn though they be themselves not free from sin! “He that is without sin among you, let him
first cast a stone at her” (John 8:7). Whereas society is in need of the
death penalty to secure the inviolability of the home life, Jesus bids the
erring woman go her way and sin no more. How readily His word might be
taken by the unspiritual to imply the condoning of woman’s peccability is
evidenced by the fact that the whole section (John 7:53 through 8:11) is
omitted by “most ancient authorities” (see Augustine’s remark).

5. A GROUND OF DIVORCE:

Adultery as a ground of divorce. — The meaning of the expression “some
unseemly thing” (Deuteronomy 24:1) being unclear, there was great
variety of opinion among the rabbis as to the grounds upon which a
husband may divorce his wife. While the school of Hillel legally at least
allowed any trivial reason as a ground for divorce, the stricter
interpretation which limited it to adultery alone obtained in the school of
Shammai. Jesus coincided with the stricter view (see Matthew 5:32;
19:9, and commentaries). From a moral point of view, divorce was
discountenanced by the rabbis likewise, save of course for that one ground
which indeed makes the continued relations between husband and wife a
moral impossibility.

See also CRIMES; & DIVORCE.

Max L. Margolis

ADUMMIM

<adum’im> (אדומים [’adhummim], perhaps “red spots”): “The ascent
of Adummim” is one of the numerous landmarks mentioned in defining the
northern border of Judah westward from the mouth of the Jordan to
Jerusalem, and in defining the southern border of Benjamin eastward from
Jerusalem to the mouth of the Jordan (Joshua 15:7; 18:17). It is
identified with the gorge part of the road from Jericho up to Jerusalem. Its
present name is Tala’at-ed-Dumm, “ascent of blood.” The stone is marked
by “curious red streaks,” a phenomenon which probably accounts for both
the ancient and the modern names, and for other similar names which have
been applied to the locality. It is the scene of our Saviour’s story of the
Good Samaritan, and tradition of course locates the inn to which the
Samaritan brought the wounded man (see HGHL, 265).
ADVANTAGE

<ad-van’-taj> ([כָּחַן] cakhan): In Job 35:3 is interpreted in succeeding clause as “profit.” In Romans 3:1 [περισσός], perissos, is likewise interpreted by a paraphrase in the next sentence. the Revised Version (British and American) prefers to render pleonekteo by “take advantage,” where the King James Version has “defraud” (2 Corinthians 7:2), or “make gain of” (2 Corinthians 12:17; compare 2 Corinthians 2:11). In Jude 1:16 “advantage” (opheleia) means “profit.”

ADVENT

<ad’-vent>.

See INCARNATION; MILLENNIUM; PAROUSIA.

ADVENTURE


ADVERSARY

<ad’-ver-sa-ri>, <ad’-ver-sa-ri>: This word (in the singular or plural) is used in the Old Testament to render different Hebrew words. In thirty-two cases the word corresponds to the noun [tsar], or the verb [tsarar]. This noun is the ordinary word for “foe” or “adversary.” In twelve passages the Hebrew word, of which “adversary” is the translation, is [saTan] = noun or [saTan] = verb. This stem means “to oppose,” or “thwart” anyone in his purpose or claims.

The angel of Yahweh was [saTan] to Balaam (Numbers 22:22). The word often denotes a political adversary (1 Kings 11:14,23,25). In four
cases (namely, Prologue to Job; Zechariah 3:1,2; 1 Chronicles 21:1; Psalm 109:6) the King James Version retains Satan as the rendering. But it is only in 1 Chronicles that the word is used without the article, that is, strictly as a proper name. The Septuagint gives διάβολος, diabolos, as the rendering, and both in Job and Zechariah, Satan is portrayed as the “false accuser.” In two cases “adversary” represents two Hebrew expressions which mean the “opponent in a suit” or “controversy” (Job 31:35; Isaiah 50:8).

In the New Testament “adversary” represents:

(1) [ἀντικείμενοι, antikeimenoi], the participle of a verb which means “to be set over against,” “to be opposed” (Luke 13:17; Philippians 2:8).

(2) [ἀντίδικος, antidikos], “opponent in a lawsuit,” “prosecutor” (Matthew 5:25; Luke 12:58; 18:3; 1 Peter 5:8). According to the last passage the devil is the “accuser” or “prosecutor” of believers, but according to another writer they have an “advocate” or “counselor for the defense” with the Father (1 John 2:1). In one passage (Hebrews 10:27) “adversary” represents a Greek word, hupenantios, which means “set over against,” “contrary to” — a word used in classical Greek and in the Septuagint.

Thomas Lewis

ADVERSITY

<ad-vur'-si-ti>: In the Revised Version (British and American) exclusively an Old Testament term, expressing the various forms of distress and evil conveyed by four Hebrew words: לָעָן [tsela‘], “a halting” or “fall”; צֶלַח [tsarah], “straits” “distress,” “affliction”; צָר [tsar], “straitness,” “affliction”; רָע [ra‘], “bad,” “evil,” “harmful.” These words cover the whole range of misfortunes caused by enemies, poverty, sorrow and trouble. “Adversity,” which occurs once in the King James Version in New Testament (Hebrews 13:3: κακουχουμένος, kakouchoumenos), “ill-treated”) is displaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by the
literal rendering which illustrates or interprets a common phase of adversity.

Dwight M. Pratt

ADVERTISE

<ad’-ver-tiz>: This word is found twice in the Old Testament: In Numbers 24:14 (from Hebrew, יָאָץ [ya`ats], “to advise”) Balsam advises Balak of the future of Israel and its influence upon his kingdom (“I will advertise thee”). In the King James Version Ruth 4:4 (from גלָה עָזֶן [galah ‘ozen], “to uncover the ear,” “to reveal”) Boaz in speaking to the nearer kinsman of Ruth: “I thought to advertise thee” (the Revised Version, margin “uncover thine ear”).

ADVICE; ADVISE; ADVISEMENT

<ad-vis’>, <ad-viz’>, <ad-viz’-ment>: Aside from their regular meaning these words are peculiarly employed as follows:

(1) Advice’ In 2 Samuel 19:43 (from, דָבָר [dabhar], “word”) the meaning is equal to “request” (the Revised Version, margin “were we not the first to speak of bringing back”). In 1 Samuel 25:33 the King James Version (from, תָּאָמ [Ta`am], “taste,” “reason”) “advice” is equal to “sagacity” (the Revised Version (British and American) “blessed be thy discretion”). In 2 Chronicles 25:17 (from יָאָכ [ya`ac], “to give or take counsel”) the meaning seems to be “to consult with oneself”; compare also Judges 19:30 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “take counsel”).

(2) Advise: In 2 Samuel 24:13 the King James Version (from ידָחָה [yadha], “to know”) “to advise” means “to advise oneself,” i.e. “to consider” (the Revised Version (British and American) “advise thee”) Compare also 1 Chronicles 21:12 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “consider” from, רָאָה [ra`ah], “to see”) and Proverbs 13:10 where “well-advised” is the same as “considerate” (from יָאָכ [ya`ac]; see 2 Chronicles 25:17).
**Advisement (antiquated):** Found once in the Old Testament in 1 Chronicles 12:19 (from הָתָסָה [’etsah], “counsel”), where “upon advisement” means “upon deliberation.” Compare 2 Macc 14:20 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “when these proposals had been long considered”).

_A. L. Breslich_

**ADVOCATE**

_<ad'-vo-kat>_ ([παράκλητος, parakletos]): Found in 1 John 2:1, “If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” The Greek word has several shades of meaning:

1. a legal advocate;
2. an intercessor,
3. a helper generally. In the passage before us the first and second meanings are included. Christ in heaven intercedes for Christians who sin upon earth. The next verse declares that He is the “propitiation for our sins” and it is His propitiatory work which lies at the basis of His intercession. The margins of the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version give as alternative readings Comforter, Helper, Greek Paraclete. Beyond doubt however, “advocate” is the correct translation in the passage in the epistle. The same Greek word also occurs in the Gospel of John (14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7) referring not to Christ but to the Holy Spirit, to whom Christ refers as “another comforter” whom He will send from the Father. In the Gospel various functions are ascribed to the Spirit in relation to believers and unbelievers. The word in the Gospel is inadequately translated “Comforter.” The Spirit according to these passages, is more than Comforter and more than Advocate.

*See PARACLETE; COMFORTER; HOLY SPIRIT.*

_E. Y. Mullins_
ADYTUM

<ad’-i-tum> (Latin from Greek [αδυτον, aduton], adjective adutos, “not to be entered”) : Applied to the innermost sanctuary or chambers in ancient temples, and to secret places which were open only to priests: hence, also to the Holy of Holies in the Jewish temple.

See TEMPLE.

AEDIAS

<a-e-di’-as> ([Ἀείδειας, Aedeias]). Mentioned in 1 Esdras 9:27, being one of those who agreed to divorce their alien wives. This name is supposed to be a corruption of the Greek [Ἡλία, Helia], there being no Hebrew equivalent for it, and in Ezra 10:26, the name occurs in the correct form as Elijah ([עליヤ, ['eliah] = “God is Yahweh”).

AELIA

<e’-li-a>.

See JERUSALEM.

AENEAS

<e-ne’-as> ([Ἀείνας, ‘Aineas]): A paralytic at Lydda, who, after he “had kept his bed eight years,” was miraculously healed by Peter (Acts 9:33,34).

AENON

<e’-non> ([Αίνων, Aion): The place where John was baptizing “because there was much water there” (John 3:23). It was on the west side of the Jordan, the place where John baptized at the first being on the east (John 1:28; 3:26; 10:40). We may be sure it was not in Samaritan territory. Eusebius, Onomasticon locates it 8 Roman miles South of Scythopolis (Beisan), this stretch of land on the west of the Jordan being then, not under Samaria, but under Scythopolis. Its position is defined by nearness to Salim. Various identifications have been suggested, the most
probable being the springs near Umm el-`Amdan, which exactly suit the position indicated by Eusebius, Onomasticon.

*See discussion under SALIM.*

**W. Ewing**

**AEON**

*e’-on>: This word originally meant “duration,” “dispensation.” In the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle the word is [αἰών], aion], from which this word is transliterated. In the Gnostic philosophy it has a special meaning and is there used to solve the problem of the world order. In the infinite separation between God and the world, it was taught, there must of necessity be mediating powers. These powers are the eons and are the successive emanations from God from eternity. They are spiritual, existing as distinct entities. They constituted the Divine fullness or the Divine Pleroma. The name was applied to these beings for two reasons: because they were thought to partake of the eternal existence of God and because they were supposed to govern the various ages. The idea of the eons in various forms may be found in nearly all oriental philosophy that attempted to deal with the problem of the world order. It appears in the writings of Philo, in Shintoism, in the old Zoroastrian religion.

*See GNOSTICISM.*

**Jacob W. Kapp**

**AESORA**

*e’-so-ra>, the King James Version Esora, <e-so’-ra> ([Ἀἰσωρά, Aisora]): A town in the borders of Samaria, mentioned in connection with Beth-boron and Jericho (Judith 4:4), and from this association we judge that it was in the eastern part of Samaria.

**AFFECT; AFFECTION**

*a-fekt’, a-fek’-shun>: The literal meaning of “affect” is to act upon (Latin ad, “to,” “upon,” facio, “to do”). It has various shades of meaning, and occurs in the following senses in the English Bible:
(1) In its literal sense: Lamentations 3:51, “Mine eye affecteth my soul”

(2) In the sense of “to endeavor after” desire,” “court”: Galatians 4:17, “They zealously affect (the Revised Version (British and American) “seek”) you .... that ye may affect (the Revised Version (British and American) “seek”) them,” i.e. they earnestly court your favor, that you may court theirs. Paul means that the proselytizing zeal of the Judaizers was rooted in personal ambition. The past part. “affected” (the Revised Version (British and American) “sought”) has the same meaning in Galatians 4:18. The same Greek word (geloo) is translated “desire earnestly” in the Revised Version (British and American) (1 Corinthians 12:31; 14:1,39). “Affect” has a similar meaning in Ecclesiasticus 13:11.

(3) In the passive, it occurs in the sense of “to be disposed,” in a neutral sense, with an adverb to characterize the nature of the disposition: Acts 14:2, “evil affected against the brethren” So also 2 Macc 4:21; 13:26.

“Affection” occurs in the following senses:

(1) In the literal sense: the state of having one’s feelings acted upon or affected in some way; bent or disposition of mind, in a neutral sense (the nature of the affection, whether good or bad, needing further description in the context). So Colossians 3:2, “Set your affection (the Revised Version (British and American) “mind”) on things above”; Colossians 3:5, “inordinate affection” (here “affection” by itself is neutral; the addition of the adjective makes it equivalent to “passion’ in an evil sense, as in the Revised Version (British and American)).

(2) In a good sense: tender feeling, warm attachment, good will; the word in itself carrying a good meaning apart from the context. 1 Chronicles 29:3, “because I have set my affection on the house of my God”; Romans 1:31; 2 Timothy 3:3, “without natural affection”, 2 Corinthians 6:12 “Ye are straitened in your own affections” (lit. “bowels,” regarded as the seat of kindly feelings, compare Eng “heart’ ) So 2 Corinthians 7:15.
(3) In an evil sense in the plural = passions. Galatians 5:24, the flesh, with the affections (the Revised Version (British and American) “passions”) and lusts”; Romans 1:26, “God gave them unto vile affections” (the Revised Version (British and American) “passions”).

“Affectioned” occurs once, in a neutral sense: Romans 12:10, “affectioned (i.e. “disposed”) one to another” In Thessalonians 2:8, we have “affectionately,” in a good sense.

D. Miall Edwards

AFFINITY

\(<a\text{-}fin\text{-}ti}\rangle\ (\text{[chathan]} “to join one-self”): This term is used three times in the Old Testament:

(1) in 1 Kings 3:1, where we read that “Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh King of Egypt”,

(2) in 2 Chronicles 18:1, where it is stated that Jehoshaphat “joined affinity with Ahab,” and (3). in Ezra 9:14, where it is asked “Shall we .... join in affinity with the peoples that do these abominations?” The Hebrew word thus rendered in the above three passages refers in each case to marriage alliances rather than to family or political relationships.

See MARRIAGE; FAMILY.

W. W. Davies

AFFIRM; AFFIRMATIVES

\(<a\text{-}fur\text{-}ma-tivs}\rangle\ (\text{dischurizomai}, \text{diischurizomai}). The verb “affirm” occurs in several passages of the New Testament in the sense of “assert” (Luke 22:59; Acts 12:15; 25:19 [\text{pha-sk\text{o}}]; Romans 3:8 [\text{phemi}]; 1 Timothy 17; Titus 3:8 [\text{diabebaioomai}, diabebaioomai]. The Hebrew does not employ affirmative particles, but gives a positive reply by either repeating the word in question or by substituting the first person in the reply for the second person in the question, or by employing the formula: “Thou hast said” or “Thou hast rightly said.” The Saviour used this idiom ([\text{su eipas}]) when
answering Judas and Caiaphas (Matthew 26:25,64). A peculiar elegance occasionally attaches to the interpretation of the Scriptures because of their use of an affirmative and a negative together, rendering the sense more emphatic; sometimes the negative occurs first, as in Psalm 118:17: “I shall not die, but live”; sometimes the affirmative precedes, as in Isaiah 88:1: “Thou shalt die, and not bye” John 1:20 is made peculiarly emphatic because of the negative placed between two affirmatives: “And he confessed, and denied not; and he confessed, I am not the Christ.”

Frank E. Hirsch

**AFFLICTION**

*a-flik’-shun*: Represents no fewer than 11 Hebrew words in the Old Testament, and 3 Greek words in the New Testament, of which the most common are (oni), (thlipsis). It is used

1. **actively** = that which causes or tends to cause bodily pain or mental distress, as “the bread of affliction” (Deuteronomy 16:3; 2 Chronicles 18:26); often in plural, as “Many are the afflictions of the righteous” (Psalm 34:19);

2. **passively** = the state of being in pain or trouble, as “to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction” (James 1:27). The following are the chief forms of affliction referred to:

1. **Individual affliction**, especially sickness, poverty, the oppression of the weak by the strong and rich, perverted justice.

2. **National**. A great place is given in the Old Testament to affliction as a national experience, due to calamities, such as war, invasion, conquest by foreign peoples, exile. These form the background of much of the prophetic writings, and largely determine their tone and character.

3. **In the New Testament** the chief form of affliction is that due to the fierce antagonism manifested to the religion of Jesus, resulting in persecution.
1. THE SOURCE OF AFFLICTION.

1. God:
The Hebrew mind did not dwell on secondary causes, but attributed everything, even afflictions, directly to the great First Cause and Author of all things: “Shall evil befall a city, and Yahweh hath not done it?” (Amos 3:6); “I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil (i.e. calamity); I am Yahweh, that doeth all these things” (Isaiah 45:7) Thus, all things, including calamity, were referred to the Divine operation. The Hebrew when afflicted did not doubt the universal sovereignty of God; yet, while assuming this sovereignty, he was sometimes tempted to accuse Him of indifference, neglect or forgetfulness. Compare Job passim; Isaiah 40:27; 49:14; Ezekiel 8:12; 9:9.

2. Evil Agents:
Yet there are traces of a dualism which assigns a certain vague limit to God’s absolute sovereignty, by referring affliction to an evil agency acting in quasi-independence of God. There could, however, never be more than a tendency in this direction, for a strict dualism was incompatible with the standpoint of Jewish monotheism. Thus Saul’s mental affliction is attributed to an “evil spirit,” which is yet said to be “from Yahweh” (I Samuel 16:14; 18:10; 19:9); and the fall of Ahab is said by Micaiah to be due to the “lying spirit” which enticed him to his doom, in obedience to God’s command (1 Kings 22:20-22). In the prologue of Job, Job’s calamities are ascribed to the Satan, but even he receives his word of command from God, and is responsible to Him, like the other “sons of God” who surround the heavenly throne. He is thus “included in the Divine will and in the circle of Divine providence” (Schultz). After the prologue, the Satan is left out of account, and Job’s misfortunes are attributed directly to the Divine causality. In later Judaism, the tendency to trace the origin of evil, physical and moral, to wicked spirits became more marked, probably because of the influence of Persian dualism. In New Testament times, physical and mental maladies were thought to be due to the agency of evil spirits called demons, whose prince was Beelzebub or Satan (Mark 1:23 ff; 3:22 f; 5:2 ff, Matthew 9:32 f, etc.). Christ gave His assent to this belief (compare the woman under infirmity, “whom Satan hath bound,” Luke 13:16). Paul attributed his
bodily affliction to an evil angel sent by Satan (2 Corinthians 12:7), though he recognized that the evil agent was subordinate to God’s purpose of grace, and was the means of moral discipline (1 Corinthians 12:7,9). Thus, while the evil spirits were regarded as malicious authors of physical maladies, they were not, in a strictly dualistic fashion, thought to act in complete independence; rather, they had a certain place assigned to them in the Divine Providence.

2. MEANING AND PURPOSE OF AFFLICTION.

Why did God afflict men? How is suffering to be explained consistently with the goodness and justice of God? This was an acute problem which weighed heavily upon the Hebrew mind, especially in the later, more reflective, period. We can only briefly indicate the chief factors which the Scriptures contribute to the solution of the problem. We begin with the Old Testament.

1. Punitive or Retributive:

The traditional view in early Hebrew theology was that afflictions were the result of the Divine law of retribution, by which sin was invariably followed by adequate punishment. Every misfortune was a proof of sin on the part of the sufferer. Thus Job’s “friends” sought to convince him that his great sufferings were due to his sinfulness. This is generally the standpoint of the historians of Israel, who regarded national calamities as a mark of the Divine displeasure on account of the people’s sins. But this naive belief, though it contains an important element of truth, could not pass uncontested. The logic of facts would suffice to prove that it was inadequate to cover all cases; e.g. Jeremiah’s sufferings were due, not to sin, but to his faithfulness to his prophetic vocation. So the “suffering servant” in Isaiah. Job, too, in spite of his many woes, was firm in the conviction of his own integrity. To prove the inadequacy of the penal view is a main purpose of the Book of Job. A common modification of the traditional view was, that the sorrows of the pious and the prosperity of the wicked were only of brief duration; in the course of time, things would adjust themselves aright (e.g. Job 20:5 ff, Psalm 73:3-20). But even granting time for the law of retribution to work itself out, experience
contradicts the view that a man’s fortune or misfortune is an infallible proof of his moral quality.

2. Probational:

The thought is often expressed that afflictions are meant to test the character or faith of the sufferer. This idea is especially prominent in Job. God allowed the Satan to test the reality of Job’s piety by over-whelming him with disease and misfortunes (2). Throughout the poem Job maintains that he has stood the test (e.g. 23:10-12). Compare Deuteronomy 8:2,16; Psalm 66:10 f; 17:3; Isaiah 48:10; Jeremiah 9:7; Proverbs 17:3.

3. Disciplinary and Purificatory:

For those who are able to stand the test, suffering has a purificatory or disciplinary value.

(1) The thought of affliction as a discipline or form of Divine teaching is found in Job, especially in the speeches of Elihu, who insists that tribulation is intended as a method of instruction to save man from the pride and presumption that issue in destruction (Job 33:14-30; 36:8-10,15 the Revised Version (British and American)). The same conception is found in Psalm 94:12; 119:67,71.

(2) The purificatory function of trials is taught in such passages as Isaiah 1:25; Zechariah 13:9; Malachi 3:2,3, where the process of refining metals in fire and smelting out the dross is the metaphor used.

4. Vicarious and Redemptive:

The above are not fully adequate to explain the mystery of the afflictions of the godly. The profoundest contribution in the Old Testament to a solution of the problem is the idea of the vicarious and redemptive significance of pain and sorrow. The author of Job did not touch this rich vein of thought in dealing with the afflictions of his hero. This was done by the author of the Second Isaiah. The classical passage is Isaiah 52:13-53, which deals with the woes of the oppressed and afflicted Servant of God with profound spiritual insight. It makes no difference to the meaning
of the afflictions whether we understand by the Servant the whole Hebrew nation, or the pious section of it, or an individual member of it, and whether the speakers in Isaiah 53 are the Jewish nation or the heathen. The significant point here is the value and meaning ascribed to the Servant’s sufferings. The speakers had once believed (in accordance with the traditional view) that the Servant suffered because God was angry with him and had stricken him. Now they confess that his sorrows were due, not to his own sin but to theirs (53:4-6,8). His sufferings were not only vicarious (the punishment of their sin falling upon him), but redemptive in their effect (peace and health coming to them as a result of his chastisement). Moreover, it was not only redemptive, but expiatory (“his soul guilt-offering,” 53:10) — a remarkable adumbration of the Christian doctrine of atonement.

5. The New Testament:

So far we have dealt only with Old Testament teaching on the meaning and purpose of affliction. The New Testament makes no new contribution to the solution of the problem, but repeats and greatly deepens the points of view already found in the Old Testament.

(1) There is a recognition throughout the New Testament of the law of retribution (Galatians 6:7). Yet Jesus repudiates the popular view of the invariable connection between misfortune and moral evil (John 9:2 f). It is clear that He had risen above the conception of God’s relation to man as merely retributive (Matthew 5:45, sunshine and ram for evil men as well as for the good). His followers would suffer tribulation even more than unbelievers, owing to the hostile reaction of the evil world, similar to that which afflicted Christ Himself (Matthew 5:10 f; 10:16-25; John 15:18-20; 16:33). Similarly the Acts and the epistles frequently refer to the sufferings of Christians (e.g. Acts 14:22; 2 Corinthians 4:8-11; Colossians 1:24; Hebrews 10:32; 1 Peter 4:13; Revelation 7:14). Hence afflictions must have some other than a purely punitive purpose.

(2) They are probational, affording a test by which the spurious may be separated from the genuine members of the Christian church (James 1:3,12; 1 Peter 1:7; 4:17), and
(3) a means of discipline, calculated to purify and train the character (Romans 5:3; 2 Corinthians 12:7,9; James 1:3).

(4) The idea of vicarious and redemptive suffering gets a far deeper significance in the New Testament than in the Old Testament, and finds concrete realization in a historical person, Jesus Christ. That which is foreshadowed in Second-Isaiah becomes in the New Testament a central, pervasive and creative thought. A unique place in the Divine purpose is given to the passion of Christ. Yet in a sense, His followers partake of His vicarious sufferings, and “fill up.... that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ” (Colossians 1:24; compare Philippians 3:10; 1 Peter 4:13). Here, surely is a profound thought which may throw a flood of light on the deep mystery of human affliction. The cross of Christ furnishes the key to the meaning of sorrow as the greatest redemptive force in the universe.

3. ENDURANCE OF AFFLICTION.

The Scriptures abound in words of consolation and exhortation adapted to encourage the afflicted. Two main considerations may be mentioned.

(1) The thought of the beneficent sovereignty of God “Yahweh reigneth; let the earth rejoice,” even though “clouds and darkness are round about him” (Psalm 97:1,2); “All things work together for good to them that love God’ (Romans 8:28 the King James Version). Since love is on the throne of the universe, we may rest assured that all things are meant for our good.

(2) The thought that tribulation is of brief duration, in comparison with the Joy that shall follow (Psalm 30:5; Isaiah 54:7 f; John 16:22); a thought which culminates in the hope of immortality. This hope is in the Old Testament only beginning to dawn, and gives but a faint and flickering light, except in moments of rare exaltation and insight, when the thought of a perfect future blessedness seemed to offer a solution of the enigmas of life (Job 19:25-27; Psalms 37; 49; 73). But in the New Testament it is a postulate of faith, and by it the Christian is able to fortify himself in affliction, remembering that his affliction is light and momentary compared with the “far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory” which is to issue out of it (2
Corinthians 4:17 the King James Version; compare Matthew 5:12; Romans 8:18). Akin to this is the comfort derived from the thought of the near approach of Christ’s second coming (James 5:7,8). In view of such truths as these, the Bible encourages the pious in trouble to show the spirit of patience (Psalm 37:7; Luke 21:19; Romans 12:12; James 1:3,4; 5:7-11; 1 Peter 2:20), and even the spirit of positive joy in tribulation (Matthew 5:11 f; Romans 5:3; 2 Corinthians 12:10; James 1:2,12; 1 Peter 4:13). In the New Testament emphasis is laid on the example of Jesus in patient endurance in suffering (John 16:33; James 5:7-11; 1 Peter 2:19-23; 3:17 f). Above all, the Scriptures recommend the afflicted to take refuge in the supreme blessedness of fellowship with God, and of trust in His love, by which they may enter into a deep peace that is undisturbed by the trials and problems of life (Psalm 73, especially 23 through 28; Isaiah 26:3,4; John 14:1,27; Philippians 4:7; et passim).

D. Miall Edwards

AFFRIGHT

&lt;a-frit’&gt;: Designates a state of terror occasioned by some unexpected and startling occurrence; not as strong as “amazed,” which refers more to the stupor resulting from fright. In the New Testament most frequently for [ἐµφοβος, emphobos] (Luke 24:37; Acts 10:4; Revelation 11:13). The Revised Version (British and American) uses it also for pturomenoi of Philippians 1:28, a word “properly used of scared horses” (Ellicott).

AFOOT

&lt;a-foot’&gt; ([πεζευω, pezeuo], “to go on foot”): By walking from Troas to Assos Paul avoided the tedious voyage round Cape Lectum (Acts 20:13 the King James Version; compare Mark 6:33).

AFORE

&lt;a-for’&gt;: Archaic for “before” of time, or “formerly”; frequently occurs as compound, as in “aforetime,” “aforehand,” etc.; in the New Testament most commonly for the Greek prefix, [προ, pro], in compound words.
Romans 1:2; 15:4); at other times, for Greek adverb [ποτέ, pote], “at some time,” “once” (John 9:13; 1 Peter 3:5; Colossians 3:7).

AFRESH

*a-fresh*: Only in Hebrews 6:6, “seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh,” where it stands for the prefix of the Greek anastauountas. It has been disputed whether in this word ana has the reiterative force (“again,” “anew”). In classical Greek anastauroo has always the simple sense of “to crucify,” (i.e. “to rinse up on a cross,” ana being merely “up”). So some would render it here (e.g. Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek). Against this it is argued

1. that the classical writers had no occasion for the idea of crucifying anew (compare Winer, Deuteronomy verb. Comp., etc., Pt III, 9 ff, Leipzig, 1843);

2. that in many compounds ana signifies both “up” and “again,” as in anablepo, which means “to recover sight” as well as “to look up”;

3. that the rendering “crucify afresh” suits the context;

4. that the Greek expositors (e.g. Chrysostom) take it so without questioning. (So also Bleek, Lunemann, Alford, Westcott; compare the Vulgate’s rursum crucifigentes.)

D. Miall Edwards

AFRICA

*a-f’-ri-ka*: The name of this tract, as a continent, does not occur in the Bible, and it was only in later days known as one of the quarters of the world, under the name of Libya — that portion opposite the coast of Greece and West of Egypt.

1. AFRICA AS KNOWN TO THE ANCIENTS:

Naturally the most considerable part of Africa known to the Hebrews was Egypt itself, but Libya is regarded as being referred to under the names of Lehabim and Lubim (Ludim) (Genesis 10:13; 2 Chronicles 12:3) — words indicating, as often with the Semites, not the country itself, but its
inhabitants. Other portions of Africa known to the Hebrews were Cush or Ethiopia, and Put, whose inhabitants they regarded as belonging to the Hamitic stock. Canaan, also Cushite and therefore Hamitic, naturally did not belong to the African continent, showing that the divisions of then known world into “quarters” (Europe, Asia, Africa) had not taken place when the Table of the Nations (Genesis 10:1 ff) was drawn up — indeed, these division were not apparently thought of until many centuries later. The Casluhim and the Naphtuhim (Genesis 10:13,14) were in all probability African peoples, though their position is in general regarded as uncertain. For the Hebrews, to all appearance, the southernmost point of Africa was Cush or Ethiopia, called by the Assyrians and Babylonians Kusu and Meluhha (Meroe), which included the district now known as the Sudan, or Black region. The sons of Cush, and also those of his firstborn, Sheba, were all Arabian tribes, nominally under the domain of Mizraim or Egypt, and on this account classed with the descendants of Ham.

2. THE CUSHITES AND THE NEGROES:

It will thus be seen that the Negro districts were practically unknown to the ancient Hebrews, though men and women of Negro race must have come within their ken. It seems doubtful, therefore, whether there be, in the Bible, any reference to that race, either collectively or individually, the word Cushite standing, not for Negro, but for Ethiopian. This term is applied to Moses’ (first) wife (Numbers 12:1), and it will probably be generally admitted, that the great Hebrew lawgiver is not likely to have espoused a Negro woman. The Ethiopian eunuch converted by Philip the Evangelist (Acts 8:26 ff) was an official of Meroe, and an educated man, for he could read the Old Testament in the Greek(Septuagint) version. Commerce must have revealed to the Hebrews the whereabouts of the various peoples of Africa with whom they came into contact, and they acquired a personal knowledge of Egypt when the 12 tribes were in bondage there. During this period, it may be supposed, they saw from time to time visitors from the South — people who are not mentioned in the sacred books of the Old Testament because the Hebrews, as a nation, never came into contact with them. Apart from Egypt, the history of the portion of Africa known to the Hebrews was a chequered one, as it came successively under Egypt, Phoenicia, Greek and Roman civilization. That
it was not overrun, or even influenced, by the barbarous tribes of the South, is due to the fact that the Mediterranean tract is isolated from the central (and southern) portion of that continent by the Sahara.

3. HEBREW TRADITION:

In the Talmud it is related that Alexander penetrated Africa on Libyan asses to find a race of women, with whom he had conversation, and from whom, as he afterward confessed, being a fool, he learned wisdom — a legend suggesting some possible tradition of the Amazons of Dahomey. But even in the Talmud it is mainly the nearer (Northeast) portion of Africa which is referred to, the Africans, who had the reputation of being flat-footed, being associated with the Canaanites.

See also CUSH; ETHIOPIA; MIZRAIM.

T. G. Pinches

AFTER; AFTERWARD

<afi’-er>, <afi’-er-werd>: The fundamental thought, in which all shades of meaning unite, is that of succession either in time or place. This succession may be immediate or remote. A very common adaptation of this conception the use of “after” to denote “according to,” “after the manner of,” or “in the order of,” as in Genesis 1:26; Ephesians 4:24; Luke 1:59; Romans 5:14; Hebrews 4:11 (the Revised Version, margin “unto”), and in many passages where the Greek uses the preposition [κατά, kata], as Matthew 23:3; Romans 8:4; 1 Corinthians 1:26, etc. “In proportion to”: Psalm 28:4; compare 90:15. It sometimes correctly translates a peculiar Greek idiom of the preposition [διά, dia], with the genitive case, indicating time elapsed, as Mark 2:1, literally, “through some days,” “after some days had passed”; compare Acts 24:17. While the Greek is expressed by a variety of words, the Hebrew uses ’achar for both preposition and adverb.

H. E. Jacobs
AFTERNOON

<afternoon’> (נֵעַת הָיָם, neToth ha-yom), “the declining of the day”; Judges 19:8 the King James Version): The expression דָיִם [kechom ha-yom], “in the heat of the day” (Genesis 18:1) refers to the early afternoon when the sun is a little past its zenith, its rays still being very strong. The phrase לֶרֶךְ הָיָם [le-ruach ha-yom], “in the cool of the day” (Genesis 3:8) is in contrast to the last phrase and points to the late afternoon; in the Orient a cooling breeze arises at this period of the day, and it is then that much of the day’s business is transacted.

See DAY.

AGABA

<ag’a-ba>: A fortress in Judea. The first of 22 “strong places” which by its commander Galestus was given over to Aristobulus, the son of Alexander Janneus and Alexandra, when he (his mother, the queen, being dangerously ill) attempted to get control of the Judean government (Ant., XIII, xvi, 5).

AGABUS


(1) In Acts 11:27 f, we find him at Antioch foretelling “a great famine over all the world,” “which,” adds the historian, “came to pass in the days of Claudius.” This visit of Agabus to Antioch took place in the winter of 43-44 AD, and was the means of urging the Antiochian Christians to send relief to the brethren in Judea by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. Two points should be noted.

(a) The gift of prophet’s here takes the form of prediction. The prophet’s chief function was to reveal moral and spiritual truth, to “forth-tell” rather than to “foretell”; but the interpretation of God’s message sometimes took the form of predicting events.
(b) The phrase “over all the world” (practically synonymous with the Roman Empire) must be regarded as a rhetorical exaggeration if strictly interpreted as pointing to a general and simultaneous famine. But there is ample evidence of severe periodical famines in various localities in the reign of Claudius (e.g. Suet Claud. 18; Tac. Ann. xii.43), and of a great dearth in Judea under the procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander, 44-48 AD (Ant., XX, ii, 6; v, 2), which probably reached its climax circa 46 AD.

(2) In Acts 21:10 f we find Agabus at Caesarea warning Paul, by a vivid symbolic action (after the manner of Old Testament prophets; compare Jeremiah 13:1 ff; Ezekiel 3; 4) of the imprisonment and suffering he would undergo if he proceeded to Jerusalem.

(3) In late tradition Agabus is included in lists of the seventy disciples of Christ.

D. Miall Edwards

AGADE

<ag’-a-de>: Ancient name for Akkad (or &ACCAD, which see), one of the chief cities of Babylonia (Genesis 10:10), and the capital city of Sargon, who lived and ruled in Babylonia circa 3500 BC. Together with Shunir it formed part of one of the royal titles: “kings of Shunir (Sumer) and Accad.”

AGAG

<a’-gag> (['aghagh], or ['aghagh], meaning unknown, possibly “violent,” BDB): A name, or title, applied to the king of the Amalekites, like Abimelech in Philistia and Pharaoh in Egypt. It is used of two of these kings:

(1) A king of Amalek, mentioned by Balaam (Numbers 24:7) in his blessing of Israel;

(2) A later king, in the days of King Saul (1 Samuel 15). Saul was sent with his army to destroy the Amalekites, who had so violently opposed Israel in the Wilderness. He disregarded the Divine command,
sparing the best of the spoil, and saving Agag the king alive (1 Samuel 15:8,9). After rebuking Saul, Samuel had Agag put to death for all the atrocities committed by himself and his nation (1 Samuel 15:32,33).

Edward Mack

AGAGITE

<\textit{a’-gag-it}>: (אֲגָגִי \textit{[‘agaghi]}, from, אגא \textit{[‘aghagh]}, “a member of the house of Agag”): A title of opprobrium given to Haman (Est 3:1,10; 8:3,5; 9:24). Jewish tradition always assigned the arch-enemies of Israel membership in the house of Amalek, the hereditary foe of the nation. Compare Ant, XI, vi, 5. The word Agag has properly been taken by Delitzsch as related to the Assyrian agagu, “to be powerful,” “vehement,” “angry.” In the Greek parts of Esther, Haman is termed a Macedonian (Est 12:6; 16:10). The name Haman is probably of Elamitic origin. Oppert’s attempt to connect the term “Agagite” with “Agaz,” a Median tribe mentioned by Sargon, has found no supporters.

See AGAG.

H. J. Wolf

AGAIN

<\textit{a-gen’}>: Advb. denoting repetition; in New Testament, generally for \textit{πάλιν}, palin], “back,” “once more.” Occasionally, it has the force of a connective, synonymous with “moreover,” as in Romans 15:10 ff; 1 Corinthians 3:20, etc. The expression “born again” of the King James Version, John 3:3,7; 1 Peter 1:23, translating the Greek “anothen” and “ana” in composition, becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) “anew,” i.e. “over again.” As these particles mean “from above” and “up,” their use as indicating repetition is sometimes disputed, but without further foundation than that “again” does not exhaust the meaning.

AGAIN; BORN

See \textit{REGENERATION}. 
AGAINST

\(<a\text{-}genst'}>([\text{κατά, kata}]; [\text{ἐναντίον, enantion}]; [\text{πρὸς, pros}]):\)

Preposition expressing contrast. When used of direction, equivalent to “toward” (Matthew 10:35; 12:14, etc.); when of position, meaning “opposite,” “facing,” “in front of” (1 Kings 7:5; Genesis 15:10, Romans 8:31); when of action, “opposed to” (Matthew 5:11; 26:59; 1 Corinthians 4:6); “in resistance to” (Hebrews 12:4); “provision for” (Greek eis, literally, “unto, toward” (1 Timothy 6:19). Sometimes also applied to what breaks an established order as “customs” (Acts 28:17), “nature” (Romans 1:26). Peculiar shades of meaning may be traced by careful examination of the variety of prepositions in Hebrew and Greek employed in the Scriptures, that are translated into English by this one word.

H. E. Jacobs

AGAPE

\(<ag^{'}\text{-}a\text{-}pe}>([\text{ἀγάπη, agape}]).

1. THE NAME AND THE THING:

The name Agape or “love-feast,” as an expression denoting the brotherly common meals of the early church, though of constant use and in the post-canonical literature from the time of Ignatius onward, is found in the New Testament only in Jude 1:12 and in 2 Peter 2:13 according to a very doubtful reading. For the existence of the Christian common meal, however, we have abundant New Testament evidence. The”breaking of bread” practiced by the primitive community in Jerusalem according to Acts 2:42,46 must certainly be interpreted in the light of Pauline usage (1 Corinthians 10:16; 11:24) as referring to the ceremonial act of the Lord’s Supper. But the added clause in 2:46, “they took there food with gladness and singleness of heart,” implies that a social meal was connected in some way with this ceremonial act. Paul’s references to the abuses that had sprung up in the Corinthian church at the meetings for the observance of the Lord’s Supper (1 Corinthians 11:20–22,33,34) make it evident that in Corinth as in Jerusalem the celebration of the rite was associated with participation in a meal of a more general character. And in one of the
“we” sections of Acts (20:11) where Luke is giving personal testimony as to the manner in which the Lord’s Supper was observed by Paul in a church of his own founding, we find the breaking of bread associated with and yet distinguished from an eating of food, in a manner which makes it natural to conclude that in Troas, as in Jerusalem and Corinth, Christians when they met together on the first day of the week were accustomed to partake of a common meal. The fact that the name Agape or love-feast used in Jude 1:12 (Revised Version) is found early in the 2nd century and often afterward as a technical expression for the religious common meals of the church puts the meaning of Jude’s reference beyond doubt.

2. ORIGIN OF THE AGAPE:

So far as the Jerusalem community was concerned, the common meal appears to have sprung out of the koinonia or communion that characterized the first days of the Christian church (compare Acts 1:14; 2:1 etc.). The religious meals familiar to Jews — the Passover being the great type — would make it natural In Jerusalem to give expression by means of table fellowship to the sense of brotherhood, and the community of goods practiced by the infant church (Acts 2:44; 4:32) would readily take the particular form of a common table at which the wants of the poor were supplied out of the abundance of the rich (Acts 6:1 ff). The presence of the Agape in the Greek church of Corinth was no doubt due to the initiative of Paul, who would hand on the observances associated with the Lord’s Supper just as he had received them from the earlier disciples; but participation in a social meal would commend itself very easily to men familiar with the common meals that formed a regular part of the procedure at meetings of those religious clubs and associations which were so numerous at that time throughout the Greek-Roman world.

3. RELATION TO THE EUCHARIST:

In the opinion of the great majority of scholars the Agape was a meal at which not only bread and wine but all kinds of viands were used, a meal which had the double purpose of satisfying hunger and thirst and giving expression to the sense of Christian brotherhood. At the end of this feast, bread and wine were taken according to the Lord’s command, and after thanksgiving to God were eaten and drunk in remembrance of Christ and as
a special means of communion with the Lord Himself and through Him with one another. The Agape was thus related to the Eucharist as Christ’s last Passover to the Christian rite which He grafted upon it. It preceded and led up to the Eucharist, and was quite distinct from it. In opposition to this view it has been strongly urged by some modern critical scholars that in the apostolic age the Lord’s Supper was not distinguished from the Agape, but that the Agape itself from beginning to end was the Lord’s Supper which was held in memory of Jesus. It seems fatal to such an idea, however, that while Paul makes it quite evident that bread and wine were the only elements of the memorial rite instituted by Jesus (1 Corinthians 11:23-29), the abuses which had come to prevail at the social gatherings of the Corinthian church would have been impossible in the case of a meal consisting only of bread and wine (compare 1 Corinthians 11:21,33 f). Moreover, unless the Eucharist in the apostolic age had been discriminated from the common meal, it would be difficult to explain how at a later period the two could be found diverging from each other so completely.

4. SEPARATION FROM THE EUCHARIST:

In the Didache (circa 100 AD) there is no sign as yet of any separation. The direction that the second Eucharistic prayer should be offered “after being filled” (x.1) appears to imply that a regular meal had immediately preceded the observance of the sacrament. In the Ignatian Epistles (circa 110 AD) the Lord’s Supper and the Agape are still found in combination (Ad Smyrn viii.2). It has sometimes been assumed that Pliny’s letter to Trajan (circa 112 AD) proves that the separation had already taken place, for he speaks of two meetings of the Christians in Bithynia, one before the dawn at which they bound themselves by a “sacramentum” or oath to do no kind of crime, and another at a later hour when they partook of food of an ordinary and harmless character (Ep x.96). But as the word “sacramentum” cannot be taken here as necessarily or even probably referring to the Lord’s Supper, the evidence of this passage is of little weight. When we come to Justin Martyr (circa 150 AD) we find that in his account of church worship he does not mention the Agape at all, but speaks of the Eucharist as following a service which consisted of the reading of Scripture, prayers and exhortation (Apol, lxvii); so that by his time the separation must have taken place. Tertullian (circa 200 AD)
testifies to the continued existence of the Agape (Apol, 39), but shows clearly that in the church of the West the Eucharist was no longer associated with it (Deuteronomy Corona, 3). In the East the connection appears to have been longer maintained (see Bigg, Christian Platonists of Alexandria, 102 ff), but by and by the severance became universal; and though the Agape continued for long to maintain itself as a social function of the church, it gradually passed out of existence or was preserved only as a feast of charity for the poor.

5. REASONS FOR THE SEPARATION:

Various influences appear to have cooperated in this direction. Trajan’s enforcement of the old law against clubs may have had something to do with it (compare Pliny as above), but a stronger influence probably came from the rise of a popular suspicion that the evening meals of the church were scenes of licentious revelry and even of crime. The actual abuses which already meet us in the apostolic age (1 Corinthians 11:20 ff; Jude 1:12), and which would tend to multiply as the church grew in numbers and came into closer contact with the heathen world, might suggest the advisability of separating the two observances. But the strongest influence of all would come from the growth of the ceremonial and sacerdotal spirit by which Christ’s simple institution was slowly turned into a mysterious priestly sacrifice. To Christ Himself it had seemed natural and fitting to institute the Supper at the close of a social meal. But when this memorial Supper had been transformed into a repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary by the action of the ministering priest, the ascetic idea became natural that the Eucharist ought to be received fasting, and that it would be sacrilegious to link it on to the observances of an ordinary social meal.

LITERATURE:


J. C. Lambert
AGAR

\(<a^\prime\text{-gar}>\) (["\text{\textalpha}\text{\textgamma}\text{\textalpha}\rho", Agar]). Found once in the Apocrypha in the Greek (Baruch 3:23) probably for the Old Testament Hagar, mother of Ishmael, whose children are mentioned with the merchants of Meran (Midian) and Teman. In \(<130510>\) 1 Chronicles 5:10 the “Hagarites” the King James Version, are located East of Gilead, and In the days of Saul were at war with the tribe of Reuben. See also \(<130519>\) 1 Chronicles 5:19,20 and \(<132731>\) 1 Chronicles 27:31. In \(<198306>\) Psalm 83:6 the name of the same people is Hagarenes.

AGARENES

\(<ag\text{-a-renz}'>\): Baruch 3:23 the King James Version. In the Old Testament the word is HAGARENES (which see).

See also AGAR.

AGATE

\(<ag\text{'-at}>\).

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

AGE

\(<aj>\): A period of time or a dispensation. In the above sense the word occurs only once in the King James Version, in the sing, as the translation of \(\text{\textdelta}\text{\textnu}\text{\textnu}\) [dor], which means, properly, a “revolution” or “round of time,” “a period,” “an age” or “generation of man’s life”; almost invariable translated “generation,” “generations” (\(<3000>\) Job 8:8, “Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age”); we have the plural as the translation of aion, properly “duration,” “the course or flow of time,” “an age or period of the world,” “the world” (\(<4200>\) Ephesians 2:7, “in the ages to come”; \(<4202>\) Colossians 1:26, “the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations,” the English Revised Version, “from all ages,” etc., the American Revised Version, margin, of geneai, “generations” (\(<4203>\) Ephesians 3:5 “generations,” \(<4204>\) Ephesians 3:21, “unto all generations for ever and ever,” Greek margin, “all the generations of the age of the ages”). “Ages is given in margin of the King James Version (\(<2500>\) Psalm 145:13; \(<2504>\) Isaiah 26:4, “the rock of ages”).
We have “age” in the above sense (2 Esdras 3:18; Tobit 14:5; aion) “ages,” aion (1 Esdras 4:40 (of Truth) “she is the strength,” etc., “of all ages”), genea, the Revised Version (British and American), “generation” (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:27; 1 Macc 2:61); Ecclesiasticus 24:33, eis geneas aionon, “generations of ages”; The Wisdom of Solomon 14:6, “generations’ (geneseos).

Revised Version has “age” for “world” (Hebrews 6:5); “ages” for “worlds” (the Revised Version, margin; Hebrews 1:2; the American Revised Version, margin; compare 1 Timothy 1:17) (margin, “unto the ages of the ages”), “ages” for “world” (1 Corinthians 10:11; Hebrews 9:26). The English Revised Version has “all ages” for “the beginning of the world; (Ephesians 3:9, the American Standard Revised Version “for ages”); “king of the ages” for “king of saints” (Revelation 15:3, corrected text; margin, many ancient authorities read “nations”; Jeremiah 10:7).

See EVERLASTING.

W. L. Walker

AGE; OLD AGE

In individual lives (cheledh); [ηληκία, helikia]): We have scarcely any word in the Old Testament or New Testament which denotes “age” in the familiar modern sense; the nearest in the Old Testament is perhaps heledh, “life,” “lifetime,” and in the New Testament helikia, “full age,” “manhood,” but which is rendered stature in Matthew 6:27, etc., the King James Version; cheledh occurs (Job 11:17, “Thine age shall be clearer than the noonday,” the Revised Version (British and American) “(thy) life”; Psalm 39:5, “Mine age is as nothing before thee,” the American Standard Revised Version, “my life-time”); we have helikia (John 9:21,23, “He is of age”; Hebrews 11:11 “past age,” Luke 2:52, “Jesus increased in wisdom and age,” so the Revised Version, margin, King James Version margin, Ephesians 4:13); yom, day, (days) is used in the Old Testament to express “age” (Genesis 47:28), the whole age of Jacob, the King James Version, “the days of the years of his life”; but it occurs mostly in connection with old age); [ben], “son” (Numbers 8:25; 1 Chronicles 23:3,24); [kelah], “to be complete,” is translated “full age”
Job 5:26); teleios, “complete” (Hebrews 5:14, the Revised Version (British and American), full-grown men, margin, perfect”), [dor], a revolution,” “a period” is translated “age” (Isaiah 38:12, “Mine age is departed and removed from me as a shepherd’s tent,” the American Standard Revised Version, “My dwelling is removed, and is carried away from me as a shepherd’s tent,” the English Revised Version, “mine age,” margin, “or habitation”; Delitzsch, “my home”; compare Psalm 49:19 (20); 2 Corinthians 5:8). In New Testament we have etos, “year” (Mark 5:42, the Revised Version (British and American), “old”; Luke 2:37; 3:23, “Jesus .... about 30 years of age”). “Old age,” “aged,” are the translation of various words, [zaqen] ([zaqan], “the chin,” the beard”), perhaps to have the chin sharp or hanging down, often translated “elders,” “old man,” etc. (2 Samuel 19:32; Job 12:20; 32:9; Jeremiah 6:11).

In New Testament we have presbutes, “aged,” “advanced in days” (Titus 2:2; Philem 1:9); presbutis, “aged woman” (Titus 2:3); probebekos en hemerais, advanced in days” (Luke 2:36); geras, “old age” (Luke 1:36).

Revised Version has “old” for “the age of” (1 Chronicles 23:3), “own age” for “sort” (Daniel 1:10); “aged” for “ancients” (Psalm 119:100), for “ancient” (Isaiah 47:6); for “old” (Hebrews 8:13); “aged men” for “the ancients” (Job 12:12); for “aged” (Job 12:20), “elders.”

 REGARD FOR OLD AGE:

(1) Among the Hebrews (and Orientals generally) old age was held in honor, and respect was required for the aged (Leviticus 19:32), “Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man”; a mark of the low estate of the nation was that “The faces of elders were not honored”; “The elders have ceased from the gate” (Lamentations 5:12,14). Compare Job 29:8 (as showing the exceptionally high regard for Job). See also The Wisdom of Solomon 2:10; Ecclesiasticus 8:6.

(2) Old age was greatly desired and its attainment regarded as a Divine blessing (Genesis 15:15; Exodus 20:12, “that thy days may be long in the land”; Job 5:26; Psalm 91:16, “With long life will I satisfy him”; 92:14; compare Isaiah 65:20; Zechariah 8:4; 1 Samuel 2:32).
(3) A Divine assurance is given, “Even to old age I am he, and even to hoar hairs will I carry you” (Isaiah 46:4); hence it was looked forward to in faith and hope (Psalm 71:9,18).

(4) Superior wisdom was believed to belong to the aged (Job 12:20; 15:10; 32:7,9; compare Kings 12:8); hence positions of guidance and authority were given to them, as the terms “elders,” “presbyters” and (Arabic) “sheik” indicate.

W. L. Walker

AGEE

\(<a\-ge>\) (aghe’], “fugitive”): A Hararite, father of Shammah, one of David’s “three mighty men” (2 Samuel 23:11). In 1 Chronicles 11:34 we read of one “Jonathan the son of Shagee the Hararite.” The parallel in 2 Samuel 23:32,33 reads “Jonathan, Shammah the Hararite.” If we read “Jonathan (son of) Shammah,” then Agee is the grandfather of Jonathan. Some, however, think 1 Chronicles 11:34 to be correct, and read “Shagee” for “Agee” in 2 Samuel 23:11, and for “Shammah” in 2 Samuel 23:33. This makes Jonathan and Shammah brothers.

AGES, ROCK OF

Applied to Yahweh as an encouragement for trust (Isaiah 26:4 the Revised Version, margin; the King James Version “everlasting strength”).

AGGABA

\(<a\-ga\-ba>\) ([Ἄγγαβα, Aggaba], and [Ἄγραβα, Agraba]; the King James Version, Graba) = Hagabah (Ezra 2:45) and Hagaba (Nehemiah 7:48): The descendants of Abraham (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:29).

See also ACCABA.

AGGAEUS

\(<a\-ge\-us>\) ([Ἄγγαιος, Aggeus]; the King James Version Aggeus). Haggai, one of the Minor Prophets. Abraham prophesied in the second
year of the reign of Darius (compare Ezra 4:24; 5:1) with Zacharias in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 6:1; 7:3) In 2 Esdras 1:40 he is mentioned as one who with others shall be given as “leader to the nation from the east.”

**AGIA**

<\'a\'-gi-a> ([\'Αγιά, Agia]; the King James Version Hagia) = Hattil (Ezra 2:57; Nehemiah 7:59): The descendants of Abraham (sons of the servants of Solomon) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:34).

**AGONE**

<\'a-gon’>: In the King James Version of 1 Samuel 30:13. Old past participle of “to go.” the Revised Version (British and American) has “ago,” namely, “three days ago,” literally, “the third day.”

**AGONY**

<ag’-o-ni> ([\'γωνία, agonia]; Vulgate agonia): A word occurring only once in the New Testament (Luke 22:44), and used to describe the climax of the mysterious soul-conflict and unspeakable suffering of our Lord in the garden at Gethsemane. The term is derived from the Greek agon “contest” and this in turn from the Greek ago “to drive or lead,” as in a chariot race. Its root idea is the struggle and pain of the severest athletic contest or conflict. The wrestling of the athlete has its counterpart in the wrestling of the suffering soul of the Saviour in the garden. At the beginning of this struggle He speaks of His soul being exceeding sorrowful even unto death, and this tumult of emotion culminated in the agony. All that can be suggested by the exhausting struggles and sufferings of charioteers, runners, wrestlers and gladiators, in Grecian and Roman amphitheaters, is summed up in the pain and death-struggle of this solitary word “agony.” The word was rendered by Wyclif (1382) “maad in agonye” Tyndale (1534) and following translators use an agony.” The record of Jesus’ suffering in Gethsemane, in the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew 26:36-46; Mark 14:32-42; Luke 22:39-46, and also in Hebrews 5:7,8) indicates that it was threefold:
1. PHYSICAL:

The agony of His soul wrought its pain on His body, until “his sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground” (<sup>42</sup>Luke 22:44, omitted by some ancient authorities). He offered His prayers and supplications “with strong crying and tears” (<sup>58</sup>Hebrews 5:7). The intensity of His struggle so distressed and weakened Him that Luke says “there appeared unto him an angel from heaven, strengthening him.” The threefold record of the evangelists conveys the idea of the intenest physical pain. As the wire carries the electric current, so every nerve in Jesus’ physical being felt the anguish of His sensitive soul as He took upon Himself the burden of the world’s sin and moral evil.

2. MENTAL:

The crisis of Jesus’ career as Messiah and Redeemer came in Gethsemane. The moral issue of His atoning work was intelligently and voluntarily met here. The Gospels exhaust language in attempting to portray the stress and struggle of this conflict. “My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.” “Being in an agony he prayed more earnestly, saying, Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me.” The mental clearness of Christ’s vision of humanity’s moral guilt and the energy of will necessary to meet the issue and take “this cup” of being the world’s sin-bearer, indicate the awful sorrow and anguish of His supernatural conflict. It is divinely significant that the word “agony” appears but once in all Scripture. This solitary word records a solitary experience. Only One ever compassed the whole range of the world’s sorrow and pain, anguish and agony. The shame of criminal arrest in the garden and of subsequent condemnation and death as a malefactor had to His innocent soul the horror of humanity’s entire and ageless guilt. The mental and moral anguish of Jesus in Gethsemane interprets the meaning of Paul’s description of the atonement, “Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf” (<sup>2</sup>Corinthians 5:21).

3. SPIRITUAL:

The agony of Jesus was supremely within the realm of His spirit. The effect of sin in separating the human soul from God was fathomed by the
suffering Saviour in the fathomless mystery of His supernatural sorrow. Undoubtedly the anguish of Gethsemane surpassed the physical torture of Calvary. The whole conflict was wrought out here. Jesus’ filial spirit, under the burden of the world’s guilt, felt isolated from the Father. This awful, momentary seclusion from His Father’s face constituted the “cup” which He prayed might pass from Him, and the “agony” of soul, experienced again on the cross, when He felt that God had forsaken Him.

No theory of the atonement can do justice to the threefold anguish of Jesus in Gethsemane and on Calvary, or to the entire trend of Scripture, that does not include the substitutionary element in His voluntary sacrifice, as stated by the prophet: “Yahweh hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,” Isaiah 53:6; and by His apostles “who was delivered up for our trespasses,” Romans 4:25; “who his own self bare our sins,” 1 Peter 2:24.

The word “agony” also occurs in 2 Macc 3:14,16,21 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “distress”) in describing the distress of the people at the attempt of Heliodorus to despoil the treasury of the temple in the days of Onias.

Dwight M. Pratt

AGRAPHA

<ag’-ra-fa> ([‟Αγραφα, agrapha]).

1. THE TERM AND ITS HISTORY:

The word agraphos of which agrapha is the neuter plural is met with in classical Greek and in Greek papyri in its primary sense of “unwritten,” “unrecorded.” In early Christian literature, especially in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, it was used of oral tradition; and in this sense it was revived by Koerner in a Leipzig Program issued in 1776 under the title Deuteronomy sermonibus Christi agraphois. For some time it was restricted to sayings of Christ not recorded in the Gospels and believed to have reached the sources in which they are found by means of oral tradition. As however graphe, the noun with which agrapha is connected, can have not only the general meaning “writing,” but the special meaning
“Scripture,” the adjective could signify not only “oral” but also uncanonical or “non-canonical”; and it was employed by Resch in the latter sense in the 1st edition of his great work on the subject which appeared in German in 1889 under the title, Agrapha: Extra-canonical Gospel Fragments. The term was now also extended so as to include narratives as well as sayings. In the second edition (also in German) it is further widened so as to embrace all extra-canonical sayings or passages connected with the Bible. The new title runs: Agrapha Extra-canonical Fragments of Scripture; and the volume contains a first collection of Old Testament agrapha. The term is still however used most frequently of non-canonical sayings ascribed to Jesus, and to the consideration of these this article will mainly be devoted.

2. EXTENT OF MATERIAL:

Of the 361 agrapha and apocrypha given by Resch about 160 are directly ascribed to Christ. About 30 others can be added from Christian and Jewish sources and about 80 sayings found in Muhammadan literature (Expository Times, V, 59, 107, 177 f, 503 f, 561, etc.). The last-mentioned group, although not entirely without interest, may largely be disregarded as it is highly improbable that it represents early tradition. The others come from a variety of sources: the New Testament outside of the Gospels, Gospel manuscripts and VSS, Apocryphal Gospels and an early collection of sayings of Jesus, liturgical texts, patristic and medieval literature and the Talmud.

3. SAYINGS TO BE EXCLUDED:

Many of these sayings have no claim to be regarded as independent agrapha. At least five classes come under this category.

(1) Some are mere parallels or variants, for instance: “Pray and be not weary,” which is evidently connected with Luke 18:1; and the saying in the Talmud: “I, the Gospel, did not come to take away from the law of Moses but to add to the law of Moses have I come” (Shab 116b) which is clearly a variant of Matthew 5:17.

(2) Some sayings are made up of two or more canonical texts. “I chose you before the world was,” for example, is a combination of John
15:19 and Ephesians 1:4; and “Abide in my love and I will give you eternal life” of John 8:31 and 10:28.

(3) Misquotation or loose quotation accounts for a number of alleged agrapha. “Sodom is justified more than thou” seems to be really from Ezekiel 16:53 and its context. “Let not the sun go down upon your wrath” is of apostolic not evangelic origin (Ephesians 4:26). “Anger destroys even the prudent” comes from Septuagint of Proverbs 15:1.

(4) Some sayings must be rejected because they cannot be traced to an early source, for instance, the fine saying: “Be brave in war, and fight with the old serpent, and ye shall receive eternal life,” which is first met with in a text of the 12th century.

(5) Several sayings are suspicious by reason of their source or their character. The reference to “my mother the Holy Spirit,” in one of them, has no warrant in the acknowledged teaching of Christ and comes from a source of uncertain value, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Pantheistic sayings such as “I am thou and thou art I, and wherever thou art I am”; “You are I and I am you”; and perhaps the famous saying: “Raise the stone and thou wilt find me; cleave the wood and there am I,” as well as the sayings reported by Epiphanius from the Gospel of the Ebionites seem to breathe an atmosphere different from that of the canonical Gospels.

4. SAYINGS IN NEW TESTAMENT:

When all the sayings belonging to these five classes, and a few others of liturgical origin, have been deducted there remain about thirty-five which are worthy of mention and in some cases of careful consideration. Some are dealt with in the article LOGIA (which see). The others, which are given here, are numbered consecutively to facilitate reference. The best authenticated are of course those found in the New Testament outside of the Gospels. These are

(1) the great saying cited by Paul at Miletus: “It is more blessed to give than to receive” (Acts 20:35);

(2) the words used in the institution of the Eucharist preserved only in I Corinthians 11:24 f;
(3) the promise of the baptism of the Spirit (Acts 1:5 and 11:16); and

(4) the answer to the question: “Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” (Acts 1:7 f). Less certain are

(5) the description of the Second Advent, said to be “by the word of the Lord” (1 Thessalonians 4:15 ff); and

(6) the promise of the crown of life to them that love God (James 1:12).

5. SAYINGS IN MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS:

Of considerable interest are some additions, in manuscripts of the Gospels and versions One of the most remarkable

(7) is the comment of Jesus on a man’s working on the Sabbath day inserted after Luke 6:4 in Codex Bezae (D) and the Freer manuscript recently discovered in Egypt: “If thou knowest what thou doest, O man, blessed art thou, but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law.” Another

(8) also found in D and in several other authorities is appended to Matthew 20:28: “But ye seek ye from little to increase and from greater to be less.” In the Curetonian Syriac the latter clause runs: “and not from greater to be less.” The new saying is noteworthy but obscure. A third passage

(9) of less value but still of interest is an insertion in the longer ending of Mark, between 16:14 and 16:15, which was referred to by Jerome as present in codices in his day but has now been met with in Greek for the first time in the above-mentioned Freer MS. (For facsimile see American Journal of Archaeology, 1908.) In reply to a complaint of the disciples about the opposition of Satan and their request: “Therefore reveal thy righteousness even now,” Jesus is reported to have said: “The limit of the years of the authority of Satan is fulfilled, but other dreadful things are approaching, and in behalf of those who had sinned was I delivered unto death in order that they might return to the truth and might sin no longer, that they might inherit the spiritual
and incorruptible glory of righteousness in heaven.” This alleged utterance of the risen Lord is most probably of secondary character (compare Gregory, Das Freer Logion; Swete, Two New Gospel Fragments).

6. SAYINGS FROM THE FATHERS, ETC.:

Apocryphal and patristic literature supplies some notable sayings. The first place must be given

(10) to the great saying which in its shortest form consists of only three words: “Be ("become," "show yourselves to be") approved money-changers.” Resch (Agrapha2, number 87) gives 69 references, at least 19 of which date from the 2nd and 3rd centuries, although they represent only a few authorities, all Egyptian. The saying seems to have circulated widely in the early church and may be genuine. Other early sayings of interest or value, from these sources, must be given without comment.

(11) “The heavenly Father willeth the repentance of the sinner rather than his punishment” (Justin Martyr).

(12) “That which is weak shall be saved by that which is strong” (circa 300 AD).

(13) “Come out from bonds ye who will” (Clement of Alexandria).

(14) “Be thou saved and thy soul” (Theodotus in id).

(15) “Blessed are they who mourn for the perdition of unbelievers” (Didaskalia).

(16) “He who is near me is near the fire; he who is far from me is far from the kingdom” (Origen).

(17) “He who has not been tempted has not been approved” (Didaskalia, etc.).

(18) He who makes sad a brother’s spirit is one of the greatest of criminals” (Ev Hebrews).
“Never be glad except when ye have seen your brother in love” (same place).

“Let not him who seeks cease .... until he find, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reach the kingdom, and when he has reached the kingdom he shall rest” (Clement of Alexandria and Logia of Oxyrhynchus).

In a fragment of a Gospel found by Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus (O Papyri number 655) is the following non-canonical passage in a canonical context: “He Himself will give you clothing. His disciples say unto Him: When wilt thou be manifest to us and when shall we see thee? He saith: When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed.” The saying or apocryphon exhibits considerable likeness to a saying cited by Clement of Alexandria from the Gospel according to the Egyptians, but the difference is great enough to make original identity doubtful. Another fragment found by the same explorers on the same site (O Papyri number 840) preserves two agrapha or apocrypha which though clearly secondary are very curious. The first is the concluding portion of a saying about the punishment of evil-doers: “Before a man does wrong he makes all manner of subtle excuses. But give heed lest you also suffer the same things as they for the evil-doers among men receive not their due among the living (Greek zois) only but also await punishment and much torment.” Professor Swete (Two New Gospel Fragments), accents zois as the plural of zoon and thus finds a contrast between the fate of animals and that of human beings. The second saying is a rather lengthy reply to the complaint of a Pharisaic stickler for outward purity. The most interesting part of it as edited by Swete runs as follows: “Woe to you blind who see not.... But I and my disciples who thou sayest have not been dipped have dipped in the waters of eternal life which come down from God out of heaven.” All these texts from Oxyrhynchus probably date from the 2nd century. Other Egypt sources, the so-called Coptic Apocryphal Gospels (Texts and Studies Camb. IV, 2, 1896), contain several sayings which are of interest as coming from the same religious environment. The following three are the most remarkable.
(24) “Repent, for it is better that a man find a cup of water in the age that is coming than all the riches of this world” (130).

(25) “Better is a single footstep in My Father’s house than all the wealth of this world” (130 f).

(26) “Now therefore have faith in the love of My Father; for faith is the end of all things” (176). As in the case of the Logia these sayings are found in association with canonical sayings and parallels. Since the Logan may well have numbered scores, if not hundreds, it is at least possible that these Coptic sayings may have been taken from the missing portions of this collection, or a recension of it, and therefore they are not unworthy of notice as conceivably early agrapha. To these sayings of Christian derivation may be added

(27) one Muhammadan saying, that inscribed in Arabic on the chief gateway of the city Futteypore Sikri built by Akbar: “The world is but a bridge, over which you must pass, but must not linger to build your dwelling” (In the Himalayas by Miss Gordon Cumming, cited by Griffenhoofe, The Unwritten Sayings of Christ, 128).

7. RESULT:

Although the number of agrapha purporting to be sayings of Jesus which have been collected by scholars seems at first sight imposing, those which have anything like a strong claim to acceptance on the ground of early and reliable source and internal character are disappointingly few. Of those given above numbers 1-4, 7, 8, 10 which have mostly early attestation clearly take precedence of the rest. Numbers 11-20 are early enough and good enough to merit respectful consideration. Still the proportion of genuine, or possibly genuine, material is very small. Ropes is probably not far from the truth when he remarks that “the writers of the Synoptic Gospels did their work so well that only stray bits here and there, and these but of small value, were left for the gleaners.” On the other hand it is not necessary to follow Wellhausen in rejecting the agrapha in toto. Recent discoveries have shown that they are the remains of a considerable body of extra-canonical sayings which circulated more or less in Christian circles, especially in Egypt, in the early centuries, and the possible presence in
what we possess of a sentence or two actually spoken by Jesus fully justifies research.

8. OTHER AGRAPHA:

The second edition of the work of Resch includes 17 agrapha from manuscripts of Acts and 1 John most of which are from Codex Bezae (D), 31 apostolic apocrypha, and 66 agrapha and apocrypha connected with the Old Testament. 19 of the latter are largely taken from pseudepigrapha, a pseudo-Ezekiel for instance These agrapha some of which are really textual variants are of inferior interest and value.
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See LOGIA.

William Taylor Smith

AGRARIAN LAWS

The Mosaic provisions on this subject form one of the most characteristic and interesting portions of the legislation. The main institutions are two,
namely, the Sabbath year and the jubilee, and they are closely linked together.

1. THE SABBATH YEAR:

In every seventh year the land was to lie fallow “that the poor of thy people may eat: and what they leave the beast of the field shall eat” (Exodus 23:10 f; compare Leviticus 25:2-7). `And the Sabbath of the land shall be for food for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant and for thy stranger that sojourn with thee; but for thy cattle, and for the beasts that are in thy land, shall all the increase thereof be for food’ (Leviticus 25:6 f). This has been quoted at length because the rendering of English Versions of the Bible is misleading. “The Sabbath of the land” does not mean that the natural increase thereof is to be eaten by the Israelite peasant. That interpretation is excluded by Leviticus. 25:3-5,20-22. What is intended is clearly shown by the latter of these two passages, “I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year.” The principle on which the manna had been provided for Sabbaths was to apply to the harvest of the sixth year, and this is the import of the phrase.

2. THE JUBILEE:

After “seven sabbaths of years, even forty and tone years” a trumpet was to be blown throughout the land on the tenth day of the seventh month (i.e. the Day of Atonement) and the fiftieth year was to be hallowed and celebrated as a “jubilee.” No agricultural work of any kind was to be performed, but “ye may (so correct EVV) eat the increase thereof out of the field” (Leviticus 25:12). God would so bless the land in the sixth year that it would bring forth enough for the Sabbath year, the ensuing jubilee and the subsequent period to the harvest of the ninth year (Leviticus 25:20-22).

3. ITS OBJECT:

In addition to being a period in which the land was left fallow, the jubilee was intended to meet the economic evils that befell peasants in ancient societies. Wars or unfavorable seasons would soon reduce a farmer to a condition in which he would have to borrow. But money is rarely to be
had without interest and security, and in early communities the rates of interest were very high indeed, while the only security the farmer could offer would consist of his land and the persons of himself and his children. Hence we find insolvency giving rise to the alienation of land and to slavery all over the world — sometimes with the retention of civil rights (as in Rome and Israel), at others in a more unalloyed form. The jubilee aims at both these evils. It is provided that in that year the peasants who had lost their full freedom through insolvency should be free (see Wiener, Studies in Biblical Law, 5 ff) and all lands that had been sold should return to the original owner or his family. “And the land shall not be sold in perpetuity; for the land is mine: for ye are strangers and sojourners with me” (lev 25:23). To this theory there are parallels elsewhere, e.g. in Togoland (Heinrici, Zeitschrift fur vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, XI, 138).

4. THE LEGAL RULES:

Leviticus 25 containing the land laws gives effect to this view by enacting that when an Israelite was compelled to part with his land there was to be a “redemption” of land, and that in default of redemption the land should return to its original owner in the jubilee year. This “redemption” covers two ideas — a right of preemption by the next of kin the first instance, and if that were not exercised, a right on the part of the original owner to buy back the land before the jubilee (25:24-28). The theory did not apply to houses in walled cities. Those might be redeemed within a year of sale: in default the property passed for ever and was unaffected by the jubilee (25:29 f). Villages were reckoned as country (25:31). The Levitical cities were subject to the rules of land, not of walled cities (25:32 f; read with the Vulgate in the American Revised Version, margin, “if they have not been redeemed” in 25:32), and their fields were not to be sold (25:34). All sales of lands to which the jubilee applied were to be made on the basis of the number of crops (25:14 ff); in fact, what was sold was not the property itself but the usufruct (i.e. the right of using, reaping, etc.) till the year of the jubilee. Similarly with the laws of Leviticus 27:16-25, where the general principle is that if a field be sanctified the value shall be estimated according to the number of years to the jubilee. Unfortunately the text is
corrupt and it is impossible to make out the exact circumstances in which no further redemption was allowed (27:20).

5. IDEAS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE LEGISLATION:

“The land laws are the product of many independent ideas and circumstances. .... First such a system as that expounded in the 25th chapter of Leviticus could only be put forward by one who had to work on what is so very rare in history — a clean slate. In other words, the system of land tenure here laid down could only be introduced in this way by men who had no preexisting system to reckon with. Secondly, there is (mutatis mutandis) a marked resemblance between the provisions of Leviticus and the system introduced in Egypt by Joseph (Genesis 47). The land is the Lord’s as it is Pharaoh’s; but the towns which are built on that land are not subject to the same theory or the same rules. Perhaps the explanation is that Joseph’s measures had affected only those who gained their living by agriculture, i.e. the dwellers in the country. Thirdly, the system shows the enormous power that the conception of family solidarity possessed in the Mosaic age. .... And fourthly, the enactment is inspired and illuminated by the humanitarian and religious convictions to which reference has already been made” (Journal of Transactions of the Victoria Institute, XLI, 160). Undoubtedly the most striking feature of the enactment is to be found in these religious convictions with the absolute reliance on constant Divine intervention to secure the working of the law (Genesis 47:20 ff).

6. FORM OF THE LEGISLATION:

Leviticus 26 shows clearly that this legislation was conceived as the terms of a covenant made between God and the children of Israel, and it appears from verses 42-45 that this of the covenant was regarded as being connected with the covenants with the patriarchs though it is also a covenant made with the generation that came forth from Egypt. The land was originally promised to Abraham in a covenant (Genesis 17) and it would seem that these laws are regarded as attaching to that covenant which had been renewed with his descendants. Indeed the laws appear to be presented as terms of the sworn agreement (covenant) under which God was about to give Israel the possession of Canaan.
7. ITS OPERATION AND EXTENSION:

As respects the operation of these laws we have no information as to the observance of any fallow years before the Exile: 2 Chronicles 36:21 is rather unfavorable, but so obviously echoes Leviticus 26:43 that it scarcely seems to be meant as a historical statement. But traces are to be found of the operation of other parts of the system. Ruth 4 shows us the law of redemption working, but with two notable extensions. Widows have acquired a right of property in their husbands’ estates, and when the next of kin refuses to redeem, the right passes to the kinsman who is nearest in succession. Neither of these cases is contemplated by the Pentateuch: both appear to be fresh applications of the Levitical law which, like all other legislations, had to be adapted to meet new sets of facts as they arose. Similarly Jeremiah 32 illustrates the law of preemption, but here a small difficulty arises, for Leviticus 25:34 forbids the sale of the suburbs of the Levitical cities. Probably however this refers only to sale outside the family and not as here to the nearest kinsman and heir presumptive. Similarly Ezekiel twice refers to the jubilee (7:12 f and 46:17) in terms that seem to show that he knew it as an existing institution (see SBL, 96; Churchman, May, 1906, 292). Historical traces of the Levitical cities are mentioned in the article LEVITICAL CITIES. It should be added that under the monarchy a rule seems to have been introduced that derelict lands fell to the king (see 2 Samuel 9:9 f; 1 Kings 21:16; 2 Kings 8:3,6).

In later times there are several references to the fallow of the Sabbatical year (1 Macc 6:49,53; Ant, XIII, viii, 1, XIV, x, 6, etc.).

8. OTHER LAWS AFFECTING THE LAND:

In addition to these laws Moses enacted provisions favoring gleaning, on which see POOR. He also prohibited sowing a field or vineyard with two kinds of seed (Leviticus 19:19; Deuteronomy 22:9) and prescribed that for three years the fruit of trees should not be eaten, while in the fourth it should be holy, and in the fifth it was to be available for ordinary purposes (Leviticus 19:23 ff).

Harold M. Wiener
AGREE

<ag-ri> ([συμφωνέω, sumphoneo], “to be of the same mind,” “to come to a mutual understanding”): This is the sense of the word in Matthew 20:2; John 9:22, and other passages. In Mark 14:56 the word is isos and has the thought not only that their words did not agree, but also that the testimony was not in agreement with or equal to what the law required in such a case. The thought of being equal occurs also in 1 John 5:8.

The figurative use of the word in Matthew 18:19 makes it of special interest. The word there is sumphoneo, from which comes our word symphony, meaning a harmonious blending. This agreement therefore is complete. Three persons are introduced: two human beings and the Father. They are in perfect agreement on the subject or purpose under consideration. It is therefore an inward unity produced by the Holy Spirit leading the two into such an agreement with the Father. There will follow then, as a matter of course, what is promised in 18:19,20. In Acts 5:9 it sets forth the justice of Peter in dealing in the same manner in both cases. Ananias and Sapphira were in perfect agreement and equally guilty (Luke 5:36; Acts 15:15).

Jacob W. Kapp

AGRICULTURE

<ag-ri-kul-tur>, <ag-ri-kul-chur>:

1. DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

One may witness in Syria and Palestine today the various stages of social progress through which the people of Bible times passed in which the development of their agriculture played an important part. To the East the sons of Ishmael still wander in tribes from place to place, depending upon their animals for food and raiment, unless by a raid they can secure the fruits of the soil from the peoples, mostly of their own blood, who have given up wandering and are supporting themselves by tilling the ground. It is only a short step from this frontier life to the more protected territory toward the Mediterranean, where in comparatively peaceful surroundings, the
wanderers become stationary. If the land which they have come to possess is barren and waterless, they become impoverished physically and spiritually, but if they have chosen the rarer spots where underground streams burst forth into valleys covered with alluvial deposits (Exodus 3:8), they prosper and there springs up the more complicated community life with its servants, hirelings, gardeners, etc. A division of labor ensues. Some leave the soil for the crafts and professions but still depend upon their farmer neighbors for their sustenance. (1 Kings 5:11.) Such was the variety of life of the people among whom Jesus lived, and of their ancestors, and of the inhabitants of the land long before the children of Israel came to take possession of it. Bible history deals with the Hebrews at a period when a large proportion of that people were engaged in agrarian pursuits, hence we find its pages filled with references to agricultural occupations.

2. CLIMATIC CONDITIONS AND FERTILITY.

With climatic conditions and fertility so varied, the mode of cultivation, seedtime and harvest differed even in closely adjacent territory. On the coastal plains and in the low Jordan valley the soil was usually rich and the season was early, whereas the mountainous regions and high interior plains the planting and reaping times were from two weeks to a month later. To make use of the soil on the hillsides, terracing was frequently necessary. Examples of these old terraces still exist. On the unwatered plains the crops could be grown only in the winter and spring, i.e. during the rainy season. These districts dried up in May or June and remained fallow during the rainless summer. The same was true of the hilly regions and valleys except where water from a stream could be diverted from its channel and spread over the fields. In such districts crops could be grown irrespective of the seasons.

See IRRIGATION.

3. AGRICULTURAL PURSUITS.

To appreciate the many references in the Bible to agricultural pursuits and the frequent allusions of our Lord to the fields and their products, we must remember how different were the surroundings of the farmers of that day
from those among which most of us live or with which we are acquainted. What knowledge we have of these pursuits is drawn from such references as disclose methods bearing a close similarity to those of the present day. The strong tendency to resist change which is everywhere manifest throughout the country and the survival of ancient descriptive words in the language of today further confirm our belief that we now witness in this country the identical operations which were used two thousand or more years ago. It would be strange if there were not a variety of ways by which the same object was accomplished when we remember that the Hebrew people benefited by the experience of the Egyptians, of the Babylonians, of the inhabitants of the land of their adoption, as well as of its late European conquerors. For this reason the drawings found on the Egyptian monuments, depicting agricultural scenes, help us to explain the probable methods used in Palestine.

Three branches of agriculture were more prominent than the others; the growing of grain, the care of vineyards (Numbers 18:30), and the raising of flocks. Most households owned fields and vineyards and the richer added to these a wealth of flocks. The description of Job’s wealth (in Job 1) shows that he was engaged in all these pursuits. Hezekiah’s riches as enumerated in 2 Chronicles 32:27,28 suggest activity in each of these branches.

1. Growing of Grain:

In this and following descriptions, present-day methods as far as they correspond to ancient records will be dealt with.

(1) Plowing and sowing.

On the plains, little or no preparation for plowing is needed, but in the hilly regions, the larger stones, which the tilling of the previous season has loosened and which the winter’s rains have washed bare, are picked out and piled into heaps on some ledge, or are thrown into the paths, which thus become elevated above the fields which they traverse. (See FIELD.) If grain is to be planted, the seed is scattered broadcast by the sower. If the land has not been used for some time the ground is first plowed, and when the seed has been scattered is plowed again. The sower may keep his supply of seed in a pocket made by pulling up his outer garment through
his girdle to a sufficient extent for it to sag down outside his girdle in the form of a loose pouch. He may, on the other hand, carry it in a jar or basket as the sowers are pictured as doing on the Egyptian monuments. As soon as the seed is scattered it is plowed in before the ever-present crows and ravens can gather it up. The path of the plow in the fields of the hilly regions is a tortuous one because of the boulders jutting out here and there (Matthew 13:3 ff) or because of the ledges which frequently lie hidden just beneath the surface (the rocky places of Christ’s parable). When the plowman respects the footpaths which the sufferance of the owner has allowed to be trodden across his fields or which mark the boundaries between the lands of different owners, and leaves them unplowed, then the seed which has fallen on these portions becomes the food of the birds. Corners of the field where the plow cannot reach are hoed by hand. Harrowing-in as we know it is not practiced today, except on some of the larger plains, and probably was not used in Palestine in earlier times.

See HARROW.

(2) Reaping.

After the plowing is over, the fields are deserted until after the winter rains, unless an unusually severe storm of rain and hail (Exodus 9:25) has destroyed the young shoots. Then a second sowing is made. In April, if the hot east winds have not blasted the grain (see BLASTING) the barley begins to ripen. The wheat follows from a week to six weeks later, depending upon the altitude. Toward the end of May or the first week in June, which marks the beginning of the dry season, reaping begins. Whole families move out from their village homes to spend the time in the fields until the harvest is over. Men and women join in the work of cutting the grain. A handful of grain is gathered together by means of a sickle held in the right hand. The stalks thus gathered in a bunch are then grasped by the left hand and at the same time a pull is given which cuts off some of the stalks a few inches above ground (see STUBBLE) and pulls the rest up by the roots. These handfuls are laid behind the reapers and are gathered up by the helpers (see GLEANING), usually the children, and made into piles for transporting to the threshing-floor.

(3) Threshing.
The threshing-floors are constructed in the fields, preferably in an exposed position in order to get the full benefit of the winds. If there is a danger of marauders they are clustered together close to the village. The floor is a level, circular area 25 to 40 ft. in diameter, prepared by first picking out the stones, and then wetting the ground, tamping or rolling it, and finally sweeping it. A border of stones usually surrounds the floor to keep in the grain. The sheaves of grain which have been brought on the backs of men, donkeys, camels, or oxen, are heaped on this area, and the process of tramping out begins. In some localities several animals, commonly oxen or donkeys, are tied abreast and driven round and round the floor. In other places two oxen are yoked together to a drag, the bottom of which is studded with pieces of basaltic stone. This drag, on which the driver, and perhaps his family, sits or stands, is driven in a circular path over the grain. In still other districts an instrument resembling a wheel harrow is used, the antiquity of which is confirmed by the Egyptian records. The supply of unthreshed grain is kept in the center of the floor. Some of this is pulled down from time to time into the path of the animals. All the while the partly threshed grain is being turned over with a fork. The stalks gradually become broken into short pieces and the husks about the grain are torn off. This mixture of chaff and grain must now be winnowed. This is done by tossing it into the air so that the wind may blow away the chaff (see WINNOWING). When the chaff is gone then the grain is tossed in a wooden tray to separate from it the stones and lumps of soil which clung to the roots when the grain was reaped. The difference in weight between the stones and grain makes separation by this process possible (see SIFTED). The grain is now poled in heaps and in many localities is also sealed. This process consists in pressing a large wooden seal against the pile. When the instrument is removed it leaves an impression which would be destroyed should any of the grain be taken away. This allows the government offers to keep account of the tithes and enables the owner to detect any theft of grain. Until the wheat is transferred to bags some one sleeps by the pries on the threshing-floor. If the wheat is to be stored for home consumption it is often first washed with water and spread out on goats’ hair mats to dry before it is stored in the wall compartments found in every house (see STOREHOUSE). Formerly the wheat was ground only as needed. This was then a household task which was accomplished with the hand-mill or mortar (see MILL).
2. Care of Vineyards:

No clearer picture to correspond with present-day practice in vine culture (see VINE) in Palestine could be given than that mentioned in Isaiah 5:1,6. Grapes probably served an important part in the diet of Bible times as they do at present. In the season which begins in July and extends for at least three months, the humblest peasant as well as the richest landlord considers grapes as a necessary part of at least one meal each day. The grapes were not only eaten fresh but were made into wine (see WINEPRESS). No parallel however can be found in the Bible for the molasses which is made by boiling down the fresh grape juice. Some writers believe that this substance was meant in some passages translated by wine or honey, but it is doubtful. The care of the vineyards fitted well into the farmer’s routine, as most of the attention required could be given when the other crops demanded no time.

3. Raising of Flocks:

The leaders of ancient Israel reckoned their flocks as a necessary part of their wealth (see SHEEP RAISING). When a man’s flocks were his sole possession he often lived with them and led them in and out in search of pasturage (Psalm 23; Matthew 18:12), but a man with other interests delegated this task to his sons (1 Samuel 16:11) or to hirelings. Human nature has not changed since the time when Christ made the distinction between the true shepherd and the hireling (John 10:12). Within a short time of the writing of these words the writer saw a hireling cursing and abusing the stray members of a flock which he was driving, not leading as do good shepherds.

The flock furnished both food and raiment. The milk of camels, sheep and goats was eaten fresh or made into curdled milk, butter or cheese. More rarely was the flesh of these animals eaten (see FOOD). The peasant’s outer coat is still made of a tawed sheepskin or woven of goats’ hair or wool (see WEAVING). The various agricultural operations are treated more fully under their respective names, (which see).

James A. Patch
AGrippa

*a-grip’-a*.

*See herod.*

ague

*a’-gu* ([kaddachath]): In *Leviticus* 26:16 the King James Version is one of the diseases threatened as a penalty for disobedience to the law. The malady is said to “consume the eyes, and make the soul to pine away.” The word means burning (Vulgate “ardor”) and was probably intended to denote the malarial fever so common now both in the Shephelah and in the Jordan valley. In Septuagint the word used ([ικτερος, ikteros]) means jaundice, which often accompanies this fever. The Revised Version (British and American) translates it “fever.”

*See fever.*

Agur

*a’-gur* ([aghur], seeming, from comparison with Arabic roots, to mean either “hireling,” or “collector,” “gatherer”): One of the contributors to Proverbs; his words being included in Proverbs 30. He takes an agnostic attitude toward God and transcendent things, and in general the range of his thought, as compared with that of other authors, is pedestrian. He shows, however, a tender reverence and awe. His most notable utterance, perhaps, is the celebrated Prayer of Agur (*Proverbs* 30:7-9), which gives expression to a charming golden mean of practical ideal. His sayings are constructed on a rather artificial plan; having the form of the so-called numerical proverb.

*See under Proverbs, Book of, II, 6.*

*John Franklin Genung*

ah; aha

*a>, *a-ha’*: Interjections of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, representing different Hebrew words and different states of feeling.
(1) ['ahah], expressing complaint and found in the phrase “Ah, Lord Yahweh” (Jeremiah 1:6; 4:10 etc.; Ezekiel 4:14 etc.). Elsewhere the word is translated “alas!” (Joel 1:15).

(2) ['ach], occurs once (Ezekiel 21:15), expressing grief in contemplating Israel’s destruction.

(3) [he’ach], usually expresses malicious joy over the reverses of an enemy, and is introduced by the verb “to say” (Brown-Driver-Briggs’ Lexicon); so in Psalm 35:21,25; Ezekiel 25:3; 26:2; 36:2; in the repeated Psalm 40:15; 70:3. It expresses satiety in Isaiah 44:16; and represents the neighing of a horse in Job 39:25.

(4) [hoy], expresses grief or pain, (Isaiah 1:4; Jeremiah 22:18). In 1 Kings 13:30 it is translated “alas!” More frequently it is used to indicate that a threat of judgment is to follow (Isaiah 10:5; 29:1; or to direct attention to some important announcement (Isaiah 55:1), where the Hebrew word is translated “Ho.”

(5) Greek [oua], in Mark 15:29, used by those who mocked Jesus, as He hung upon the cross. All of these words are evidently imitative of the natural sounds, which spontaneously give expression to these emotions of complaint, grief, pain, exultation, etc.

Edward Mack

AH

In proper names.

See AHI.

AHAB

<’a’hab> ([’ach’abh], Assyrian [a-cha-ab-bu]; Septuagint [’Αχααβ, Achaab], but Jeremiah 29:21 f, [’Αχααβ, Achiab], which, in analogy with [’-h-y-m-l-k], [’-h-y-m-l-k], indicates an original [’achi’abh], meaning “the father is my brother”): The compound
probably signifies that “the father,” referring to God, has been chosen as a brother.

1. AHAB’S REIGN:

Ahab, son of Omri, the seventh king of Israel, who reigned for twenty-two years, from 876 to 854 (<sup>111628</sup> 1 Kings 16:28 ff), was one of the strongest and at the same time one of the weakest kings of Israel. With his kingdom he inherited also the traditional enemies of the kingdom, who were no less ready to make trouble for him than for his predecessors. Occupying a critical position at the best, with foes ever ready to take advantage of any momentary weakness, the kingdom, during the reign of Ahab, was compelled to undergo the blighting effects of misfortune, drought and famine. But Ahab, equal to the occasion, was clever enough to win the admiration and respect of friend and foe, strengthening the kingdom without and within. Many of the evils of his reign, which a stronger nature might have overcome, were incident to the measures that he took for strengthening the kingdom.

2. HIS FOREIGN POLICY:

In the days of David and Solomon a beneficial commercial intercourse existed between the Hebrews and the Phoenicians. Ahab, recognizing the advantages that would accrue to his kingdom from an alliance with the foremost commercial nation of his time, renewed the old relations with the Phoenicians and cemented them by his marriage with Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre (the Ithobalos, priest of Astarte mentioned by Meander).

He next turns his attention to the establishment of peaceful and friendly relations with the kindred and neighboring kingdom of Judah. For the first time since the division of the kingdoms the hereditary internecine quarrels are forgotten, “and Jehoshaphat,” the good king of Judah, “made peace with the king of Israel.” This alliance, too, was sealed by a marriage relationship, Jehoram, the crown-prince of Judah, being united in marriage with the princess Athaliah, daughter of Ahab.

Perhaps some additional light is thrown upon Ahab’s foreign policy by his treatment of Benhadad, king of Damascus. An opportunity was given to
crush to dust the threatening power of Syria. But when Benhadad in the
garb of a suppliant was compelled to sue for his life, Ahab received into
kindly as his brother, and although denounced by the prophets for his
leniency, spared his enemy and allowed him to depart on the condition
that he would restore the cities captured from Omri, and concede certain
“streets” in Damascus as a quarter for Israelite residents. No doubt Ahab
thought that a king won as a friend by kindness might be of greater service
to Israel than a hostile nation, made still more hostile, by having its king
put to death. Whatever Ahab’s motives may have been, these hereditary
foes really fought side by side against the common enemy, the king of
Assyria, in the battle at Karkar on the Orontes in the year 854, as is
proved by the inscription on the monolith of Shalmaneser II, king of
Assyria.

3. HIS RELIGIOUS POLICY:

Ahab’s far-sighted foreign policy was the antithesis of his short-sighted
religious policy. Through his alliance with Phoenicia he not only set in
motion the currents of commerce with Tyre, but invited Phoenician
religion as well. The worship of Yahweh by means of the golden calves of
Jeroboam appeared antiquated to him. Baal, the god of Tyre, the proud
mistress of the seas and the possessor of dazzling wealth, was to have an
equal place with Yahweh, the God of Israel. Accordingly he built in Samara
a temple to Baal and in it erected an altar to that god, and at the side of the
altar a pole to Asherab (<111632>1 Kings 16:32,33). On the other hand he tried to
serve Yahweh by naming his children in his honor — Ahaziah (“Yah
holds”), Jehoram (“Yah is high”), and Athaliah (“Yah is strong”).
However, Ahab failed to realize that while a coalition of nations might be
advantageous, a syncretism of their religions would be disastrous. He failed
to apprehend the full meaning of the principle, “Yahweh alone is the God
of Israel.” In Jezebel, his Phoenician wife, Ahab found a champion of the
foreign culture, who was as imperious and able as she was vindictive and
unscrupulous. She was the patron of the prophets of Baal and of the
devotees of Asherab (<111819>1 Kings 18:19,20; 19:1,2) At her instigation the
altars of Yahweh were torn down. She inaugurated the first great religious
persecution of the church, killing off the prophets of Yahweh with the
sword. In all this she aimed at more than a syncretism of the two religions;
she planned to destroy the religion of Yahweh root and branch and put that of Baal in its place. In this Ahab did not oppose her, but is guilty of conniving at the policy of his unprincipled wife, if not of heartily concurring in it.

4. THE MURDER OF NABOTH:

Wrong religious principles have their counterpart in false ethical ideals and immoral civil acts. Ahab, as a worshipper of Baal, not only introduced a false religion, but false social ideals as well. The royal residence was in Jezreel, which had probably risen in importance through his alliance with Phoenicia. Close to the royal palace was a vineyard (1 Kings 21:1) owned by Naboth, a native of Jezreel. This piece of ground was coveted by Ahab for a vegetable garden. He demanded therefore that Naboth should sell it to into or exchange it for a better piece of land. Naboth declined the offer. Ahab, a Hebrew, knowing the laws of the land, was stung by the refusal and went home greatly displeased. Jezebel, however, had neither religious scruples nor any regard for the civil laws of the Hebrews. Accordingly she planned a high-handed crime to gratify the whim of Ahab. In the name and by the authority of the king she had Naboth falsely accused of blasphemy against God and the king, and had him stoned to death by the local authorities. The horror created by this judicial murder probably did as much to finally overthrow the house of Omri as did the favor shown to the Tyrian Baal.

5. AHAB AND ELIJAH:

Neither religious rights nor civil liberties can be trampled under foot without Divine retribution. The attempt to do so calls forth an awakened and quickened conscience, imperatively demanding that the right be done. Like an accusing conscience, Elijah appeared before Ahab. His very name (“my God is Yah”) inspired awe. “As Yahweh, the God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years,” was the conscience-troubling message left on the mind of Ahab for more than three years. On Elijah’s reappearance, Ahab greets into as the troubler of Israel. Elijah calmly reforms him that the king’s religious policy has caused the trouble in Israel. The proof for it is to be furnished on Mount Carmel. Ahab does the bidding of Elijah. The people shall know whom to serve.
Baal is silent. Yahweh answers with fire. A torrent of rain ends the drought. The victory belongs to Yahweh.

Once more Elijah’s indignation flashes against the house of Ahab. The judicial murder of Naboth calls it forth. The civil rights of the nation must be protected. Ahab has sold himself to do evil in the sight of Yahweh. Therefore Ahab’s house shall fall. Jezebel’s carcass shall be eaten by dogs; the king’s posterity shall be cut off; the dogs of the city or the fowls of the air shall eat their bodies (1 Kings 21:20-26). Like thunderbolts the words of Elijah strike home. Ahab “fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly.” But the die was cast. Yahweh is vindicated. Never again, in the history of Israel can Baal, the inspirer of injustice, claim a place at the side of Yahweh, the God of righteousness.

6. AHAB’S BUILDING OPERATIONS:

In common with oriental monarchs, Ahab displayed a taste for architecture, stimulated, no doubt, by Phoenician influence. Large building operations were undertaken in Samaria (1 Kings 16:32; 2 Kings 10:21). Solomon had an ivory throne, but Ahab built for himself, in Jezreel, a palace adorned with woodwork and inlaid with ivory (1 Kings 21:1; 22:39). Perhaps Amos, one hundred years later, refers to the work of Ahab when he says, “The houses of ivory shall perish” (Amos 3:15). In his day Hiel of Bethel undertook to rebuild Jericho, notwithstanding the curse of Joshua (1 Kings 16:33,34). Many cities were built during his reign (1 Kings 22:39).

7. AHAB’S MILITARY CAREER:

Ahab was not only a splendor-loving monarch, but a great military leader as well. He no doubt began his military policy by fortifying the cities of Israel (1 Kings 16:34; 22:39). Benhadad (the Dadidri of the Assyrian annals; Hadadezer and Barhadad are Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic forms of the same name), the king of Syria, whose vassals the kings of Israel had been (1 Kings 15:19), promptly besieges Samaria, and sends Ahab an insulting message. Ahab replies, “Let not him that girdeth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off.” At the advice of a prophet of Yahweh, Ahab, with 7,000 men under 232 leaders, inflicts a crushing
defeat upon Benhadad and his 32 feudal kings, who had resigned themselves to a drunken carousal (1 Kings 20 through 21).

In the following year, the Syrian army, in spite of its overwhelming superiority, meets another defeat at the hands of Ahab in the valley, near Aphek. On condition that Benhadad restore all Israelite territory and grant the Hebrews certain rights in Damascus, Ahab spares his life to the great indignation of the prophet (1 Kings 20:22 f).

In the year 854, Ahab with 2,000 chariots and 10,000 men, fights shoulder to shoulder with Benhadad against Shalmaneser II, king of Assyria. At Karkar, on the Orontes, Benhadad, with his allied forces, suffered an overwhelming defeat (COT, II, i, 183 f).

Perhaps Benhadad blamed Ahab for the defeat. At any rate he fails to keep his promise to Ahab (1 Kings 22:3; 20:34). Lured by false prophets, but against the dramatic warning of Micaiah, Ahab is led to take up the gauntlet against Syria once more. His friend, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, joins him in the conflict. For the first time since the days of David all Israel and Judah stand united against the common foe.

8. AHAB’S DEATH:

Possibly the warning of Micaiah gave Ahab a premonition that this would be his last fight. He enters the battle in disguise, but in vain. An arrow, shot at random, inflicts a mortal wound. With the fortitude of a hero, in order to avoid a panic, Ahab remains in his chariot all day and dies at sunset. His body is taken to Samaria for burial. A great king had died, and the kingdom declined rapidly after his death. He had failed to comprehend the greatness of Yahweh; he failed to stand for the highest justice, and his sins are visited upon his posterity (1 Kings 22:29 f).

9. AHAB AND ARCHAEOLOGY:

(1) The Moabite Stone

The Moabite Stone (see MOABITE STONE) bears testimony (lines 7, 8) that Omri and his son (Ahab) ruled over the land of Mehdeba for forty years. When Ahab was occupied with the Syriac wars, Moab rose in insurrection. Mesha informs us in an exaggerated manner that “Israel
perished with an everlasting destruction.” Mesha recognizes Yahweh as the God of Israel.

(2) The Monolith of Shalmaneser II

The Monolith of Shalmaneser II (Brit Mus; see ASSYRIA) informs us that in 854 Shalmaneser II came in conflict with the kingdom of Hamath, and that Benhadad II with Ahab of Israel and others formed a confederacy to resist the Assyrian advance. The forces of the coalition were defeated at Karkar.

(3) Recent Excavations.

Under the direction of Harvard University, excavations have been carried on in Samaria since 1908. In 1909 remains of a Hebrew palace were found. In this palace two grades of construction have been detected. The explorers suggest that they have found the palace of Omri, enlarged and improved by Ahab. This may be the “ivory house” built by Ahab. In August, 1910, about 75 potsherds were found in a building adjacent to Ahab’s palace containing writing. The script is the same as that of the Moabite Stone, the words being divided by ink spots. These ostraca seem to be labels attached to jars kept in a room adjoining Ahab’s palace. One of them reads, “In the ninth year. From Shaphtan. For Ba`al-zamar. A jar of old wine.” Another reads, “Wine of the vineyard of the Tell.” These readings remind one of Naboth’s vineyard. In another room not far from where the ostraca were found, “was found an alabaster vase inscribed with the name of Ahab’s contemporary, Osorkon II of Egypt.” Many proper names are found on the ostraca, which have their equivalent in the Old Testament. It is claimed that the writing is far greater than all other ancient Hebrew writing yet known. Perhaps with the publication of all these writings we may expect much light upon Ahab’s reign. (See OSTRACA; Harvard Theological Review, January, 1909, April, 1910, January, 1911; Sunday School Times, January 7, 1911; The Jewish Chronicle, January 27, 1911.)

S. K. Mosiman
AHAB AND ZEDEKIAH

<\textit{a’-hab}>, <\textit{zed-e-ki’-a}> (אַחָב [’ach’abh], “uncle”; צִדְקִיאָה [tsidqiyahu], “Yahweh is my righteousness”): Ahab, son of Kolaiah, and Zedekiah, son of Maaseiah, were two prophets against whom Jeremiah uttered an oracle for prophesying falsely in the name of Yahweh, and for immoral conduct. They should be delivered over to Nebuchadrezzar and be slain, and the captives of Judah that were in Babylon should take up the curse concerning them. “Yahweh make thee like Zedekiah and like Ahab, whom the King of Babylon roasted in the fire” (Jeremiah 29:21 ff).

\textit{S. F. Hunter}

AHARAH

<\textit{a’-har-a}>, <\textit{a-har’-a}> (אַרָה [’achrach]; A, [אַאֵרָא, Aara]; B, [אַאֵרָא, Iaphael], “brother of Rach,” or, a brother’s follower, though some regard it as a textual corruption for Ahiram): A son of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:1).

\textit{See AHIRAM.}

AHARAHEL

<\textit{a-har’-hel}> (אַרָהֵל [’acharchel], “brother of Rachel”; Septuagint ἀδελφός Ρηχάββ, adelphou Rechab, “brother of Rechab”): A son of Harum of the tribe of Judah (1 Chronicles 4:8).

AHASAI

<\textit{a’-ha-si}>, <\textit{a-ha’-si}>.

\textit{See AHAZAI.}

AHASBAI

<\textit{a-has’-bi}> (אַבַּי [’achacbay], “blooming”): The father of Eliphelet, a Maacathite, a soldier in David’s army (2 Samuel 23:34). He was either a native of Abel-beth-maackah (2 Samuel 20:14) or, more probably, of Maacah in Syria (2 Samuel 10:6). The list in
Chronicles 11:35,36 gives different names entirely. Here we have Ur and Hepher, which simply show that the text is corrupt in one or both places.

**AHASUERUS OR ASSEURUS**

<a-haz-u-e’-rus>, (Septuagint [ʾΑσσούηρος, Assoueros], but in Tobit 14:15 Asueros; the Latin form of the Hebrew [ʾaḥashwērosh], a name better known in its ordinary Greek form of Xerxes): It was the name of two, or perhaps of three kings mentioned in the canonical, or apocryphal, books of the Old Testament.

1. **IN ESTHER:**

There seems to be little reasonable doubt, that we should identify the Ahasuerus of Est with the well-known Xerxes, who reigned over Persia from 485 to 465 BC, and who made the great expedition against Greece that culminated in the defeat of the Persian forces at Salamis and Plataea. If Est be taken as equivalent to Ishtar, it may well be the same as the Amestris of Herodotus, which in Babylonian would be Ammi-Ishtar, or Ummi-Ishtar. Amestris is said to have been the daughter of Otanes, a distinguished general of Xerxes, and the grand-daughter of Sisamnes, a notorious judge, who was put to death with great cruelty by the king because of malfeasance in office. Sisamnes may be in Babylonian Shamash-ammanu-(shallim). If he were the brother and Otanes the nephew of Mordecai, we can easily account for the ease with which the latter and has ward Esther, were advanced and confirmed in their Positions at the court, of Xerxes.

2. **IN EZRA:**

An Ahasuerus is mentioned in Ezra 4:6, as one to whom some persons unnamed wrote an accusation against Judah and Jerusalem. Ewald and others have suggested that this Ahasuerus was Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus. It seems to be more probable that Xerxes, the son and successor of Darius Hystaspis, is meant: first, because in the following verse Artaxerxes, the son and successor of Xerxes, is mentioned; and secondly, because we have no evidence whatever that Cambyses was ever called Ahasuerus, whereas there is absolute certainty that the Pets
Khshayarsha, the Hebrew ['achashwerosh], the Greek Assoueros or Xerxes, and the Latin Ahasuerus, are the exact equivalents of one another.

3. IN TOBIT:

In the apocryphal book of Tobit (14:15, the King James Version) it is said that before Tobias died he heard of the destruction of Nineveh, which was taken by Nabuchodonosor and Assuerus. This Assuerus can have been no other than Cyaxares, who according to Herodotus (i.196) took Nineveh and reduced the Assyrians into subjection, with the exception of the Babylonian district. As we shall see below, he was probably the same as the Ahasuerus of Daniel 9:1. The phrase “which was taken by Nabuchodonosor and Assuerus” is not found in the Syriac version of Tobit.

4. IN DANIEL:

An Ahasuerus is said in Daniel 9:1 to have been the father of Darius the Mede, and to have been of the seed of the Medes. It is probable that this Ahasuerus is the same as the Uvakhshatara of the Persian recension of the Behistun inscription, which in the Babylonian is Umaku’ishtar, in the Susian Makishtarra, and in Herod Cyaxares. It will be noted that both the Greek Cyaxares and the Hebrew Akhashwerosh omit the preformative uwa- and the “t” of the Persian form Uvakhshatara. That this Median king had sons living in the time of Cyrus is shown by the fact that two rebel aspirants to the throne in the time of Darius Hystaspis claimed to be his sons, to wit: Fravartish, a Median, who lied saying, “I am Khshathrita of the family of Uvakhshatara” (Behistun Inscr, col. II, v); and Citrantakhma, who said, “I am king in Sagartia of the family of Uvakhshatara” (id, II, xiv). If we accept the identification of Gubaru with Darius the Mede, then the latter may well have been another of his sons, at first a sub-king to Astyages the Scythian, as he was later to Cyrus the Persian.

R. Dick Wilson

AHAVA

<\textit{a-ha’-va}> (א•ה•ו• [’ahawa’]): The river in Babylonia on the banks of which Ezra gathered together the Jews who accompanied him to Jerusalem.
At this rendezvous the company encamped for three days to make preparation for the difficult and dangerous journey (Ezra 8:15 ff). On reviewing the people and the priests Ezra found no Levites among them; he therefore sent to Iddo, “the chief at the place Casiphia,” a request for ministers for the temple. A number of Levites with 220 Nethinim returned to the rendezvous with the deputation. Ezra had expressed to the king his faith in the protection of God; being, therefore, ashamed to ask for a military escort he proclaimed a fast to seek of God “a straight way.” To 12 priests Ezra assigned the care of the offering for the temple in Jerusalem. When all was ready the company “departed from the river Ahava,” and journeyed in safety to Jerusalem.

This river, apparently called after a town or district toward which it flowed (Ezra 8:15), remains unidentified, though many conjectures have been made. Rawlinson thinks it is the “Is” of Herodotus (i.79), now called “Hit,” which flowed past a town of the same name in the Euphrates basin, 8 days’ journey from Babylon. Some identify the district with “Ivvah” (2 Kings 18:34, etc.). Most probably, however, this was one of the numerous canals which intersected Babylonia, flowing from the Euphrates toward a town or district “Ahava.” If so, identification is impossible.

S. F. Hunter

AHAZ

<α’-haz> (אַחַז, [’achaz], “he has grasped,” 2 Kings 16; 2 Chronicles 28; Isaiah 7:10 ff; [Ἀχάζ, Achaz]).

1. NAME:

The name is the same as Jehoahaz; hence appears on Tiglath-pileser’s Assyrian inscription of 732 BC as Ia-u-ha-zi. The sacred historians may have dropped the first part of the name in consequence of the character of the king.

2. THE ACCESSION:

Ahaz was the son of Jotham, king of Judah. He succeeded to the throne at the age of 20 years (according to another reading 25). The chronology of
his reign is difficult, as his son Hezekiah is stated to have been 25 years of age when he began to reign 16 years after (2 Kings 18:2). If the accession of Ahaz be placed as early as 743 BC, his grandfather Uzziah, long unable to perform the functions of his office on account of his leprosy (2 Chronicles 26:21), must still have been alive. (Others date Ahaz later, when Uzziah, for whom Jotham had acted as regent, was already dead.)

3. EARLY IDOLATRIES:

Although so young, Ahaz seems at once to have struck out an independent course wholly opposed to the religious traditions of his nation. His first steps in this direction were the causing to be made and circulated of molten images of the Baalim, and the revival in the valley of Hinnom, south of the city, of the abominations of the worship of Moloch (2 Chronicles 28:2,3). He is declared to have made his own son “pass through the fire” (2 Kings 16:3); the chronicler puts it even more strongly: he “burnt his children in the fire” (2 Chronicles 28:3). Other acts of idolatry were to follow.

4. PERIL FROM SYRIA AND ISRAEL:

The kingdom of Judah was at this time in serious peril. Rezin, king of Damascus, and Pekah, king of Samaria, had already, in the days of Jotham, begun to harass Judah (2 Kings 15:37); now a conspiracy was formed to dethrone the young Ahaz, and set upon the throne a certain “son of Tabeel” (Isaiah 7:6). An advance of the two kings was made against Jerusalem, although without success (2 Kings 16:5; Isaiah 7:1); the Jews were expelled from Elath (2 Kings 16:6), and the country was ravaged, and large numbers taken captive (2 Chronicles 28:5 ff). Consternation was universal. The heart of Ahaz “trembled, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the forest tremble with the wind” (Isaiah 7:2). In his extremity Ahaz appealed to the king of Assyria for help (2 Kings 16:7; 2 Chronicles 28:16).

5. ISAIAH’S MESSAGES TO THE KING:

Amid the general alarm and perturbation, the one man untouched by it in Jerusalem was the prophet Isaiah. Undismayed, Isaiah set himself, apparently single-handed, to turn the tide of public opinion from the
channel in which it was running, the seeking of aid from Assyria. His appeal was to both king and people. By Divine direction, meeting Ahaz “at the end of the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller’s field,” he bade him have no fear of “these two tails of smoking firebrands,” Rezin and Pekah, for, like dying torches, they would speedily be extinguished (Isaiah 7:3 ff). If he would not believe this he would not be established (Isaiah 7:9). Failing to win the young king’s confidence, Isaiah was sent a second time, with the offer from Yahweh of any sign Ahaz chose to ask, “either in the depth, or in the height above,” in attestation of the truth of the Divine word. The frivolous monarch refused the arbitrament on the hypocritical ground, “I will not ask, neither will I tempt Yahweh” (Isaiah 7:10-12). Possibly his ambassadors were already dispatched to the Assyrian king. Whenever they went, they took with them a large subsidy with which to buy that ruler’s favor (2 Kings 16:8). It was on this occasion that Isaiah, in reply to Ahaz, gave the reassuring prophecy of Immanuel (Isaiah 7:13 ff).

6. ISAIAH’S TABLET:

As respects the people, Isaiah was directed to exhibit on “a great tablet” the words “For Maher-shalal-hash-baz” (“swift the spoil, speedy the prey”). This was attested by two witnesses, one of whom was Urijah, the high priest. It was a solemn testimony that, without any action on the part of Judah, “the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried away before the king of Assyria” (Isaiah 8:1-4).

7. FALL OF DAMASCUS AND ITS RESULTS:

It was as the prophet had foretold. Damascus fell, Rezin was killed (2 Kings 16:9), and Israel was raided (2 Kings 15:29). The action brought temporary relief to Judah, but had the effect of placing her under the heel of Assyria. Everyone then living knew that there could be no equal alliance between Judah and Assyria, and that the request for help, accompanied by the message, “I am thy servant” (2 Kings 16:7,8) and by “presents” of gold and silver, meant the submission of Judah and the annual payment of a heavy tribute. Had Isaiah’s counsel been followed, Tiglath-pileser would probably, in his own interests, have been compelled to crush the coalition, and Judah would have retained her freedom.
8. SUN-DIAL OF AHAZ:

The political storm having blown over for the present, with the final loss of the important port of Elath on the Red Sea (2 Kings 16:6), Ahaz turned his attention to more congenial pursuits. The king was somewhat of a dilettante in matters of art, and he set up a sun-dial, which seems to have consisted of a series of steps arranged round a short pillar, the time being indicated by the position of the shadow on the steps (compare 2 Kings 20:9-11; Isaiah 38:8). As it is regarded as possible for the shadow to return 10 steps, it is clear that each step did not mark an hour of the day, but some smaller period.

9. THE LAVERS AND BRAZEN SEA:

Another act of the king was to remove from the elaborate ornamental bases on which they had stood (compare 1 Kings 7:27-39), the ten layers of Solomon, and also to remove Solomon’s molten sea from the 12 brazen bulls which supported it (compare 1 Kings 7:23-26), the sea being placed upon a raised platform or pavement (2 Kings 16:17). From Jeremiah 52:20, where the prophet sees “the 12 brazen bulls that were under the bases,” it has been conjectured that the object of the change may have been to transfer the layers to the backs of the bulls.

10. THE DAMASCUS ALTAR:

To this was added a yet more daring act of impiety. In 732 Ahaz was, with other vassal princes, summoned to Damascus to pay homage to Tiglath-pileser (2 Kings 16:10; his name appears in the Assyrian inscription). There he saw a heathen altar of fanciful pattern, which greatly pleased him. A model of this was sent to Urijah the high priest, with instructions to have an enlarged copy of it placed in the temple court. On the king’s return to Jerusalem, he sacrificed at the new altar, but, not satisfied with its position, gave orders for a change. The altar had apparently been placed on the east side of the old altar; directions were now given for the brazen altar to be moved to the north, and the Damascus altar to be placed in line with it, in front of the temple giving both equal honor. Orders were further given to Urijah that the customary sacrifices should be offered on the new altar, now called “the great altar,” while the
king reserved the brazen altar for himself “to inquire by” (2 Kings 16:15).

11. FURTHER IMPIETIES:

Even this did not exhaust the royal innovations. We learn from a later notice that the doors of the temple porch were shut, that the golden candlestick was not lighted, that the offering of incense was not made, and other solemnities were suspended (2 Chronicles 29:7). It is not improbable that it was Ahaz who set up ‘the horses of the sun’ mentioned in 2 Kings 23:11, and gave them accommodation in the precincts of the temple. He certainly built the “altars .... on the roof of the upper chamber of Ahaz,” perhaps above the porch of the temple, for the adoration of the heavenly bodies (verse 12). Many other idolatries and acts of national apostasy are related regarding him (2 Chronicles 28:22 ff).

12. RECURRENCE OF HOSTILITIES:

In the later years of his unhappy reign there was a recurrence of hostilities with the inhabitants of Philistia and Edom, this time with disaster to Judah (see the list of places lost in 2 Chronicles 28:18,19). New appeal was made to Tiglath-pileser, whose subject Ahaz, now was, and costly presents were sent from the temple, the royal palace, and even the houses of the princes of Judah, but without avail (2 Chronicles 28:19-21). The Assyrian ‘distressed’ Ahaz, but rendered no assistance. In his trouble the wicked king only “trespassed yet more” (2 Chronicles 28:22).

13. DEATH OF AHAZ:

Ahaz died in 728, after 16 years of misused power. The exultation with which the event was regarded is reflected in Isaiah’s little prophecy written “in the year that King Ahaz died” (Isaiah 14:28-32). The statement in 2 Kings 16:20 that Ahaz “was buried with his fathers in the city of David” is to be understood in the light of 2 Chronicles 28:27, that he was buried in Jerusalem, but that his body was not laid in the sepulchers of the kings of Israel. His name appears in the royal genealogies in 1 Chronicles 3:13 and Matthew 1:9.

W. Shaw Caldecott
AHAZ, DIAL OF

See DIAL OF AHAZ.

AHAZIAH

<\textit{a-ha-zi’-a}> (אַחֲזִיָּה Hebrew: [‘achazyah] and אַחֲזָיָה [‘achazyahu], “Yah holds, or sustains”):

1. AHAZIAH.

Son of Ahab and Jezebel, eighth king of Israel (1 Kings 22:51 through 2 Kings 1:18).

1. His Reign:

Ahaziah became king over Israel in the seventeenth year of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and he reigned two years, 854-853 BC. There is, here an incongruity between the synchronism and the length of the reigns of the kings. Jehoshaphat began to reign in the fourth year of Ahab (1 Kings 22:41), and he reigned 22 years (1 Kings 16:29). Accordingly Ahaziah’s first year, in the twenty-second year of Ahab, would fall in the nineteenth year of Jehoshaphat. The chronological statement in 2 Kings 1:17 is probably taken from the Syriac, and both are in harmony wrath a method of computation followed by certain Greek manuscripts.

2. His Character:

A good name does not insure a good character. Ahaziah, the “God-sustained,” served Baal and worshipped him, and provoked to anger Yahweh, the God of Israel, Just as his father before him had done. He appears to have been weak and unfortunate, and calamities in quick succession pursued him.

3. The Revolt of Moab:

Ahab had sought the good and became an enemy to the best. His house and the nation suffered the consequences. “Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab.” Ahaziah appears to have been too weak to offer resistance. The Moabite Stone dates the revolt in the days of Ahab. No doubt it began at the time of Ahab’s last campaign against Syria.
4. His Maritime Alliance:
According to 1 Kings 22:48 f Ahaziah attempted to form an alliance with Jehoshaphat of Judah to revive the ancient maritime traffic, but failed. According to 2 Chronicles 20:35-37 the alliance was consummated, in consequence of which the enterprise came to nothing.

See JEHOSHAPHAT.

5. His Sickness and Death:
Ahaziah suffered a severe accident by falling through the lattice in his upper apartment in Samaria, and lay sick. As a worthy son of Jezebel and Ahab, he sent messengers to consult Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, regarding his recovery. But Israel belonged to Yahweh. Accordingly the messengers were met by the prophet Elijah who for the last time warns against the corrupting moral influences of the Baal religion. “Thus saith Yahweh, Is it because there is no God in Israel, that thou sendest to inquire of Baal-zebub, the god of Ekron? therefore thou shalt not come down from the bed whither thou art gone up, but shalt surely die” was the message which he sent back to the embassy, and the death of the king speedily followed.

II. AHAZIAH.

Sixth king of Judah (2 Kings 8:25-29; 9:16 f = 2 Chronicles 22:1-9); also written Jehoahaz (2 Chronicles 21:17; 25:23), which is merely a transposition of the component parts of the compound. The form “Azariah” (2 Chronicles 22:6) is an error, fifteen Hebrew manuscripts and all the versions reading Ahaziah.

1. His Brief Reign:
Ahaziah, youngest son of Jehoram, began to reign in the twelfth year (2 Kings 8:25) of Jehoram of Israel. In 2 Kings 9:29 it is stated as the eleventh. The former is probably the Hebrew, the latter the Greek method of computation, the Septuagint Luc also reading eleventh in 8:25. He was 22 years old when he began to reign and he reigned one year (2 Kings 8:26). The reading “forty two” (2 Chronicles 22:2) is a scribal error, since according to 2 Chronicles 21:5,20 Jehoram the father was only 40
years old at the time of his death. Syriac, Arabic and Luc read 22, Septuagint Codex Vaticanus 20.

See CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

2. His Character:

(Compare 2 Kings 8:27; 2 Chronicles 22:3,4.) In view of the disaster which befell the royal house (2 Chronicles 21:16,17), the inhabitants of Jerusalem placed Ahaziah the youngest son upon the throne. That “he walked in the way of the house of Ahab” is exemplified by Chronicles to the effect that his mother, the daughter of Jezebel, counseled him in the ways of wickedness and that the house of Ahab led him to his destruction. The influence of Jezebel was at work in Judah. Ahaziah dedicated “hallowed things” to Yahweh (2 Kings 12:18), but he did evil in Yahweh’s eyes.

3. His Alliance with Jehoram of Israel:

(Compare 2 Kings 8:28,29; 2 Chronicles 22:5,6.) Ahaziah cultivated the relations which had been established between the two kingdoms by Ahab. Accordingly he joined his uncle Jehoram of Israel in an expedition against Hazael, king of Syria. Ramoth-gilead was captured and held for Israel against the king of Syria (2 Kings 9:14). However, Jehoram of Israel was wounded and returned to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds. It appears that the army was left in charge of Jehu at Ramoth-gilead. Ahaziah apparently went to Jerusalem and later went down to Jezreel to visit Jehoram. In the meantime Jehu formed a conspiracy against Jehoram.

4. His Death:

The death of Ahaziah, as told in 2 Kings 9:16 f, differs from the account in 2 Chronicles 22:7-9. According to the account in Kings, Ahaziah who is visiting Jehoram, joins him in a separate chariot to meet Jehu. Jehoram suspecting treachery turns to flee, but an arrow from the bow of Jehu pierces his heart and he dies in his chariot. Ahaziah tries to escape, but is overtaken near Ibleam and mortally wounded by one of Jehu’s men. He fled to the fortress of Megiddo, where he died. His servants conveyed his body in a chariot to Jerusalem, where he was buried. According to the Chronicler, this account is very much abbreviated (2 Chronicles 22:7 f).
His destruction is of God because of his alliance with Jehoram. Jehu, who was executing judgment on the house of Ahab, first slew the kinsmen of Ahaziah. He then sought Ahaziah who was hiding in Samaria. When he was found, he was brought to Jehu and put to death. He was buried, but where and by whom we are not told.

That there were other traditions respecting the death of Ahaziah, is proved by Josephus, who says that when Ahaziah was wounded he left his chariot and fled on horseback to Megiddo, where he was well cared for by his servants until he died (Ant., IX, vi, 3).

S. K. Mosiman

AHBAN

<\textit{a’-ban}> (אַבָּן) [‘achban], “brother of an intelligent one”(?)
[\textit{אֵחַבָּר, Achabar}]: The son of Abishur of the tribe of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:29).

AHER

<\textit{a’-her}> (אַהֵר) [‘acher], “another”; [\textit{אֶהֶר}, Aer]: A man of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 7:12), apparently a contracted form, perhaps the same as Ahiram (King James Version) (Numbers 26:38) or Aharah (1 Chronicles 8:1).

AHU OR AH

In proper names (<אַח [‘achi] or אַח [‘ach] “brother”): The usage is practically the same with that of [‘abh], [‘abhi].

\textit{See ABI; NAMES, PROPER.}

AHI

<\textit{a’-hi}> (אַח [‘achi], “my brother,” or perhaps a contraction from &\textit{AHIJAH}, which see):

(1) A member of the tribe of Gad (1 Chronicles 5:15).

(2) A member of the tribe of Asher (1 Chronicles 7:34).
AHIAH

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{'}-a\text{}>\): A variant in the King James Version (\(<1\text{Sam}\text{>1:3;18; <1\text{Kings}\text{>4:3; <1\text{Chron}\text{>8:7}) for AHIJAH, which see. Also in the Revised Version (British and American) (\(<\text{Neh}\text{>10:26).}\)

AHIAM

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{'}-am\text{}> (\[\text{'achi'am}], “mother’s brother”): One of David’s thirty heroes. He was the son of Sharar (\(<2\text{Sam}\text{>23:33) or according to \(<1\text{Chron}\text{>11:35 of Sacar, the Hararite.}\)

AHIAN

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{'}-an\text{}> ([\text{‘achyan], “brotherly”): A son of Shemida of the tribe of Manasseh (\(<1\text{Chron}\text{>7:19).}\)

AHIEZER

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{'}-e\text{’}-zer\text{> (\[\text{‘achi\text{’}ezer], “brother is help”)

(1) A son of Ammishaddai, a Danite prince, who acted as representative of his tribe on several occasions. (See \(<\text{Num}\text{>1:12; 2:25; 7:66,71; 10:25.})

(2) One of the mighty men or warriors, who joined David at Ziklag when a furtive before Saul (\(<1\text{Chron}\text{>12:3).}\)

AHIHUD

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{’}-hud\text{> (\[\text{‘achihu\text{’}dh], “brother is majesty”)

(1) One of the chief men of the tribe of Asher. He was selected by Moses to help divide the land west of the Jordan (\(<\text{Num}\text{>34:27).}\)

(2) A son of Ehud of the tribe of Benjamin (\(<1\text{Chron}\text{>8:6,7). The text here is obscure and probably corrupt.}\)
AHIJAH

<\(a-hi’-ja\)> (יהי, [’achiyyah] or יִיהי, [’achiyahu], “brother of Yahweh,” “my brother is Yahweh,” “Yah is brother.” In the King James Version the name sometimes appears as Ahiah):

(1) One of the sons of Jerahmeel the great-grandson of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:25).

(2) A descendant of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:7).

(3) The son of Ahitub, priest in the time of King Saul (1 Samuel 14:3,18). Either he is the same with Ahimelech, who is mentioned later, or he is the father or brother of Ahimelech. He is introduced to us when Saul has been so long on the throne that his son Jonathan is a man grown and a warrior. He is in attendance upon Saul, evidently as an official priest, “wearing an ephod.” When Saul wishes direction from God he asks the priest to bring hither the ark; but then, without waiting for the message, Saul counts the confusion in the Philistine camp a sufficient indication of the will of Providence, and hurries off to the attack. Some copies of the Greek here read “ephod” instead of “ark,” but the documentary evidence in favor of that reading is far from decisive. If the Hebrew reading is correct, then the seclusion of the ark, from the time of its return from Philistia to the time of David, was not so absolute as many have supposed.

See AHIMELECH I.

(4) One of David’s mighty men, according to the list in 1 Chronicles 11:36. The corresponding name in the list in 2 Samuel 23:34 is Eliam the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite.

(5) A Levite of David’s time who had charge of certain treasures connected with the house of God (1 Chronicles 26:20). The Greek copies presuppose the slightly different text which would give in English “and their brethren,” instead of Ahijah. This is accepted by many scholars, and it is at least more plausible than most of the proposed corrections of the Hebrew text by the Greek.

(6) Son of Sinsha and brother of Elihoreph (1 Kings 4:3). The two brothers were scribes of Solomon. Can the scribes Ahijah and Shemaiah
(1 Chronicles 24:6) be identified with the men of the same names who, later, were known as distinguished prophets? Sinsha is probably the same with Shavsha (1 Chronicles 18:16; compare 2 Samuel 8:17; 20:25), who was scribe under David, the office in this case descending from father to son.

(7) The distinguished prophet of Shiloh, who was interested in Jeroboam I. In Solomon’s lifetime Ahijah clothed himself with a new robe, met Jeroboam outside Jerusalem, tore the robe into twelve pieces, and gave him ten, in token that he should become king of the ten tribes (1 Kings 11:29-39). Later, when Jeroboam had proved unfaithful to Yahweh, he sent his wife to Ahijah to ask in regard to their sick son. The prophet received her harshly, foretold the death of the son, and threatened the extermination of the house of Jeroboam (1 Kings 14). The narrative makes the impression that Ahijah was at this time a very old man (1 Kings 14:4). These incidents are differently narrated in the long addition at 1 Kings 12:24 found in some of the Greek copies. In that addition the account of the sick boy precedes that of the rent garment, and both are placed between the account of Jeroboam’s return from Egypt and that of the secession of the ten tribes, an order in which it is impossible to think that the events occurred. Further, this addition attributes the incident of the rent garment to Shemaiah and not to Ahijah, and says that Ahijah was 60 years old.

Other notices speak of the fulfillment of the threatening prophecies spoken by Ahijah (2 Chronicles 10:15; 1 Kings 12:15; 15:29). In 2 Chronicles “the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite” is referred to as a source for the history of Solomon (9:29).

(8) The father of Baasha king of Israel (1 Kings 15:27,33; 21:22; 2 Kings 9:9).

(9) A Levite of Nehemiah’s time, who sealed the covenant (Nehemiah 10:26 the King James Version).

Willis J. Beecher
AHIKAM

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{'}\text{-}kam>\) (אֲחִיקָם [‘achiqam], “my brother has risen up”): A prominent man of the time of King Josiah and the following decades (2 Kings 22:12,14; 25:22; 2 Chronicles 34:20; Jeremiah 26:24; 39:14; 40:5 ff; 41:1 ff; 43:6). He was the son of Shaphan, who very likely is to be identified with Shaphan the scribe, who was at that time so prominent. Ahikam was the father of Gedaliah, whom, on the capture of Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar made governor of the land. Ahikam was a member of the deputation sent by Josiah to the prophetess Huldah to consult her concerning the contents of the Book of the Law which had been found. Under Jehoiakim he had sufficient influence to protect Jeremiah from being put to death. On the capture of Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar committed Jeremiah into the care of Gedaliah. It is clear that both Shaphan and his son, like Jeremiah, belonged to the party which held that the men of Judah were under obligation to keep the oath which they had sworn to the tang of Babylon.

Willis J. Beecher

AHILUD

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{'}\text{-}lud>\) (אֲחִילֻד [‘achiludh], “child’s brother,” perhaps): The father of Jehoshaphat, who is mentioned as “recorder” in both the earlier and the later lists under David, and in the list under Solomon (2 Samuel 8:16 and 1 Chronicles 18:15; 2 Samuel 20:24; 1 Kings 4:3). In the absence of proof we may assume that the father of Baana, one of Solomon’s district superintendents, was the same Ahilud (1 Kings 4:12).

AHIMAAZ

\(<a\text{-}hi\text{-}ma\text{'}\text{-}az>, <a\text{-}him\text{'}\text{-}a\text{-}az>\) (אֲחֵימָאָז [‘achima`ats], perhaps “my brother is rage,” or “brother of rage”):

(1) Father of Ahinoam the wife of King Saul (1 Samuel 14:50).

(2) The son of Zadok the high priest (1 Chronicles 6:8,9,53). With his father he remained loyal to Dared in the rebellions both of Absalom and of
Adonijah. With Jonathan the son of Abiathar he carried information to Dared when he fled from Absalom (2 Samuel 15:27,36; 17:17,20). At his own urgent request he carried tidings to David after the death of Absalom (2 Samuel 18:19 ff). He told the king of the victory, and also, through his reluctance to speak, informed him of Absalom’s death. By his reluctance and his sympathy he softened a little the message, which the Cushite presently repeated more harshly.

That Ahimaaz did not succeed his father as high priest has been inferred from the fact that in the Solomon list of heads of departments (1 Kings 4:2) Azariah the son of Zadok is mentioned as priest. It is assumed that this Azariah is the one who appears in the genealogy as the son of Ahimaaz, and that for some reason Ahimaaz was left out of the succession. These inferences are not Justified by the record, though possibly the record does not absolutely disprove them. As the list stands it makes Zadok and Abiathar the high priests. Azariah and Zabud, the son of Nathan (1 Kings 4:2,5), are spoken of as holding priestly offices of a different kind. Ahimaaz may have died early, or may have followed some other career, but the simple fact is that we do not know.

(3) Ahimaaz, in Naphtali, was one of Solomon’s twelve commissary officers (1 Kings 4:15), who married Basemath the daughter of Solomon. It is not impossible that he was Ahimaaz the son of Zadok, though there is no proof to that effect.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIMAN

<ahim-an> (<אָחִי-מָן> [‘achiman], perhaps, “brother of fortune,” or, “my brother is fortune”):

(1) One of the names given as those of the three “children of the Anak” (Numbers 13:22; Joshua 15:14; Numbers 13:28; 2 Samuel 21:16,18), or the three “sons of the Anak” (Joshua 15:14; Judges 1:20). The three names (Ahiman, Sheshai, Talmai) also occur together in Judges 1:10. The word Anak in the Hebrew Bible has the definite article except in Numbers 13:33 and Deuteronomy 9:2. Its use is that of a common noun denoting a certain type of man, rather than as the proper
name of a person or a clan, though this need not prevent our thinking of
the Anakim as a clan or group of clans, who regarded Arba as their
founder. The question is raised whether Ahiman and Sheshai and Talmai
are to be thought of as persons or as clans. The most natural understanding
of the Bible statements is certainly to the effect that they were personal
leaders among the Anakim of Kiriath-arba (Hebron). They were smitten
and dispossessed by the tribe of Judah, with Caleb for leader.

(2) A Levite, one of the gatekeepers of the latest Bible times (1 Chronicles 9:17). He is associated with Akkub and Talmon and their
brethren: compare Nehemiah 11:19.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIMELECH

<ahim’-e-lek> (אַחִימֶלֶךְ [‘achimelekh], “brother of a king,” or, “my
brother is king,” or, “king is brother”):

(1) The father of David’s high priest Abiathar: son of Ahitub, the son of
Phinehas, the son of Eli (1 Samuel 21:1,2,8; 22:9-20; 23:6; 30:7). Ahijah
the son of Ahitub (1 Samuel 14:3,18) was either the same person under
another name, or was Ahimelech’s father or brother. See AHIJAH, 3.
Ahimelech is an interesting person, especially because he stands for
whatever information we have concerning the priestly office in Israel
during the period between Eli and David. Whether the Deuteronomic law
for a central sanctuary originated with Moses or not, its provisions were
very imperfectly carried out during the times of the Judges. This was
particularly the case after the capture of the ark by the Philistines, and the
deaths of Eli and his sons. From that time to the middle of the reign of
David the ark was in the custody of the men of Kiriath-jearim “in the hill,”
or “in Gibeah” (1 Samuel 7:1; 2 Samuel 6:2,3). As a general
proposition Israel “sought not unto it” (1 Chronicles 13:3), though there
is nothing to forbid the idea that it may, on occasion, have been brought
out from its seclusion (1 Samuel 14:18). Before and after the accession
of Saul some of the functions of the national sanctuary were transacted, of
course very incompletely, at Gilgal (1 Samuel 10:8; 11:14,15; 13:7 ff;
15:12,21,33). Whether there was a priesthood, with Ahitub the grandson
of Eli as high priest, is a matter on which we have no information; but we
may remind ourselves that the common assumption that such men as
Samuel and Saul performed priestly offices is nothing but an assumption.

After Saul has been king for a good many years we find Ahijah in his
retinue, acting as priest and wearing priestly vestments. A few years later
Ahimelech is at the head of the very considerable priestly establishment at
Nob. The scale on which it existed is indicated by the fact that 85 robed
priests perished in the massacre (1 Samuel 22:18). They had families
residing at Nob (1 Samuel 22:19). They were thought of as priests of
Yahweh, and were held in reverence (1 Samuel 22:17). It was a
hereditary priesthood (1 Samuel 22:11,15). Men deposited votive
offerings there, the sword of Goliath, for example (1 Samuel 21:9).
There seems to have been some kind of police authority, whereby a person
might be “detained” (1 Samuel 21:7). It was customary to inquire of
Yahweh there (1 Samuel 22:10,15). A distinction was made between the
common and the holy (1 Samuel 21:4-6). The custom of the shewbread
was maintained (1 Samuel 21:6). In fine, Jesus is critically correct in
calling the place “the house of God” (Mark 2:26). The account does not
say that the ark was there, or that the burnt-offering of the morning and
evening was offered, or that the great festivals were held. The priestly head
of the establishment at Nob is represented to have been the man who had
the right to the office through his descent from Aaron. It is gratuitous to
assume that there were other similar sanctuaries in Israel, though the
proposition that there were none might be, like other negative
propositions, hard to establish by positive proof.

(2) A son of Abiathar (2 Samuel 8:17; 1 Chronicles 18:16; 24:6), and
grandson of the above. In a list of the heads of departments under David, a
list belonging later than the middle of David’s 40 years, and in which
David’s sons appear, this Ahimelech, the son of David’s friend, is
mentioned as sharing with Zadok a high position in the priesthood. In this
capacity, later, he shared with David and Zadok in the apportionment of
the priests into 24 ancestral classes, 16 of the house of Eleazar, and 8 of
the house of Ithamar (1 Chronicles 24). In this account Ahimelech is
mentioned three times, and with some detail. It is alleged as a difficulty
that Abiathar was then living, and was high priest along with Zadok (1 Chronicles 15:11; 2 Samuel 15:29; 19:11; 20:25; 1 Kings 2:27,35; 4:4,
etc.). But surely there is no improbability in the affirmation that Abiathar had a son named Ahimelech, or that this son performed prominent priestly functions in his father’s lifetime.

Many regard “Ahimelech the son of Abiathar” (Matthew gives Ahimelech) as an inadvertent transposition for “Abiathar the son of Ahimelech.” This is rather plausible in the passage in 2 Samuel 8 and the duplicate of it in 1 Chronicles 18:16, but it has no application in the detailed account in 1 Chronicles 24. One must accept Ahimelech the son of Abiathar as historical unless, indeed, one regards the testimony of Chronicles to a fact as evidence in disproof of that fact.

See ABIAITHAR.

(3) A Hittite, a companion and friend of David, when he was hiding from Saul in the wilderness (1 Samuel 26:6).

Willis J. Beecher

AHIMOTH

<ah-moth> (אћימותא [’achimoth], “brother of death,” or, “my brother is death”): A descendant of Kohath the son of Levi (1 Chronicles 6:25); ancestor of Elkanah the father of Samuel. The name Mahath holds a similar place in the list that follows (1 Chronicles 6:35).

AHINADAB

<ah-ad> (אћינדאב [’achinadhabh], “brother of willingness,” or, “my brother is willing”): Decidedly the ordinary use of the stem nadhabh is to denote willingness rather than liberality or nobleness One of Solomon’s twelve commissary officers (1 Kings 4:14). He was the son of Iddo, and his district was Mahanaim.

AHINOAM

<ah-no-am>, <ah-no-am> (אћינוֹאמ [’achino’am], “my brother is pleasantness”):

(1) Daughter of Ahimaaz, and wife of King Saul (1 Samuel 14:50).
(2) The woman from Jezreel whom David married after Saul gave Michal to another husband. She and Abigail, the widow of Nabal, seem to have been David’s only wives prior to the beginning of his reign in Hebron. His marriage to Abigail is mentioned first, with some details, followed by the statement, easily to be understood in the pluperfect, that he had previously married Ahinoam (1 Samuel 25:39-44). Three times they are mentioned together, Ahinoam always first (1 Samuel 27:3; 30:5; 2 Samuel 2:2), and Ahinoam is the mother of David’s first son and Abigail of his second (2 Samuel 3:2; 1 Chronicles 3:1). Ahinoam’s son was Amnon. The record really represents David’s polygamy as a series of bids for political influence; the names of Amnon, Absalom, Adonijah suggest that the method was not finally a success.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIO

<ahio’-o> ([‘achyo], variously explained as “his brother,” “brotherly,” “brother of Yahweh,” “my brother is Yah”): Proper names containing a similar form of the name of Yahweh are found on the ostraca recently exhumed at Samaria. The word is always treated as a common noun in the ordinary Greek copies, being rendered either “brother” or “brothers,” or “his brother” or “his brothers”; but this is probably to be taken as an instance of the relative inferiority of the Greek text as compared with the Massoretic Text.

See OSTRACA.

(1) One of the sons of Beriah, the son of Elpaal, the son of Shaharaim and Hushim, reckoned among the families of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:14). Beriah and Shema are described as ‘ancestral heads’ “of the inhabitants of Aijalon, who put to flight the inhabitants of Gath.”

(2) A descendant of Jeiel (“the father of Gibeon”) and his wife Maacah (1 Chronicles 8:31; 9:37). King Saul apparently came from the same family (1 Chronicles 8:30,33; 9:39).

(3) One of the men who drove the new cart when David first attempted to bring the ark from the house of Abinadab to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6:3,4;
1 Chronicles 13:7). In Samuel Uzza and Ahio are called sons of Abinadab. By the most natural understanding of the Biblical data about 100 years had elapsed since the ark was brought to the house; they were sons of that Abinadab in the sense of being his descendants. Whether he had a successor of the same name living in David’s time is a matter of conjecture.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIRA

<ahira> (אֵהִירהֵי, [‘achira`], “brother of evil,” or, “my brother is evil”): A man of Naphtali, contemporary with Moses. He is five times mentioned as the son of Enan. He was the representative of his tribe who assisted Moses in the census (Numbers 1:15). He was the hereditary “prince” of the tribe; he made the tribal offering (Numbers 2:29; 7:78; compare 7:83), and was commander of the tribal host when on the march (Numbers 10:27).

AHIRAM

<a-iram> (אֵהִירהֵם, [‘achiram], “exalted brother,” or “my brother is exalted”): A son of Benjamin. Mentioned third of the five in Numbers 26:38,39. In Chronicles 8:1 five sons are likewise mentioned, being explicitly numbered; the third name, Aharah ([‘achrach]), is conjectured to be either a corruption of Ahiram or a different name for the same person. In 1 Chronicles 7:6 ff is a fuller list of Benjamite names, but it is fragmentary and not clear. In it occurs Aher ([‘acher]), which may be either Ahiram or Aharah with the end of the word lost. In Genesis 46:21 ten sons of Benjamin are mentioned, some being there counted as sons who, in the other lists, are spoken of as more remote descendants. In this list Ehi ([‘echi]) is perhaps Ahiram shortened.

See AHARAH; AHER; EHI.

Willis J. Beecher
AHIRAMITE


See AHIRAM.

AHISAMACH

<α-η’-σ-α-μ-α-χ> (אֵחִישָּמָאכ, ‘achicamakh), “my brother supports”): A man of the tribe of Daniel, father of Oholiab, who was the assistant of Bezalel in the building of the tent of meeting and preparing its furniture (Exodus 31:6; 35:34; 38:23).

AHISHAHAR

<α-η’-σ-α-χ-α-ר> (אֵחִישָּחָר, ‘achishachar), “brother of dawn”):
One of the sons of Bilhan, the son of Jedediael, the son of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 7:10).

AHISHAR

<α-η’-σ-α-χ-α-ר> (אֵחִישָּר, ‘achishar), “my brother has sung”): Mentioned in Solomon’s list of heads of departments as “over the household” (Kings 4:6).

AHITHOPHEL

<α-η’-θ-ο-φ-ε-λ> (אֵחִיתֹפֶהֵל, ‘achithophel), “brother of foolishness,” perhaps): The real leader of the Absalom rebellion against David. He is described as “the king’s counselor,” in a context connected with events some of which are dated in the fortieth year of David (1 Chronicles 27:33,34; compare 26:31). Concerning him and his part in the rebellion we have rather full information (2 Samuel 15:12 ff).

Some hold that he was the grandfather of Bathsheba, and make much of this in forming their estimates of him. Does the evidence sustain this view? In the latter half of the list of David’s mighty men, not among the older veterans with whom the list begins, appears “Eliam the son of Ahithophel
the Gilonite” (2 Samuel 23:34), the corresponding name in the other copy of the list being “Ahijah the Pelonite” (1 Chronicles 11:36). It is assumed that this is the same Eliam who was father to Bath-sheba (2 Samuel 11:3).Apparently the Chronicler testifies (1 Chronicles 3:5) that the mother of Solomon was “Bath-shua the daughter of Ammiel.” Bathshua may easily be a variant of Bathsheba, and the names Eliam and Ammiel are made up of the same parts, only in reversed order. It is not strange that men have inferred that the son of Ahithophel was the father of Bathsheba. But the inference is really not a probable one. The record does not make the impression that Ahithophel was an older man than David. The recorded events of David’s life after his misconduct with Bathsheba cannot have occupied less than about twenty years; that is, he cannot have been at the time older than about fifty years. That Ahithophel had then a married grand-daughter is less probable than that there were in Israel two Eliams. Further, Ahithophel was not the sort of man to conspire against the interests of his grand-daughter and her son, however he may, earlier, have resented the conduct of David toward her. Ahithophel’s motive in the rebellion was doubtless ambition for personal power, though he very likely shared with many of his countrymen in the conviction that it was unjust to push aside an older son by elevating a younger son to the throne. Ahithophel has a reputation for marvelous practical sagacity (2 Samuel 16:23). He did not show this in joining the conspiracy but it is in evidence in his management of the affair. According to the record the hearts of the people, in spite of the much fault they had to find, were all the time with David. Absalom’s only chance of success was by the method of surprise and stampede. There must be a crisis in which everybody would join Absalom because everybody thought that everybody else had done so. Such a state of public sentiment could last only a very few days; but if, in those few days, David could be put out of the way, Absalom might hold the throne in virtue of his personal popularity and in default of a rival. The first part of the program was carried out with wonderful success; when it came to the second part, Ahithophel’s practical wisdom was blocked by Hushai’s adroit appeal to Absalom’s personal vanity. Ahithophel saw with absolute clearness that Absalom had sacrificed his one opportunity, and he committed suicide to avoid participation in the shameful defeat which he saw could not be averted.
AHITOB

<\textit{a-hi’-tob}> ([\'Αχιτώβ'], Achitob; the King James Version Achitob): One of the ancestors of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2; 2 Esdras 1:1). Compare \textit{AHITUB}, 3 (\textit{Ezra} 7:2 et al.).

AHITUB

<\textit{a-hi’-tub}> ([\'achiTubh], “brother of goodness,” i.e. “good brother,” or, “my brother is goodness”):

(1) The brother of Ichabod and son of Phinehas the son of Eli (\textit{1 Samuel} 14:3; 22:9,11,12,20), According to 1 Chronicles 24 he and his line were descended from Aaron through Ithamar. The record implies that he was born while his father and grandfather were priests at Shiloh, and it says that he was the father and grandfather of priests; but it is silent as to his own exercise of the priestly office. We have no information concerning the office from the time when the Philistines captured the ark till Saul became king.

\textit{See AHIJAH; AHIMELECH; ABIATHAR.}

(2) A descendant of Aaron through Eleazar: by this fact distinguished from Ahitub, the descendant of Ithamar, though nearly contemporaneous with him. Especially known as the father of Zadok who, at Solomon’s accession, became sole high priest (\textit{2 Samuel} 8:17; \textit{1 Chronicles} 6:8; 18:16). His genealogical line, from Levi to the Exile, is given in \textit{1 Chronicles} 6:1-15 (5:27-41). The three successive names, Ahitub and Zadok and Ahimaaz, appear in \textit{2 Samuel} (8:17; 15:27, etc.). The line is paralleled by selected names in \textit{Ezra} 7:1-5, and relatively late parts of it are paralleled in \textit{1 Chronicles} 9:11 and \textit{Nehemiah} 11:11. The best explanation of certain phenomena in Chronicles is that the record was copied from originals that were more or less fragmentary. In some cases, also, a writer gives only such parts of a genealogy as are needed for his purpose. It is due to these causes that there are many omissions in the genealogical lists, and that they supplement one another. Allowing for
these facts there is no reason why we should not regard the genealogies of Ahitub as having distract historical value.

(3) In the genealogies, in the seventh generation from Ahitub, the descendant of Eleazar, appears another Ahitub, the son of another Amariah and the father (or grandfather) of another Zadok (1 Chronicles 6:11 (5:37); 9:11; Nehemiah 11:11). The list in Ezra 7 omits a block of names, and the Ahitub there named may be either 2 or 3. He is mentioned in 1 Esdras 8:2 and 2 Esdras 1:1, and the name occurs in Judith 8:1. In these places it appears in the English versions in the various forms: Ahitub, Ahitob, Achitob, Acitho.

Willis J. Beecher

AHLAB

<אַ-לָּב> (אַ-לָּב) ['achlabh], “fat or fruitful”): A town of Asher. It is clear, however, that the Israelites failed to drive away the original inhabitants (Judges 1:31). Some have identified Ahlab with Gush Halab or Geschila, Northwest of the Sea of Galilee.

AHLAI

<אַ-לָּא> (אַ-לָּא) ['achlay] “O would that!”):

(1) A Son of Sheshan (1 Chronicles 2:31) or according to 1 Chronicles 2:34 a daughter of Sheshan, for here we read: “Now Sheshan had no sons, but daughters.”

(2) The father of Zabad, a soldier in David’s army (1 Chronicles 11:41).

AHOAH

<א-הוֹ-א> (א-הוֹ-א) ['achoah], “brotherly”?): A son of Bela of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:4).
**AHOHITE**

<ah-o'-hit> (אַהוֹהִים [’achochi]): A patronymic employed in connection with the descendants of AHOAH (which see) such as Doda (<u>2 Samuel 23:9</u>) or Dodo (<u>1 Chronicles 11:12</u>), Ilai (29) or Zalmon (<u>2 Samuel 23:28</u>), and also Eleazar, son of Dodo (<u>1 Chronicles 11:12</u>). The family must have been fond of military affairs, for all the above were officers in David and Solomon’s armies.

**AHOLAH**

<ah-o’-la>.

*See OHOLAH.*

**AHOLIAB**

<ah-o-li’-ab>.

*See OHOLIAB.*

**AHOLIAH**

<ah-o-li’-a>.

*See OHOLIAH.*

**AHOLIBAH**

<ah-o’-li-ba>.

*See OHOLIBAH.*

**AHOLIBAMAH**

<ah-o-li-ba’-ma>.

*See OHOLIBAMAH.*
AHUMAI

<ahu’-ma-i>, <ahu’-mi> (אָחוֹמָי [‘achumay], “brother of water”(?)): A descendant of Shobal of the tribe of Judah (כֹּל I Chronicles 4:2).

AHUZZAM; AHUZAM

<ahuz’-am>, <ahuz’-zam> (אַחוֹזָמָה [‘achuzzam], “possessor”). A son of Ashahur of the tribe of Judah, his mother’s name was Naarah (כֹּל I Chronicles 4:6); written Ahuzam in the King James Version.

AHUZZATH

<ahuz’-ath> (אַחוֹצָת [‘achuzzath], “possession”): A “friend” perhaps a minister, of Abimelech, king of Gerar. He together with Phicol, commander of the army, accompanied their sovereign to Beersheba to make a covenant with Isaac (genesis 26:26). The termination “-ath” reminds us of Philistine proper names, such as Gath, Goliath, etc. Compare Genubath (כֹּל I Kings 11:20).

AHZAI

<ah’-zi> (אַחש [‘achzay], “my protector”): A priest who resided in Jerusalem (כֹּל Nehemiah 11:13). The the King James Version has Ahasai which is probably the same as Jahzevah of כֹּל I Chronicles 9:12.

AI

<ah’-i> (אַי [‘ay], written always with the definite article, [ha-‘ay], probably meaning “the ruin,” kindred root, [awah]):

(1) A town of central Palestine, in the tribe of Benjamin, near and just east of Bethel (כֹּל Genesis 12:8). It is identified with the modern Haiyan, just south of the village Der Diwan (Conder in HDB; Delitzsch in Commentary on כֹּל Genesis 12:8) or with a mound, El-Tell, to the north of the modern village (Davis, Dict. Biblical). The name first appears in the earliest journey of Abraham through Palestine (כֹּל Genesis 12:8), where its location is given as east of Bethel, and near the altar which Abraham built between
the two places. It is given similar mention as he returns from his sojourn in Egypt (Genesis 13:3). In both of these occurrences the King James Version has the form Hai, including the article in transliterating. The most conspicuous mention of Ai is in the narrative of the Conquest. As a consequence of the sin of Achan in appropriating articles from the devoted spoil of Jericho, the Israelites were routed in the attack upon the town; but after confession and expiation, a second assault was successful, the city was taken and burned, and left a heap of ruins, the inhabitants, in number twelve thousand, were put to death, the king captured, hanged and buried under a heap of stones at the gate of the ruined city, only the cattle being kept as spoil by the people (Joshua 7:8). The town had not been rebuilt when Joshua was written (Joshua 8:28). The fall of Ai gave the Israelites entrance to the heart of Canaan, where at once they became established, Bethel and other towns in the vicinity seeming to have yielded without a struggle. Ai was rebuilt at some later period, and is mentioned by Isaiah (10:28) in his vivid description of the approach of the Assyrian army, the feminine form (תֵּאַיָּת) being used. Its place in the order of march, as just beyond Michmash from Jerusalem, corresponds with the identification given above. It is mentioned also in post-exilic times by Ezra (2:28) and Nehemiah (7:32, and in 11:31 as, אֵיתָן ['ayya’]), identified in each case by the grouping with Bethel.

(2) The Ai of Jeremiah 49:3 is an Ammonite town, the text probably being a corruption of יָר [‘ar]; or יִיר [ha-‘ir], “the city” (BDB).

_Aiah_

<אָיָה> (אֵיתָן ['ayyah], “falcon”; once in the King James Version Ajah, Genesis 36:24):

(1) A Horite, son of Zibeon, and brother of Anah, who was father of one of Esau’s wives (Genesis 36:24; 1 Chronicles 1:40).

(2) Father of Rizpah, a concubine of Saul, about whom Ishbosheth falsely accused Abner (2 Samuel 3:7), and whose sons were hanged
to appease the Gibeonites, whom Saul had wronged (2 Samuel 21:8-11).

**AIATH**

<\textit{a'-yath}> (אָיָֽתּ [‘ayath]): Found in Isaiah 10:28; feminine form of the city &AI (which see).

**AID**

<\textit{ad}> (חָזַק [chazaq], “to strengthen,” “to aid”): A military term used only once in Old Testament in the King James Version (Judges 9:24) and displaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by the literal rendering, “who strengthened his hands.” The men of Shechem supported Abimelech in his fratricidal crime, with money, enabling him to hire men to murder his brethren. The fundamental idea in the word, as used in the Old Testament, is “abounding strength.”

**AIJA**

<\textit{a-i'-ja}> (אַיָּֽהּ [‘ayya’]): A form of name for city Ai, found in Nehemiah 11:31.

*See AI; AIATH.*

**AIJALON**

<\textit{a'-ja-lon}> (אִיָּֽלְוָֽן [‘ayyalon], “deerplace”; the King James Version, Ajalon (Joshua 10:12)):

(1) The name of a town allotted to the tribe of Daniel (Joshua 19:42), which was also designated a Levitical city (Joshua 21:24), which fell to the Sons of Kohath (1 Chronicles 6:69). The first mention of Aijalon is in the narrative of Joshua’s defeat of the five Amorite kings: “thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon” (Joshua 10:12). The Danites failed to take it from the Amorites (Judges 1:35), although the men of Ephraim held it in vassalage. Here Saul and Jonathan won a great victory over the Philistines (1 Samuel 14:31). At one time it was held by the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:13). Rehoboam fortified it against the kingdom of Israel (2
Chronicles 11:10). In the days of King Ahaz it was captured by the Philistines (2 Chronicles 28:18). It has been identified with the modern Yalo; its antiquity goes back to Tell el-Amarna Letters, in which it has mention. It is situated Northwest of Jerusalem in a valley of the same name, which leads down from the mountains to the sea.

(2) A town in the tribe of Zebulun, site unknown, where Elon the judge was buried (Judges 12:12).

Edward Mack

AIJELETH HASH-SHAHAR

<a’-je-leth hash-sha’-har>.

See PSALMS; SONG.

AIL

<al> (Anglo-Saxon: eglan, “to pain”): As a verb translation, is “to trouble,” “afflict” (obsolete); intrans, “to feel pain, trouble, uneasiness,” etc.; it represents Hebrew [mah lekha] “what to thee” (Genesis 21:17, “What aileth thee, Hagar?”; Judges 18:23; 1 Samuel 11:5; 2 Samuel 14:5; 2 Kings 6:28; Isaiah 22:1); in Psalm 114:5, it is figuratively or poetically applied to the sea, the river Jordan, etc.: “What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest?” etc.; the Revised Version (British and American), “What aileth thee, O thou sea that thou fleest?” etc.; in 2 Esdras 9:42; 10:31, “What aileth thee?”

AIM

<am>: In The Wisdom of Solomon 13:9. Lit. translation by the King James Version of Greek [στοχάσασφαι, stochasasthai], which commonly means “to shoot at.” This is Interpreted and explained by the Revised Version (British and American) as “explore,” with a hint as to the nature of the process, and may be paraphrased: “If they be able to conjecture the mysteries of the universe.”

AIN (1)

See AYIN.
AIN (2)

\(<a'-\text{in}>\) ([יָיִן, \text{\textbackslash ayin}], \text{\textquoteright\,eye or spring (of water)}\)):

(1) A town in the extreme Northwest corner of Canaan, so named, most probably, from a noted spring in the vicinity (\text{\textbackslash Numbers 34:11}). Thomson and after him Robinson make Ain the same as `Ain el-`Asy, the chief source of the Orontes, some fifteen miles Southwest of Riblah, which, in turn, is about twenty miles Southwest of Emesa (Hums). As Ain is named in connection with Lake Gennesaret, some claim that Riblah of \text{\textbackslash Numbers 34:11} must be another place farther South and closer to that lake.

(2) A Levitical city (\text{\textbackslash Joshua 21:16}) in the Negeb or southern part of Judah. It was first allotted to the tribe of Judah (\text{\textbackslash Joshua 15:32}) but later to Simeon (\text{\textbackslash Joshua 19:7}). The fact that it is several times named in immediate connection with Rimmon has lent plausibility to the view that we have here a compound word, and that we should read En-Rimmon, i.e. Ain-Rimmon (see \text{\textbackslash Joshua 15:32}; 19:7; \text{\textbackslash 1 Chronicles 4:32}).

See also AYIN.

W. W. Davies

AIR

\(<\text{ar}>\) ([אֶר, aer]): In the Old Testament “air” is used (with one exception) in the phrase “fowl” or “fowls (birds) of the air.” The Hebrew word is usually rendered “heaven” or “heavens.” According to ancient Hebrew cosmogony the sky was a solid dome (firmament) stretching over the earth as a covering. In the above phrase the air means the space between the earth and the firmament. In Job (41:16) “air” renders [ruach], “breath,” “wind,” “spirit.” The scales of the leviathan are so closely joined together that no air can penetrate. In the New Testament the phrase “birds (or fowls) of the air,” occurs ten times. This simply reproduces the Hebraism noticed above. Apart from this expression “air” in the King James Version represents [aer], which denotes the atmosphere which surrounds us. The expression “beating the air” (\text{\textbackslash 1 Corinthians 9:26}) means to “deal blows that do not get home” — that miss the mark. In his conflict with the lower
life represented by the body, Paul compares himself to a boxer who aims with unerring accuracy at his opponent. No stroke is lost. Paul also uses the phrase “speaking into the air” (1 Corinthians 14:9) in reference to the unintelligible utterances of those who “spake with tongues.” In the expression, “prince of the powers of the air” (Ephesians 2:2 the King James Version) we find an echo of the current belief that the air was the dwelling place of spirits, especially of evil spirits.

_Thomas Lewis_

**AIRUS**

<ai'-rus>, <ar'-us> ([Ἰαῖρος, Iairos]): the King James Version, one of the heads of a family of temple servants (1 Esdras 5:31 the Revised Version (British and American) &JAIRUS), which returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel; in the Old Testament called Reaiah (Ezra 2:47; Nehemiah 7:50), and classed among the Nethinim.

**AJAH**

<a'-ja>. An Edomite tribe (Genesis 36:24 the King James Version).

*See AIAH.*

**AJALON**

<aj’-a-lon>.

*See AIJALON.*

**AKAN**

<a’-kan> ([’aqan], “twisted”): A son of Ezer, a descendant of Esau of Seir (Genesis 36:27). He is called Jaakan in 1 Chronicles 1:42. The King James Version margin has Jakan.

**AKATAN**

<ak’-a-tan> ([Ἀκατάν, Akatan]; the King James Version, Acatan = Hakkatan; Ezra 8:12): The father of Joannes who returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:38).
AKELDAMA

<ak-el'-da-ma> ([‘Ἀκελδαμά, Akeldama], or, in many manuscripts, [‘Ἀκελδαμᾶ, Akeldamach]; the King James Version, Aceldama): A field said in Acts 1:19 to have been bought by Judas with the “thirty pieces of silver.” In Matthew 27:6,7 it is narrated that the priests took the silver pieces which Judas had “cast down .... into the sanctuary” and “bought with them the potter’s field, to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day.” Doubtless it was a supposed connection between this potter’s field and the potter’s house (Jeremiah 18:2) and the Valley of the Son of Hinnom (Jeremiah 19:2) which influenced the selection of the present site which, like the Aramaic ḫ-q-l-d-m-’ (Dalman), is today known as haqq-ed-dumm, “field of blood.”

Tradition, which appears to go back to the 4th century, points to a level platform on, and some distance up, the southern slope of the Wady er Rababi (Valley of Hinnom) just before it joins the Kidron Valley. Upon this spot there is a very remarkable ruin (78 ft. x 57 ft.) which for many centuries was used as a charnel house. The earth here was reputed to have the property of quickly consuming dead bodies. So great was its reputation that vast quantities of it are said to have been transported in 1215 AD to the Campo Santo at Pisa. When this building was standing entire, the bodies were lowered into it through five openings in the roof and then left to disintegrate, so that a few years ago there were very many feet of bones all over the floor. These have now been removed. A little Southeast of this ruin is a new Greek monastery erected in recent years over the remains of a large number of cave tombs; many of the bones from “Akeldama” are now buried here.

E. W. G. Masterman

AKKAD; AKKADIANS

<ak'-ad>, <a-ka'-di-ans>.

See ACCAD; ACCADIANS.
AKKOS

<ak’-os> ([’Akḇôς, Akbos] in 1 Esdras 5:38; the King James Version Accos, which see): The Old Testament equivalent (ср) Chronicles 24:10; Ezra 2:61; Nehemiah 3:4,21) is HAKKOZ (חָקְוָץ [haqqots]), which also see.

AKKUB

<ak’-ub> ([’aqqubh], “pursuer”):

(1) A son of Elioenai, a descendant of Zerubbabel (ср 1 Chronicles 3:24).

(2) A Levite porter on duty at the east gate of the second Temple (ср 1 Chronicles 9:17).

AKRABATTINE

<ak-ra-ba-ti’-ne> ([’Akrabbâti>nh, Akrabattine]; the King James Version, Arabattine): A place in Idumaea where Judas Maccabee defeated the children of Esau (1 Macc 5:3).

AKRABBIM

<ak-rab’-im> (once in the King James Version, Acrabbim (ср Joshua 15:3); [’aqrabbim], “scorpions”): Three times found (Numbers 34:4; Joshua 15:3; Judges 1:36), and always with [ma`aleh], “ascent” or “pass”; and so “Ascent of the Scorpions,” an ascent at the Southwest point of the Dead Sea and a part of the boundary line between Judah and Edom. At this pass Judas Maccabeus won a victory over the Edomites (1 Macc 5:3), called in the King James Version, Arabattine.

ALABASTER

<al’-a-bas-ter> ([αλάβαστρον, alabastron] (Matthew 26:7; Mark 14:3; Luke 7:37)): In modern mineralogy alabaster is crystalline gypsum or sulphate of lime. The Greek word alabastron or alabastos meant a stone casket or vase, and alabastites was used for the stone of which the
casket was made. This stone was usually crystalline stalagmitic rock or carbonate of lime, now often called oriental alabaster, to distinguish it from gypsum. The word occurs in the Bible only in the three passages of the Synoptic Gospels cited above.

See BOX.

ALAMETH

<al'-a-meth> (אַלָּמְתָּן [alameth], “concealment”; <1 Chronicles 7:8 the King James Version): The name of a son of Becher and grandson of Benjamin. His name was preserved as the name of a town near Anathoth (ALLEMELECH, <1 Chronicles 6:60 the Revised Version (British and American)). Except for the strong pausal accent in the Hebrew the form of the word would be the same as ALEMETH (which see).

ALAMMELECH

<a-lam'-e-lek>: the King James Version (<Joshua 19:26) for ALLAMMELECH (which see).

ALAMOTH

<al'-a-moth>.

See MUSIC.

ALARM

<a-larm'> (חִשָּׁמָה [teru`ah]): This expression is found six times in the Old Testament. The Hebrew word so rendered is derived from a verb meaning “to shout” or “blow a horn,” as a signal for breaking up camp, starting on a journey or into battle, or in triumphant shout over the defeat of enemies. In a few instances it is employed of a cry of despair or distress. The noun [teru`ah] translated “alarm” in Numbers 10:5 f refers to the signal given the people of Israel to start on their journey in the Wilderness. The passages in Jeremiah (4:19; 49:2) both refer to the summons for war. The same is true of Zephaniah 1:16.
The law concerning the sounding of the alarm is fully stated in Numbers 10:1-10. Here we read that two silver trumpets of beaten work were sounded by the sons of Aaron in case of war and also “in the day of gladness” to gather the people together for the various feasts, new moons, sacrifices and offerings.

W. W. Davies

**ALBEIT**

<ol-be’-it> ([׳ינו μַּה, hina me]; literally, “lest”): Occurs in a paraphrase rather than as a translation of a clause in Philem 1:19 the King James Version. The thought is: “although” or “albeit” (synonym of “although”) “I might say,” etc. This the Revised Version (British and American) translates with intense literalness: “that I say not”.

**ALCIMUS**

<al’-si-mus> ([׳elyaquam], “God will rise”; [’Αλκιμος, Alkimos], “valiant”): A high priest for three years, 163-161 BC, the record of whose career may be found in 1 Macc 7:4-50; 9:1-57; 2 Macc 14; see also Ant, XII, 9-11; XX, 10. He was a descendant of Aaron, but not in the high-priestly line (1 Macc 7:14; also Ant, XX, 10); and being ambitious for the office of high priest, he hastened to Antioch to secure the favor and help of the new king, Demetrius, who had just overthrown Antiochus Eupator and made himself king. Alcimus was of the Grecianizing party, and therefore bitterly opposed by the Maccabees. Demetrius sent a strong army under Bacchides to establish him in the high-priesthood at Jerusalem. The favor with which Alcimus was received by the Jews at Jerusalem on account of his Aaronic descent was soon turned to hate by his cruelties. When Bacchides and his army returned to Antioch, Simon Maccabeus attacked and overcame Alcimus, and drove him also to Syria. There he secured from Demetrius another army, led by Nicanor, who, failing to secure Simon by treachery, joined battle with him, but was defeated and killed. A third and greater army, under Bacchides again, was dispatched to save the falling fortunes of Alcimus. Now Simon was overwhelmed and slain, Alcimus established as high priest and a strong force left in Jerusalem
to uphold him. But he did not long enjoy his triumph, since he died soon after from a paralytic stroke.

Edward Mack

ALCOVE

<al’-kov> ([qubbah]; the King James Version tent; the American Standard Revised Version pavilion; the American Revised Version, margin alcove): Perhaps a large tent occupied by a prince (<Numbers 25:8>).

ALEMA

<al’-e-ma> ([Alemois]): A town in Gilead, mentioned once only (1 Macc 5:26), besieged by the nations under Timotheus, together with Bosor and other cities; and probably relieved along with these cities by Judas Maccabeus, although no mention is made of Alema’s relief. The name occurs the one time as dative plural.

ALEMETH

<al’-e-meth> ([`alemeth], “concealment”):

(1) the Revised Version (British and American) for Alameth of the King James Version in <130708> 1 Chronicles 7:8.

(2) Descendant of Saul and Jonathan, and son of Jehoaddah, <130836> 1 Chronicles 8:36, or of Jarah, <130942> 1 Chronicles 9:42. The genealogies in the two chapters are identical, and he is the fifth generation after Jonathan.

(3) In some Hebrew texts, Ginsburg and Baer, for ALLEMETH (which see); so in the King James Version.

ALEPH

<a’-lef> ([’]): The first letter of the Hebrew alphabet. It is nearly soundless itself and best represented, as in this Encyclopedia, by the smooth breathing (‘), but it is the direct ancestor of the Greek, Latin and English “a” as in “father.” In either case this beginning of the alphabet
happens to be near the very basis of all speech — in one case the simple expiration of breath, in the other the simplest possible vocal action — the actual basis from which all other vowels are evolved. It became also the symbol for the number one

(1) and, with the diacritical mark, 1,000. It is the symbol also for one of the most famous of Greek Biblical manuscripts, the Codex Sinaiticus. For name, written form, etc., see ALPHABET.

E. C. Richardson

ALEPPO

<al-eg-zan’-der> ([Ἀλέξανδρος, Alexandros], literal meaning “defender of men.” This word occurs five times in the New Testament, Mark 15:21; Acts 4:6; 19:33; 1 Timothy 1:19,20; 2 Timothy 4:14): It is not certain whether the third, fourth and fifth of these passages refer to the same man.

1. A SON OF SIMON OF CYRENE:

The first of these Alexanders is referred to in the passage in Mark, where he is said to have been one of the sons of Simon of Cyrene, the man who carried the cross of Christ. Alexander therefore may have been a North African by birth. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all record the fact, with varying detail, that Simon happened to be passing at the time when Christ was being led out of the city, to be crucified on Calvary. Mark alone tells that Simon was the father of Alexander and Rufus. From this statement of the evangelist, it is apparent that at the time the Second Gospel was written, Alexander and Rufus were Christians, and that they were well known in the Christian community. Mark takes it for granted that the first readers of his Gospel will at once understand whom he means.

There is no other mention of Alexander in the New Testament, but it is usually thought that his brother Rufus is the person mentioned by Paul in
Romans 16:13, “Salute Rufus the chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine.” If this identification is correct, then it follows, not only that the sons of Simon were Christians, but that his wife also was a Christian, and that they had all continued faithful to Christ for many years. It would also follow that the households were among the intimate friends of Paul, so much so that the mother of the family is affectionately addressed by him as “Rufus’ mother and mine.” The meaning of this is, that in time past this lady had treated Paul with the tender care which a mother feels and shows to her own son.

This mention of Rufus and his mother is in the list of names of Christians resident in Rome. Lightfoot (Comm. on Phil, 176) writes: “There seems no reason to doubt the tradition that Mark wrote especially for the Romans; and if so, it is worth remarking that he alone of the evangelists describes Simon of Cyrene, as `the father of Alexander and Rufus.’ A person of this name therefore (Rufus) seems to have held a prominent place among the Roman Christians; and thus there is at least fair ground for identifying the Rufus of Paul with the Rufus of Mark. The inscriptions exhibit several members of the household (of the emperor) bearing the names Rufus and Alexander, but this fact is of no value where both names are so common.”

To sum up, Alexander was probably by birth a North African Jew; he became a Christian, and was a well-known member of the church, probably the church in Rome. His chief claim to recollection is that he was a son of the man who carried the cross of the Saviour of the world.

2. A RELATIVE OF ANNAS:

The second Alexander, referred to in Acts 4:6, was a relative of Annas the Jewish high priest. He is mentioned by Luke, as having been present as a member of the Sanhedrin, before which Peter and John were brought to be examined, for what they had done in the cure of the lame man at the gate of the temple. Nothing more is known of this Alexander than is here given by Luke. It has been conjectured that he may have been the Alexander who was a brother of Philo, and who was also the alabarch or magistrate of the city of Alexandria. But this conjecture is unsupported by any evidence at all.
3. ALEXANDER AND THE RIOT AT EPHESUS:

The third Alexander is mentioned in Acts 19:33: “And some of the multitude instructed Alexander, the Jews putting him forward. And Alexander beckoned with the hand, and would have made defense unto the people. But when they perceived that he was a Jew, all with one voice,” etc., the Revised Version, margin. In the matter of the riot in Ephesus the whole responsibility rested with Demetrius the silversmith. In his anger against the Christians generally, but specially against Paul, because of his successful preaching of the gospel, he called together a meeting of the craftsmen; the trade of the manufacture of idols was in jeopardy. From this meeting there arose the riot, in which the whole city was in commotion. The Jews were wholly innocent in the matter: they had done nothing to cause any disturbance. But the riot had taken place, and no one could tell what would happen. Modern anti-Semitism, in Russia and other European countries, gives an idea of an excited mob stirred on by hatred of the Jews. Instantly recognizing that the fury of the Ephesian people might expend itself in violence and bloodshed, and that in that fury they would be the sufferers, the Jews “put forward” Alexander, so that by his skill as a speaker he might clear them, either of having instigated the riot, or of being in complicity with Paul. “A certain Alexander was put forward by the Jews to address the mob; but this merely increased the clamor and confusion. There was no clear idea among the rioters what they wanted: an anti-Jewish and an anti-Christian demonstration were mixed up, and probably Alexander’s retention was to turn the general feeling away from the Jews. It is possible that he was the worker in bronze, who afterward did Paul much harm” (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, etc., 279).

4. ALEXANDER AN EPHESIAN HERETIC:

The fourth of the New Testament Alexanders is one of two heretical teachers at Ephesus — the other being Hymeneus: see article under the word — against whom Paul warns Timothy in 1 Timothy 1:19,20. The teaching of Hymeneus and Alexander was to the effect that Christian morality was not required — antinomianism. They put away — ”thrust from them,” the Revised Version (British and American) — faith and a good conscience; they willfully abandoned the great central facts regarding Christ, and so they “made shipwreck concerning the faith.”


5. HIS HERESY INCIPIENT GNOSTICISM:

In 2 Timothy 2:17,18, Hymeneus is associated with Philetus, and further details are there given regarding their false teaching. What they taught is described by Paul as “profane babblings,” as leading to more ungodliness, and as eating “as doth a gangrene.” Their heresy consisted in saying that the resurrection was past already, and it had been so far successful, that it had overthrown the faith of some. The doctrine of these three heretical teachers, Hymeneus, Alexander and Philetus, was accordingly one of the early forms of Gnosticism. It held that matter was originally and essentially evil; that for this reason the body was not an essential part of human nature; that the only resurrection was that of each man as he awoke from the death of sin to a righteous life; that thus in the case of everyone who has repented of sin, “the resurrection was past already,” and that the body did not participate in the blessedness of the future life, but that salvation consisted in the soul’s complete deliverance from all contact with a material world and a material body.

So pernicious were these teachings of incipient Gnosticism in the Christian church, that they quickly spread, eating like a gangrene. The denial of the future resurrection of the body involved also the denial of the bodily resurrection of Christ, and even the fact of the incarnation. The way in which therefore the apostle dealt with those who taught such deadly error, was that he resorted to the same extreme measures as he had employed in the case of the immoral person at Corinth; he delivered Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme. Compare 1 Corinthians 5:5.

6. ALEXANDER THE COPPERSMITH:

The fifth and last occurrence of the name Alexander is in 2 Timothy 4:14,15, “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord will render to him according to his works: of whom do thou also beware (the King James Version “of whom be thou ware also”); for he greatly withstood our words.” This Alexander was a worker in copper or iron, a smith. It is quite uncertain whether Alexander number 5 should be identified with Alexander number 4, and even with Alexander number 3. In regard to this, it should be remembered that all three of these Alexanders
were resident in Ephesus; and it is specially to be noticed that the fourth and the fifth of that name resided in that city at much the same time; the interval between Paul’s references to these two being not more than a year or two, as not more than that time elapsed between his writing 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy. It is therefore quite possible these two Alexanders may be one and the same person.

In any case, what is stud of this last Alexander is that he had shown the evil which was in him by doing many evil deeds to the apostle, evidently on the occasion of a recent visit paid by Paul to Ephesus. These evil deeds had taken the form of personally opposing the apostle’s preaching. The personal antagonism of Alexander manifested itself by his greatly withstanding the proclamation of the gospel by Paul. As Timothy was now in Ephesus, in charge of the church there, he is strongly cautioned by the apostle to be on his guard against this opponent.

John Rutherfurd

ALEXANDER BALAS

Alexander <ba’-las> ([Ἀλέξανδρος ό Βάλας λεγόμενος, Alexandros ho Balas legomenos]): He contended against Demetrius I of Syria for the throne and succeeded in obtaining it. He was a youth of mean origin, but he was put forth by the enemies of Demetrius as being Alexander, the son and heir of Antiochus Epiphanes. He received the support of the Roman Senate and of Ptolemy VI of Egypt, and on account of the tyranny of Demetrius, was favored by many of the Syrians. The country was thrown into civil war and Demetrius was defeated by Alexander II took up the cause of his father and in 147 BC, Alexander fled from his kingdom and was soon after assassinated.

Our chief interest in Alexander is his connection with the Maccabees. Jonathan was the leader of the Maccabean forces and both Alexander and Demetrius sought his aid. Demetrius granted Jonathan the right to raise and maintain an army. Alexander, not to be outdone, appointed Jonathan high priest, and as a token of his new office sent him a purple robe and a diadem (Ant., XIII, ii, 2). This was an important step in the rise of the Maccabean house, for it insured them the support of the Chasidim. In 153 BC, Jonathan officiated as high priest at the altar (1 Macc 10:1-14; Ant,
XIII, ii, 1). This made him the legal head of Judea and thus the movement of the Maccabees became closely identified with Judaism. In 1 Macc 10:1, he is called Alexander Epiphanes.

A. W. Fortune

ALEXANDER, THE GREAT

([Ἀλέξανδρος, Alexándros]).

1. PARENTAGE AND EARLY LIFE:

Alexander, of Macedon, commonly called “the Great” (born 356 BC), was the son of Philip, king of Macedon, and of Olympias, daughter of Neoptolemos, an Epeirote king. Although Alexander is not mentioned by name in the canonical Scriptures, in Daniel he is designated by a transparent symbol (8:5,21). In 1 Macc 1:1 he is expressly named as the overthrower of the Persian empire, and the founder of that of the Greeks. As with Frederick the Great, the career of Alexander would have been impossible had his father been other than he was. Philip had been for some years a hostage in Thebes: while there he had learned to appreciate the changes introduced into military discipline and tactics by Epaminondas. Partly no doubt from the family claim to Heracleid descent, deepened by contact in earlier days with Athenians like Iphicrates, and the personal influence of Epaminondas, Philip seems to have united to his admiration for Greek tactics a tincture of Hellenistic culture, and something like a reverence for Athens, the great center of this culture. In military matters his admiration led him to introduce the Theban discipline to the rough peasant levies of Macedon, and the Macedonian phalanx proved the most formidable military weapon that had yet been devised. The veneer of Greek culture which he had taken on led him, on the one hand, laying stress on his Hellenistic descent, to claim admission to the comity of Hellas, and on the other, to appoint Aristotle to be a tutor to his son. By a combination of force and fraud, favored by circumstances, Philip got himself appointed generalissimo of the Hellenistic states; and further induced them to proclaim war against the “Great King.” In all this he was preparing the way for his son, so soon to be his successor.
2. HIS PREPARATION FOR HIS CAREER:

He was also preparing his son for his career. Alexander was, partly no doubt from being the pupil of Aristotle, yet more imbued with Greek feelings and ideas than was Preparation his father. He was early introduced into the cares of government and the practice of war. While Philip was engaged in the siege of Byzantium he sent his son to replace Antipater in the regency; during his occupancy of this post, Alexander, then only a youth of sixteen, had to undertake a campaign against the Illyrians, probably a punitive expedition. Two years later, at the decisive battle of Chaeroneia, which fixed the doom of the Greek autonomous city, Alexander commanded the feudal cavalry of Macedon, the “Companions.” He not only saved his father’s life, but by his timely and vehement charge materially contributed to the victory.

3. HIS ACCESSION TO THE HEGEMONY OF GREECE:

When all his plans for the invasion of Persia were complete, and a portion of his troops was already across the Hellespont, Philip was assassinated. Having secured his succession, Alexander proceeded to Corinth, where he was confirmed in his father’s position of leader of Hellas against Darius. Before he could cross into Asia he had to secure his northern frontier against possible raids of barbarian tribes. He invaded Thrace with his army and overthrew the Triballi, then crossed the Danube and inflicted a defeat on the Getae. During his absence in these but slightly known regions, the rumor spread that he had been killed, and Thebes began a movement to throw off the Macedonian yoke. On his return to Greece he wreaked terrible vengeance on Thebes, not only as promoter of this revolt, but also as the most powerful of the Greek states.

4. CAMPAIGN IN ASIA MINOR:

Having thus secured his rear, Alexander collected his army at Pella to cross the Hellespont, that he might exact the vengeance of Greece on Persia for indignities suffered at the hands of Xerxes, who “by his strength through his riches” had stirred, up “all against the realm of Grecia” (Daniel 11:2, the King James Version). Steeped as he was in the romance of the Iliad, Alexander, when he came to the site of Troy, honored Achilles, whom he
claimed as his ancestor, with games and sacrifices. This may have been the outflow of his own romantic nature, but there was also wise policy in it; the Greeks were more readily reconciled to the loss of their freedom when it was yielded up to one who revived in his own person the heroes of the Iliad. It may be noted how exactly the point of Alexander’s invasion is indicated in Daniel’s prophecy (Daniel 8:5). From Troy he advanced southward, and encountered the Persian forces at the Granicus. While in the conflict Alexander exhibited all the reckless bravery of a Homeric hero. He at the same time showed the skill of a consummate general. The Persian army was dispersed with great slaughter. Before proceeding farther into Persia, by rapid marches and vigorously pressed sieges, he completed the conquest of Asia Minor. Here, too, he showed his knowledge of the sensitiveness of Asiatic peoples to omens, by visiting Gordium, and cutting the knot on which, according to legend, depended the empire of Asia.

5. BATTLE OF ISSUS AND MARCH THROUGH SYRIA TO EGYPT:

What he had done in symbol he had to make a reality; he had to settle the question of supremacy in Asia by the sword. He leaned that Darius had collected an immense army and was coming to meet him. Although the Persian host was estimated at a half-million men, Alexander hastened to encounter it. Rapidity of motion, as symbolized in Daniel by the “he-goat” that “came from the west .... and touched not the ground” (Daniel 8:5), was Alexander’s great characteristic. The two armies met in the relatively narrow plain of Issus, where the Persians lost, to a great extent, the advantage of their numbers; they were defeated with tremendous slaughter, Darius himself setting the example of flight. Alexander only pursued the defeated army far enough to break it up utterly. He began his march southward along the seacoast of Syria toward Egypt, a country that had always impressed the Greek imagination. Though most of the cities, on his march, opened their gates to the conqueror, Tyre and Gaza only yielded after a prolonged siege. In the case of the latter of these, enraged at the delay occasioned by the resistance, and emulous of his ancestor, Alexander dragged its gallant defender Batis alive behind his chariot as Achilles had dragged the dead Hector. It ought to be noted that this episode does not
appear in Arrian, usually regarded as the most authentic historian of Alexander. Josephus relates that after he had taken Gaza, Alexander went up to Jerusalem, and saw Jaddua the high priest, who showed him the prophecy of Daniel concerning him. The fact that none of the classic historians take any notice of such a detour renders the narrative doubtful: still it contains no element of improbability that the pupil of Aristotle, in the pursuit of knowledge, might, during the prosecution of the siege of Gaza, with a small company press into the hill country of Judea, at once to secure the submission of Jerusalem which occupied a threatening position in regard to his communications, and to see something of that mysterious nation who worshipped one God and had no idols.

6. FOUNDING OF ALEXANDRIA AND VISIT TO THE SHRINE OF JUPITER AMMON:

When he entered Egypt, the whole country submitted without a struggle. Moved at once by the fact that Pharos is mentioned in the Odyssey, and that he could best rule Egypt from the seacoast, he founded Alexandria on the strip of land opposite Pharos, which separated Lake Mareotis from the Mediterranean. The island Pharos formed a natural breakwater which made possible a spacious double harbor; the lake, communicating with the Nile, opened the way for inland navigation. As usual with Alexander, romance and policy went hand in hand. The city thus founded became the capital of the Ptolemies, and the largest city of the Hellenistic world. He spent his time visiting shrines, in the intervals of arranging for the government of the country. The most memorable event of his stay in Egypt was his expedition to the oracle or Jupiter Ammon (Amen-Ra) where he was declared the son of the god. To the Egyptians this meant no more than that he was regarded a lawful monarch, but he pretended to take this declaration as assigning to him a Divine origin like so many Homeric heroes. Henceforward, there appeared on coins Alexander’s head adorned with the ram’s horn of Amen-Ra. This impressed the eastern imagination so deeply that Mohammed, a thousand years after, calls him in the Quran Iskander dhu al-qarnain, “Alexander the lord of the two horns.” It is impossible to believe that the writer of Daniel could, in the face of the universal attribution of the two ram’s horns to Alexander, represent Persia, the
power he overthrew, as a two-horned ram (Daniel 8:3,20), unless he had written before the expedition into Egypt.

7. THE LAST BATTLE WITH DARIUS:

Having arranged the affairs of Egypt, Alexander set out for his last encounter with Darius. In vain had Darius sent to Alexander offering to share the empire with him; the “king of Javan” (Revised Version margin) “was moved with anger against him” (Daniel 8:7) and would have nothing but absolute submission. There was nothing left for Darius but to prepare for the final conflict. He collected a yet huger host than that he had had under him at Issus, and assembled it on the plain east of the Tigris. Alexander hastened to meet him. Although the plain around Gaugamela was much more suitable for the movements of the Persian troops, which consisted largely of cavalry, and gave them better opportunity of making use of their great numerical superiority to outflank the small Greek army, the result was the same as at Issus — overwhelming defeat and immense slaughter. The consequence of this victory was the submission of the greater portion of the Persian empire.

After making some arrangements for the government of the new provinces, Alexander set out in the pursuit of Darius, who had fled in the care or custody of Bessus, satrap of Bactria. Bessus, at last, to gain the favor of Alexander, or, failing that, to maintain a more successful resistance, murdered Darius. Alexander hurried on to the conquest of Bactria and Sogdiana, in the course of his expedition capturing Bessus and putting him to death. In imitation of Bacchus, he proceeded now to invade India. He conquered all before him till he reached the Sutlej; at this point his Macedonian veterans refused to follow him farther.

8. CLOSE OF HIS LIFE:

Thus compelled to give up hopes of conquests in the farther East, he returned to Babylon, which he purposed to make the supreme capital of his empire, and set himself, with all his superabundant energy, to organize his dominions, and fit Babylon for its new destiny. While engaged in this work he was seized with malaria, which, aggravated by his recklessness in eating and drinking, carried him off in his 33rd year.
9. HIS INFLUENCE:

Alexander is not to be estimated merely as a military conqueror. If he had been only this, he would have left no deeper impress on the world than Tamerlane or Attila. While he conquered Asia, he endeavored also to Hellenize her. He everywhere founded Greek cities that enjoyed at all events a municipal autonomy. With these, Hellenistic thought and the Hellenistic language were spread all over southwestern Asia, so that philosophers from the banks of the Euphrates taught in the schools of Athens. It was through the conquests of Alexander that Greek became the language of literature and commerce from the shores of the Mediterranean to the banks of the Tigris. It is impossible to estimate the effect of this spread of Greek on the promulgation of the gospel.

J. E. H. Thomson

ALEXANDRIA

<al-eg-zan’-dri-a> ([Ἀλεξάνδρεια, he Alexandreia]).

1. HISTORY:

In 331 BC, Alexander the Great, on his way to visit the Oracle of Amon seeking divine honors, stopped at the West extremity of the Delta at the isle of Pharos the landing-place of Odysseus (Od. iv.35) His keen eye noted the strategic possibilities of the site occupied by the little Egyptian village of Rhacotis, and his decision was immediate to erect here, where it would command the gateway to the richest domain of his empire, a glorious city to be called by his own name. Deinocrates, greatest living architect, already famous as builder of the Temple of Diana, was given free hand and like a dream the most beautiful city of the ancient or modern world (with the single exception of Rome) arose with straight, parallel streets — one at least 200 feet wide — with fortresses, monuments, palaces, government buildings and parks all erected according to a perfect artistic plan. The city was about fifteen miles in circumference (Pliny), and when looked at from above represented a Macedonian cloak, such as was worn by Alexander’s heroic ancestors. A colossal mole joined the island to the main land and made a double harbor, the best in all Egypt. Before Alexander died (323 BC) the future of the city as the commercial
metropolis of the world was assured and here the golden casket of the conqueror was placed in a fitting mausoleum. Under the protection of the first two Ptolemies and Euergetes Alexandria reached its highest prosperity, receiving through Lake Mareotis the products of Upper Egypt, reaching by the Great Sea all the wealth of the West, while through the Red Sea its merchant vessels brought all the treasures of India and Arabia into the Alexandria docks without once being unladen. The manufactories of Alexandria were extensive, the greatest industry however being shipbuilding, the largest merchant ships of the world and battleships capable of carrying 1,000 men, which could hurl fire with fearful effect, being constructed here. This position of supremacy was maintained during the Roman domination up to the 5th century during which Alexandria began to decline. Yet even when Alexandria was captured by the Arabs (641) under the caliph Omar, the general could report: “I have taken a city containing 4,000 palaces and 4,000 baths and 400 theaters.” They called it a “city of marble” and believed the colossal obelisks, standing on crabs of crystal, and the Pharos, that white stone tower 400 ft. high, “wonder of the world,” to be the creation of jinn, not of men. With oriental exaggeration they declared that one amphitheater could easily hold a million spectators and that it was positively painful to go upon the streets at night because of the glare of light reflected from the white palaces. But with the coming of the Arabs Alexandria began to decline. It sank lower when Cairo became the capital (circa 1000 AD), and received its death blow when a sea route to India was discovered by way of the Cape of Good Hope (circa 1500). Today the ancient Alexandria lies entirely under the sea or beneath some later construction. Only one important relic remains visible, the so-called Pompey’s Pillar which dates from the reign of Diocletian. Excavations by the English (1895) and Germans (1898-99) have yielded few results, though Dr. G. Botti discovered the Serapeum and some immense catacombs, and only recently (1907) some fine sphinxes. In its most flourishing period the population numbered from 600,000 to 800,000, half of whom were perhaps slaves. At the close of the 18th century it numbered no more than 7,000. Under the khedives it has recently gained something of its old importance and numbers now 320,000, of whom 46,000 are Europeans, chiefly Greeks (Baedeker, Handbook, 1902; Murray, Handbook, 1907).
2. THE JEWS IN ALEXANDRIA:

Among the private papers of Alexander it is said a sketch was found outlining his vast plan of making a Greek empire which should include all races as harmonious units. In accordance with this, Europeans, Asiatics and Africans found in Alexandria a common citizenship. Indeed in several cities, under the Ptolemies, who accepted this policy, foreigners were even given superiority to natives. Egyptians and Greeks were conciliated by the introduction of a syncretic religion in which the greatest Greek god was worshipped as Osiris, Egyptian god of the underworld, whose soul appeared visibly in the form of the Apis bull. This was the most popular and human form of the Egyptian worship. This new religion obtained phenomenal success. It was in furtherance of this general policy that the Jews in Alexandria were given special privileges, and though probably not possessing full civic rights, yet they “occupied in Alexandria a more Influential position than anywhere else in the ancient world” (Jewish Encyclopedia). To avoid unnecessary friction a separate district was given to the Jews, another to the Greeks and another to the native Egyptians. In the Greek section were situated the palaces of the Ptolemies, the Library and Museum. In the Egyptian district was the temple dedicated to Serapis (Osiris-Apis) which was only excelled in grandeur by the capitol at Rome. The Jews possessed many synagogues in their own district and in Philo’s day these were not confined to any one section of the city. Some synagogues seem to have exercised the right of asylum, the same as heathen temples. One of these was so large that the [chazan] signaled by a flag when the congregation should give the Amen! Each district had a practically independent political government. The Jews were at first ruled by a Hebrew ethnarch. By the days of Augustus a Council of Elders (gerusia) had control, presided over by 71 archons. Because of their wealth, education and social position they reached high public office. Under Ptol. VI and Cleopatra the two generals-in-chief of the royal army were Jews. Ptol. I had 30,000 Jewish soldiers, in his army, whose barracks have only recently been discovered. It may have been a good thing that the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (2nd century BC) checked Jewish Hellenization. During the Roman supremacy the rights of the Jews were maintained, except during their persecution for a brief period by the insane Caligula, and the control of the most important industries, including the
corn trade, came into their hands. When Christianity became the state religion of Egypt the Jews at once began to be persecuted. The victory of Heraclius over the Persians (629 AD) was followed by such a massacre of the Jews that the Coptics of Egypt still denominate the first week in Lent as the “Fast of Heraclius.” Wisdom and many other influential writings of the Jews originated in Alexandria. Doubtless numbers of the recently discovered documents from the Cairo [genizah] came originally from Alexandria. But the epochal importance of Alexandria is found in the teaching which prepared the Hebrew people for the reception of a gospel for the whole world, which was soon to be preached by Hebrews from Hellenized Galilee.

3. ALEXANDRIA’S INFLUENCE ON THE BIBLE:

(1) In Daniel 11 the Ptolomies of Alexandria and their wives are made a theme of prophecy. Apollos, the “orator,” was born in Alexandria (<441824>Acts 18:24). Luke twice speaks of himself and Paul sailing in “a ship of Alexandria” (<442706>Acts 27:6; 28:11). Stephen `disputed’ in Jerusalem in the synagogue of the Alexandrians (<440609>Acts 6:9). These direct references are few, but the influence of Alexandria on the Bible was inestimable.

(2) The Septuagint, translated in Alexandria (3rd to 2nd centuries BC), preserves a Hebrew text 1,000 years older than any now known. This translation if not used by Jesus was certainly used by Paul and other New Testament writers, as shown by their quotations. It is Egyptian even in trifles. This Greek Bible not only opened for the first time the “Divine Oracles” to the Gentiles and thus gave to the Old Testament an international influence, but it affected most vitally the Hebrew and Christian development.

(3) The Alexandrinus Codex (4th to 5th centuries) was the first of all the great uncialys to come into the hands of modern scholars. It was obtained in Alexandria and sent as a present to the king of England (1628) by Cyrellus Lucaris, the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus uncialys with many other most important Bible manuscripts — Hebrew, Greek, Coptic and Syriac — came from Alexandria.
(4) John and several other New Testament writings have justly been regarded as showing the influence of this philosophic city. Neither the phraseology nor conceptions of the Fourth Gospel could have been grasped in a world which Alexandria had not taught. Pfleiderer’s statement that He “may be termed the most finished treatise of the Alexandria philosophy” may be doubted, but no one can doubt the fact of Alexandrian influence on the New Testament.

4. INFLUENCE OF ALEXANDRIA ON CULTURE:

With the founding of the University of Alexandria began the “third great epoch in the history of civilization” (Max Muller). It was modeled after the great school of Athens, but excelled, being preeminently the “university of progress” (Mahaffy). Here for the first time is seen a school of science and literature, adequately endowed and offering large facilities for definite original research. The famous library which at different eras was reported as possessing from 400,000 to 900,000 books and rolls — the rolls being as precious as the books — was a magnificent edifice connected by marble colonnades with the Museum, the “Temple of the Muses.” An observatory, an anatomical laboratory and large botanical and Zoological gardens were available. Celebrated scholars, members of the various faculties, were domiciled within the halls of the Museum and received stipends or salaries from the government. The study of mathematics, astronomy, poetry and medicine was especially favored (even vivisection upon criminals being common); Alexandrian architects were sought the world over; Alexandrian inventors were almost equally famous; the influence of Alexandrian art can still be marked in Pompeii and an Alexandrian painter was a hated rival of Apelles. Here Euclid wrote his Elements of Geometry; here Archimedes, “that greatest mathematical and inventive genius of antiquity,” made his spectacular discoveries in hydrostatics and hydraulics; here Eratosthenes calculated the size of the earth and made his other memorable discoveries; while Ptolemy studied here for 40 years and published an explanation of the stellar universe which was accepted by scientists for 14 centuries, and established mathematical theories which are yet the basis of trigonometry. “Ever since this epoch the conceptions of the sphericity of the earth, its poles, axis, the equator, the arctic and antarctic circles, the equinoctial points, the
solstices, the inequality of climate on the earth’s surface, have been current notions among scientists. The mechanism of the lunar phases was perfectly understood, and careful though not wholly successful calculations were made of inter-sidereal distances. On the other hand literature and art flourished under the careful protection of the court. Literature and its history, philology and criticism became sciences” (Alexandria Weber). It may be claimed that in literature no special originality was displayed though the earliest “love storms” and pastoral poetry date from this period (Mahaffy); yet the literature of the Augustan Age cannot be understood “without due appreciation of the character of the Alexandrian school” (EB, 11th ed.), while in editing texts and in copying and translating manuscripts inconceivable patience and erudition were displayed. Our authorized texts of Homer and other classic writers come from Alexandria not from Athens. All famous books brought into Egypt were sent to the library to be copied. The statement of Josephus that Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247) requested the Jews to translate the Old Testament into Greek is not incredible. It was in accordance with the custom of that era. Ptol. Euergetes is said to have sent to Athens for the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, etc., and when these were transcribed, sent back beautiful copies to Greece and kept the originals! No library in the world except the prophetic library in Jerusalem was ever as valuable as the two Alexandrian libraries. The story that the Arabs burned it in the 7th century is discredited and seemingly disproved (Butler). At any rate, after this period we hear of great private libraries in Alexandria, but the greatest literary wonder of the world has disappeared.

5. INFLUENCE ON PHILOSOPHY:

Though no department of philosophy was established in the Museum, nevertheless from the 3rd century BC to the 6th century AD it was the center of gravity in the philosophic world. Here Neo-Pythagoreanism arose. Here Neo-Platonism, that contemplative and mystical reaction against the materialism of the Stoics, reached its full flower. It is difficult to overestimate the influence of the latter upon religious thought. In it the profoundest Aryan speculations were blended with the sublimest Semitic concepts. Plato was numbered among the prophets. Greece here acknowledged the Divine Unity to which the Old Testament was pledged.
Here the Jew acknowledged that Athens as truly as Jerusalem had taught a vision of God. This was the first attempt to form a universal religion. The Alexandrian philosophy was the Elijah to prepare the way for a Saviour of the world. The thought of both Sadducee and Pharisee was affected by it and much late pre-Christian Jewish literature is saturated with it. Neo-Platonism drew attention to the true relation between matter and spirit, good and evil, finite and infinite; it showed the depth of antagonism between the natural and spiritual, the real and ideal; it proclaimed the necessity of some mystic union between the human and the Divine. It stated but could not solve the problem. Its last word was escape, not reconciliation (Ed. Caird). Neo-Platonism was the “germ out of which Christian theology sprang” (Caird) though later it became an adverse force. Notwithstanding its dangerous teaching concerning evil, it was on the whole favorable to piety, being the forerunner of mysticism and sympathetic with the deepest, purest elements Of a spiritual religion.

6. CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN ALEXANDRIA:

According to all tradition, Mark the evangelist, carried the gospel to Alexandria, and his body rested here until removed to Venice, 828 AD. From this city Christianity reached all Egypt and entered Nubia, Ethiopia and Abyssinia. During the 4th century, ten councils were held in Alexandria, it being theological and ecclesiastical center of Christendom. The first serious persecution of Christians by heathen occurred here under Decius (251) and was followed by many others, the one under Diocletian (303-11) being so savage that the native Coptic church still dates its era from it. When the Christians reached political power they used the same methods of controversy, wrecking the Caesarion in 366 and the Serapeum twenty-five years later. Serapis (Osiris-Apis) was the best beloved of all the native deities. His temple was built of most precious marbles and filled with priceless sculptures, while in its cloisters was a library second only to the Great Library of the Museum. When Christianity became the state religion of Egypt the native philosophers, moved by patriotism, rallied to the support of Serapis. But Theodosius (391) prohibited idolatry, and led by the bishop, the Serapeum was seized, and smitten by a soldier’s battle-axe, the image — which probably represented the old heathen religion at its best — was broken to pieces, and dragged through the streets. That day, as
Steindorff well puts it, “Egyp paganism received its death blow; the Egyptian religion fell to pieces” (History of Egypt). Thereafter heathen worship hid itself in the dens and caves of the earth. Even secret allegiance to Serapis brought persecution and sometimes death. The most appalling tragedy of this kind occurred in 415 when Hypatia, the virgin philosopher, celebrated equally for beauty, virtue and learning, was dragged by a mob to the cathedral, stripped, and torn to pieces before the altar. Some of the greatest Christian leaders used all their influence against such atrocities, but the Egyptian Christians were always noted for their excitability. They killed heretics easily, but they would themselves be killed rather than renounce the very slightest and most intangible theological tenet. It only needed the change of a word e.g. in the customary version to raise a riot (Expos, VII, 75). Some curious relics of the early Egyptian church have very recently come to light. The oldest autographic Christian letter known (3rd century) proves that at that time the church was used as a bank, and its ecclesiastics (who, whether priests or bishops, were called “popes”) were expected to help the country merchants in their dealings with the Roman markets. Some sixty letters of the 4th century written to a Christian cavalry officer in the Egyptian army are also preserved, while papyri and ostraca from circa 600 AD show that at this time no deacon could be ordained without having first learned by heart as much as an entire Gospel or 25 Psalms and two epistles of Paul, while a letter from a bishop of this period is filled with Scripture, as he anathematizes the “oppressor of the poor,” who is likened unto him who spat in the face of our Lord on the cross and smote Him on the head (Adolph Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, etc., 1910). Oppression of Jews and heretics was not, however, forbidden and during the 5th and 6th centuries. Egypt was a battle-field in which each sect persecuted every other. Even when the Arabs under the caliph Omar captured the city on Good Friday (641), Easter Day was spent by the orthodox in torturing supposed heretics! The next morning the city was evacuated and Jews and Coptics received better treatment from the Arabs than they had from the Roman or Greek ecclesiastics. After the Arab conquest the Coptic church, being released from persecution, prospered and gained many converts even from the Mohammedans. But the Saracenic civilization and religion steadily displaced the old, and the native learning and native religion soon disappeared into the desert. By the 8th century, Arabic had taken the
place of Greek and Coptic, not only in public documents but in common speech. Then for 1,000 years the Egyptian church remained without perceptible influence on culture or theology. But its early influence was immeasurable and can still be marked in Christian art, architecture and ritual as well as in philosophy and theology. Perhaps its most visible influence was in the encouragement of image-reverence and asceticism. It is suggestive that the first hermit (Anthony) was a native Egyptian, and the first founder of a convent (Pachomius) was a converted Egyptian (heathen) monk. Today Alexandria has again become a Christian metropolis containing Coptics, Romans, Greeks, Armenians, Maronites, Syrians, Chaldeans and Protestants. The Protestants are represented by the Anglican church, the Scotch Free church, the evangelical church of Germany and the United Presbyterian church of the U.S. (For minute divisions see Catholic Encyclopedia)

7. CATECHETICAL SCHOOL IN ALEXANDRIA:

The first theological school of Christendom was founded in Alexandria. It was probably modeled after earlier Gnostic schools established for the study of religious philosophy. It offered a three years’ course. There were no fees, the lecturers being supported by gifts from rich students. Pantaenus, a converted Stoic philosopher, was its first head (180). He was followed by Clement (202) and by Origen (232) under whom the school reached its zenith. It always stood for the philosophical vindication of Christianity. Among its greatest writers were Julius Africanus (215), Dionysius (265), Gregory (270), Eusebius (315), Athanasius (373) and Didymus (347), but Origen (185-254) was its chief glory; to him belongs the honor of defeating paganism and Gnosticism with their own weapons; he gave to the church a “scientific consciousness,” his threefold interpretation of Scripture affected Biblical exegesis clear down to the last century. Arius was a catechist in this institution, and Athanasius, the “father of orthodoxy” and “theological center of the Nicene age” (Schaff), though not officially connected with the catechetical school was greatly affected by it, having been bred and trained in Alexandria. The school was closed toward the end of the 4th century because of theological disturbances in Egypt, but its work was continued from Caesarea and other centers, affecting profoundly Western teachers like Jerome and
Ambrose, and completely dominating Eastern thought. From the first there was a mystical and Docetic tendency visible, while its views of inspiration and methods of interpretation, including its constant assumption of a secret doctrine for the qualified initiate, came legitimately from Neo-Platonism. For several centuries after the school disbanded its tenets were combated by the “school of Antioch,” but by the 8th century the Alexandrian theology was accepted by the whole Christian world, east and west.

**LITERATURE.**

Besides works mentioned in the text see especially: Petrie, History of Egypt (1899), V, VI, Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies (1895), Progress of Hellenism (1905); Butler, Arab Conquest of Egypt (1902); Ernst Sieglin, Ausgrabungen in Alexandrien (1908); Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (1895-1900), and in New Sch-Herz (1910); Inge, Alexandrian Theology in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (1908); Ed. Caird, Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers (1904); Pfleiderer, Philosophy and Development of Religion (1894); Schaff, History of Christian Church (1884-1910); Zogheb, Etudes sur l’ancienne Alexandrie (1909).

*Camden M. Cobern*

**ALEXANDRIANS**

<al-eg-zan’-dri-ans> ([Ἀλεξανδρείας, Alexandrēia]): Jews of Alexandria, who had, with the Libertines and Cyrenians, a synagogue in Jerusalem. They were among those who disputed with Stephen ([Acts 6:9]).

**ALGUM OR ALMUG**

<al’-gum>, ([אַלְגָּמוֹם, ’algummim] ([2 Chronicles 2:8; 9:10 f]); ([אַלְמָגָמוֹם, ’almaggim], [1 Kings 10:11 f]): It is generally supposed that these two names refer to one kind of tree, the consonants being transposed as is not uncommon in Semitic words. Solomon sent to Hiram, king of Tyre, saying, “Send me also cedar-trees, fir-trees, and algum-trees, out of Lebanon” ([2 Chronicles 2:8]). In [1 Kings 10:11] it is said that the navy of Hiram “that brought gold from Ophir, brought in from Ophir great
plenty of almug-trees and precious stones.” In the parallel passage in 2 Chronicles 9:10 it is said that “algum-trees and precious stones” were brought. From this wood “the king made .... pillars for the house of Yahweh, and for the king’s house, harps also and psalteries for the singers: there came no such almug-trees, nor were seen, unto this day” (1 Kings 10:12). The wood was evidently very precious and apparently came from East Asia — unless we suppose from 2 Chronicles 2:8 that it actually grew on Lebanon, which is highly improbable; it was evidently a fine, close grained wood, suitable for carving. Tradition says that this was the famous sandal wood, which was in ancient times put to similar uses in India and was all through the ages highly prized for its color, fragrance, durability and texture. It is the wood of a tree, Pterocarpus santalinus (N.D. Santalaceae), which grows to a height of 25 to 30 feet; it is a native of the mountains of Malabar.

E. W. G. Masterman

ALIAH

<al’-a> (ךליא [‘alyah]): One of the dukes, or heads of thousands of Edom (1 Chronicles 1:51). In Genesis 36:40 the name is Alvah (ךליא [‘alwah]), the only difference being the change of the weaker [w], of Genesis to the somewhat stronger, [y], of the later Chronicles, a change which is not infrequent in Hebrew. He is not to be confused, as in HDB, with the Alian of the same chapter.

ALIAN

<al’-an> (ךליא [‘alian]): A descendant of Esau, and son of Shobal (1 Chronicles 1:40). In the corresponding earlier genealogy (Genesis 36:23) the same person is given as Alvan (ךליא [‘alwan]), the change of the third consonant being a simple one, common to Hebrew, occurring similarly in Aliah (which see). Alian is not to be identified with Aliah, since the groups of names in which these occur are quite different, and the context in each case is not the same.
ALIEN

<al’-yen>: Found in the King James Version for יֵצֵא [ger], (Exodus 18:3) = “guest,” hence: “foreigner,” “sojourner” the Revised Version (British and American); also for נָכָר [nekhar] (Isaiah 61:5) = “foreign,” “a foreigner” the Revised Version (British and American) (concrete), “heathendom” (abstract), “alien,” “strange” (-er), and for נֹכְרי [nokhri] (Deuteronomy 14:21 the Revised Version (British and American) “foreigner”; compare Job 19:15; Psalm 69:8; Lamentations 5:2) — ”strange,” in a variety of degrees and meanings: “foreign,” “non-relative,” “adulterous,” “different,” “wonderful,” “alien,” “outlandish,” “strange.” In the New Testament we find ἀπολλοτριώμενος, apollotiromenos (Ephesians 4:18; Colossians 1:21) = “being alienated,” and allotrios (Hebrews 11:34) = “another’s,” “not one’s own,” hence: “foreign,” “not akin,” “hostile.” In the Old Testament the expression was taken in its literal sense, referring to those who were not Israelites — the heathen; in the New Testament it is given a figurative meaning, as indicating those who have not become naturalized in the kingdom of God, hence are outside of Christ and the blessing of the gospel.

Frank E. Hirsch

ALIENATE

<al’-yen-at> (עב [abhar]; ἀπολλοτριόω, apollotiioo), “to estrange from”): In Old Testament, for the break between husband and wife caused by unfaithfulness to the marriage vow (Jeremiah 6:8; Ezekiel 23:17); also applied to the diversion of property (Ezekiel 48:14). In New Testament, spiritually, for the turning of the soul from God (Ephesians 2:12; Colossians 1:21). The Greek allotrios, which is the root of the verb, is the opposite of ἴδιος, “one’s own.” The word implies a former state, whence the person or thing has departed, and that, generally, by deterioration.

ALIVE

<a-liv’> (חי [chai], “living”; ζωο, zao, “to live,” ἀναζω, anazao), “to live again”): These Hebrew and Greek originals are the chief terms for
life in both Testaments. They cover all life, including soul and spirit, although primarily referring to physical vitality. Striking examples may be cited: “Is your father yet alive?” (Genesis 43:7); “To whom he also showed himself alive” (Acts 1:3). Often used of God: “the living God” (Joshua 3:10); also of the resurrection life: “In Christ shall all be made alive” (1 Corinthians 15:22); of the soul’s regenerate life: “Reckon .... yourselves .... alive unto God,” “as those that are alive from the dead” (Romans 6:11:13 the King James Version). The term is vital with the creative energy of God; the healing, redemptive, resurrection life of Christ; the renewing and recreative power of the Holy Spirit.

_Dwight M. Pratt_

**ALL**

*<ol>*: Used in various combinations, and with different meanings.

1. All along, “Weeping all along as he went” (Jeremiah 41:6), i.e. throughout the whole way he went, feigning equal concern with the men from Shiloh, etc., for the destruction of the Temple, so as to put them off their guard.

2. All in all, “That God may be all in all” (1 Corinthians 15:28, Greek: _panta en pasin_, “all things in all (persons and) things”). “The universe, with all it comprises, will wholly answer to God’s will and reflect His mind” (Dummelow).

3. All one, “It is all one” (Job 9:22), “it makes no difference whether I live or die.”

4. At all, “If thy father miss me at all” (1 Samuel 20:6), “in any way,” “in the least.”

5. All to, “All to brake his skull” (Judges 9:53 the King James Version) an obsolete form signifying “altogether”; “broke his skull in pieces.”

6. Often used indefinitely of a large number or a great part, “All the cattle of Egypt died” (Exodus 9:6; compare 9:19,25); “all Judea, and all the region round about” (Matthew 3:5); “that all the world should be
enrolled” (Luke 2:1); “all Asia and the world” (Acts 19:27); “All (people) verily held John to be a prophet” (Mark 11:32).

M. O. Evans

ALLAMMELECH

<\textit{a-lam’-e-lek} (אַלָּמֶלֶךְ, [’allammelekh], “oak of a king”): A town in the tribe of Asher, the location of which is not known (Joshua 19:26; the King James Version Alammelech).

ALLAR

<\textit{al’-ar} (the King James Version, Aalar; [Αλάρ, Aalar]): Occurring once (1 Esdras 5:36) and used apparently to indicate a place from which certain Jews came on the return from captivity, who could not prove their lineage, and were excluded for this reason from the privileges of the priesthood. HDB identifies with Immer of Ezra 2:59 and Nehemiah 7:61 (which see), but this is not at all certain.

ALLAY

<\textit{a-la’} ([הֵנִיח, heniach], “to cause to rest,” “soothe”: “Gentleness allayeth (lit., “pacifieth”) great offenses” (Ecclesiastes 10:4)): The word is applied to what “excites, disturbs and makes uneasy” (Smith, Synonyms Discriminated, 106).

ALLEGE

<\textit{a-lej’} ([παρατιθημι, paratithemi], “to set forth,” Acts 17:3): It is not used in the English Bible in its more modern and usual sense, “to assert,” but is about equivalent to “to prove.”

ALLEGIANC

<\textit{a-le’-jans} ([משמר, mishmereth], “a charge,” from shamar, “to keep,” I Chronicles 12:29): the Revised Version, margin gives as literal meaning, “kept the charge of the house of Saul,” which revisers consider figurative for “maintaining their loyalty and fidelity,” i.e. “allegiance.”
ALLEGORY

<al’-e-go-ri>: The term allegory, being derived from [ἀλλο ἀγορεύειν, allo agoreuein], signifying to say something different from what the words themselves imply, can etymologically be applied to any figurative form of expression of thought. In actual usage in theology, the term is employed in a restricted sense, being used however in three ways, namely, rhetorically, hermeneutically and homiletically. In the first-mentioned sense it is the ordinary allegory of rhetoric, which is usually defined as an extended or continued metaphor, this extension expanding from two or more statements to a whole volume, like Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress. Allegories of this character abound in the Scriptures, both in Old Testament and in New Testament. Instructive examples of this kind are found in Psalm 80:8-19; Ecclesiastes 12:3-7; John 10:1-16; Ephesians 6:11-17. According to traditional interpretation of both the Jewish exegesis and of the Catholic and Protestant churches the entire book of Canticles is such an allegory. The subject is discussed in full in Terry’s Biblical Hermeneutics, etc., chapter vii, 214-38.

In the history of Biblical exegesis allegory represents a distinct type of interpretation, dating back to pre-Christian times, practiced particularly by the Alexandrian Jews, and adopted by the early Church Fathers and still practiced and defended by the Roman Catholic church. This method insists that the literal sense, particularly of historical passages, does not exhaust the divinely purposed meaning of such passages, but that these latter also include a deeper and higher spiritual and mystical sense. The fourfold sense ascribed to the Scriptures finds its expression in the well-known saying: Littera gesta docet; quid credas, allegorica; moralis, quid agas, quid speres, anagogica (“The letter shows things done; what you are to believe, the allegoric; what you are to do, the moral; what you are to hope, the anagogic”), according to which the allegorical is the hidden dogmatical meaning to be found in every passage. Cremer, in his Biblico-Theological New Testament Lexicon, shows that this method of finding a hidden thought behind the simple statement of a passage, although practiced so extensively on the Jewish side by Aristobulus and especially Philo, is not of Jewish origin, but was, particularly by the latter, taken from the Alexandrian Greeks (who before this had interpreted Greek mythology as the expression of higher religious conceptions) and applied to a deeper
explanation of Old Testament historical data, together with its theophanies, anthropomorphisms, anthropopathies, and the like, which in their plain meaning were regarded as unworthy of a place in the Divine revelation of the Scriptures. Such allegorizing became the common custom of the early Christian church, although not practiced to the same extent in all sections, the Syrian church exhibiting the greatest degree of sobriety in this respect. In this only Jewish precedent was followed; the paraphrases commonly known as the Targum, the Midrash, and later in its most extreme form in the Kabbalah, all showed this mark of eisegesis instead of exegesis. This whole false hermeneutical principle and its application originated doubtless in an unhistorical conception of what the Scriptures are and how they originated. It is characteristic of the New Testament, and one of the evidences of its inspiration, that in the entire Biblical literature of that age, both Jewish and Christian, it is the only book that does not practice allegorizing but abides by the principle of the literal interpretation. Nor is Paul’s exegesis in Galatians 4:21-31 an application of false allegorical methods. Here in 4:24 the term \textit{allegoroumena} need not be taken in the technical sense as expressive of a method of interpretation, but merely as a paraphrase of the preceding thought; or, if taken technically, the whole can be regarded as an argumentum ad hominem, a way of demonstration found also elsewhere in Paul’s writings. The Protestant church, beginning with Luther, has at all times rejected this allegorizing and adhered to the safe and sane principle, practiced by Christ and the entire New Testament, namely, \textit{Sensum ne inferas, sed efferas} (“Do not carry a meaning into (the Scriptures) but draw it out of (the Scriptures)”). It is true that the older Protestant theology still adheres to a sensus mysticus in the Scriptures, but by this it means those passages in which the sense is conveyed not \textit{per verba} (through words), but \textit{per res verbis descriptas} (“through things described by means of words”), as e.g. in the parable and the type.

In homiletics allegorizing is applied to the method which draws spiritual truths from common historical statements, as e.g. when the healing of a leper by Christ is made the basis of an exposition of the healing of the soul by the Saviour. Naturally this is not interpretation in the exegetical sense.

\textit{G. H. Schodde}
ALLELUIA

<al-e-loo’-ya>.

See HALLELUJAH.

ALLEMETH

<al’-e-meth> (בָּלֶמֶת [’allemeth], “concealment”; the King James Version Alemeth, 1 Chronicles 6:60): Name of a town in tribe of Benjamin, near Anathoth, one of the cities given to the sons of Aaron, the same as Almon of Joshua 21:18. The King James Version ALEMETH (which see) is based upon the Hebrew reading בָּלֶמֶת [’alemeth]. Its site is the modern Almit, a village a short distance Northeast of Anathoth.

ALLIANCE

<a-li’-ans>.

1. IN THE PATRIARCHAL STORIES:

Frequent references are made to alliances between the patriarchs and foreigners. Abraham is reported to have had “confederates” among the chiefs of the Canaanites (Genesis 14:13). He also allied with Abimelech, king of Gerar (Genesis 21:22-34). Isaac’s alliance with Abimelech (Genesis 26:26-34), which is offered as an explanation of the name Beer-sheba (Genesis 26:33), appears to be a variant of the record of alliance between Abraham and Abimelech. Jacob formed an alliance with Laban, the Syrian (Genesis 31:44-54), by which Gilead was established as a boundary line between Israel and Aramaic. These treaties refer, in all probability, to the early period of Israel’s history, and throw a good deal of light upon the relation between Israel and the Philistines and the Syrians immediately after the conquest of Canaan.

2. IN PRE-CANAANITIC HISTORY:

The only reference to an alliance between Israel and foreign people prior to the conquest of Canaan, that might be regarded as historical, is that made between Israel and the Kenite tribes at the foot of Sinai, the precise nature of which, however, is not very clearly indicated. Such alliances led to
intermarriages between the members of the allied tribes. Thus Moses married a Kenite woman ( Judges 1:16; 4:11). The patriarchal marriages refer to the existing conditions after the conquest. Possibly one more alliance belonging to that period is that between Israel and Moab ( Numbers 25:1-3). According to the narrative, Israel became attached to the daughters of Moab, at Shittim, and was led astray after Baal-peor. Its historicity is proven from the prophetic allusions to this event (compare Hosea 9:10; Micah 6:5).

3. DURING THE CONQUEST:

The invading hordes of Israel met with strong opposition on the part of the natives of Palestine ( Judges 1:21,27-36). In time, alliances were formed with some of them, which generally led, as might be expected, to considerable trouble. One concrete illustration is preserved in the story of the Gibeonites (Joshua 9). Intermarriages were frequent. The tribe of Judah thus became consolidated through the alliance and the amalgamation with the Kenites and Calebites ( Judges 1:10-16). These relations between Israel and the Canaanites threatened the preservation of Yahwism.

4. THE MONARCHY:

Prohibitory measures were adopted in the legal codes with a view to Jewish separateness and purity ( Exodus 23:32; 34:12,15; Deuteronomy 7:2; compare Judges 2:2,3; Leviticus 18:3,4; 20:22 f). But at a very early date in the history of the Jewish kingdom the official heads of the people formed such alliances and intermarried. David became an ally to Achish of Gath ( 1 Samuel 27:2-12) and later on with Abner, which led to the consolidation of Judah and Israel into one kingdom ( 2 Samuel 3:17-21; 5:1-3). It appears likewise that Toi, king of Hamath, formed an alliance with David ( 2 Samuel 9:10) and that Hiram of Tyre was his ally ( 1 Kings 5:12a). Alliances wrath foreign nations became essential to the progress of trade and commerce during the reign of Solomon. Two of his treaties are recorded: one with Hiram of Tyre ( 1 Kings 5:12-18; 9:11-14) and one with Pharaoh, king of Egypt ( 1 Kings 9:16).
5. THE DIVIDED KINGDOM:

After the disruption, Shishak of Egypt invaded Judea, and probably also Israel. This meant an abrogation of the treaty existing between Israel and Egypt during the reign of Solomon. In consequence of the war between the two kingdoms, Asa formed an alliance with Benhadad of Syria (1 Kings 15:18-20). Later on Ahab sought an alliance with Ben-hadad (1 Kings 20:31-34). Friendly relations ensued between Israel and Judah, during the reign of Jehoshaphat, which continued to the close of the dynasty of Omri (1 Kings 22:2-4,50; 2 Kings 3:7). With the accession of Jehu, hostilities were resumed. In the Syro-Ephraimitic war, Israel was allied with Syria, and Judah with Assyria (2 Kings 16:6-9; Isaiah 7). This opened the way to the Assyrian power into both kingdoms. Relief against Assyria was sought in Egypt; Hoshea rebelled against Shalmaneser, and allied with So (Sevechus, the Shabaka of the 25th Dynasty) and thus brought about the fall of Samaria.

6. THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH:

Hezekiah likewise sought an alliance with So, but derived no assistance from him. He is recorded to have formed friendly relations with Berodach-baladan of Babylon (2 Kings 20:12-18). These alliances resulted in the introduction of foreign cults into Jerusalem (2 Kings 16:10,11). During the reign of Manasseh, Yahwism was seriously threatened by foreign religious practices (2 Kings 21:2-9). The protesting spirit against the prevailing conditions found expression in the Deuteronomic code, which emphasizes the national policy. Josiah fought against Pharaoh-necoh as an ally of Assyria (2 Kings 23:29). Jehoahaz continued the Assyrian alliance and was dethroned in consequence by Pharaoh-necoh (2 Kings 23:33). Jehoiakin was disposed to be friendly with Egypt, and even after his subjection to Nebuchadnezzar, he remained loyal to the Pharaoh (2 Kings 23:35). Zedekiah came to the throne as an ally of Babylon. When he broke this alliance, the destruction of Jerusalem resulted (2 Kings 25).

7. IN POST-EXILIC TIMES:

Judas Maccabeus sought an alliance with the Romans (1 Macc 8; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 6) which was renewed by Jonathan (1 Macc 12:1;
Ant, XIII, v, 8) and by Simon (1 Macc 15:17; Ant, XIII, vii, 3). Treaties were concluded with the Spartans (1 Macc 12:2; 14:20; Ant, XII, iv, 10; XIII, v, 8). The Roman alliance was again renewed by Hyrcanus about 128 BC (Ant., XIII, ix, 2). This alliance proved to be of fatal consequence to the independence of the Jews (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; and xiv, 5). For the rites connected with the formation of the earlier alliances, see COVENANT.

Samuel Cohon

ALLIED

<a-lid’> (גַּרְרוּל, qarobh), “near,” as in Genesis 45:10; Exodus 13:17, etc.): Nehemiah 13:4 refers either to family ties, as in Ruth 2:20, or to intimate association.

ALLOM

<al’-om> ([Ἀλλων, Allon]): the Revised Version (British and American) & ALLON (which see): One of the families of the “servants of Solomon,” whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon in the First Return, 537 BC (1 Esdras 5:34). The name is not found in the parallel lists of Ezra and Nehemiah, although some have tried to identify with the last name of each list, Ami of Ezra 2:57, and Amon of Nehemiah 7:59. This is not probable.

ALLON

<al’-on> ([אָלֹן, ‘allon], “oak”):

(1) A town in the tribe of Naphtali in northern Palestine (Joshua 19:33), according to the King James Version, which follows some Hebrew texts. It is better however to read with the Revised Version (British and American), “oak” ([’elon]), rather than as proper noun.

(2) A prominent descendant of the tribe of Simeon (1 Chronicles 4:37).

(3) the Revised Version (British and American) for Allom of the King James Version in 1 Esdras 5:34 (which see).
**ALLON-BACUTH**

<al’-on-ba’-kuth> (אַלֹּן בַּכְוָה [’allon bakhuth]; the King James Version transliterates Allon-bachuth, [al-on-bak’uth], “oak of weeping”): The burial place of Deborah, the nurse of Rebekah (Genesis 35:8); it appears from the narrative that she made her home with Jacob, who had returned from Paddan-aram, and was sojourning at the time at Bethel, in the vicinity of which was the “oak of weeping,” under which she was buried.

**ALLOW; ALLOWANCE**

<a-lou’>, <a-lou’-ans>: The verb “to allow” is used in the King James Version to translate four different Greek words:


3. **ginosko**, “to know,” “recognize”: “That which I do, I allow not” (the Revised Version (British and American) “I know not”), i.e. “I do not understand what I am doing, my conduct is inexplicable to me” (Grimm-Thayer); Romans 7:15.

4. **dokimazo**, “to prove,” “approve.” “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth” (the Revised Version (British and American) “approveth,” i.e. in practice), i.e. who is not troubled with scruples; Romans 14:22. Thus the Revised Version (British and American) has removed the verb “allow” in each case in which it occurs in the King James Version, it being somewhat ambiguous in meaning (its original sense, as derived from Latin allocate, “to place,” “assign,” “grant,” being influenced by another word, Latin allaudare, “to praise”). The noun “allowance” occurs in the sense of quantity of food allowed, in 2 Kings 25:30 (King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) and the parallel passage Jeremiah 52:34 (RV; “diet” in the King James Version).


**ALLOY**

\(<a-loi’>\) ([בָּדִילים] [bedhil]): In \(^{\text{ס}}\text{Isaiah 1:25}\) the Revised Version, margin; translated “tin” in the text. Elsewhere in both versions [bedhil] is translated &TIN (which see).

**ALLURE**

\(<a-lur’>\) ([פָּתָח] [pathah], “to persuade,” “woo,” “entice”; [διαλέγω, deleazo], “to entrap,” “lay a bait”):

1. “I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness” (\(^{\text{ס}}\text{Hosea 2:14}\)), with evident reference to the Assyrian invasion and the devastation of the land, followed up by the Exile. Thus would Yahweh entice Israel to repent by gentle punishment; then would follow her restoration and the outpouring of His love (\(^{\text{ס}}\text{Hosea 2:14 ff}\)).

2. “They allure through the lusts of the flesh” (\(^{\text{ד}}\text{2 Peter 2:18}\), the Revised Version (British and American) “entice”). Wicked men allure to destruction; God (as above) allures to punishment, repentance and restoration.

**ALMIGHTY**

\(<\text{ol-mi’t’-i}>\):

1. ([שדיא] [shaddai] (\(^{\text{כ}}\text{Genesis 17:1}\)): Found in the Old Testament forty-eight times, most of these in the Book of Job; it occurs either alone or in combination with [‘ט, “God”]). The root meaning is uncertain.

2. ([παντοκράτωρ, pantokrator]), the exclusive translation of this Greek word in the New Testament, found principally in Revelation (nine times), once besides (\(^{\text{ד}}\text{2 Corinthians 6:18}\). Its occurrence in the Apocrypha is frequent.
See GOD, NAMES OF.

ALMODAD

<al-mo’-dad> (אַלֹמְדָדָד [‘almodhadh], “the beloved,” or, “God is beloved”): The first mentioned of the thirteen sons of Joktan (Genesis 10:25-29; 1 Chronicles 1:19-23). A south Arabian name, and pointing to a south Arabian tribe.

See ABIMAEL.

ALMON

<al’-mon> (אַלֹמִן [‘almon], “hidden”): A Levitical city in the tribe of Benjamin (Joshua 21:18), the same as “Allemeth” the Revised Version (British and American), “Alemeth” the King James Version, of 1 Chronicles 6:60 (which see).

ALMON-DIBLATHAIM

<al’-mon-dib-la-tha’-im> (אַלֹמִון דִּבְלַתְתָּאִים [‘almon dibhlathayim], “Almon of the double cake of figs”): A station in the wilderness journeyings of the Israelites, located in Moab between Diban-gad and the mountains of Abarim (Numbers 33:46,47). It was near the end of the forty years’ wanderings. The name was probably given because the location was like two lumps of pressed figs. In both occurrences the word has the accusative ending of direction, and should properly be read: “Almon toward Diblathaim.” It was probably the same place as Beth-diblathaim of Jeremiah 48:22, mentioned in the prophet’s oracle against Moab.

ALMOND

<a’-mund>:

(1) [shaqedh], Genesis 43:11; Numbers 17:8, etc. The word shaked comes from a Hebrew root meaning to “watch” or “wait.” In Jeremiah 1:11,12 there is a play on the word, “And I said, I see a rod of
an almond-tree ([shaqedh]). Then said Yahweh unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will watch ([shoqedh]) over my word to perform it.”

(2) לְעַז [luz]; the King James Version hazel, ֶהֶלְקֶנֶגֶנֶסֶג 30:37; lauz is the modern Arabic name for “almond” — Luz was the old name of Bethel (which see).

1. ALMOND TREE:

The almond tree is mentioned in ֶהֶלֶכְכֶשָּׁש 12:5, where in the description of old age it says “the almond-tree shall blossom.” The reference is probably to the white hair of age. An almond tree in full bloom upon a distant hillside has a certain likeness to a head of white hair.

2. A ROD OF ALMOND:

A rod of almond is referred to ֶהֶלֶכְכֶשָּׁש 30:37, where “Jacob took him rods of fresh poplar, and of the almond ([luz]) and of the plane-tree; and peeled white streaks in them” as a means of securing “ring-streaked, speckled, and spotted” lambs and goats — a proceeding founded doubtless upon some ancient folklore. Aaron’s rod that budded (ֶהֶלֶכְכֶשָּׁש 17:2,3) was an almond rod. Also see ֶהֶלֶכְכֶשָּׁש 1:11 referred to above.

3. THE BLOSSOMS:

The blossoms of the almond are mentioned ֶהֶלֶכְכֶשָּׁש 25:33 f; 37:19 f, etc. “Cups made like almond-blossoms in one branch, a knop (i.e. knob) and a flower,” is the description given of parts of the sacred candlesticks. It is doubtful exactly what was intended — the most probable is, as Dillmann has suggested, that the cup was modeled after the calyx of the almond flower.

See CANDLESTICK.

4. THE FRUIT:

Israel directed his sons (ֶהֶלֶכְכֶשָּׁש 43:11) to carry almonds as part of their present to Joseph in Egypt. Palestine is a land where the almond flourishes, whereas in Egypt it would appear to have been uncommon.
Almonds are today esteemed a delicacy; they are eaten salted or beaten into a pulp with sugar like the familiar German Marzipan.

The almond is Amygdalus communis (N.O. Rosaceae), a tree very similar to the peach. The common variety grows to the height of 25 feet and produces an abundant blossom which appears before the leaves; In Palestine this is fully out at the end of January or beginning of February; it is the harbinger of spring. This early blossoming is supposed to be the origin of the name [shaqedh] which contains the idea of “early.” The masses of almond trees in full bloom in some parts of Palestine make a very beautiful and striking sight. The bloom of some varieties is almost pure white, from a little distance, in other parts the delicate pink, always present at the inner part of the petals, is diffused enough to give a pink blush to the whole blossom. The fruit is a drupe with a dry fibrous or woody husk which splits into two halves as the fruit ripens. The common wild variety grows a kernel which is bitter from the presence of a substance called amygdalon, which yields in its turn prussic (hydrocyanic) acid. Young trees are grafted with cuttings from the sweet variety or are budded with apricot, peach or plum.

E. W. G. Masterman

ALMOST

<ol’-most> ([ἐν ὀλίγῳ, en oligo]): In Acts 26:28 the Greek en oligo does not mean “almost,” although scholars have for centuries translated the clause “Almost thou persuadest me to become a Christian.” The revisers saw clearly the errors of their predecessors, so far as the signification of the first two words is concerned; but their explanation of the sentence is also erroneous; for the Greek cannot mean “With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian.” Paul’s reply proves that en oligo must be taken with the last word poiesai, not with peitheis, since he takes up Agrippa’s en oligo, couples it with en megalo and continues with genesthai which is the regular passive of poiesai (compare Lysias xii.71 with 72). And the idea of “Christian” is also taken up and repeated in hopoios kai ego eimi.
An investigation of the usage of *en oligo* shows that it was never used in the sense of “almost.” Soil from the peoples, mostly of their own blood, who have given up

The phrase occurs first in the Hymn to Hermes, 240, and here it is evidently an abbreviated expression for the Homeric [ὅλιγῳ ἐνὶ χῶρῳ, oligo eni choro] (M 423). Compare K 161, P 394. But it was used for both time and place, with the substantive expressed or understood (Thuc. i.93.1; iii.66.3; iv.26.3; iv.55.3; ii.84.3; ii.86.5; iv.96.3; v.112; vii.67.3; vii.87.1; Pind. Pyth. viii.131; Eur. Suppl. 1126; Hel. 771; Isoc. iv.83; Dem. lviii.60; iii.18). These uses persist from Homer far down into the post-classical literature (Plut. Per. 159 F; Coriol. 217 F; Mar. 427 A; Crass. 547 C; Polyb. x.18; Appian, Mithrad. 330; Themistius xi.143 C; Eustath. II.B, p.339.18). In the New Testament the phrase occurs also in Ephesians 3:3. Here too the common versions are incorrect. The clause in which the phrase occurs means simply, “as I said a little while ago” — the addition of *en oligo* merely indicates that the interval indicated by *pro* is short, an idea which would have been expressed in classical Greek by the simple dative, *oligo* and the adverb *proteron* (Ar. Thesm. 578; Aeschin. i. 2, 26, 72, 165; ii. 77, 147). Only a short while before Paul had expressed practically the same thought (Ephesians 3:3) and in almost identical language.

Consequently, *en oligo*, in the New Testament, means “a little,” and is equivalent to *oligos* which occurs in 2 Peter 2:18. In classical writers the idea would have been expressed by *oligon*, or *kat’ oligon*. So *en oligo*, which originally signified “in a little space” (or time), comes to mean simply “a little (bit),” ein bischen, but is never equivalent to *oligou* (“within a little”) in any period of the language. The King James translators disregarded the real significance of *poiesai*, or adopted the reading of the inferior manuscripts (*genesthai*), so as to make the rest of the sentence harmonize with their translation of the first two words; and the revisers force the last two words into an impossible service, since the object of *poiesai* of which *Christianon* is the lucrative predicate, must be a third person, but certainly not Agrippa. Some scholars are of the opinion that the thought is: “You are trying to persuade me so as to make me a Christian.” This is, indeed, the Spanish version; but examples show that the infinitive after [πείθειν, peithein] was used in a different sense. The
best manuscript reads [ΠΙΘΕΙΣ, PITHEIS]. This might, of course, stand for [πείθεις, peitheis]. But [μεπιθείς, mepitheis] may point to an original [μεπιποθείς, mepipotheis]. Compare James 4:5 and 2 Corinthians 5:2, Plato Leg. 855 E. If these contentions be correct, the verb means simply “earnestly desire,” and not “persuade.” Compare Herod. v.93; Plato Protag. 329 D; Aesch. Persian. 542; Soph. Phil. 534; Eur. H.F. 1408; I.T. 542; Cycl. 68; Ion 1432, Ar. Lys. 605, tou dei; ti potheis; Agrippa is asking, “What do you want, Paul? What are you trying to do? Make me a Christian?” The implication in Paul’s reply is that he is very desirous indeed of making him a Christian. And this interpretation harmonizes with the scene. The apostle’s business at this juncture is not to convert heathen to Christianity; for he is in chains before Agrippa, Berenice, Festus and prominent men of Caesarea, meta polles phantasias (Acts 26:23), to answer the charges brought against him by the Jews. But he holds forth at length and with such ardor that the Roman king says (though not necessarily in irony): “You seem to be anxious to make me a Christian in small measure.” And Paul responds: “both small and great.” All the manuscripts, except Sinaiticus, have [πείθεις, peitheis] (Alexandrinus [ΠΕΙΘΗ, PEITHE]). Several read genesthai (instead of poiesai). Wetstenius (Amsterdam 1752) and Knapp (Halle 1829) follow these manuscripts. So most of the old translates: Coverdale (1535), “Thou persuadest me in a parte to become a Christen”; Biblia Sacra (Paris 1745) “In modico suades me C. fieri”; a Latin MS, 14th century, now in Lane Semitic., Cincinnati; Rosenmueller’s Scholia (1829), “Parum abest quin mihi persuadeas ut fiam”; Stier und Theile’s Polyglotten Bibel (1849), Tregelles (1857-1879, with Jerome’s version); Edouard Reuss, Histoire apostolique (Paris 1876), “Tu vas me persuader bientot de devenir Chretien.” The translation of Queen Elizabeth’s Bible is “Somewhat thou bryngeste me in minde for to become Chryste.” Wycliffe renders “In litil thing thou counceliste me for to be maad a Christen man.” Erasmus takes en oligo in the sense of “a little.” Calvin’s rendering, “Thou writ make me a Christian in a moment,” has been adopted in various countries (Wetstenius, Kuinoel, Neander, de Wette, Lange, Robinson, Hackett, Conybeare). The older scholars generally hold to “almost” (Valla, Luther, Beza, Grotius, Castalio, Du Veil, Bengel, Stier). Some interpret the phrase “with little labor” (Oecumenius, Olshausen, Baumgarten, Meyer, Lechler). Neander maintains that if we adopt the readings en megalo in Paul’s
answer, Agrippa’s words must be explained “with a few reasons” (“which will not cost you much trouble”). Meyer-Wendt (Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch uber die Apostelgeschichte) translates “mit Weregem innerredest du mich Christ zu werden.” Meyer himself conceives the words to have been spoken sarcastically. Se Classical Review, XXII, 238-41.

J. E. Harry

ALMS; ALMSGIVING

<ams>, <ams-giv’-ing>: The English word “alms” is an abridged form of the Greek word, [ἐλεμοσόνη, eleemosune] (compare “eleemosynary”), appearing in gradually reduced forms in German Almosen, Wyclif’s Almesse, Scotch Aw’mons, and our alms.

The later Jews often used “righteousness” [tsedhaqah] as meaning alms, that being in their view the foremost righteousness. (Compare our modern use of “charity” to denote almsgiving.) This use is seen in the Talmud and in the frequent translations of the Hebrew word for “righteousness” ([tsedhaqah]) by “alms” ([eleemosune]) in the Septuagint, though nothing warranting this is found in the Hebrew Old Testament, or in the true text of the New Testament. This notion of righteousness as alms being well-nigh universal among Jews in Jesus’ day, and spreading even among Christians, accounts for “alms” in Matthew 6:1, where the true text has “righteousness”: “Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them” (the Revised Version (British and American) with Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae, the Latin versions, etc.). The oriental versions which generally read “alms” may be accounted for on the supposition that “alms” was first written on the margin as explaining the supposed meaning of “righteousness,” and then, as according with this accepted oriental idea, was substituted for it in the text by the copyists.

Dikaiosune and eleemosune are both used in the Septuagint to translate [chesedh], “kindness,” and are also both used to translate [tsedhaqah], “justice.” Almsgiving was regarded not merely as a plain evidence of righteousness in general but also as an act of justice, a just debt owing to the needy. “No one refuses directly,” Mackie says, hence, possibly,
Christ’s teaching in Luke 11:41, “Let your righteousness (charity) be from within,” “Give your hearts to almsgiving.”

In the course of time the impulse and command to give alms in a true human way, out of pity, such as is found expressed in Deuteronomy 15:11 the King James Version, “Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land,” gave place to a formal, meritorious” practice, possessing, like sacrifice, as men came to think, the power of atoning for man’s sins, and redeeming him from calamity and death. For instance, Proverbs 11:4 (compare 16:6: 21:3) was expounded: “Water will quench blazing fire; so doth almsgiving make atonement for sins” (Ecclesiasticus 3:30). “Lay up alms in thy storehouse; it shall deliver thee from affliction” (Ecclesiasticus 29:12). The story of Tobit is especially in point: it is simply a lesson on almsgiving and its redeeming powers: “Alms delivers from death and will purge away all sin” (Tobit 1:3,16; 2:14; 4:7-11; 12:8,9. Compare Sirach 29:11 ff). Kindred teaching abounds in the Talmud: “Alms-giving is more excellent than all offerings,” is “equal to the whole law,” will “deliver from the condemnation of hell,” will “make one perfectly righteous,” etc. According to Rabbi Assi, “Almsgiving is a powerful paraclete between the Israelites and their Father in heaven, it brings the time of redemption nigh (Babha’ Bathra’ Talmud 10a).

The Roman Catholics, holding the books of Tobit and Sirach to be canonical, find in them proof-texts for their doctrine of almsgiving, and likewise attach great value to the gifts to the poor as atoning for sins. Protestants, by a natural reaction, have failed to hold always at its true value what was and is an important Christian duty (see Luke 12:33 the King James Version, and, compare Matthew 6:19-24: “Sell that ye have and give alms,” etc.). It seems to have been so regarded and kept up in the Christian communities until the beginning of the 4th century (Apos Const II 36; Cyprian, Deuteronomy Opera and Eleemos. xiv).

The teaching of Jesus on the subject is important, first, as bearing upon Jewish ideas and practices, and second, as bearing upon present-day Christian ideas and practices.

This teaching appears most conspicuously in the Sermon on the Mount. While showing what is required of the subjects of the Messianic reign, He
avowedly sets forth a higher and more spiritual morality than that which
was taught and practiced by the scribes and Pharisees: “Except your
righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees,
ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Matthew 5:20).
There, too, He lays down the general principle embodied in the words of
Matthew 6:1: “Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men,
to be seen of them,” and illustrates it by applying it to the three exercises
most valued among the Jews (commended together in Tobit 12:8), namely,
almsgiving (Matthew 6:2,4), prayer (Matthew 6:5-15), and fasting
(Matthew 6:16-18). Jewish writers claim that these are “the three
cardinal disciplines which the synagogue transmitted to the Christian
church and the Mohammedan mosque” (compare Koran, Sura 2 40, 104; 9
54).

Clearly what Jesus here forbids in general is not publicity in performing
good deeds, which is often necessary and proper, but ostentatious
publicity, for the purpose of attracting attention. (The Greek conveys
distinctly this idea of purpose, and the verb for “to be seen” is the one
from which comes our word “theater.”)

Jewish writers, as also Greek and Roman philosophers, have many notable
maxims upon the beauty and importance of being unostentatious in virtue,
especially in deeds of benevolence. The Essenes had their treasury in a
chamber of their own in the temple that both the giving and the taking
should be unobserved (Mishnah, Sheq., v.6). Rabbi Eleazer said, “Alms-
giving should be done in secret and not before men, for he who gives before
men is a sinner, and God shall bring also the good deed before his
judgment” (B.B. 9a; compare Ecclesiastes 12:14).

In applying this principle to almsgiving Jesus teaches His disciple: “When
... thou doest alms, sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do”
(Matthew 6:2). The conjecture of Calvin, followed by Stier and others,
and mentioned as early as Euthymius, that it was a practice among Jews
for an ostentatious almsgiver literally to sound a trumpet, or cause a
trumpet to be sounded before him, in public places to summon the needy
is without foundation (Lightfoot); as is also the notion, made current by
the rabbis and accepted by Edersheim (The Temple, etc., 26), that by
“sounding a trumpet” Jesus was alluding to the trumpet-like receptacles of
brass in the temple treasury. There is no proof that these were found “in the synagogues,” or “in the streets.” “Sound a trumpet,” according to the Greek commentators, and the best modern authorities, is merely a figurative expression common to many languages, for self-parade — efforts to attract notice and win applause (compare our vulgar English saying about “blowing your own horn”). The contrast with the common practice instituted by Jesus is the significant thing: “But when thou doest alms” — ”thou” is emphatic by position in the Greek — ”let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth,” etc., i.e. “So far from trumpeting your almsgiving before the public, do not even let it be known to yourself.” Jesus here, Calvin well says, “silently glances at a kind of folly which prevails everywhere among men, that they think they have lost their pares if there have not been many spectators of their virtues.” (The traditional saying of Mohammed, “In almsgiving, the left hand should not know what the right has given,” is evidently borrowed from this saying of Jesus.) It is worthy of note that, despite popular practice, to give alms with right motives, and only to those who were worthy to receive, was a matter of special solicitude and instruction with the best among Jews as well as among Christians. The words of the Psalmist, “Blessed is he that considereth the poor,” are construed to be an admonition to “take personal interest in him and not simply give him alms” (Lev. R. xxxiv). “When thou wilt do good, know to whom thou doest it. Give unto the good and help not the sinner” (Ecclesiasticus 12:1-6; compare Didache 1:5,6). “He that gives a free offering should give with a well-meaning eye” (Yer. B.D. 4 11). Jesus’ words concerning the “single” and the “evil” eye (compare Luke 11:34-36), and Paul’s teaching, “God loveth a cheerful giver” (2 Corinthians 9:7-9) have their counterparts in Jewish teaching. Rabbi Eleazer, referring to Hosea 10:12, taught this high doctrine. “The kindness displayed in the giving of alms decides the final reward” (Suk. 49b). Other kindred teaching in a way anticipated Jesus’ supreme lesson, “that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee” (Matthew 6:4).

**LITERATURE.**

Commentaries at the place Rabbinical literature in point. D. Cassel, Die Armenverwaltung des alten Israel, 1887.
ALMUG

<al’-mug>.

See ALGUM.

ALNATHAN

<al’-na-than> ([ Ἀλναθάν, Alnathan], “God has given,” the Revised Version (British and American) ELNATHAN): Apocryphal name of a person (1 Esdras 8:44) corresponding to Elnathan of Ezra 8:16. He was one of the learned men summoned by Ezra, as he was beginning his journey to Jerusalem, and sent to Iddo to ask for ministers for the house of Yahweh.

ALOES; LIGNALOES

<al’-oz>, <lin-al’-oz>, <lig-nal’-oz> (ʾāhalim, Numbers 24:6, translation “lign-aloës” (= lignum aloes, “wood of aloes”), Proverbs 7:17; ʾāhaloth, Psalm 45:8; Song 4:14; .PIPE, aloe], John 19:39): Mentioned as a substance for perfuming garments (Psalm 45:8) and beds (Proverbs 7:17). In Song 4:14, it occurs in a list of the most precious spices. The most memorable use of aloes as a spice is in John 19:39: “There came also Nicodemus, he who at the first came to him at night, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds.” This was an immense quantity and if the aloes bore any large proportion to the myrrh the mixture must have been purchased at a very high cost. The most difficult mention of aloes is the earliest where (Numbers 24:5, 6) Balaam in his blessing on Israel exclaims —

“How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, Thy tabernacles, O Israel! As valleys are they spread forth, As gardens by the river-side, As lign-aloes which Yahweh hath planted, As cedar-trees beside the waters.”

As the aloes in question grow in East Asia it is difficult to see how Balaam could have come to speak of them as living trees. Post (HDB, I, 69) suggests that they may possibly have been growing at that time in the
Jordan valley; this is both improbable and unnecessary. Balaam need have had no actual tree in his mind’s eye but may have mentioned the aloe as a tree famous over the Orient for its preciousness. That the reference is poetical rather than literal may be supposed by the expression in the next verse “cedar-trees beside the waters” — a situation very unnatural for the high-mountain-loving cedar. Yet another explanation is that the Hebrew has been altered and that מִלְתָּן [’elim], “terebinths” instead of מֵהלַת [’ahalim], “aloes” stood in the original text.

The aloe wood of the Bible is eaglewood — so misnamed by the Portuguese who confused the Malay name for it (agora) with the Latin aquila, “eagle” — a product of certain trees of the Natural Order Aquilariaeae, growing in Southeast Asia The two most valued varieties are Aquilaria malaccensis and Aloes agallocha — both fine spreading trees. The resin, which gives the fragrant quality to the wood, is formed almost entirely in the heart wood; logs are buried, the outer part decays while the inner, saturated with the resin, forms the “eagle wood” or “aloe wood” of commerce; “aloes” being the same wood in a finely powdered condition. To the Arabs this wood is known as [`ud]. It shows a beautiful graining and takes a high polish.

These aloes must be clearly distinguished from the well-known medicinal aloes, of ancient fame. This is a resin from Aloes socatrina, and allied species, of the Natural Order Liliaceae, originally from the island of Socotra, but now from Barbados, the Cape of Good Hope and other places. The “American aloe” (Agave americana) which today is cultivated in many parts of Palestine, is also quite distinct from the Biblical plant.

E. W. G. Masterman

ALOFT

<al Loft’> ([ἐπάνω, epano]): Only in 1 Esdras 8:92. Meaning obscure. The statement following a confession of sin means probably that Israel in penitence returning to the Lord, is exultant in the assurance of His forgiveness, and encouraged in efforts at reformation.
ALONG

<\textit{a-long'}>: Corresponding to two different Hebrew words, Judges 9:25; I Samuel 6:12; Jeremiah 41:6, joined with “come” and “go,” vividly describes a course that is taken — it emphasizes its directness and immediateness. In Judges 7:12, “lay along in the valley,” probably means “all the length” or “at length.”

ALOTH

<\textit{a'-loth}>(\textit{aloth}): So found in the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin in 1 Kings 4:16, where the Revised Version (British and American) has BEALOTH ([be`aloth]). A town, or district in northern Palestine, together with Asher under Baana, one of Solomon’s twelve civil officers. Conder identifies with the ruin `Alia, near Achzib. There was another Bealoth in southern Palestine (Joshua 15:24). The difference in the form of the word in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) is due to interpretation of the initial “b” as the preposition “in” in the former, and as part of the word itself in the latter.

ALPHA AND OMEGA

<\textit{al'-fa}, <\textit{o'-me-ga}, <\textit{o-me'-ga}>(Alpha and Omega = A and O): The first and last letters of the Greek alphabet, hence, symbolically, “beginning and end”; in Revelation “The Eternal One” in Revelation 1:8 of the Father, in Revelation 21:6 and Revelation 22:13 of the Son. Compare Theodoret, Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, iv. 8: “We used alpha down to omega, i.e. all.” A similar expression is found in Latin (Martial, v.26). Compare Aretas (Cramer’s Catenae Graecae in New Testament) on Revelation 1:8 and Tertullian (Monog, 5): “So also two Greek letters, the first and last, did the Lord put on Himself, symbols of the beginning and the end meeting in Him, in order that just as alpha rolls on to omega and omega returns again to alpha, so He might show that both the evolution of the beginning to the end is in Him and again the return of the end to the beginning.” Cyprian, Testim, ii.1; vi.22, iii.100, Paulinus of Nola Carm. xix.645; xxx.89; Prudentius, Cathem., ix.10-12. In Patristic and later literature the phrase is regularly applied to the Son. God blesses Israel
from ‘aleph to taw (Leviticus 26:3-13), but curses from waw to mem (Leviticus 26:14-43). So Abraham observed the whole law from ‘aleph to taw. Consequently, “Alpha and Omega” may be a Greek rendering of the Hebrew phrase, which expressed among the later Jews the whole extent of a thing.

J. E. Harry

**ALPHABET**

<al’-fa-bet>.

1. DEFINITION:

An alphabet is a list of the elementary sounds used in any language. More strictly speaking it is that particular series, commonly known as the Phoenician or Canaanite alphabet, which was in use in the region of Palestine about 1000 BC, and which is the ancestor of nearly all modern written alphabets whether Semitic or European. It is the alphabet therefore of Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic and New Testament Greek, of the superscription of Caesar and the Latin inscription on the cross, as well as of English through the Greek and Latin. It is an interesting fact, with many practical bearings on text and exegesis, that three sets of letters so very unlike in appearance as Hebrew, Greek and modern English should be the same in origin and alike in nature. Although the earliest surviving inscriptions must be a good deal later than the separation between the Greek and Hebrew, the records in each are more like one another than either is like its own modern printed form.

The characteristics of an alphabet are

1. the analysis of sounds into single letters rather than syllables or images,
2. the fixed order of succession in the letters,
3. the signs for the sounds, whether names or written symbols.

Of these the analysis into single letters, instead of whole words or syllables, is the characteristic element. The order of the letters may vary, as that of the Sanskrit does from the European, and yet the list remain not
only alphabetic but the “same” alphabet, i.e. each sound represented by a similar name or written character. On the face of it, therefore, it might be imagined that the Egyptian and Babylonian, the Cypriote, the Minoan and other forms earlier than the Canaanite which are known or suspected to have had phonetic systems, may have had lists of these forms arranged in a fixed order, but these lists were not alphabetic until the final analysis into individual letters.

2. NAME:

The name alphabet comes from the first two letters of the Greek, alpha beta, just as the old English name for the alphabet, abc or abece, is simply the first three letters of the English alphabet, and thus merely an abbreviation for the whole alphabet. It appears that the Greeks also used the first and last letters of the alphabet (alpha and omega) as the Jews did the first and last, or the first, middle and last letters of their alphabet, as abbreviation for the whole and in the same sense that in English one says “a to izzard.” Alpha and beta are themselves derived from the Semitic names for the same letters (‘aleph, beth) and have no meaning in the Greek.

3. INVENTION:

The question of the invention of this alphabet differs from the question of the origin of the written forms of the letters with which it is often confused, and relates to the recognition of the individual letters. Alphabetical language whether written or spoken, inward or outward, is distinguished from the pictographic, hieroglyphic, and syllabic stages by this analysis into individual sounds or letters. It begins with the picture, passes to the ideogram and syllable, and from the syllable to the letter. This is best seen in writing, but it is equally true in speech. At the letter stage the alphabet begins. It is alleged by some that another stage, a consonantal writing, between syllabic and alphabetic writing, should be recognized. This would deny to the Phoenician the character of a true alphabet since, as in all Semitic languages, the vowels were in ancient times not written at all. Some go so far as to speak of it as syllabic in character, but on the other hand it may be said with equal pertinence that various syllabaries are nearly alphabetic. When a syllabic writing is reduced, as was the case with the Egyptian, the Cypriote and others, to a point where
a character represents uniformly a certain consonant and a certain vowel, the vocal analysis has been made and the essential alphabet begun, although it was only later that men discovered that the consonant common to several syllables might be expressed to advantage in writing by one unvarying sign, and later still that the vowels too might be distinguished to advantage.

4. ORIGIN OF THE LETTERS:

Few modern questions are changing shape so rapidly as that of the historical predecessor of the Canaanite or Phoenician alphabet. For a long time it was thought that Deuteronomy Rouge had solved the problem by tracing the letters to the Egyptian hieratic. This is the view of most of the popular literature of the present time, but is wholly surrendered by most workers in the field now, in spite of the fact that the latest studies in hieratic show a still greater resemblance in forms (Moller, Hierat. Palaographie, 1909). Winckler and others have claimed derivation from the Cuneiform, Praetorius from the Cypriote, Sayce gets at least three letters from the Hittite, while Evans and others incline to believe that the Minoan was the direct source of the alphabet, introduced from Crete into Palestine by the Philistines who were Cretans, or at least that the two are from a common ancestor, which is also the ancestor of many other of the Mediterranean alphabets.

Some, like Evans and Mosso, even suggest that, perhaps through the Minoan, the letter forms may be traced to the pictographs of the neolithic era in the caves of Europe. There is, in fact, an extraordinary resemblance between some of the letters of the Phoenician alphabet and some of the conventionalized signs of the neolithic age, and it may not be too fantastic to imagine that these early signs are the historic ancestors of the written alphabetical characters, but that they were in any sense alphabetical themselves is impossible if the invention of the alphabet was historical as here supposed, and is unlike from any point of view.

If in fact the Paestos disk dates from before 1600 BC, and if Dr. Hempl’s resolution of it into Ionic Greek is sound, we have another possible source or stock of characters from which the inventor of the alphabet may have chosen (Harper’s Magazine, January, 1911).
5. NUMBER OF LETTERS:

The ideal written alphabet contains a separate character for each sound used in any or every language. Practically in most languages the alphabet falls a good deal short of the number of recognized sounds to be expressed in that language and in pronouncing dictionaries they have to be analyzed into say a broad, a short, a open, etc., by adding diacritical marks. “In educated English without regarding finer distinctions” (Edmonds, Comparative Philology, 45) about 50 sounds are commonly used, but Murray distinguishes at least 96, and the number sometimes used or which maybe used is much greater, the possible number of vowel sounds alone being as many as 72.

Moreover the individual letters differ in sound in different individuals, and even in the same individual in successive utterances of what would be called the same letter or the same sound. It is alleged that the average sound of the a for example, is never the same in any two languages; the a in “father,” even, is never the same in any two individuals, and that the same individual, even, never pronounces it twice so exactly in the same fashion that the difference may not be detected by sound photography.

The written alphabet is always thus less than the number of sounds used. The Phoenician and the Semitic alphabets generally had 22 letters, but they omitted the vowels. English has 26, of which many have two or more sounds.

6. NAMES OF THE LETTERS:

The names of the Greek alphabet are derived from the Semitic names and are meaningless in the Greek, while in the Semitic it has been pretty clearly shown that they signify for the most part some object or idea of which the earliest form of the written letter was a picture, as e.g. ‘aleph, the ox. The forms of the letters are apparently derived from pictures of the ox, house, etc., made linear and finally reduced to a purely conventional sign which was itself reduced to the simplest writing motion. All this has been boldly denied by Mr. Pilcher (PSBA, XXVI (1904), 168-73; XXVII (1905), 65-68), and the original forms declared to be geometric; but he does not seem to have made many converts, although he has started up rival claimants to his invention.
The names of the letters at least seem to indicate the Semitic origin of the alphabet, since the majority of them are the Semitic names for the objects which gave name to the letter, and the picture of which gives form to the written letter.

Following is Sayce’s list (PSBA, XXXII (1910), 215-22) with some variants:

1. ‘aleph = ox;
2. beth = house (tent);
3. gimel = camel;
4. daleth = door;
5. he = house;
6. waw = nail (Evans, tent peg);
7. zayin = weapon;
8. cheth = fence;
9. Teth = cake of bread (Lidzbarski, a package);
10. yodh = hand;
11. kaph = palm of hand;
12. lamedh = ox-goad;
13. mem = water flowing;
14. nun = fish;
15. camekh = ?;
16. ‘ayin = eye;
17. pe = mouth;
18. tsadhe = trap (others, hook or nose or steps),
19. qoph = cage (Evans says picture is an outline head and Lidzbarski, a helmet);
(20) resh = head;

(21) shin = tooth (not teeth);

(22) taw = mark. Not all of these meanings are, however, generally accepted (compare also Noldeke, Beitrage Strassb. (1904), 124-36; Lidzbarski, Ephemeris, II, 125-39).

7. ORDER OF LETTERS:

The order of the letters differs more or less in different languages, but it is in the main the same in all the Semitic and Western alphabets derived from the Phoenician alphabet and this is roughly the order of the English alphabet. This order is, however, full of minor variations even among the Western alphabets and in the Indian languages the letters are entirely regrouped on a different principle.

The conventional order of the Semitic alphabet may be traced with some certainty in the Biblical books to as early as the 6th century BC, even accepting the dates of a radical higher criticism, for there are more than a dozen passages in the Old Testament composed on the principle of the alphabetical acrostic (Pss 111; 112; 119; Proverbs 31:10-31; Lamentations 1; 2; 3; 4, etc.) and the oldest of these are of this period (see ACROSTIC). The Formello abecedarium, if it is in fact from the 7th century BC, carries the known order back a century farther still and shows it prevailing in Italy as well as Palestine. Moreover, there are those who still consider some of the alphabetical psalms older even than this.

It must be noted, however, that while the order is in general fixed, there are local and temporary differences. In several cases e.g. the order of the sixteenth and seventeenth letters of the alphabet is inverted in the alphabetical acrostics, and this would seem to point to a time or place where pe, ‘ayin, was the accepted order. It happens that the inversion occurs in both the passages which are counted earliest by the modern critics (G. B. Gray in HDB2, 8). Mr. Sayce too has recently altered or restored the order by relegating the original camekh to a place after shin, while Mr. Pilcher has quite reconstructed the original order on a geometrical basis, to his own taste at least, as brd; hvg; mnl; szt.
A certain grouping together of signs according to the relationship of the objects which they represent has often been noticed, and Sayce (PSBA, XXXII (1910), 215-22) thinks that he has (after having put camekh in its right place) reduced the whole matter to a sequence of pairs of things which belong together: ox-house, camel-tent door, house-nail, weapon-fence (city wall), bread-hand, open hand-arm with goad, water-fish, eye-mouth, trap-cage, head-tooth, camekh, taw. This arranging he thinks was done by someone who knew that ‘aluph was the West Semitic for “leader” and taw was the Cretan sign for ending — an Amorite therefore in touch with the Philistines. The final word on order seems not yet to have been spoken.

8. THE EARLIEST TEXTS:

The chief North Semitic texts are

(1) Moabite stone (circa 850 BC);
(2) inscriptions of Zkr, Zenjirli, etc. (circa 800 BC);
(3) Baal-Lebanon inscription (circa 750 BC);
(4) Siloam inscription (circa 700 BC);
(5) Harvard Samaritan ostraca (time of Ahab?);
(6) Gezer tablet;
(7) various weights and seals before 600 BC. The striking fact about the earliest inscriptions is that however remote geographically, there is on the whole so little difference in the forms of the letters. This is particularly true of the North Semitic inscriptions and tends to the inference that the invention was after all not so long before the surviving inscriptions. While the total amount of the earliest Palestine inscriptions is not even yet very large, the recent discovery of the Samaritan ostraca, the Gezer tablet, and various minor inscriptions, is at least pointing to a general use of Semitic writing in Palestine at least as early as the 9th century BC.
9. CHANGES IN LETTER FORMS:

The tendency of letters to change form in consequence of changed environment is not peculiar to alphabetical writing but is characteristic of the transmission of all sorts of writing. The morphology of alphabetical writing has however its own history. The best source for studying this on the Semitic side is Lidzbarski’s Handbuch (see below), and on the Greek side the best first source is E. S. Roberts, Introduction to Greek Epigraphy (Cambr.). The best synoptical statement of the Semitic is found in the admirable tables in the Jewish Encyclopedia, V, i, 449-53.

For the later evolution of both Greek and Latin alphabets, E. M. Thompson’s Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography, Oxford, 1912, is far the best Introduction. In this he takes account of the great finds of papyri which have so revolutionized the study of the forms of Greek letters around the beginning of the Christian era, since his first Handbook was published. (See articles on the text of Old Testament and New Testament.)

In the Hebrew, the old Phoenician alphabet of the early inscriptions had in the New Testament times given way to the square Aramaic characters of the modern Hebrew which possibly came into use as early as the time of Ezra.

The most comprehensive modern brief conspectus covering both Hebrew and Greek is that reproduced in this article from the little manual of Specht.

See also WRITING.

LITERATURE.

Isaac Taylor’s Alphabet (2nd ed., 1899) is still useful for orientation, and his article in the HDB likewise, but Edward Clodd’s little Story of the Alphabet (New York, 1907), taken with Faulmann’s Geschichte der Schrift and Buch der Schrift, is better for general purposes. For scientific purposes see the bibliography prefixed to Lidzbarski’s Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik (1898, 2 vols) and his Ephemeris passim to date, Evans’ Scripta minoa, Oxf., 1909, and the literature of the article WRITING in this Encyclopedia. See also C. G. Ball, “Origin of the

E. C. Richardson

ALPHAUEUS

<al-fe’-us> ([ Ἄλφαῖος, Alphaios]; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, [Αλφαῖος, Halphaios]):

(1) The father of the second James in the list of the apostles (Matthew 10:3; Mark 3:18; Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13).

(2) The father of Levi, the publican (Mark 2:14). Levi is designated as Matthew in the Gospel of Matthew (Matthew 9:9). There is no other reference to this Alpheus.

Some writers, notably Weiss, identify the father of Levi with the father of the second James. He says that James and Levi were undoubtedly brothers; but that seems improbable. If they were brothers they would quite likely be associated as are James and John, Andrew and Peter. Chrysostom says James and Levi had both been tax-gatherers before they became followers of Jesus. This tradition would not lend much weight as proof that they were brothers, for it might arise through identifying the two names, and the western manuscripts do identify them and read James instead of Levi in Mark 2:14. This, however, is undoubtedly a corruption of the text. If it had been the original it would be difficult to explain the substitution of an unknown Levi for James who is well known.

Many writers identify Alpheus, the father of the second James, with Clopas of John 19:25. This had early become a tradition, and Chrysostom believed they were the same person. This identity rests on four suppositions, all of which are doubtful:
(a) That the Mary of Clopas was the same as the Mary who was the mother of the second James. There is a difference of opinion as to whether “Mary of Clopas” should be understood to be the wife of Clopas or the daughter of Clopas, but the former is more probable. We know from Matthew 27:56 and Mark 15:40 that there was a James who was the son of Mary, and that this Mary belonged to that little group of women that was near Jesus it the time of the crucifixion. It is quite likely that this Mary is the one referred to in John 19:25. That would make James, the son of Mary of Matthew 27:56, the son of Mary of Clopas. But Mary was such a common name In the New Testament that this supposition cannot be proven.

(b) That the James, who was the son of Mary, was the same person as the James, the son of Alpheus. Granting the supposition under (a), this would not prove the identity of Clopas and Alpheus unless this supposition can also be proven, but it seems impossible to either prove it or disprove it.

(c) That Alpheus and Clopas are different variations of a common original, and that the variation has arisen from different pronunciations of the first letter “ch” of the Aramaic original. There are good scholars who both support and deny this theory.

(d) That Clopas had two names as was common at that time; but there is nothing to either substantiate or disprove this theory.

See CLOPAS.

It seems impossible to determine absolutely whether or not Alpheus, the father of the second James, and Clopas of John 19:25 are the same person, but it is quite probable that they are.

A. W. Fortune

ALSO

<ol'-so>: In the Greek [καί, kai], when it is equivalent to “also” or “even,” is always placed before the word or phrase which it is intended to emphasize (e.g. Acts 12:3; 1 John 4:21). Matthew 6:14 should therefore read, “Your heavenly Father will forgive you also”; Luke 6:13,
“Whom also he named apostles”; Hebrews 8:6, “The mediator of a better covenant also”; and 1 Thessalonians 4:14, `If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also (we believe that) those who are fallen asleep in Jesus, God will bring with Him.’

ALTANEUS

<al-ta-ne’-us>.

See MALTANNEUS (Apocrypha).

ALTAR

<ol’-ter> (מִזְבֵּחַ, literally, “place of slaughter or sacrifice,” from זבח, which is found in both senses; בּוֹמֹס, bomos], (only in Acts 17:23), θυσιαστήριον, thusiasterion]):

A. CRITICAL

I. Classification of Hebrew Altars.

Before considering the Biblical texts attention must be drawn to the fact that these texts know of at least two kinds of altars which were so different in appearance that no contemporary could possibly confuse them. The first was an altar consisting of earth or unhewn stones. It had no fixed shape, but varied with the materials. It might consist of a rock (Judges 13:19) or a single large stone (1 Samuel 14:33-35) or again a number of stones (1 Kings 18:31 f). It could have no horns, nor it would be impossible to give the stone horns without hewing it, nor would a heap of earth lend itself to the formation of horns. It could have no regular pattern for the same reason. On the other hand we meet with a group of passages that refer to altars of quite a different type. We read of horns, of fixed measurements, of a particular pattern, of bronze as the material. To bring home the difference more rapidly illustrations of the two types are given side by side. The first figure represents a cairn altar such as was in use in some other ancient religions. The second is a conjectural restoration of Hebrew altars of burnt offering and incense of the second kind.

Importance of the Distinction:
Both these might be and were called altars, but it is so evident that this common designation could not have caused any eye-witness to confuse the two that in reading the Bible we must carefully examine each text in turn and see to which kind the author is referring. Endless confusion has been caused, even in our own time, by the failure to note this distinction, and the reader can hope to make sense of the Biblical laws and narratives only if he be very careful to picture to himself in every case the exact object to which his text refers. For the sake of clearness different terms will be adopted in this article to denote the two kinds of altars. The first will be termed “lay altars” since, as will be seen, the Law permitted any layman to offer certain sacrifices at an altar of earth or unhewn stone without the assistance of a priest, while the second while be styled “horned altars,” owing to their possession of horns which, as already pointed out, could not exist in a lay altar that conformed with the provisions of the law.

II. Lay Altars.

1. Pre-Mosaic:

In Genesis we often read of the erection of altars, e.g. Genesis 8:20; Genesis 12:7; Genesis 13:4. Though no details are given we are able to infer their general character with considerable precision. In reading the accounts it is sometimes evident that we are dealing with some rough improvised structure. For example, when Abraham builds the altar for the sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22 it cannot be supposed that he used metal or wrought stone. When Jacob makes a covenant with Laban a heap of stones is thrown up “and they did eat there by the heap” (Genesis 31:46). This heap is not expressly termed an altar, but if this covenant be compared with later covenants it will be seen that in these its place is taken by an altar of the lay type (SBL, chapter 2), and it is reasonable to suppose that this heap was in fact used as an altar (compare Genesis 31:54). A further consideration is provided by the fact that the Arabs had a custom of using any stone as an altar for the nonce, and certainly such altars are found in the Mosaic and post-Mosaic history. We may therefore feel sure that the altars of Genesis were of the general type represented by Fig. 1 and were totally unlike the altars of Fig. 2.

2. In the Mosaic Age:
Thus Moses found a custom by which the Israelite threw up rude altars of the materials most easily obtained in the field and offered sacrificial worship to God on sundry occasions. That the custom was not peculiar to the Israelites is shown by such instances as that of Balaam (Numbers 23:1, etc.). Probably we may take the narrative of Jethro’s sacrifice as a fair example of the occasions on which such altars were used, for it cannot be supposed that Aaron and all the elders of Israel were openly committing an unlawful act when they ate bread with Moses’ father-in-law before God (Exodus 18:12). Again, the narrative in which we see Moses building an altar for the purposes of a covenant probably exemplifies a custom that was in use for other covenants that did not fall to be narrated (Exodus 24:4 ff).

3. Dangers of the Custom:

But a custom of erecting altars might easily lend itself to abuses. Thus archaeology has shown us one altar — though of a much later date — which is adorned with faces, a practice that was quite contrary to the Mosaic ideas of preserving a perfectly imageless worship. Other possible abuses were suggested by the current practices of the Canaanites or are explained by the terms of the laws.

See HIGH PLACE.

4. The Mosaic Provisions:

Accordingly Moses regulated these lay altars. Leaving the occasion of their erection and use to be determined by custom he promulgated the following laws: “An altar of earth mayest thou make unto me, and mayest sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen; in all the place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee. And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones; for if thou lift thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Neither mayest thou go up by steps unto mine altar,” etc. (Exodus 20:24-26; so correct English Versions of the Bible). Several remarks must be made on this law. It is a law for laymen, not priests. This is proved by the second person singular and also by the reason given for the prohibition of steps — since the priests were differently garbed. It applies “in all the place where I record my name,” not, as the ordinary rendering has it, “in
every place.” This latter is quite unintelligible: it is usually explained as meaning places hallowed by theophanies, but there are plenty of instances in the history of lay sacrifices where no theophany can be postulated; see e.g. Genesis 31:54; 1 Samuel 20:6, 29 (EPC, 185 f). “All the place” refers to the territory of Israel for the time being. When Naaman desired to cease sacrificing to any deity save the God of Israel he was confronted by the problem of deciding how he could sacrifice to Him outside this “place.” He solved it by asking for two mules’ burden of the earth of the “place” (2 Kings 5:17). Lastly, as already noticed, this law excludes the possibility of giving the altars horns or causing them to conform to any given pattern, since the stone could not be wrought One other law must be noticed in this connection: Deuteronomy 16:21 f: `Thou shalt not plant thee an ‘asherah of any kind of tree beside the altar of the Lord thy God, which thou shalt make thee. Neither shalt thou set thee up a pillar, which the Lord thy God hateth.’ Here again the reference is probably to the lay altars, not to the religious capital which was under the control of the priests.

III. Horned Altars of Burnt Offering.

1. The Tabernacle Altar:

In Exodus 27:1-8 (compare 38:1-7) a command is given to construct for the Tabernacle an altar of shittim wood covered with bronze. It was to be five cubits long by five broad and three high. The four corners were to have horns of one piece with it. A network of bronze was to reach halfway up the altar to a ledge. In some way that is defined only by reference to what was shown to Moses in the Mount the altar was to be hollow with planks, and it was to be equipped with rings and staves for facility of transport. The precise construction cannot be determined, and it is useless to speculate where the instructions are so plainly governed by what was seen by Moses in the Mount; but certain features that are important for the elucidation of the Bible texts emerge clearly. The altar is rectangular, presenting at the top a square surface with horns at the four corners. The more important material used is bronze, and the whole construction was as unlike that of the ordinary lay altar as possible. The use of this altar in the ritual of the Tabernacle falls under the heading SACRIFICES. Here we must notice that It was served by priests. Whenever we find references to the
horns of an altar or to its pattern we see that the writer is speaking of an
altar of this general type. Thus, a criminal seeking asylum fled to an altar
of this type, as appears from the horns which are mentioned in the two
historical instances and also from such expressions as coming down or
going up.

See ASYLUM.

2. The Altar of Joshua 22:

We read in Joshua 22:9 ff that the children of Reuben and the children of
Gad built an altar. In Joshua 22:28 we find them saying, “Be hold the
pattern of the altar,” etc. This is decisive as to the meaning, for the lay
altar had no pattern. Accordingly in its general shape this altar must have
conformed to the type of the Tabernacle altar. It was probably not made
of the same materials, for the word “build” is continually used in
connection with it, and this word would scarcely be appropriate for
working metal: nor again was it necessarily of the same size, but it was of
the same pattern: and it was designed to serve as a witness that the
descendants of the men who built it had a portion in the Lord. It seems to
follow that the pattern of the Tabernacle altar was distinctive and unlike
the heathen altars in general use in Palestine and this appears to be
confirmed by modern excavations which have revealed high places with
altars quite unlike those contemplated by the Pentateuch.

See HIGH PLACE.

3. The Altar till Solomon:

In the subsequent history till the erection of Solomon’s Temple attention
need only be directed to the fact that a horned altar existed while the Ark
was still housed in a tent. This is important for two reasons. It shows a
historical period in which a horned altar existed at the religious capital side
by side with a number of lay altars all over the country, and it negatives
the suggestion of G. A. Smith (Jerusalem, II, 64) that the bare rock ec-
Cakhra was used by Solomon as the altar, since the unhewn rock
obviously could not provide a horned altar such as we find as early as 1
Kings 1:50-53.

4. The Horned Altar in Use:
Note too that we read here of bringing down from the altar, and this expression implies elevation. Further in 1 Kings 9:25 we hear that Solomon was in the habit of offering on the altar which he had built, and this again proves that he had built an altar and did not merely use the temple rock. (See also Watson in PEFS (January, 1910), 15 ff, in reply to Smith.)

5. The Temple of Solomon:

For the reasons just given it is certain that Solomon used an altar of the horned type, but we have no account of the construction in Kings. According to a note preserved in the Septuagint but not in the Hebrew, Solomon enlarged the altar erected by David on Araunah’s threshing-floor (2 Samuel 24:25), but this notice is of very doubtful historical value and may be merely a glossator’s guess. According to 2 Chronicles 4:1 the altar was made of bronze and was twenty cubits by twenty by ten. The Chronicler’s dimensions are doubted by many, but the statement of the material is confirmed by 1 Kings 8:64; 2 Kings 16:10-15. From the latter passage it appears that an altar of bronze had been in use till the time of Ahaz.

6. The Altar of Ahaz:

This king saw an altar in Damascus of a different pattern and had a great altar made for the temple on its model. As the text contrasts the great altar with the altar of bronze, we may refer that the altar of Ahaz was not made of bronze. Whether either or both of these altars had steps (compare Ezekiel 43:17) or were approached by a slope as in Fig. 2 cannot be determined with certainty. It may be noted that in Isaiah 27:9 we read of the stones of the altar in a passage the reference of which is uncertain.

7. Ezekiel:

Ezekiel also gives a description of an altar (Ezekiel 43:13-17), but there is nothing to show whether it is purely ideal or represents the altar of Solomon or that of Ahaz, and modern writers take different views. In the vision it stood before the house (Ezekiel 40:47). In addition he describes an altar or table of wood (Ezekiel 41:22). This of course could only be a table, not in any sense an altar.
8. The Post-exilic Altar:

Ezra 3:2 f tells of the setting up of the altar by Zerubbabel and his contemporaries. No information as to its shape, etc., can be extracted from this notice. We read of a defilement of the temple altar in 1 Macc 1:54. This was made of stones (Exodus 20:24-26 having at this date been applied to the temple altar contrary to its original intent) and a fresh altar of whole stones was constructed (1 Macc 4:44-49). Presumably this altar had no horns.

9. Idolatrous and Unlawful Altars:

It is clear from the historical and prophetical books that in both kingdoms a number of unlawful altars were in use. The distinction which has been drawn between lay altars and horned altars helps to make these passages easy to understand. Thus when Amos in speaking of Bethel writes, “The horns of the altar shall be cut off,” we see that he is not thinking of lay altars which could have no horns (3:14). Again Hosea’s “Because Ephraim hath multiplied altars `to sin,’ altars have been to him `for sin’“ (8:11, compare 10:1-8; 12:11 (12)), is not in contradiction to Exodus 20:24-26 because the prophet is not speaking of lay altars. The high places of Jeroboam (1 Kings 12:28-33) were clearly unlawful and their altars were unlawful altars of the horned type. Such cases must be clearly distinguished from the lay altars of Saul and others.

10. The Horns:

The origin of the horns is unknown, though there are many theories. Fugitives caught hold of them (1 Kings 1:50,51), and victims could be tied to them (Psalm 118:27).

IV. Altars of Incense.

Exodus 30:1-10 contains the commands for the construction and use of an altar of incense. The material was shittim wood, the dimensions one cubit by one by two, and it also had horns. Its top and sides were overlaid with gold and it was surrounded by a crown or rim of gold. For facility of
transport it had golden rings and staves. It stood before the veil in front of the ark.

Solomon also constructed an altar of incense (1 Kings 6:20; 7:48; 1 Chronicles 28:18), cedar replacing shittim wood. The altar of incense reappears in 1 Macc 1:21; 4:49.

V. Recent Archaeological Materials.

Recently several altars have been revealed by excavations. They throw light on the Bible chiefly by showing what is forbidden.

See especially HIGH PLACE.

1. A Gezer Altar:

Fig. 3 represents an altar found at Gezer built into the foundation of a wall dating about 600 BC. Mr. Macalister describes it in the following words: “It is a four-sided block of limestone, 1 ft. 3 inches high. The top and bottom are approximately 10 1/2 and 9 inches square respectively; but these are only the average dimensions of the sides, which are not regularly cut. The angles are prolonged upward for an additional 1 1/2 inches as rounded knobs — no doubt the ‘horns’ of the altar. The top is very slightly concave so as to hold perhaps an eighth of a pint of liquid” (PEFS (July, 1907), 196 f). The size suggests an altar of incense rather than an altar of burnt offering, but in view of the general resemblance between the Tabernacle altars of burnt offering and incense, this is a fact of minor importance. On the other hand, the shape, pattern and material are of great interest. That the altar violates in principle the law of Exodus 20:25 forbidding the dressing of the stones is obvious, though that passage does not apply in terms to altars of incense, but certainly the appearance of the block does recall in a general way the altars of the other type — the horned altars. Like them it is four-sided with a square top, and like them it has knobs or horns at each corner. Possibly it was formed in general imitation of the Temple altars.

Other altars in Canaanite high places exemplify by their appearance the practices prohibited by the Pentateuch. See for illustrations H. Vincent, Canaan d’apres l’exploration recente; R. Kittel, Studien zur hebräischen
2. The Taanach Altar of Incense:

Importance attaches to a terra cotta altar of incense found by Sellin at Taanach, because its height and dimensions at the base recall the altar of Ex. “It was just 3 ft. high, and in shape roughly like a truncated pyramid, the four sides at the bottom being each 18 inches long, and the whole ending at the top in a bowl a foot in diameter. .... The altar is hollow. .... Professor Sellin places the date of the altar at about 700 BC. .... An incense-altar of exactly the same shape .... but of much smaller size .... has been found quite recently at Gezer in debris of about 1000-600 BC” (Driver, Modern Research, etc., 85). These discoveries supply a grim comment on theories of those critics who maintain that incense was not used by the Hebrews before the time of Jeremiah. The form of the altar itself is as contrary to the principles of the Pentateuch law as any thing could be.

On altar furniture see POTS; SHOVELS; BASINS; FLESH-HOOKS; FIREPANS. On the site, TEMPLE, and generally, ARIEL; SACRIFICE; SANCTUARY; TABERNACLE; HIGH PLACE.
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B. IN WORSHIP

I. In Worship: Tabernacle and Temples.

In the literature of the Bible, sacrifices are prior to altars, and altars prior to sacred buildings. Their first mention is in the case of the altar built by Noah after the Flood (Genesis 8:20).
1. Patriarchal Altars:

The next is the altar built at the place of Shechem, by which Abraham formally took possession, on behalf of his descendants, of the whole land of Canaan (Genesis 12:7). A second altar was built between Bethel and Ai (Genesis 12:8). To this the patriarch returned on his way from Egypt (Genesis 13:4). His next place of sacrifice was Hebron (Genesis 13:18); and tradition still professes to show the place where his altar stood. A subsequent altar was built on the top of a mountain in the land of Moriah for the sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22:9).

2. Sacred Sites:

Each of these four spots was the scene of some special revelation of Yahweh; possibly to the third of them (Hebron) we may attribute the memorable vision and covenant of Genesis 15. These sites became, in after years, the most venerated and coveted perquisites of the nation, and fights for their possession largely determined its history. To them Isaac added an altar at Beersheba (Genesis 26:25), probably a re-erection, on the same site, of an altar built by Abraham, whose home for many years was at Beersheba. Jacob built no new altars, but again and again repaired those at Shechem and Bethel. On one occasion he offered a sacrifice on one of the mountains of Gilead, but without mention of an altar (Genesis 31:54). There were thus four or five spots in Canaan associated at once with the worship of Yahweh, and the name of their great ancestor, which to Hebrews did not lose their sanctity by the passage of time, namely, Shechem, Bethel, Hebron, Moriah and Beersheba.

3. Pre-Tabernacle Altars:

The earliest provision for an altar as a portion of a fixed establishment of religion is found in Exodus 20:24-26, immediately after the promulgation of the Decalogue. Altars are commanded to be made of earth or of unhewn stone, yet so as to have, not steps, but only slopes for ascent to the same — the injunction implying that they stood on some elevation (see ALTAR, A, above). Before the arrival at Sinai, during the war with Amalek, Moses had built an emergency altar, to which he gave the name Yahweh-Nissi (Exodus 17:15). This was probably only a memorial altar (compare the altar [^Ed] in Joshua 22:21 ff). At Sinai took place the great crisis in
Israel’s national history. It was required that the covenant about to be made with Yahweh should be ratified with sacrificial blood; but before Moses could sprinkle the Book of the Covenant and the people who covenanted (Exodus 24:6,7; compare Hebrews 9:19), it was necessary that an altar should be built for the sacrificial act. This was done “under the mount,” where, beside the altar, were reared twelve pillars, emblematic of the twelve tribes of Israel (Exodus 24:4).

In connection with the tabernacle and the successive temples there were two altars — the Altar of Burnt Offering (the altar by preeminence, Ezekiel 43:13), and the Altar of Incense. Of these it is now necessary to speak more particularly.

II. The Altar of Burnt Offering (The Brazen Altar)

The altar which stood before the tabernacle was a portable box constructed of acacia wood and covered on the outside with plates of brass (Exodus 27:1 ff). “Hollow with planks,” is its definition (Exodus 27:8). It was five cubits long, five cubits broad, and three cubits high; on the ordinary reckoning, about 7 1/2 ft. on the horizontal square, and 4 1/2 ft. in height (possibly less; see CUBIT). On the “grating of network of brass” described as around and half-way up the altar (verses 4,5), see GRATING. Into the corners of this grating, on two sides, rings were riveted, into which the staves were inserted by which the Ark was borne (see STAVES). For its corner projections, see HORNS OF THE ALTAR. The prohibition of steps in Exodus 20:26 and the analogy of later altars suggest that this small altar before the tabernacle was made to stand on a base or platform, led up to by a slope of earth. The right of sanctuary is mentioned in Exodus 21:14. For the utensils connected with the altar, see PANS; SHOVELS; BASINS; FLESH-HOOKS; CENSERS. All these utensils were made of brass.

2. Its History:
The history of the altar before the tabernacle was that of the tabernacle itself, as the two were not parted during its continuance (see TABERNACLE). Their abolition did not take place till Solomon’s temple was ready for use, when the great high place at Gibeon (1 Kings 3:4) was dismantled, and the tabernacle and its holy vessels were brought to the new temple (1 Kings 8:4). Another altar had meanwhile been raised by David before the tabernacle he had made on Zion, into which the Ark of the Covenant was moved (1 Chronicles 15:1; 1 Chronicles 16:1). This would be a duplicate of that at Gibeon, and would share its supersession at the erection of the first temple.

3. Altar of Solomon’s Temple:

In Solomon’s temple the altar was considerably enlarged, as was to be expected from the greater size of the building before which it stood. We are indebted to the Chronicler for its exact dimensions (2 Chronicles 4:1). It formed a square of twenty cubits, with an elevation of ten cubits (30 x 30 x 15 ft.; or somewhat less). It is described as “an altar of brass” (2 Chronicles 4:1), or “brazen altar” (1 Kings 8:64; 2 Chronicles 7:7; compare 2 Kings 16:14), either as being, like its predecessors, encased in brass, or, as others think, made wholly of brass. It was not meant to be portable, but that the altar itself was movable is shown by the fact of Ahaz having it removed (2 Kings 16:14). Further details of its structure are not given. The altar stood in “the middle of the court that was before the house,” but proved too small to receive the gifts on the day of the temple’s dedication (1 Kings 8:64; 2 Chronicles 7:7). It remained, however, the center of Israelite worship for 2 1/2 centuries, till Ahaz removed it from the forefront of the house, and placed it on the northern side of is Damascene altar (2 Kings 16:14). This indignity was repaired by Hezekiah (compare 2 Kings 18:22), and the altar assumed its old place in the temple service till its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in 586 BC.

4. Altar of Ezekiel’s Temple:

The altar of Ezekiel’s ideal temple was, as planned, a most elaborate structure, the cubit used for this purpose being that of “a cubit and an handbreadth” (Ezekiel 43:13), or the large cubit of history (see CUBIT). The paragraph describing it (Ezekiel 43:13-17) is very specific, though
uncertainty rests on the meaning of some of the details. The altar consisted
of four stages lying one above another, gradually diminishing in size till the
hearth was reached upon which the fire was literal. This was a square of
twelve cubits (18 ft.), from the corners of which 4 horns projected upward
(⁵Ezekiel 43:15). The base or lowest stage was one cubit in height, and
had a border round about, half a cubit high (⁵Ezekiel 43:13); the remaining
stages were two, four, and four cubits high respectively (⁵Ezekiel
43:14,15); the horns may have measured another cubit (thus, the
Septuagint). Each stage was marked by the inlet of one cubit (⁵Ezekiel
43:13,14). The basement was thus, apparently, a square of eighteen cubits
or 27 ft. The word “bottom” (literally, “bosom”) in Ezekiel’s description
is variously interpreted, some regarding it as a “drain” for carrying off the
sacrificial blood, others identifying it with the “basement.” On its eastern
face the altar had steps looking toward the east (⁵Ezekiel 43:17) — a
departure from the earlier practice (for the reason of this, compare
Perowne’s article “Altar” in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible).

5. Altar of Second Temple:

Of the altar of the second temple no measurements are given. It is told
only that it was built prior to the temple, and was set upon its base
⁵Ezra 3:3), presumably on the Cakhra stone — the ancient site.

6. Altar of Herod’s Temple:

In Herod’s temple a difficulty is found in harmonizing the accounts of the
Mishna and Josephus as to the size of the altar. The latter gives it as a
square of fifty cubits (BJ, V, v, 6). The key to the solution probably lies in
distinguishing between the structure of the altar proper (thirty-two cubits
square), and a platform of larger area (fifty cubits square = 75 ft.) on which
it stood. When it is remembered that the Cakhra stone is 56 ft in length and
42 ft. in width, it is easy to see that it might form a portion of a platform
built up above and around it to a level of this size. The altar, like that of
Ezekiel’s plan, was built in diminishing stages; in the Mishna, one of one
cubit, and three of five cubits in height, the topmost stage measuring
twenty-six cubits square, or, with deduction of a cubit for the officiating
priests, twenty-four cubits. Josephus, on the other hand, gives the height
at fifteen cubits. The altar, as before, had four horns. Both Josephus and
the Mishna state that the altar was built of unhewn stones. The ascent,
thirty-two cubits long and sixteen broad, likewise of unhewn stone, was on the south side. See further, TEMPLE, HEROD’S. It is of this altar that the words were spoken, “Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift” (Matthew 5:24).

III. The Altar of Incense (Golden Altar)

This was a diminutive table of acacia overlaid with gold, the upper surface of which was a square of one cubit, and its height two cubits, with an elevated cornice or crown around its top (Exodus 30:2 ff). Like the great altar of burnt offering, it was in the category of “most holy” things (Exodus 30:10); a distinction which gave it a right to a place in the inner room of the cella or holy of holies. Hence, in 1 Kings 6:22, it is said to “belong to the oracle,” and in Hebrews 9:4 that chamber is said to have the “altar of incense.” It did not, however, actually stand there, but in the outer chamber, “before the veil” (Exodus 40:26). The reason for this departure from the strict rule of temple ritual was that sweet incense was to be burnt daily upon it at the offering of every daily sacrifice, the lamps being then lit and extinguished (compare Numbers 28:3 f; Exodus 30:7,8), so that a cloud of smoke might fill the inner chamber at the moment when the sacrificial blood was sprinkled (see MERCY-SEAT). To have burnt this incense within the veil would have required repeated entries into the holy of holies, which entries were forbidden (Leviticus 16:2). The altar thus stood immediately without the veil, and the smoke of the incense burnt upon it entered the inner chamber by the openings above the veil. For the material construction which admitted of this, see HOLY PLACE.

For other uses of the altar of incense see HORNS OF THE ALTAR, where it is shown that at the time of the offerings of special sin offerings and on the day of the annual fast its horns were sprinkled with blood. This, with the offering of incense upon it, were its only uses, as neither meal offerings might be laid upon it, nor libations of drink offerings poured thereon
(Exodus 30:9). The [Tamiyd], or standing sacrifice for Israel, was a whole burnt offering of a lamb offered twice daily with its meal offering, accompanied with a service of incense.

2. Mode of Burning Incense:

It is probable that the censers in use at the time of the construction of this altar and after were in shape like a spoon or ladle (see TABLE OF SHEWBREAD), which, when filled with live coals from the great altar, were carried within the sanctuary and laid upon the altar of incense (Leviticus 16:12). The incense-sticks, broken small, were then placed upon the coals. The narrative of the deaths of Aaron’s sons, Nadab and Abihu, is thus made intelligible, the fire in their censers not having been taken from the great altar.

3. In Solomon’s Temple and Later:

The original small altar made by Moses was superseded by one made by Solomon. This was made of cedar wood, overlaid with gold (1 Kings 6:20,22; 7:48; 9:25; 2 Chronicles 4:19); hence, was called the “golden altar.” This was among “all the vessels of the house of God, great and small,” which Nebuchadnezzar took to Babylon (2 Chronicles 36:18). As a consequence, when Ezekiel drew plans for a new temple, he gave it an incense altar made wholly of wood and of larger dimensions than before (Ezekiel 41:22). It had a height of three cubits and a top of two cubits square. There was an incense altar likewise in the second temple. It was this altar, probably plated with gold, which Antiochus Epiphanes removed (1 Macc 1:21), and which was restored by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:49). (On critical doubts as to the existence of the golden altar in the first and second temples, compare POT, 323.)

4. In Herod’s Temple:

That the Herodian temple also had its altar of incense we know from the incident of Zacharias having a vision there of “an angel .... standing on the right side of the altar of incense” when he went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense (Luke 1:11). No representation of such an altar appears on the arch of Titus, though it is mentioned by Josephus (BJ, V, v, 5).
was probably melted down by John during the course of the siege (V, xiii, 6).

5. Symbolism of Incense Burning:

In the apocalypse of John, no temple was in the restored heaven and earth (Revelation 21:22), but in the earlier part of the vision was a temple (Revelation 14:17; 15:6) with an altar and a censer (Revelation 8:3). It is described as “the golden altar which was before the throne,” and, with the smoke of its incense, there went up before God the prayers of the saints. This imagery is in harmony with the statement of Luke that as the priests burnt incense, “the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the hour of incense” (Luke 1:10). Both history and prophecy thus attest the abiding truth that salvation is by sacrificial blood, and is made available to men through the prayers of saints and sinners offered by a great High Priest.

W. Shaw Caldecott

AL-TASHHETH; AL-TASCHITH

<al-tash’-heth>, <al-tas’-kith>.

See PSALMS; SONG.

ALTOGETHER

<ol-too-geth’-er>: Representing five Hebrew and three Greek originals, which variously signify

(1) “together”; i.e. all, e.g. “all men, high and low, weighed together in God’s balance are lighter than vanity” (Psalm 62:9); so also Psalm 53:3; Jeremiah 10:8.

(2) “all”: so the Revised Version (British and American), Isaiah 10:8: “Are not my princes all of them kings?”

(3) “with one accord have broken the yoke”; so the Revised Version (British and American), Jeremiah 5:5.

(4) “completely,” “entirely,” “fully”: “so as not to destroy him altogether” (2 Chronicles 12:12; compare Genesis 18:21;
Exodus 11:1; Psalm 39:5; Jeremiah 30:11 the King James Version; compare the Revised Version (British and American)).


(6) In 1 Corinthians 5:10 the Revised Version (British and American) rendered “at all”; 1 Corinthians 9:10 “assuredly.”

(7) A passage of classic difficulty to translators is Acts 26:29, where “altogether” in the Revised Version (British and American) is rendered “with much,” Greek en megalo (en pollo). See ALMOST. Many of the instances where “altogether” occurs in the King James Version become “together” in the Revised Version (British and American). Used as an adjective in Psalm 39:5 (“altogether vanity”).

Dwight M. Pratt

ALUSH

<al’-lush> (אַלָש): A desert camp of the Israelites between Dophkah and Rephidim (Numbers 33:13,14). The situation is not certainly known.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

ALVAH

<al’-va> (אָלָו): A chief (the King James Version duke) of Edom (Genesis 36:40), called “Aliah” in 1 Chronicles 1:51. Probably the same as Alvan, or Ahan, son of Shobal son of Seir (Genesis 36:23; 1 Chronicles 1:40).

ALVAN

<al’-van> (אָלָן, “tall”?): A son of Shobal, the Horite (Genesis 36:23). In 1 Chronicles 1:40 the name is written Alian, Septuagint [Αλάμ, Olam]. It is probably the same as Alvah of Genesis 36:23, which appears in 1 Chronicles 1:51 as Aliah.
ALWAY; ALWAYS

<ol’-way>, <ol’-waz> (archaic and poetic): Properly applied to acts or states perpetually occurring, but not necessarily continuous. In Hebrew, most frequently, פִַּמְיָד [tamiydh]. In Greek διὰ πάντος, dia pantos, ordinarily expresses continuity. In Matthew 28:20 “alway” the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “always,” translation Greek πασας τας ημερας, “all the days,” corresponding to the Hebrew idiom similarly rendered in Deuteronomy 5:29; 6:24; 11:1; 28:33; 1 Kings 11:36, etc. Greek αει in Acts 7:51; 2 Corinthians 6:10; 1 Peter 3:15, means “at every and any time.”

AMAD

<a’-mad> (אָמָד [am`adh]): A town in northern Palestine, which fell to the tribe of Asher in the division of the land (Joshua 19:26). The modern ruin `Amud near Accho may be the site.

AMADATHA; AMADATHUS

<a-mad’-a-tha>, <a-mad’-a-thus> (Additions to Esther 12:6).

See AMAN; HAMMEDATHA.

AMAIN

<a-man’> (translated from the Greek εἰς φυγὴν ὄρμησαν, eis phugen hormesan, “they rushed to flight”): The word is composed of the prefix “a” and the word “main,” meaning “force.” The expression is used by Milton, Parker, et al., but in Biblical literature found only in 2 Macc 12:22 where used to describe the flight of Timotheus and his army after he suffered defeat at the hands of Judas Maccabee (“They fled amain,” i.e. violently and suddenly).

AMAL

<a’-mal> (אָמַל [`amal], “toiler”): A son of Helem of the tribe of Asher (1 Chronicles 7:35).
AMALEK

<am'-a-lek> (אָמאָלֵק, ‘amālek): The son, by his concubine Timna, of Eliphaz, the eldest son of Esau. He was one of the chiefs (the King James Version dukes) of Edom (Genesis 36:12,16).

See AMALEKITE.

AMALEK; AMALEKITE

<am'-a-lek>, <a-mal’e-kit>, <am’-a-lek-it> (אָמאָלֵק, ‘amālek, אָמַלְּקִי, ‘amāleqi): A tribe dwelling originally in the region south of Judah, the wilderness of et-Tih where the Israelites came into conflict with them. They were nomads as a people dwelling in that tract would naturally be. When they joined the Midianites to invade Israel they came “with their cattle and their tents” ( Judges 6:3-5). They are not to be identified with the descendants of Esau (Genesis 36:12,16) because they are mentioned earlier, in the account of the invasion of Chedorlaomer (Genesis 14:7) and in Balaam’s prophecy (Numbers 24:20) Amalek is called “the first of the nations,” which seems to refer to an early existence. We are uncertain of their origin, for they do not appear in the list of nations found in Genesis 10. They do not seem to have had any relationship with the tribes of Israel, save as, we may surmise, some of the descendants of Esau were incorporated into the tribe. It is probable that they were of Semitic stock though we have no proof of it.

The first contact with Israel was at Rephidim, in the wilderness of Sinai, where they made an unprovoked attack and were defeated after a desperate conflict (Exodus 17:8-13; Deuteronomy 25:17,18). On account of this they were placed under the ban and Israel was commanded to exterminate them (Deuteronomy 25:19; I Samuel 15:2,3). The next encounter of the two peoples was when the Israelites attempted to enter Canaan from the west of the Dead Sea. The spies had reported that the Amalekites were to be found in the south, in connection with the Hittites, Jebusites and Amorites (Numbers 13:29). The Israelites at first refused to advance, but later determined to do so contrary to the will of God and the command of Moses. They were met by Amalek and the Canaanites and completely defeated (Numbers 14:39-45). Amalek is next found among the allies of
Moab in their attack upon Israel in the days of Eglon (Judges 3:13). They were also associated with the Midianites in their raids upon Israel (Judges 6:3), and they seemed to have gained a foothold in Ephraim, or at least a branch of them, in the hill country (Judges 5:14; 12:15), but it is evident that the great body of them still remained in their old habitat, for when Saul made war upon them he drove them toward Shur in the wilderness toward Egypt (1 Samuel 15:1-9). David also found them in the same region (1 Samuel 27:8; 30:1). After this they seem to have declined, and we find, in the days of Hezekiah, only a remnant of them who were smitten by the Simeonites at Mount Seir (1 Chronicles 4:41-43). They are once mentioned in Psalms in connection with other inveterate enemies of Israel (Psalm 83:7). The hatred Inspired by the Amalekites is reflected in the passages already mentioned which required their utter destruction. Their attack upon them when they were just escaped from Egypt and while they were struggling through the wilderness made a deep impression upon the Israelites which they never forgot, and the wrath of David upon the messenger who brought him news of the death of Saul and Jonathan, declaring himself to be the slayer of Saul, was no doubt accentuated by his being an Amalekite (2 Samuel 1:1-16).

H. Porter

AMAM

<\'amam> ([\'amam]): An unidentified town in southern Palestine, which fell to Judah in the allotment of the land; occurs only in Joshua 15:26.

AMAN

<\'aman> ([\’Aμάν, Aman]; Codex Vaticanus reads [\’Aδόμ, Adam]): Tobit 14:10; Additions to Esther 12:6; 16:10,17, probably in each case for Haman, the arch-enemy of the Jews in the canonical Book of Esther (compare Est 3:1 with Additions to Esther 12:6). In Additions to Esther (16:10) Aman is represented as a Macedonian, in all other points corresponding to the Haman of the Book of Esther.
AMANA

<\textit{a-ma’-na}>, ([‘amanah]): A mountain mentioned in Song 4:8 along with Lebanon, Senir and Hermon. The name probably means the “firm,” or “constant.” “From the top of Amana” is mistranslated by the Septuagint \[\text{ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς πίστεως, apō archēs pisteos}\]. The Amana is most naturally sought in the Anti-Lebanon, near the course of the river Abana, or Amana (see \textit{ABANAH}). Another possible identification is with Mt. Amanus in the extreme north of Syria.

AMARIAH

<\textit{am-a’ri'-a}> ([‘amaryah] and ([‘amaryahu], “the Lord has said”; compare HPN, 180, 285).

(1) A Levite in the line of Aaron-Eleazar; a son of Meraioth and grandfather of Zadok (1 Chronicles 6:7,52) who lived in David’s time. Compare Zadok (2 Samuel 15:27, etc.) also Ant, VIII, i, 3 and X, viii, 6.

(2) A Levite in the line of Kohath-Hebron referred to in 1 Chronicles 23:19 and 24:23 at the time when David divided the Levites into courses.

(3) A Levite in the line of Aaron-Eleazar; a son of Azariah who “executed the priest’s office in the house that Solomon built” (1 Chronicles 6:10 f). Compare Ezra 7:3 where in the abbreviated list this Amariah is mentioned as an ancestor of Ezra. See \textit{AMARIAS} (1 Esdras 8:2; 2 Esdras 1:2) and number

(4) A descendant of Judah in the line of Perez and an ancestor of Ataiah who lived in Jerusalem after the Babylonian exile (Nehemiah 11:4). Compare Imri (1 Chronicles 9:4) and number

(4) of this article

(4) Chief priest and judge “in all matters of Yahweh” appointed by Jehoshaphat (2 Chronicles 19:11). Possibly identical with Amariah, number (3).

(5) A descendant of Judah in the line of Perez and an ancestor of Ataiah who lived in Jerusalem after the Babylonian exile (Nehemiah 11:4). Compare Imri (1 Chronicles 9:4) and number
(7) of this article, which Amariah seems to be of the same family,
(6) A Levite and an assistant of Kore who was appointed by Hezekiah
to distributed the “oblations of Yahweh” to their brethren (2 Chronicles 31:15).
(7) A son of Bani who had married a foreign woman (Ezra 10:42).
See number (5) of this article
(8) A priest who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant (Nehemiah
10:3); he had returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Nehemiah
12:2) and was the father of Jehohanan (compare Hanani, Ezra
10:20), priest at the time of Joiakim (Nehemiah 12:13). Compare
Immer (Ezra 2:37; 10:20; Nehemiah 7:40) and also Emmeruth (the
King James Version “Meruth,” 1 Esdras 5:24).
(9) An ancestor of Zephaniah, the prophet (Zephaniah 1:1).

A. L. Breslich

AMARIAS

<am-a-ri’-as> (A, [ ‘Ale’amos, Amarias]; B, [ ‘Ale’amos,
Amartheias]) = Amariah number 3: An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2; 2
Esdras 1:2).

AMARNA, TELL EL-

<tel-el-a-mar’-na>.

See TELL EL-AMARNA TABLETS.

AMASA

<am-as’-sa> (אמאסא [’amasa’], or read אמאסא [’amamishai], i.e.
אמאסא [’am yishai], “people of Jesse”): The form אמאסא [’amasa’],
is based upon a mistaken etymology (from = אמאסא [’amac] “to burden”).
(1) According to 2 Samuel 17:25, Amasa is the son of Abigail, the sister
of Zeruiah and David, and Ithra, an Israelite; but another source, 1
Chronicles 2:17, calls his father Jether the Ishmaelite. He was a nephew of
David and a cousin of Absalom, who made him commander of the army of rebellion. When the uprising had been quelled, David, in order to conciliate Amasa, promised him the position held by Joab; the latter had fallen from favor (2 Samuel 19:13 ff). When a new revolt broke out under Sheba, the son of Bichri (2 Samuel 20), Amasa was entrusted with the task of assembling the men of Judah. But Joab was eager for revenge upon the man who had obtained the office of command that he coveted. When Amasa met Joab at Gibeon, the latter murdered him while pretending to salute (2 Samuel 20:8-10; 1 Kings 2:5).

(2) Son of Hadlai, of the [Bene ‘Ephrayim] (“Children of Ephraim”), who, obeying the words of the prophet Oded, refused to consider as captives the Judeans who had been taken from Ahaz, king of Judah, by the victorious Israelites under the leadership of Pekah (2 Chronicles 28:12).

H. J. Wolf

AMASAI

<\a-ma’-si> (אמשי [\amasay], perhaps rather to be read עמשי [\ammishay]; so Wellhausen, IJG, II, 24, n.2):

(1) A name in the genealogy of Kohath, son of Elkanah, a Levite of the Kohathite family (compare 1 Chronicles 6:25; 2 Chronicles 29:12).

(2) Chief of the captains who met David at Ziklag and tendered him their allegiance. Some have identified him with Amasa and others with Abishai, who is called Abshai in 1 Chronicles 11:20 m (compare 1 Chronicles 18:12). The difficulty is that neither Amasa nor Abishai occupied the rank of the chief of thirty according to the lists in 2 Samuel 23 and 1 Chronicles 11, the rank to which David is supposed to have appointed into (compare 1 Chronicles 12:18).

(3) One of the trumpet-blowing priests who greeted David when he brought back the Ark of the Covenant (compare 1 Chronicles 15:24).
AMASHSAI

<amash’si> [‘amashcay], probably a textual error for  יִמְשָׁא יֶשׁי-י [‘amashay]; the ס (“s”) implies a reading יִמְשָׁא [‘-M-C-Y], based on a mistaken derivation from יִמְשָׁא [‘-M-C]. The original reading may have been יִמְשָׁא [‘ammishay]; compare AMASAI. Amashsai is a priestly name in the post-exilic list of inhabitants of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 11:13; Maasai, 1 Chronicles 9:12); the reading in Chronicles is יִמְשֵׁה [ma`asay], the King James Version “Maasiai,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Maasai.”

AMASIAH

<am-a-si’a> (יִמְשַׁי [‘amacyah], “Yah bears”): One of the captains of Jehoshaphat (compare 2 Chronicles 17:16).

AMATH; AMATHIS

<a’-math>, <am’a-this> (1 Macc 12:25).

See HAMATH.

AMATHEIS

<am-a-the’is>.

See EMATHEIS.

AMAZED

<a-mazed>: A term which illustrates the difficulty of expressing in one English word the wide range of startled emotion, wonder, astonishment, awe, covered, in the Old Testament, by four Hebrew words and in the New Testament by as many Greek words. Its Scripture originals range in meaning from amazement accompanied with terror and trembling to an astonishment full of perplexity, wonder, awe and joyous surprise. It is the word especially used to show the effect of Christ’s miracles, teaching, character and Divine personality on those who saw and heard Him, and were made conscious of His supernatural power (Matthew 12:23: “All
the multitudes were amazed”). The miracles of Pentecost and the Holy Spirit’s bestowal of the gift of tongues produced the same universal wonder (“They were all amazed and marveled”).

Dwight M. Pratt

AMAZIAH

<am-a-zi’-a> (‘amatsyah, ‘amatsyahu), “Yahweh is mighty”; 2 Kings 14:1-20; 2 Chronicles 25). Son of Jehoash, and tenth king of Judah. Amaziah had a peaceable accession at the age of 25. A depleted treasury, a despoiled palace and temple, and a discouraged people were among the consequences of his father’s war with Hazael, king of Syria. When settled on the throne, Amaziah brought to justice the men who had assassinated his father. Amaziah verbal citation of Deuteronomy 24:16 in 2 Kings 14:6, forbidding the punishment of children for a father’s offense, shows that the laws of this book were then known, and were recognized as authoritative, and, in theory, as governing the nation. His accession may be dated circa 812 (some put later).

1. THE EDOMITE WAR:

The young king’s plan for the rehabilitation of his people was the restoration of the kingdom’s military prestige, so severely lowered in his father’s reign. A militia army, composed of all the young men above 20 years of age, was first organized and placed upon a war footing (2 Chronicles 25:5; the number given, 300,000, is not a reliable one). Even this not being considered a large enough force to effect the project, 100 talents of silver were sent to engage mercenary troops for the expedition from Israel. When these came, a man of God strongly dissuaded the king from relying on them (2 Chronicles 25:7 ff). When this was communicated to the soldiers, and they were sent back unemployed, it roused them to “fierce anger” (2 Chronicles 25:10).

2. ITS OCCASION:

Amaziah’s purpose in making these extensive preparations for war, in a time of profound peace, is clear to the Southeast of Judah lay the Edomite state, with its capital at Petra. For many years Edom had been subject to
Jehoshaphat, and a Hebrew “deputy” had governed it (1 Kings 22:47). In the reign of his son and successor, Jehoram, a confederacy of Philistines, Arabians and Edomites took Libnah and made a raid on Jerusalem. A band of these penetrated the palace, which they plundered, abducted some women, and murdered all the young princes but the youngest (2 Chronicles 21:17; 22:1). The public commotion and distress caused by such an event may be seen reflected in the short oracle of the prophet Obadiah, uttered against Edom, if, with some, Obadiah’s date is put thus early.

3. THE VICTORY IN THE VALLEY OF SALT:
From that time “Edom .... made a king over themselves” (2 Chronicles 21:8), and for fifty years following were practically independent. It was this blot on Jerusalem and the good name of Judah that Amaziah determined to wipe out. The army of retaliation went forward, and after a battle in the Valley of Salt, south of the Dead Sea, in which they were the victors, moved on to Petra. This city lies in a hollow, shut in by mountains, and approached only by a narrow ravine, through which a stream of water flows. Amaziah took it “by storm” (such is Ewald’s rendering of “by war,” in 2 Kings 14:7). Great execution was done, many of the captives being thrown from the rock, the face of which is now covered with rock-cut tombs of the Greek-Roman age.

4. APOSTASY AND ITS PUNISHMENT:
The campaign was thus entirely successful, but had evil results. Flushed with victory, Amaziah brought back the gods of Edom, and paid them worship. For this act of apostasy, he was warned of approaching destruction (2 Chronicles 25:14-17). Disquieting news soon came relating to the conduct of the troops sent back to Samaria. From Beth-horon in the south to the border of the northern state they had looted the villages and killed some of the country people who had attempted to defend their property (2 Chronicles 25:13). To Amaziah’s demand for reparation, Jehoash’s answer was the contemptuous one of the well-known parable of the Thistle and the Cedar.
5. BATTLE OF BETH-SHEMESH:

War was now inevitable. The kings “looked one another in the face,” in the valley of Beth-shemesh, where there is a level space, suitable to the movements of infantry. Judah was utterly routed, and the king himself taken prisoner. There being no treasures in the lately despoiled capital, Jehoash contented himself with taking hostages for future good behavior, and with breaking down 400 cubits of the wall of Jerusalem at the Northwest corner of the defense (2 Kings 14:13,14; 2 Chronicles 25:22-24).

6. CLOSING YEARS AND TRAGICAL END:

Amaziah’s career as a soldier was now closed. He outlived Jehoash of Israel “fifteen years” (2 Kings 14:17). His later years were spent in seclusion and dread, and had a tragical ending. The reason for his unpopularity is not far to seek. The responsibility for the war with Jehoash is by the inspired writer placed upon the shoulders of Amaziah (2 Kings 14:9-11). It was he who “would not hear.” The quarrel between the kings was one which it was not beyond the power of diplomacy to remedy, but no brotherly attempt to heal the breach was made by either king. When the results of the war appeared, it could not but be but that the author of the war should be called upon to answer for them. So deep was his disgrace and so profound the sense of national humiliation, that a party in the state determined on Amaziah’s removal, so soon as there was another to take his place. The age of majority among the Hebrew kings was 16, and when Amaziah’s son was of this age, the conspiracy against his life grew so strong and open that he fled to Lachish. Here he was followed and killed; his body being insultingly carried to Jerusalem on horses, and not conveyed in a litter or coffin (2 Kings 14:19,20; 2 Chronicles 25:27,28). He was 54 years old and had reigned for 29 years. The Chronicler (2 Chronicles 26:1) hardly conceals the popular rejoicings at the exchange of sovereigns, when Uzziah became king.

In 2 Chronicles 25:28 is a copyist’s error by which we read “in the city of Judah,” instead of “in the city of David,” as in the corresponding passage in Kings. The singular postscript to the record of Amaziah in 2
Kings 14:22 is intended to mark the fact that while the port of Elath on the Red Sea fell before the arms, in turn, of Amaziah and of his son Uzziah, it was the latter who restored it to Judah, as a part of its territory. Amaziah is mentioned in the royal genealogy of 1 Chronicles 3:12, but not in that of Matthew 1. There is a leap here from Jehoram to Uzziah, Ahaziah, Jehoash and Amaziah being omitted.

W. Shaw Caldecott

AMBASSADOR

<am-bas’-a-dor> (מָלָאָךְ, [mal’akh], “messenger”; לְעֵץ, [’luts], “interpreter”; צִיר, [tsir], “to go”; hence a messenger; ἀπεσβέω, presbeuo], “to act as an ambassador,” literally, to be older): An ambassador is an official representative of a king or government, as of Pharaoh (Isaiah 30:4); of the princes of Babylon (2 Chronicles 32:31); of Neco, king of Egypt (2 Chronicles 35:21); of the messengers of peace sent by Hezekiah, king of Judah, to Sennacherib, king of Assyria (Isaiah 33:7). The same Hebrew term is used of the messengers sent by Jacob to Esau (Genesis 32:3); by Moses to the king of Edom (Numbers 20:14). For abundant illustration consult “Messenger” ([mal’akh]) in any concordance. See CONCORDANCE. The inhabitants of Gibeon made themselves pretended ambassadors to Joshua in order to secure by deceit the protection of a treaty (“covenant”) (Joshua 9:4).

In the New Testament the term is used in a figurative sense. As the imprisoned representative of Christ at Rome Paul calls himself “an ambassador in chains” (Ephesians 6:20); and in 2 Corinthians 5:20 includes, with himself, all ministers of the gospel, as “ambassadors .... on behalf of Christ,” commissioned by Him as their sovereign Lord, with the ministry of reconciling the world to God. The Bible contains no finer characterization of the exalted and spiritual nature of the minister’s vocation as the representative of Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Saviour of the world.

Dwight M. Pratt
AMBASSAGE

<am'-ba-saj> ([πρεσβεία, presbeia], “an embassy,” a body of ambassadors on the message entrusted to them): Twice used by Christ

(1) in the parable of the Pounds, of the citizens who hated the nobleman and sent an ambassage, refusing to have him reign over them, thus illustrating those who willfully rejected His own spiritual sovereignty and kingdom (Luke 19:14);

(2) of a weak king who sends to a stronger an ambassage to ask conditions of peace (Luke 14:32). Not used elsewhere in the Bible.

AMBER

<am'-ber>.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

AMBITIOUS

<am-bish'-us> ([φιλοτιμεόμαι, philotimeomai], “to be strongly desirous,” “strive earnestly,” “make it one’s aim”): Given as a marginal reading in Romans 15:20 (“being ambitious to bring good tidings”), 2 Corinthians 5:9 (“We are ambitious, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him”), and 1 Thessalonians 4:11 (“that ye be ambitious to be quiet”).

AMBUSH

<am'-boosh> (בִּרְבּ [’arab], “to set an ambush”; רב יב [ma’arab], “an ambush”): A military stratagem in which a body of men are placed in concealment to surprise an enemy unawares, or to attack a point when temporarily undefended. This stratagem was employed successfully by Joshua at Ai (Joshua 8). Jeremiah calls upon the Medes to “set up a standard against the walls of Babylon, make the watch strong, set the watchmen, prepare the ambushes” (Jeremiah 51:12).
AMBUSHMENT

<am’-boosh-ment> (as above) has now disappeared in 2 Chronicles 20:22, where the Revised Version (British and American) gives for “ambushment” “liers-in-wait.” It still remains in 2 Chronicles 13:13 where both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render the Hebrew noun “ambushment.”

AMEN

<a-men’> (in ritual speech and in singing a-men’, a’men) (אָ֣מֶ֔ן; [אָמֶ֖ן, amen], = “truly,” “verily”): Is derived from the reflexive form of a verb meaning “to be firm,” or “to prop.” It occurs twice as a noun in Isaiah 65:16, where we have (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) “God of truth.” This rendering implies the pointing [‘omen] or [‘emun] i.e. “truth,” or “faithfulness,” a reading actually suggested by Cheyne and adopted by others. “Amen” is generally used as an adverb of assent or confirmation — fiat, “so let it be.” In Jeremiah 28:6 the prophet endorses with it the words of Hananiah. Amen is employed when an individual or the whole nation confirms a covenant or oath recited in their presence (Numbers 5:22; Deuteronomy 27:15 ff; Nehemiah 5:13, etc.). It also occurs at the close of a psalm or book of psalms, or of a prayer.

That “Amen” was appended to the doxology in the early church is evident both from Paul and Rev, and here again it took the form of a response by the hearers. The ritual of the installation of the Lamb (Revelation 5:6-14) concludes with the Amen of the four beasts, and the four and twenty elders. It is also spoken after “Yea: I come quickly” (Revelation 22:20). And that Revelation reflects the practice of the church on earth, and not merely of an ideal, ascended community in heaven, may be concluded from 1 Corinthians 14:16, whence we gather that the lay brethren were expected to say “Amen” to the address. (See Weizsacker’s The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, English translation, II, 289.)

James Millar
AMERCE

\(<a-murs’>\): Found in the King James Version only in Deuteronomy 22:19, “And they shall amerce him in an hundred shekels of silver.” Amerce is a legal term derived from the French (a = “at”; merci = “mercy,” i.e. literally, “at the mercy” (of the court)). Here it is used of the imposing of a fine, according to the Law of Moses, upon the man who has been proven by the Elders to have brought a false charge against the virginity of the maid he has married by saying to the father, “I found not thy daughter a maid.”

AMERICAN REVISED VERSION

\(<a-mer’-i-kan re-vizd’ vur’-shun>\).

1. HISTORY:

On July 7, 1870, it was moved in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury that in the work of revision the cooperation of American divines be invited. This resolution was assented to, and on December 7, 1871, the arrangements were completed. Under the general presidency of Dr. Philip Schaff, an Old Testament Company of fifteen scholars was formed, with Dr. W. H. Green as chairman, and a New Testament Company of sixteen members (including Dr. Schaff), with Dr. T. D. Woolsey as chairman. Work was begun on October 4, 1872, and took the form of offering criticisms on the successive portions of the English revision as they were received. These criticisms of the American Companies were duly considered by the English Companies during the second revision and the decisions were again sent to America for criticism. The replies received were once more given consideration and, finally, the unadopted readings for which the American Companies professed deliberate preference were printed as appendices to the two Testaments as published in 1881 and 1885. These lists, however, were not regarded by the American Companies as satisfactory. In the first place, it became evident that the English Companies, on account of their instructions and for other reasons, were not willing to make changes of a certain class. Consequently the American Companies insisted on only such readings as seemed to have a real chance of being accepted. And, in the second place,
the English presses hurried the last part of the work and were unwilling to allow enough time for adequate thoroughness in the preparation of the lists. But it was hoped that the first published edition of the English Revised Version would not be considered definitive and that in the future such American proposals as had stood the test of public discussion might be incorporated into the text. This hope was disappointed — the English Companies disbanded as soon as their revision was finished and their work stood as final. As a result the American Companies resolved to continue their organization. They were pledged not to issue or endorse any new revision within fourteen years after the publication of the English Revised Version, and so it was not until 1900 that the American Standard Revised Version New Testament was published. The whole Bible was issued in the following year.

2. DIFFERENCES FROM ENGLISH REVISED VERSION:

As the complete editions of the American Standard Revised Version give a full list of the changes made, only the more prominent need be mentioned here. A few of the readings printed in the appendices to the English Revised Version were abandoned, but many new ones were introduced, including some that had been adopted while the English work was in progress but which had not been pressed. (See above.) Still, in general appearance, the American Standard Revised Version differs but slightly from the English. The most important addition is found in the page-headings. Some changes have been made in shortening the titles of the New Testament books. The printing of poetical passages in poetical form has been carried through more consistently. The paragraphs have been altered in some cases and (especially in the Old Testament) shortened. The punctuation has been simplified, especially by the more frequent use of the semi-colon. The removal of obsolete words (“magnifical,” “neesings,” etc.) has been effected fairly thoroughly, obsolete constructions (“jealous over,” etc.) have been modernized, particularly by the use of “who” or “that” (instead of “which”) for persons and “its” (instead of “his”) for things. In the Old Testament “Yahweh” has been introduced systematically for the proper Hebrew word, as has “Sheol” (“Hades” in the New Testament). Certain passages too literally rendered in the English Revised Version (“reins,” “by the hand of,” etc.) are given in modern
terms. In the New Testament, the substitution of “Holy Spirit” for “Holy Ghost” was completed throughout (in the English Revised Version it is made in some twenty places), “demons” substituted for “devils,” “Teacher” for “Master,” and “try” for “tempt” when there is no direct reference to wrongdoing. And so on.

3. CRITICISM:

It may be questioned whether the differences between the two Revisions are great enough to counterbalance the annoyance and confusion resulting from the existence of two standard versions in the same language. But, accepting the American Standard Revised Version as an accomplished fact, and acknowledging a few demerits that it has or may be thought to have in comparison with the English Revised Version (a bit of pedantry in Psalm 148:12 or renderings of disputed passages such as Psalm 24:6), these demerits are altogether outweighed by the superiorities — with one exception. In the Psalter, when used liturgically, the repetition of the word “Yahweh” becomes wearisome and the English Revised Version which retains “The Lord” is much preferable. Most to be regretted in the American Standard Revised Version is its extreme conservatism in the readings of the original texts. In the Old Testament the number of marginal variants was actually reduced. In the New Testament, only trivial changes are made from the so-called Revisers’ Greek Text, although this text did not represent the best scholarly opinion even in 1881, while in 1900 it was almost universally abandoned (Today — in 1914 — it is obsolete.) It is very unfortunate that the American Revisers did not improve on the example of their English brethren and continue their sessions after the publication of their version, for it is only by the successive revisions of published work that a really satisfactory result can be attained.

4. APOCRYPHA:

No American Standard Revised Version Apocrypha was attempted, a particularly unfortunate fact, as the necessity for the study of the Apocrypha has become imperative and the English Revised Version Apocrypha is not a particularly good piece of work. However, copies of the American Standard Revised Version can now be obtained with the English Revised Version Apocrypha included.
See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

Burton Scott Easton

AMETHYST

<am’-e-thist>.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

AMI

<a’-mi>, <a’-me> (<בָּאָמִי> ['ami]): Ancestor of a family among “Solomon’s servants” in the Return (Ezra 2:57); the same as Amon in Nehemiah 7:59.

AMIALE

<a’-mi-a-b’-l> (<ָּיִדְּדָּה> [yedhidh], “beloved”): Applied to the tabernacle or tent of meeting “How amiable (“lovely” the Revised Version, margin) are thy tabernacles” (Psalm 84:1), the plural having reference to the subdivisions and appurtenances of the sanctuary (compare Psalm 68:35). The adjective is rendered “amiable” in the sense of the French amiable, lovely; but the usage of the Hebrew word requires it to be understood as meaning “dear,” “beloved.” Compare “so amiable a prospect” (Sir T. Herbert), “They keep their churches so cleanly and amiable” (Howell, 1644). “What made the tabernacle of Moses lovely was not the outside, which was very mean, but what was within” (John Gill).

See TABERNACLE.

M. O. Evans

AMINADAB

<a-min’-a-dab> ([Ἀμιναδὰβ, Aminadab]): the King James Version: Greek form of Amminadab (which see). Thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Matthew 1:4; Luke 3:33).
AMISS

\(<a-mis'>\): There are two words translated “amiss” in the New Testament, [ἀτοπος, atopos], referring to that which is improper or harmful (Luke 23:41; Acts 28:6), while [κακως, kakos], refers to that which is evil in the sense of a disaster, then to that which is wicked, morally wrong. This latter is the use of it in James 4:3. The purpose of the prayer is evil, it is therefore amiss and cannot be granted (compare 2 Chronicles 6:37 ff).

AMITTAI

\(<a-mit’-i>\) (אָמִיתָי ['amittay], “faithful”): The father of the prophet Jonah. He was from Gath-hepher in Zebulun (2 Kings 14:25; Jonah 1:1).

AMMAH

\(<am’-a>\) (אַמָּה ['ammah], “mother” or “beginning”): A hill in the territory of Benjamin (2 Samuel 2:24), where Joab and Abishai halted at nightfall in their pursuit of Abner and his forces after their victory over him in the battle of Gibeon. It “lieth before Giah by the way of the wilderness of Gibeon”; but the exact location has not been identified. The same Hebrew word appears as the second part of Metheg-ammah in 2 Samuel 8:1 the King James Version, but rendered “mother city” in the Revised Version (British and American), probably however not the same place as in 2 Samuel 2:24.

AMMI

\(<am’-i>\) (אַמִּי ['ammi], “my people”): A symbolic name given to Israel by Hosea (2:1; 2:3 in Hebrew text), descriptive of Israel in the state of restoration, and in contrast to sinful and rejected Israel, represented by Hosea’s son, who was called Lo-ammi, “not my people,” when born to the prophet (Hosea 1:9,10). This restoration to the Divine favor is more fully described in Hosea 2:21,23 in words quoted by Paul (Romans 9:25,26). The use of such figurative and descriptive names is frequent in the Old Testament; compare Isaiah 62:4,12.
AMMIDIOI; AMMIDIOI

<\textit{a-mid’-i-oi}, \textit{am’-i-do}i> (the King James Version [ʿ\textit{Ammimdai}, Ammiddioi], (also with aspirate); occurring only in 1 Esdras 5:20): One of the families returning from the Babylonian Captivity in the First Return, under Zerubbabel, in 537 BC. This name is not found in the corresponding lists of the canonical books, Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7. Their identity is uncertain.

AMMIEL

<\textit{am’-i-el}> (עֲמִיֵּ֣ל [ʿammi’el], “my kinsman is God”; [ʿ\textit{Ameiel}, Ameiel]): A name borne by four men in the Old Testament.

(1) One of the twelve spies sent into Canaan by Moses; son of Gemalli, of the tribe of Daniel (Numbers 13:12).

(2) A Benjamite, the father of Machir, a friend of David, living at Lodebar in Gilead (2 Samuel 9:4,5; 17:27).

(3) Father of Bathshua (or Bathsheba), one of David’s wives, who was mother of Solomon (1 Chronicles 3:5). In the parallel passage, 2 Samuel 11:3, by transposition of the two parts of the name, he is called Eliam, meaning “my God is a kinsman.”

(4) The sixth son of Obed-edom, a Levite, one of the doorkeepers of the tabernacle of God in David’s life-time (1 Chronicles 26:5).

Edward Mack

AMMIHUD

<\textit{a-mi’-hud}> (עְמִימִיוּד [ʿammihudh], “my kinsman is glorious”; variously in the Septuagint, [Ē\textit{Mmioüd}, Emioud] or [Σε\textit{Mmioüd}, Semioud] or [ʿ\textit{Amioüd}, Amioud]): The name of several Old Testament persons.

(1) Father of Elishama, who in the wilderness was head of the tribe of Ephraim (Numbers 1:10; 2:18; 7:48,53; 10:22; 1 Chronicles 7:26).
(2) Father of Shemuel, who was appointed by Moses from the tribe of Simeon to divide the land among the tribes after they should have entered Canaan (Numbers 34:20).

(3) Father of Pedahel, who was appointed from the tribe of Naphtali for the same purpose as the Ammihud of (2) (Numbers 34:28).

(4) In the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin for the Ammihur (אממיור [ʼammīhūr],”my kinsman is noble”), who was father of Talmai of Geshur, a little Aramaic kingdom East of the Lebanon mountains, to whom Absalom fled after the murder of his brother Amnon. The weight of evidence seems to favor the reading Ammichur (2 Samuel 13:37).

(5) A descendant of Judah through the line of Perez (1 Chronicles 9:4).

Edward Mack

**AMMIHUR**

<ammi’-hur> (the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin; אמיור [ʼammīhūr], “my kinsman is noble”; Ἠμιοῦδ, Emioud).

*See AMMIHUD (4).*

**AMMINADAB**

<amin’-a-dab> (אמנ畜禽ב [ʼamminadhabh] = “my people (or my kinsman) is generous or noble”): Three persons bearing this name are mentioned in the Old Testament.

(1) In Ruth 4:19,20 and 1 Chronicles 2:10 Amminadab is referred to as one of David’s ancestors. He was the great-grandson of Perez, a son of Judah (Genesis 38:29; 46:12) and the great-grandfather of Boaz, who again was the great-grandfather of David. Aaron’s wife, Elisheba, was a daughter of Amminadab (Exodus 6:23), while one of the sons, namely, Nahshon, occupied an important position in the Judah-clan (Numbers 1:7; 2:3; 7:12; 10:14).
(2) In the first Book of Chronicles (1 Chronicles 6:22) Amminadab is mentioned as a son of Kohath (and therefore a grandson of Levi) and the father of Korah. But in other genealogical passages (Exodus 6:18; Numbers 3:19; 1 Chronicles 6:2) the sons of Kohath are Amram, Izhar, Hebron and Uzziel, and in two places (Exodus 6:21; 1 Chronicles 6:38) Izhar is mentioned as the father of Korah.

(3) According to 1 Chronicles (15:10,11) Amminadab was the name of a priest who took part in the removal of the ark to Jerusalem. He was the son of Uzziel, and therefore a nephew of Amminadab, son of Kohath (= Izhar).

Thomas Lewis

AMMINADIB

<ammin’-a-dib> (אָמִּינְדִיב): The name occurs in the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin only in one passage (Song 6:12, “the chariots of Amminadib”). In King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) text, however, it is not regarded as a proper name, and the clause is rendered, “among the chariots of my princely people.” Interpretations widely vary (see COMMENTARIES).

AMMISHADDAI

<am-i-shad’-i>, <am-i-shad-a’-i> (אָמִּישַדָּי, שַׁדַּי): The father of Ahiezer, a Danite captain or “head of his fathers’ house,” during the wilderness journey (Numbers 1:12; 2:25, etc.).

AMMIZABAD

<a-miz’-a-bad> (אָמִּיזָבָד, אָמִּיָּבָד): The son of Benaiah, one of David’s captains for the third month (1 Chronicles 27:6).
AMMON; AMMONITES

<am’-on>, <am’-on-its> (אָמֹן [ammon]; אֲמֹנָה, אֲמֹנִים [ammonim]): The Hebrew tradition makes this tribe descendants of Lot and hence related to the Israelites (Genesis 19:38). This is reflected in the name usually employed in Old Testament to designate them, [Ben `Ammi, Bene `Ammon], “son of my people,” “children of my people,” i.e. relatives. Hence we find that the Israelites are commanded to avoid conflict with them on their march to the Promised Land (Deuteronomy 2:19). Their dwelling-place was on the east of the Dead Sea and the Jordan, between the Arnon and the Jabbok, but, before the advance of the Hebrews, they had been dispossessed of a portion of their land by the Amorites, who founded, along the east side of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, the kingdom of Sihon (Numbers 21:21-31). We know from the records of Egypt, especially Tell el-Amarna Letters, the approximate date of the Amorite invasion (14th and 13th centuries, BC). They were pressed on the north by the Hittites who forced them upon the tribes of the south, and some of them settled east of the Jordan. Thus, Israel helped Ammonites by destroying their old enemies, and this makes their conduct at a later period the more reprehensible. In the days of Jephthah they oppressed the Israelites east of the Jordan, claiming that the latter had deprived them of their territory when they came from Egypt, whereas it was the possessions of the Amorites they took (Judges 11:1-28). They were defeated, but their hostility did not cease, and their conduct toward the Israelites was particularly shameful, as in the days of Saul (1 Samuel 11) and of David (2 Samuel 10). This may account for the cruel treatment meted out to them in the war that followed (2 Samuel 12:26-31). They seem to have been completely subdued by David and their capital was taken, and we find a better spirit manifested afterward, for Nahash of Rabbah showed kindness to him when a fugitive (2 Samuel 17:27-29). Their country came into the possession of Jeroboam, on the division of the kingdom, and when the Syrians of Damascus deprived the kingdom of Israel of their possessions east of the Jordan, the Ammonites became subjects of Benhadad, and we find a contingent of 1,000 of them serving as allies of that king in the great battle of the Syrians with the Assyrians at Qarqar (854 BC) in the reign of Shalmaneser II. They may have regained their old territory when Tiglath-pileser carried off the Israelites East of the
Jordan into captivity (2 Kings 15:29; 1 Chronicles 5:26). Their hostility to both kingdoms, Judah and Israel, was often manifested. In the days of Jehoshaphat they joined with the Moabites in an attack upon him, but met with disaster (2 Chronicles 20). They paid tribute to Jotham (2 Chronicles 27:5). After submitting to Tiglath-pileser they were generally tributary to Assyria, but we have mention of their joining In the general uprising that took place under Sennacherib; but they submitted and we find them tributary in the reign of Esarhaddon. Their hostility to Judah is shown in their joining the Chaldeans to destroy it (2 Kings 24:2). Their cruelty is denounced by the prophet Amos (1:13), and their destruction by Jeremiah (49:1-6), Ezekiel (21:28-32), Zephaniah (2:8,9). Their murder of Gedaliah (2 Kings 25:22-26; Jeremiah 40:14) was a dastardly act. Tobiah the Ammonites united with Sanballat to oppose Nehemiah (Nehemiah 4), and their opposition to the Jews did not cease with the establishment of the latter in Judea.

They joined the Syrians in their wars with the Maccabees and were defeated by Judas (1 Mac 5:6).

Their religion was a degrading and cruel superstition. Their chief god was Molech, or Moloch, to whom they offered human sacrifices (1 Kings 11:7) against which Israel was especially warned (Leviticus 20:2-5). This worship was common to other tribes for we find it mentioned among the Phoenicians.

H. Porter

AMMONITESS

<am-on-i’-tes>, <a-mon’-i-tes> (נשים [‘ammonith]): A woman of the Ammonites, Naamah, the mother of Rehoboam (1 Kings 14:21,31; 2 Chronicles 12:13; 24:26).

AMNON

<am’-non> (אמון [‘amnon], “faithful”; compare אמון [‘aminon], 2 Samuel 13:20, which is probably a diminutive. Wellhausen (IJG, II,
24, note 2) resolves יָאִיֹּנִית [’amiynown] into יִמְיָה [’immi], and נְנוּן [nun], “my mother is the serpent”; compare &NUN):

(1) The eldest son of David and Ahinoam, the Jezreelites (compare 2 Samuel 3:2). As the crown prince and heir presumptive to the throne, he was intensely hated by Absalom, who was, therefore, doubly eager to revenge the outrage committed by Amnon upon his sister Tamar (2 Samuel 3:2; 13:1 ff, 1 Chronicles 3:1).

(2) A name in the genealogy of Judah (1 Chronicles 4:20).

**AMOK**

<אַ-מוֹק> (ים[;]אֵמוּק, “deep”): A chief priest who came to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Nehemiah 12:7) and the forefather of Eber, who was priest in the days of Joiakim (Nehemiah 12:20).

**AMON**

<אַ-מוֹן> (אמ[;]ון, [’amon]): A name identical with that of the Egyptian local deity of Thebes (No); compare Jeremiah 46:25. The foreign name given to a Hebrew prince is remarkable, as is also the fact that it is one of the two or three royal names of Judah not compounded with the name of Yahweh. See MANASSEH. It seems to reflect the sentiment which his fanatical father sought to make prevail that Yahweh had no longer any more claim to identification with the realm than had other deities.

(1) A king of Judah, son and successor of Manasseh; reigned two years and was assassinated in his own palace by the officials of his household. The story of his reign is told briefly in 2 Kings 21:19-26, and still more briefly, though in identical terms, so far as they go, in 2 Chronicles 33:21-25. His short reign was merely incidental in the history of Judah; just long enough to reveal the traits and tendencies which directly or indirectly led to his death. It was merely a weaker continuation of the regime of his idolatrous father, though without the fanaticism which gave the father positive character, and without the touch of piety which, if the Chronicler’s account is correct, tempered the father’s later years.
If the assassination was the initial act of a revolution the latter was immediately suppressed by “the people of the land,” who put to death the conspirators and placed Amon’s eight-year-old son Josiah on the throne. In the view of the present writer the motive of the affair was probably connected with the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty, which, having survived so long according to prophetic prediction (compare 2 Samuel 7:16; Psalm 89:36,37), was an essential guarantee of Yahweh’s favor. Manasseh’s foreign sympathies, however, had loosened the hold of Yahweh on the officials of his court; so that, instead of being the loyal center of devotion to Israel’s religious and national idea, the royal household was but a hotbed of worldly ambitions, and all the more for Manasseh’s prosperous reign, so long immune from any stroke of Divine judgment. It is natural that, seeing the insignificance of Amon’s administration, some ambitious clique, imitating the policy that had frequently succeeded in the Northern Kingdom, should strike for the throne. They had reckoned, however, without estimating the inbred Davidic loyalty of the body of the people. It was a blow at one of their most cherished tenets, committing the nation both politically and religiously to utter uncertainty. That this impulsive act of the people was in the line of the purer religious movement which was ripening in Israel does not prove that the spiritually-minded “remnant” was minded to violence and conspiracy, it merely shows what a stern and sterling fiber of loyalty still existed, seasoned and confirmed by trial below the corrupting cults and fashions of the ruling classes. In the tragedy of Amon’s reign, in short, we get a glimpse of the basis of sound principle that lay at the common heart of Israel.

(2) A governor of Samaria (1 Kings 22:26); the one to whom the prophet Micaiah was committed as a prisoner by King Ahab, after the prophet had disputed the predictions of the court prophets and foretold the king’s death in battle.

(3) The head of the “children of Solomon’s servants” (Nehemiah 7:59) who returned from captivity; reckoned along with the Nethinim, or temple slaves. Called also Ami (Ezra 2:57).

John Franklin Genung
AMORITES

<am'-o-rits>; Amorites (אָרִים, ['emori], always in the singular like the Babylonian Amurru from which it is taken; [ Ἀμορραῖοι, Amorraioi]):

The name Amorite is used in the Old Testament to denote

(1) the inhabitants of Palestine generally,

(2) the population of the hills as opposed to the plain, and

(3) a specific people under a king of their own.

Thus

(1) we hear of them on the west shore of the Dead Sea (Genesis 14:7), at Hebron (Genesis 14:13), and Shechem (Genesis 48:22), in Gilead and Bashan (Deuteronomy 3:10) and under Hermon (Deuteronomy 3:8; 4:48). They are named instead of the Canaanites as the inhabitants of Palestine whom the Israelites were required to exterminate (Genesis 15:16; Deuteronomy 20:17; Judges 6:10; 1 Samuel 7:14; 1 Kings 21:26; 2 Kings 21:11); the older population of Judah is called Amorite in Joshua 10:5,6, in conformity with which Ezekiel (16:3) states that Jerusalem had an Amorite father; and the Gibeonites are said to have been “of the remnant of the Amorites” (2 Samuel 21:2). On the other hand

(2) in Numbers 13:29 the Amorites are described as dwelling in the mountains like the Hittites and Jebusites of Jerusalem, while the Amalekites or Bedouins lived in the south and the Canaanites on the seacoast and in the valley of the Jordan. Lastly

(3) we hear of Sihon, “king of the Amorites,” who had conquered the northern half of Moab (Numbers 21:21-31; Deuteronomy 2:26-35).

1. VARYING USE OF THE NAME EXPLAINED:

Assyriological discovery has explained the varying use of the name. The Hebrew form of it is a transliteration of the Babylonian Amurru, which was both sing. and plural. In the age of Abraham the Amurru were the
dominant people in western Asia; hence Syria and Palestine were called by the Babylonians “the land of the Amorites.” In the Assyrian period this was replaced by “land of the Hittites,” the Hittites in the Mosaic age having made themselves masters of Syria and Canaan. The use of the name “Amorite” in its general sense belongs to the Babylonian period of oriental history.

2. THE AMORITE KINGDOM:

The Amorite kingdom was of great antiquity. About 2500 BC it embraced the larger part of Mesopotamia and Syria, with its capital probably at Harran, and a few centuries later northern Babylonia was occupied by an “Amorite” dynasty of kings who traced their descent from Samu or Sumu (the Biblical Shem), and made Babylon their capital. To this dynasty belonged Khammu-rabi, the Amraphel of Genesis 14:1. In the astrological documents of the period frequent reference is made to “the king of the Amorites.” This king of the Amorites was subject to Babylonia in the age of the dynasty of Ur, two or three centuries before the birth of Abraham. He claimed suzerainty over a number of “Amorite” kinglets, among whom those of Khana on the Euphrates, near the mouth of the Khabur, may be named, since in the Abrahamic age one of them was called Khammu-rapikh and another Isarlim or Israel. A payment of a cadastral survey made at this time by a Babylonian governor with the Canaanite name of Urimelech is now in the Louvre. Numerous Amorites were settled in Ur and other Babylonian cities, chiefly for the purpose of trade. They seem to have enjoyed the same rights and privileges as the native Babylonians. Some of them were commercial travelers, but we hear also of the heads of the great firms making journeys to the Mediterranean coast.

In an inscription found near Diarbekir and dedicated to Khammu-rabi by Ibirum (= Eber), the governor of the district, the only title given to the Babylonian monarch is “king of the Amorites,” where instead of Amurru the Sumerian Martu (Hebrew [moreh]) is used. The great-grandson of Khammu-rabi still calls himself “king of the widespread land of the Amorites,” but two generations later Babylonia was invaded by the Hittites, the Amorite dynasty came to an end, and there was once more a “king of the Amorites” who was not also king of Babylonia.
The Amorite kingdom continued to exist down to the time of the Israelite invasion of Palestine, and mention is made of it in the Egyptian records as well as in the cuneiform Tell el-Amarna Letters, and the Hittite archives recently discovered at Boghaz-keui, the site of the Hittite capital in Cappadocia. The Egyptian conquest of Canaan by the kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty had put an end to the effective government of that country by the Amorite princes, but their rule still extended eastward to the borders of Babylonia, while its southern limits coincided approximately with what was afterward the northern frontier of Naphtali. The Amorite kings, however, became, at all events in name, the vassals of the Egyptian Pharaoh. When the Egyptian empire began to break up, under the “heretic king” Amenhotep IV, at the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty (1400 BC), the Amorite princes naturally turned to their more powerful neighbors in the north. One of the letters in the Tell el-Amarna correspondence is from the Pharaoh to his Amorite vassal Aziru the son of Ebed-Asherah, accusing him of rebellion and threatening him with punishment. Eventually Aziru found it advisable to go over openly to the Hittites, and pay the Hittite government an annual tribute of 300 shekels of gold. From that time forward the Amorite kingdom was a dependency of the Hittite empire, which, on the strength of this, claimed dominion over Palestine as far as the Egyptian frontier.

The second successor of Aziru was Abi-Amurru (or Abi-Hadad), whose successor bore, in addition to a Semitic name, the Mitannian name of Bentesinas. Bente-sinas was dethroned by the Hittite King Muttallis and imprisoned in Cappadocia, where he seems to have met the Hittite prince Khattu-sil, who on the death of his brother Muttallis seized the crown and restored Bente-sinas to his kingdom. Bente-sinas married the daughter of Khattu-sil, while his own daughter was wedded to the son of his Hittite suzerain, and an agreement was made that the succession to the Amorite throne should be confined to her descendants. Two or three generations later the Hittite empire was destroyed by an invasion of “northern barbarians,” the Phrygians, probably, of Greek history, who marched southward, through Palestine, against Egypt, carrying with them “the king of the Amorites.” The invaders, however, were defeated and practically exterminated by Ramses III of the XXth Egyptian Dynasty (1200 BC).
The Amorite king, captured on this occasion by the Egyptians, was probably the immediate predecessor of the Sihon of the Old Testament.

3. SIHON’S CONQUEST:

Egyptian influence in Canaan had finally ceased with the invasion of Egypt by the Libyans and peoples of the Aegean in the fifth year of Menephtah, the successor of Ramesses II, at the time of the Israelite Exodus. Though the invaders were repulsed, the Egyptian garrisons had to be withdrawn from the cities of southern Palestine, where their place was taken by the Philistines who thus blocked the way from Egypt to the north. The Amorites, in the name of their distant Hittite suzerains, were accordingly able to overrun the old Egyptian provinces on the east side of the Jordan; the Amorite chieftain Og possessed himself of Bashan (Deuteronomy 3:8), and Sihon, “king of the Amorites,” conquered the northern part of Moab.

The conquest must have been recent at the time of the Israelite invasion, as the Amorite song of triumph is quoted in Numbers 21:27-29, and adapted to the overthrow of Sihon himself by the Israelites. `Woe unto thee,’ it reads, `O Moab; thou art undone, O people of Chemosh! (Chemosh) hath given thy sons who escaped (the battle) and thy daughters into captivity to Sihon king of the Amorites.’ The flame that had thus consumed Heshbon, it is further declared, shall spread southward through Moab, while Heshbon itself is rebuilt and made the capital of the conqueror: “Come to Heshbon, that the city of Sihon (like the city of David, 2 Samuel 5:9) may be rebuilt and restored. For the fire has spread from Heshbon, the flame from the capital of Sihon, devouring as far as Moab (reading `adh with the Septuagint instead of `ar), and swallowing up (reading bale`ah with the Septuagint) the high places of Arnon.” The Israelite invasion, however, prevented the expected conquest of southern Moab from taking place.

4. DISAPPEARANCE OF THE AMORITE KINGDOM:

After the fall of Sihon the Amorite kingdom disappears. The Syrians of Zobah, of Hamath and of Damascus take its place, while with the rise of Assyria the “Amorites” cease to be the representatives in contemporary
literature of the inhabitants of western Asia. At one time their power had extended to the Babylonian frontier, and Bente-sinas was summoned to Cappadocia by his Hittite overlord to answer a charge made by the Babylonian ambassadors of his having raided northern Babylonia. The Amorite king urged, however, that the raid was merely an attempt to recover a debt of 30 talents of silver.

5. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AMORITES:

In Numbers 13:29 the Amorites are described as mountaineers, and in harmony with this, according to Professor Petrie’s notes, the Egyptian artists represent them with fair complexions, blue eyes and light hair. It would, therefore, seem that they belonged to the Libyan race of northern Africa rather than to the Semitic stock. In western Asia, however, they were mixed with other racial elements derived from the subject populations, and as they spoke a Semitic language one of the most important of these elements would have been the Semites. In its general sense, moreover, the name “Amorite” included in the Babylonian period all the settled and civilized peoples west of the Euphrates to whatever race they might belong.
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A. H. Sayce

AMOS (1)

<אָמֹס> (אָמֹס [‘amoc], “burdensome” or “burden-bearer”; [ Αμώς, Amos]):

I. THE PROPHET.

1. Name:

Amos is the prophet whose book stands third among the “Twelve” in the Hebrew canon. No other person bearing the same name is mentioned in the
Old Testament, the name of the father of the prophet Isaiah being written differently (‘amots). There is an Amos mentioned in the genealogical series Luke 3:25, but he is otherwise unknown, and we do not know how his name would have been written in Hebrew. Of the signification of the prophet’s name all that can be said is that a verb with the same root letters, in the sense of to load or to carry a load, is not uncommon in the language.

2. Native Place:

Tekoa, the native place of Amos, was situated at a distance of 5 miles South from Bethlehem, from which it is visible, and 10 miles from Jerusalem, on a hill 2,700 ft. high, overlooking the wilderness of Judah. It was made a “city for defense” by Rehoboam (2 Chronicles 11:6), and may have in fact received its name from its remote and exposed position, for the stem of which the word is a derivative is of frequent occurrence in the sense of sounding an alarm with the trumpet: e.g. “Blow the trumpet in Tekoa, and set up a sign of fire in Beth-haccerem” (Jeremiah 6:1 the King James Version). The same word is also used to signify the setting up of a tent by striking in the tent-pegs; and Jerome states that there was no village beyond Tekoa in his time. The name has survived, and the neighborhood is at the present day the pasture-ground for large flocks of sheep and goats. From the high ground on which the modern village stands one looks down on the bare undulating hills of one of the bleakest districts of Palestine, “the waste howling wilderness,” which must have suggested some of the startling imagery of the prophet’s addresses. The place may have had — as is not seldom the case with towns or villages — a reputation for a special quality of its inhabitants; for it was from Tekoa that Joab fetched the “wise woman” who by a feigned story effected the reconciliation of David with his banished son Absalom (2 Samuel 14). There are traces in the Book of Amos of a shrewdness and mother-wit which are not so conspicuous in other prophetic books.

3. Personal History:

The particulars of a personal kind which are noted in the book are few but suggestive. Amos was not a prophet or the son of a prophet, he tells us (Amos 7:14), i.e. he did not belong to the professional class which frequented the so-called schools of the prophets. He was “among the
herdsmen of Tekoa” (1:1), the word here used being found only once in another place (2 Kings 3:4) and applied to Mesha, king of Moab. It seems to refer to a special breed of sheep, somewhat ungainly in appearance but producing an abundant fleece. In Amos 7:14 the word rendered “herdman” is different, and denotes an owner of cattle, though some, from the Septuagint rendering, think that the word should be the same as in Amos 1:1. He was also “a dresser of sycomore-trees” (Amos 7:14). The word rendered “dresser” (Revised Version) or “gatherer” (the King James Version) occurs only here, and from the rendering of the Septuagint ([κνίζων, knizon]) it is conjectured that there is reference to a squeezing or nipping of the sycamore fig to make it more palatable or to accelerate its ripening, though such a usage is not known in Palestine at the present day.

4. His Preparation:

Nothing is said as to any special preparation of the prophet for his work: The Lord took me from following the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel” (Amos 7:15, the English Revised Version). In these words he puts himself in line with all the prophets who, in various modes of expression, claim a direct revelation from God. But the mention of the prophetic call in association with the mention of his worldly calling is significant. There was no period interposed between the one and the other, no cessation of husbandry to prepare for the work of prophesying. The husbandman was prepared for this task, and when God’s time came he took it up. What was that preparation? Even if we suppose that the call was a momentary event, the man must have been ready to receive it, equipped for its performance. And, looking at the way in which he accomplished it, as exhibited in his book, we can see that there was a preparation, both internal and external, of a very thorough and effective character.

(1) Knowledge of God.

First of all, he has no doubt or uncertainty as to the character of the God in whose name he is called to speak. The God of Amos is one whose sway is boundless (Amos 9:2 ff), whose power is infinite (Amos 8:9 f), not only controlling the forces of Nature (Amos 4; 5:8 f) but guiding the movements and destinies of nations (Amos 6:1 ff, 14; 9:7 ff). Moreover,
He is righteous in all His ways, dealing with nations on moral principles (Amos 1:3 ff; 2:1 ff); and, though particularly favorable to Israel, yet making that very choice of them as a people a ground for visiting them with sterner retribution for their sins (Amos 3:2). In common with all the prophets, Amos gives no explanation of how he came to know God and to form this conception of His character. It was not by searching that they found out God. It is assumed that God is and that He is such a Being; and this knowledge, as it could come only from God, is regarded as undisputed and undisputable. The call to speak in God’s name may have come suddenly, but the prophet’s conception of the character of the God who called him is no new or sudden revelation but a firm and well-established conviction.

(2) Acquaintance with History of His People.

Then his book shows not only that he was well acquainted with the history and traditions of his nation, which he takes for granted as well known to his hearers, but that he had reflected upon these things and realized their significance. We infer that he had breathed an atmosphere of religion, as there is nothing to indicate that, in his acquaintance with the religious facts of his nation, he differed from those among whom he dwelt, although the call to go forth and enforce them came to him in a special way.

(3) Personal Travel.

It has been conjectured that Amos had acquired by personal travel the accurate acquaintance which he shows in his graphic delineations of contemporary life and conditions; and it may have been the case that, as a wool-merchant or flock-master, he had visited the towns mentioned and frequented the various markets to which the people were attracted.

(4) Scenery of His Home.

Nor must we overlook another factor in his preparation: the scenery in which he had his home and the occupations of his daily life. The landscape was one to make a solemn impression on a reflective mind: the extensive desert, the shimmering waters of the Dead Sea, the high wall of the distant hills of Moab, over all which were thrown the varying light and shade. The
silent life of the desert, as with such scenes ever before him, he tended his flock or defended them from the ravages of wild beasts, would to one whose thoughts were full of God nourish that exalted view of the Divine Majesty which we find in his book, and furnish the imagery in which his thoughts are set (Amos 1:2; 3:4 f; 4:13; 5:8; 9:5 f). As he is taken from following the flock, he comes before us using the language and figures of his daily life (Amos 3:12), but there runs through all the note of one who has seen God’s working in all Nature and His presence in every phenomenon. Rustic he may be, but there is no rudeness or rusticity in his style, which is one of natural and impassioned eloquence, ordered and regular as coming from a mind which was responsive to the orderly working of God in Nature around him. There is an aroma of the free air of the desert about his words; but the prophet lives in an ampler ether and breathes a purer air; all things in Nature and on the field of history are seen in a Divine light and measured by a Divine standard.

5. His Mission:

Thus, prepared in the solitudes of the extreme south of Judah, he was called to go and prophesy unto the people of Israel, and appears at Bethel the capital of the Northern Kingdom. It may be that, in the prosecution of his worldly calling, he had seen and been impressed by the conditions of life and religion in those parts. No reason is given for his mission to the northern capital, but the reason is not far to seek. It is the manner of the prophets to appear where they are most needed; and the Northern Kingdom about that time had come victorious out of war, and had reached its culmination of wealth and power, with the attendant results of luxury and excess, while the Southern Kingdom had been enjoying a period of outward tranquillity and domestic content.

6. Date:

The date of the prophet Amos can approximately be fixed from the statement in the first verse that his activity fell “in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel, two years before the earthquake.” Both these monarchs had long reigns, that of Uzziah extending from 779 to 740 BC and that of Jeroboam II from 783 to 743 BC. If we look at the years when they were concurrently reigning, and bear in mind that, toward the end of Uzziah’s reign, Jotham
acted as co-regent, we may safely place the date of Amos at about the year 760 BC. In a country in which earthquakes are not uncommon the one here mentioned must have been of unusual severity, for the memory of it was long preserved (Zechariah 14:5). How long he exercised his ministry we are not told. In all probability the book is the deposit of a series of addresses delivered from time to time till his plain speaking drew upon him the resentment of the authorities, and he was ordered to leave the country (Amos 7:10 ff). We can only conjecture that, some time afterward, he withdrew to his native place and put down in writing a condensed record of the discourses he had delivered.

2. THE BOOK.

We can distinguish with more than ordinary certainty the outlines of the individual addresses, and the arrangement of the book is clear and simple. The text, also, has been on the whole faithfully preserved; and though in a few places critics profess to find the traces of later editorial hands, these conclusions rest mainly on subjective grounds, and will be estimated differently by different minds.

1. Its Divisions:

The book falls naturally into three parts, recognizable by certain recurring formulas and general literary features.

1) The first section, which is clearly recognizable, embraces Amos 1 and 2. Here, after the title and designation of the prophet in Amos 1:1, there is a solemn proclamation of Divine authority for the prophet’s words. “Yahweh will roar from Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem” (verse 2). This is notable in one who throughout the book recognizes God’s power as world-wide and His operation as extensive as creation; and it should be a caution in view, on the one hand, of the assertion that the temple at Jerusalem was not more sacred than any of the numerous “high places” throughout the land, and, on the other hand, the superficial manner in which some writers speak of the Hebrew notion of a Deity whose dwelling-place was restricted to one locality beyond which His influence was not felt. For this God, who has His dwelling-place in Zion, now through the mouth of the prophet denounces in succession the surrounding nations, and this mainly not for offenses committed against the chosen
people but for moral offenses against one another and for breaches of a law binding on humanity. It will be observed that the nations denounced are not named in geographical order, and the prophet exhibits remarkable rhetorical skill in the order of selection. The interest and sympathy of the hearers is secured by the fixing of the attention on the enormities of guilt in their neighbors, and curiosity is kept awake by the uncertainty as to where the next stroke of the prophetic whip will fall. Beginning with the more distant and alien peoples of Damascus, Gaza and Tyre, he wheels round to the nearer and kindred peoples of Edom, Ammon and Moab, till he rests for a moment on the brother tribe of Judah, and thus, having relentlessly drawn the net around Israel by the enumeration of seven peoples, he swoops down upon the Northern Kingdom to which his message is to be particularly addressed.

(2) The second section embraces Amos 3 to 6, and consists apparently of a series of discourses, each introduced by the formula: “Hear this word” (Amos 3:1; 4:1; 5:1), and another introduced by a comprehensive: “Woe to them that are at ease in Zion, and to them that are secure in the mountain of Samaria” (Amos 6:1). The divisions here are not so clearly marked. It will be observed e.g. that there is another “Woe” at Amos 5:18; and in chapter 4, though the address at the outset is directed to the luxurious women of Samaria, from 4:4 onward the words have a wider reference. Accordingly some would divide this section into a larger number of subsections; and some, indeed, have described the whole book as a collection of ill-arranged fragments. But, while it is not necessary to suppose that the written book is an exact reproduction of the spoken addresses, and while the division into chapters has no authority, yet we must allow for some latitude in the details which an impassioned speaker would introduce into his discourses, and for transitions and connections of thought which may not be apparent on the surface.

(3) The third section has some well-marked characteristics, although it is even less uniform than the preceding. The outstanding feature is the phrase, “Thus the Lord Yahweh showed me” (Amos 7:1,4,7; 8:1) varied at Amos 9:1 by the words, “I saw the Lord standing beside the altar.” We have thus a series of “visions” bearing upon, and interpreted as applying to, the condition of Israel. It is in the course of one of these,
when the prophet comes to the words, “I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword” (Amos 7:9) that the interposition of Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, is recorded, with the prophet’s noble reply as to his Divine call, and his rebuke and denunciation of the priest, ending with a prophetic announcement of the downfall and captivity of Israel (Amos 7:14-17).

2. Its Outlook:

If the discourses are put down in chronological order of their delivery, it would appear that Amos did not immediately take his departure, since more visions follow this episode, and there is a special appropriateness in the intervention of Amaziah just at the point where it is recorded. As to the closing passage of this section (Amos 9:11-15) which gives a bright prospect of the future, there is a class of critics who are inclined to reject it just on this account as inconsistent with the severe denunciatory tone of the rest of the book. It is quite possible, however, that the prophet himself (and no succeeding later editor) may have added the passage when he came to write down his addresses. There is no reason to believe that any of the prophets — harsh though their words were — believed that the God of Israel would make a full end of His people in captivity: on the contrary, their assurance of God’s faithfulness to His promise, and the deep-seated conviction that right would ultimately prevail, lead us to expect even in the sternest or earliest of the prophets the hope of a future glory — that hope which grew brighter and brighter as the nation’s outlook grew darker, and attained intensity and clearness in the Messianic hope which sustained them in the darkest days of exile. It is difficult to believe that any of the prophets were prophets of despair, or to conceive how they could have prophesied at all unless they had a firm faith in the ultimate triumph of the good.

3. Value of the Book:

The Book of Amos is particularly valuable from the fact that he is certainly one of the earliest prophets whose writings have come down to us. It is, like the Book of Hosea which belongs to about the same time, a contemporaneous document of a period of great significance in the history of Israel, and not only gives graphic sketches or illuminating hints of the life and religious condition of the people, but furnishes a trustworthy
standard for estimating the value of some other books whose dates are not so precisely determined, a definite starting-point for tracing the course of Israel’s history.

(1) As a Picture of the Social Condition.

The book is valuable as embodying a contemporary picture of society and the condition of religion. From the abuses which the prophet denounces and the lifelike sketches he draws of the scenes amid which he moved, taken along with what we know otherwise of the historical movements of the period, we are able to form a fairly adequate estimate of the condition of the age and the country. During the reign of Jeroboam II the kingdom of Israel, after having been greatly reduced during preceding reigns, rose to a degree of extent and influence unexampled since the days of Solomon (2 Kings 14:25); and we are not astonished to read in the Book of Amos the haughty words which he puts into the mouth of the people of his time when they spoke of Israel as the “chief of the nations” a first-class power in modern language, and boasted of the “horns” by which they had attained that eminence (Amos 6:1,13). But success in war, if it encouraged this boastful spirit, brought also inevitable evils in its train. Victory, as we know from the Assyrian monuments, meant plunder; for king after king recounts how much spoil he had taken, how many prisoners he had carried away; and we must assume that wars among smaller states would be conducted on the same methods. In such wars, success meant an extension of territory and increase of wealth, while defeat entailed the reverse. But it is to be remembered that, in an agricultural country and in a society constituted as that of Israel was, the result of war to one class of the population was to a great extent disastrous, whatever was the issue, and success, when it was achieved, brought evils in its train which even aggravated their condition. The peasant, required to take up arms for offense or defense, was taken away from the labors of the field which, in the best event, were for a time neglected, and, in the worst, were wasted and rendered unproductive. And then, when victory was secured, the spoils were liable to fall into the hands of the nobles and leaders, those “called with a name” (Amos 6:1), while the peasant returned to his wasted or neglected fields without much substantial resource with which to begin life again. The wealth secured by the men of strong hand led to the increase of luxury in its possessors, and became actually the means of still
further adding to the embarrassment of the poor, who were dependent on
the rich for the means of earning their livelihood. The situation would be
aggravated under a feeble or corrupt government, such as was certainly that
of Jeroboam’s successors. The condition prevails in modern eastern
countries, even under comparatively wise and just administration; and that
it was the state of matters prevailing in the time of Amos is abundantly
clear from his book. The opening denunciation of Israel for oppression of
the poor and for earth-hunger (Amos 2:6,7) is re-echoed and amplified in
the succeeding chapters (Amos 3:9,10; 4:1; 5:11,12; 8:4-6); and the
luxury of the rich, who batten on the misfortune of their poorer
brethren, is castigated in biting irony in such passages as Amos 6:3-6.
Specially noticeable in this connection is the contemptuous reference to
the luxurious women, the “kine of Bashan” (Amos 4:1), whose
extravagances are maintained by the oppression of the poor. The situation,
in short, was one that has found striking parallels in modern despotic
countries in the East, where the people are divided into two classes, the
powerful rich, rich because powerful and powerful because rich, and, the
poor oppressed, men who have no helper, no “back” in the common
eastern phrase, dependent on the rich and influential and tending to greater
poverty under greedy patrons.

(2) As a Picture of the Religious Condition.

In such a social atmosphere, which poisoned the elementary virtues,
religion of a vital kind could not flourish; and there are plain indications in
the words of Amos of the low condition to which it had sunk. There was,
indeed, as we gather from his addresses, no lack of outward attention to
the forms of worship; but these forms were of so corrupted a character and
associated with so much practical godlessness and even immorality, that
instead of raising the national character it tended to its greater degradation.
The people prided themselves in what they regarded the worship of the
national God, thinking that so long as they honored Him with costly
offerings and a gorgeous ritual, they were pleasing Him and secure in His
protection. Bethel, Dan, Gilgal, Beersheba, and we know not how many
other places were resorted to in pilgrimage by crowds of worshippers.
With all the accompaniments of ceremonious ritual which the newly found
wealth put in their power, with offerings more than the legally prescribed
or customary (Amos 4:4,5) the service of these sanctuaries was
maintained; but even these offerings were made at the expense of the poor (Amos 5:11), the prevailing luxury forced its way even to the precincts of the altars (Amos 2:8), and justice and mercy were conspicuously absent from the religious life. The people seemed to have settled down to a complacent optimism, nourished no doubt by national prosperity, and, though there had not been wanting reminders of the sovereignty of a righteous God, in convulsions of Nature — drought, famine, pestilence and earthquake (Amos 4:6-11) — these had been of no avail to awaken the sleeping conscience. They put the evil day far from them (Amos 6:3), for Yahweh was their national God and “the day of the Lord,” the good time coming (Amos 5:18), when God would come to their help, was more in their mind than the imperative duty of returning to Him (Amos 4:6,8, etc.).

(3) Testimony to History.

The book is valuable for the confirmation it gives of the historical statements of other books, particularly for the references it contains to the earlier history contained in the Pentateuch. And here we must distinguish between references to, or quotations from, books, and statements or hints or indications of historical events which may or may not have been written in books or accessible to the prophet and his hearers. Opinions differ as to the date of composition of the books which record the earlier history, and the oldest Biblical writers are not in the habit of saying from what sources they drew their information or whether they are quoting from books. We can hardly believe that in the time of Amos copies of existing books or writings would be in the hands of the mass of the people, even if the power to read them was general. In such circumstances, if we find a prophet like Amos in the compass of a small book referring to outstanding events and stages of the past history as matters known to all his hearers and unquestionable, our confidence in the veracity of the books in which these facts are recorded is greatly increased, and it becomes a matter of comparatively less importance at what date these books were composed. Now it is remarkable how many allusions, more or less precise, to antecedent history are found in the compass of this small book; and the significance of them lies not in the actual number of references, but in the kind of reference and the implications involved in the individual references. That is to say, each reference is not to be taken as an isolated testimony to
some single event in question, but involves a great deal more than is expressed, and is intelligible only when other facts or incidents are taken into consideration. Thus e.g. the reference to the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah (Amos 4:11) is only intelligible on the supposition that the story of that catastrophe was a matter of common knowledge; and it would be a carping criticism to argue that the destruction of other cities of the plain at the same time and the whole story of Lot were unknown in the days of Amos because they are not mentioned here in detail. So, when we have in one passage a reference to the house of Isaac (Amos 7:16), in another to the house of Jacob (Amos 3:13), in another to the house of Joseph (Amos 5:6) and in another to the enmity between Jacob and Esau (Amos 1:11), we cannot take these as detached notices, but must supply the links which the prophet’s words would suggest to his hearers. In other words, such slight notices, just because they are incidental and brief, imply a familiarity with a connected patriarchal history such as is found in the Book of Gen. Again, the prophet’s references to the “whole family” of the “children of Israel” whom the Lord “brought up out of the land of Egypt” (Amos 3:1), to the Divine leading of the people “forty years in the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite” (Amos 2:10) are not odds and ends of popular story but links in a chain of national history. It seems to be on the strength of these and similar references in the books of Amos and Hos, whose dates are known, that critics have agreed to fix the date of the earliest historical portions of the Pentateuch as they understand them, namely, the parts designated as Jahwist and Elohist, in the 8th and 9th centuries BC, i.e. at or shortly before the time of these prophets. It may be left to the unbiased judgment of the reader to say whether the references look like references to a newly composed document, or whether it is not more probable that, in an age when written documents were necessarily few and not accessible to the multitude, these references are appeals to things well fixed in the national memory, a memory extending back to the things themselves. Or, if the prophet’s words are to be taken as sufficient proof of the existence of written sources, the fact that the matters are assumed as well known would rather encourage the conclusion that the written sources in question go back to a much earlier period, since the matters contained in them had by this time become matters of universal knowledge.
(4) Testimony to the Law.

(a) The Ritual.

And what about those other elements of the Pentateuch of a legal and ritual character which bulk so prominently in those books? The question whether the Book of Amos indicates an acquaintance with these or not is important because it is to a great extent on the silence of prophetic and historical writers that critics of a certain school relegate these legalistic portions of the Pentateuch to a late date. Now at the outset it is obvious to ask what we have a reasonable right to expect. We have to bear in mind what was the condition of the people whom Amos addressed, and the purpose and aim of his mission to the Northern Kingdom. It is to be remembered that, as we are told in the Book of Kings (1 Kings 12:25 ff), Jeroboam I deliberately sought to make a breach between the worship of Jerusalem and that of his own kingdom, while persuading his people that the worship of Yahweh was being maintained. The schism occurred some 170 years before the time of Amos and it is not probable that the worship and ritual of the Northern Kingdom tended in that interval to greater purity or greater conformity to what had been the authoritative practice of the undivided kingdom at the temple of Jerusalem. When, therefore, Amos, in face of the corrupt worship combined with elaborate ritual which prevailed around him, declares that God hates and despises their feasts and takes no delight in their solemn assemblies (Amos 5:21), we are not justified in pressing his words, as is sometimes done, into a sweeping condemnation of all ritual. On the contrary, seeing that, in the very same connection (Amos 5:22), he specifies burnt offerings and meal offerings and peace offerings, and, in another passage (Amos 4:4,5), daily sacrifices and tithes, sacrifices of thanksgiving and free-will offerings, it is natural to infer that by these terms which are familiar in the Pentateuch he is referring to those statutory observances which were part of the national worship of united Israel, but had been overlaid with corruption and become destitute of spiritual value as practiced in the Northern Kingdom. So we may take his allusions to the new moon and the Sabbath (Amos 8:5) as seasons of special sacredness and universally sanctioned. Having condemned in such scornful and sweeping terms the worship that he saw going on around him, what was Amos to gum by entering into minute ritual prescriptions or defining the precise duties and perquisites of priests and Levites; and
having condemned the pilgrimages to the shrines of Bethel, Gilgal, Beersheba, Samaria and Daniel (Amos 4:4; 5:5; 8:14), what was he to gain by quoting the law of Deut as to a central sanctuary? And had one of his hearers, like the woman of Samaria of a later day, attempted to draw him into a discussion of the relative merits of the two temples, we can conceive him answering in the spirit of the great Teacher: “Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship” (John 4:22 the King James Version). A regulation of the form was of no avail while the whole spirit of the observance was corrupt; the soul of religion was dead, and the prophet had a higher duty than to dress out the carcass.

At the root of the corruption of the religion lay a rottenness of moral sense; and from beginning to end Amos insists on the necessity of a pure and righteous life. In this connection his appeals are in striking agreement with the specially ethical demands of the law books, and in phraseology so much resemble them as to warrant the conclusion that the requirements of the law on these subjects were known and acknowledged. Thus his denunciations of those who oppress the poor (Amos 2:7; 4:1; 8:4) are quite in the spirit and style of Exodus 22:21,22; 23:9; his references to the perversion of justice and taking bribes (Amos 2:6; 5:7,10 ff, 6:12) are rhetorical enforcements of the prohibitions of the law in Exodus 23:6-8; when he reproves those that “lay themselves down beside every altar upon clothes taken in pledge” (Amos 2:8) we hear an echo of the command: “If thou at all take thy neighbor’s garment to pledge, thou shalt restore it unto him before the sun goeth down” (Exodus 22:26); and when he denounces those making “the ephah small, and the shekel great, and dealing falsely with balances of deceit” (Amos 8:5) his words are in close agreement with the law, “Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in mete-yard, in weights, or in measure. Just balances, just weight, a just ephah, and a just hin shall ye have” (Leviticus 19:35,36, the King James Version).

(b) Ethical Teaching.

As a preacher of righteousness, Amos affirms and resists upon those ethical parts of the law which are its vital elements, and which lie at the foundation of all prophecy; and it is remarkable how even in phraseology he agrees with the most ethical book of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy. He
does not, indeed, like his contemporary Hosea, dwell on the love of God as Deuteronomy does; but, of sterner mould, in almost the very words of Deuteronomy, emphasizes the keeping of God’s commandments, and denounces those who despise the law (compare Amos 2:4 with Deuteronomy 17:19). Among verbal coincidences have been noticed the combinations “oppress” “crush” (Amos 4:1; Deuteronomy 28:33), “blasting” and “mildew” (Amos 4:9; Deuteronomy 28:22), and “gall” and “wormwood” (Amos 6:12; Deuteronomy 29:18). Compare also Amos 9:8 with Deuteronomy 6:15, and note the predilection for the same word to “destroy” common to both books (compare Amos 2:9 with Deuteronomy 2:22). In view of all of which it seems an extraordinary statement to make that “the silence of Amos with reference to the centralization of worship, on which Deuteronomy is so explicit, alone seems sufficient to outweigh any linguistic similarity that can be discovered” (H. G. Mitchell, Amos, an Essay in Exegesis, 185).

5 The Prophetic Order.

As Amos is without doubt one of the earliest writing prophets, his book is invaluable as an example of what prophecy was in ancient Israel. And one thing cannot fail to impress the reader at the very outset: namely, that he makes no claim to be the first or among the first of the line, or that he is exercising some new and hitherto unheard-of function. He begins by boldly speaking in God’s name, assuming that even the people of the Northern Kingdom were familiar with that kind of address. Nay, he goes farther and states in unequivocal terms that “the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets” (Amos 3:7, the King James Version). We need not search farther for a definition of the prophet as understood by him and other Old Testament writers: the prophet is one to whom God reveals His will, and who comes forward to declare that will and purpose to man. A great deal has been made of the words of Amaziah the priest of Bethel (Amos 7:12), as if they proved that the prophet in those times was regarded as a wandering rhetorician, earning his bread by reciting his speeches; and it has been inferred from the words of Amos himself that the prophets of his day were so disreputable a class that he disdained to be named along with them (Amos 7:14). But all this is fanciful. Even if we admit that there were men calling themselves prophets who prophesied for hire (Micah 3:5,11), it cannot be assumed that the
expression here to “eat bread” has that meaning; for in other passages it seems simply to signify to lead a quiet or ordinary life, to go about one’s daily business (see Exod. 24:11; Jer. 22:15). In any case we are not to take the estimate of a man like Amaziah or a godless populace in preference to the conception of Amos himself and his account of his call. It was not by man or by any college of prophets but by Yahweh Himself that he was appointed, and by whatever name he might be called, the summons was “Go, prophesy unto my people Israel” (Amos 7:15). There is no trace here of the “prophets becoming conscious of a distinction between themselves and the professional [nebhi’im], who were apt simply to echo the patriotic and nationalistic sentiments of the people, and in reality differed but little from the soothsayers and diviners of Semitic heathenism” (Ottley, The Religion of Israel, 90). Whoever the “professional [nebhi’im]” may have been in his day, or whatever he thought of them if they existed, Amos tells us nothing; but he ranges himself with men to whom Yahweh has spoken in truth (Amos 3:7,8), and indicates that there had been a succession of such men (Amos 2:11), faithful amid the prevailing corruption though tempted to be unfaithful (Amos 2:12); in short he gives us to understand that the “prophetic order” goes back to a period long before his day and has its roots in the true and original religion of Israel.

(6) The Prophetic Religion.

Finally, from the Book of Amos we may learn what the prophetic religion was. Here again there is no indication of rudimentary crudeness of conception, or of painful struggling upward from the plane of naturalism or belief in a merely tribal God. The God in whose name Amos speaks has control over all the forces of Nature (Amos 4:6 ff; 5:8,9), rules the destinies of nations (Amos 6:2,14; 9:2-6), searches the thoughts of the heart (Amos 4:13), is inflexible in righteousness and deals with nations and with men on equal justice (Amos 1 and Amos 2; Amos 9:7), and is most severe to the people who have received the highest privileges (Amos 3:2). And this is the God by whose name his hearers call themselves, whose claims they cannot deny, whose dealings with them from old time are well known and acknowledged (Amos 2:11), whose laws they have broken (Amos 2:4; 3:10) and for whose just judgment they are warned to prepare (Amos 4:12). All this the prophet enforces
faithfully and sternly; not a voice is raised in the circle of his hearers to dispute his words; all that Amaziah the priest can do is to urge the prophet to abstain from unwelcome words in Bethel, because it is the king’s sanctuary and a royal house; the only inference is that the people felt the truth and justice of the prophet’s words. The “prophetic religion” does not begin with Amos.
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**AMOS (2)**

*amox* ([Ἀμώς, Amos]): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy, the eighth before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Luke 3:25).

**AMOZ**

*amoz* ([אָמוֹז, Amots], “strong”): The father of Isaiah the prophet (2 Kings 19:2,20; 20:1; 2 Chronicles 26:22; 32:20,32; Isaiah 1:1; 2:1; 13:1; 20:2; 37:2,21; 38:1).

**AMPHIPOLIS**

*am-fip’-o-lis* ([Ἀμφίπολις, Amphipolis]): A town in Macedonia, situated on the eastern bank of the Strymon (modern Struma or Karasu) some three miles from its mouth, near the point where it flows out of Lake Prasias or Cercinitis. It lay on a terraced hill, protected on the North, West and South by the river, on the East by a wall (Thuc. iv.102), while its
harbor-town of Eion lay on the coast close to the river’s mouth. The name is derived either from its being nearly surrounded by the stream or from its being conspicuous on every side, a fact to which Thucydides draws attention (in the place cited). It was at first called Ennea Hodoi, Nine Ways, a name which suggests its importance both strategically and commercially. It guarded the main route from Thrace into Macedonia and later became an important station on the Via Egnatia, the great Roman road from Dyrrhachium on the Adriatic to the Hebrus (Maritza), and it was the center of a fertile district producing wine, oil, figs and timber in abundance and enriched by gold and silver mines and considerable manufactures, especially of woolen stuffs. In 497 BC Aristagoras, ex-despot of Miletus, tried to settle there, and a second vain attempt was made in 465-464 by the Athenians, who succeeded in founding a colony there in 437 under the leadership of Hagnon. The population, however, was too mixed to allow of strong Athenian sympathies, and in 424 the town fell away to the Spartan leader Brasidas and defied all the subsequent attempts of the Athenians to recover it. It passed under the protectorate of Perdicas and Philip of Macedon, and the latter finally made himself master of it in 358. On the Roman partition of Macedonia after the battle of Pydna (168 BC) Amphipolis was made a free city and capital of Macedonia Prima. Paul and Silas passed through it on their way from Philippi to Thessalonica, but the narrative seems to preclude a long stay (Acts 17:1). The place was called Popolia in the Middle Ages, while in modern times the village of Neochori (Turkish, Yenikeui) marks the site (Leake, Northern Greece, III, 181 ff, Cousinery, Macedoine, I, 100 ff, 122 ff; Heuzey et Daumet, Mission archeol. de Macedoine, 165 ff).

Marcus N. Tod

AMPLIAS

<am'-pli-as> (Textus Receptus [ Ἀμπλιᾶς, Amplias]), the King James Version form: a contraction of &AMPLIATUS (thus, the Revised Version (British and American); which see).
AMPLIATUS

<am-pli-a'-tus> ([´Αμπλιάτος, Amliatos], Codex Sinaiticus, A,B,F, Ampliatus; [´Αμπλίατος, Amplias], D,E,L,P, the Revised Version (British and American) form; the King James Version Amplias): The name of a member of the Christian community at Rome, to whom Paul sent greetings (Romans 16:8). He is designated “my beloved in the Lord.” It is a common name and is found in inscriptions connected with the imperial household. The name is found twice in the cemetery of Domitilla. The earlier inscription is over a cell which belongs to the end of the 1st century or the beginning of the 2nd century. The bearer of this name was probably a member of her household and conspicuous in the early Christian church in Rome.

AMRAM

<am'-ram> (עַמְרָם [amram], “people exalted”):

(1) Father of Aaron, Moses and Miriam (Exodus 6:20; Numbers 26:59; 1 Chronicles 6:3; 23:13); and a son of Kohath, the son of Levi (Exodus 6:18; Numbers 3:19, etc.). It is not certain that he was literally the son of Kohath, but rather his descendant, since there were ten generations from Joseph to Joshua (1 Chronicles 7:20-27), while only four are actually mentioned from Levi to Moses for the corresponding period. Moreover the Kohathites at the time of the Exodus numbered 8,600 (Numbers 3:28), which would therefore have been an impossibility if only two generations had lived. It seems best to regard Amram as a descendant of Kohath, and his wife Jochebed as a “daughter of Levi” in a general sense.

(2) One of the Bani, who in the days of Ezra had taken a foreign wife (Ezra 10:34).

(3) In 1 Chronicles 1:41 (the King James Version) for the properly read HAMRAN of the Revised Version (British and American) ([חָמָרָן [chamran]), a Horite, who in Genesis 36:26 is called &HEMDAN (which see).
AMRAMITES

<am'-ram-its> (['amrami]): The descendants of Amram, one of the Levitical families mentioned in Numbers 3:27 and 1 Chronicles 26:23, who had the charge of the tabernacle proper, guarding the ark, table, candlestick, etc., called in 1 Chronicles 26:22 “the treasures of the house of Yahweh.”

AMRAPHEL

<am'-ra-fel>, <am-ra'-fel> (['amraphel], or, perhaps better, ['ameraphel]).

1. THE EXPEDITION AGAINST SODOM AND GOMORRAH:

This name, which is identified with that of the renowned Babylonian king Hammurabi (which see), is only found in Genesis 14:1,9, where he is mentioned as the king of Shinar (Babylonia), who fought against the cities of the plain, in alliance with Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of Nations (the Revised Version (British and American) &GOIIM). The narrative which follows is very circumstantial. From it we learn, that Bera king of Sodom, Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, Shemeber king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela or Zoar, had served Chedorlaomer for 12 years, rebelled in the 13th, and in the 14th year Chedorlaomer, with the kings enumerated, fought with and defeated them in the vale of Siddim, which is described as being the Salt Sea. Previous to this engagement, however, the Elamites and their allies had attacked the Rephaim (Onkelos: “giants”) in Ashtaroth-karnaim, the Zuzim (O: “mighty ones,” “heroes”) in Ham (O: [Chamta’]), the Emim (O: “terrible ones”) in Shaveh-kiriathaim, and the Horites in their Mount Seir, by the Desert. These having been rendered powerless to aid the revolted vassals, they returned and came to Enmishpat, or Kadesh, attacked the country of the Amalekites, and the Amorites dwelling in Hazazontamar (Genesis 14:2-7).
2. THE PREPARATION AND THE ATTACK:

At this juncture the kings of the cities of the plain came out against them, and opposed them with their battle-array in the vale of Siddim. The result of the fight was, that the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah, with their allies, fled, and fell among the bitumen-pits of which the place was full, whilst those who got away took refuge in the mountain. All the goods and food (the camp-equipment and supplies) of the kings of the plain were captured by Chedorlaomer and his allies, who then continued their march (to their own lands) (Genesis 14:8-11).

3. ABRAHAM’S RESCUE OF LOT:

Among the captives, however, was Lot, Abram’s nephew, who dwelt in Sodom. A fugitive, having escaped, went and announced the result of the engagement to Abram, who was at that time living by Mamre’s oak plantation. The patriarch immediately marched forth with his trained men, and pursued them to Dan, where he divided his forces, attacked the Elamite-Babylonian army by night, and having put them to flight, pursued them again to Hobah, on the left (or North) of Damascus. The result of this sudden onslaught was that he rescued Lot, with the women and people, and recaptured Lot’s goods, which the allies of Amraphel had carried off (Genesis 14:12-16).

4. DIFFICULTIES OF THE IDENTIFICATION OF AMRAPHEL:

There is no doubt that the identification of Amraphel with the Hammurabi of the Babylonian inscriptions is the best that has yet been proposed, and though there are certain difficulties therein, these may turn out to be apparent rather than real, when we know more of Babylonian history. The “l” at the end of Amraphel (which has also “ph” instead of “p” or “b”) as well as the fact that the expedition itself has not yet been recognized among the campaigns of Hammurabi, must be acknowledged as two points hard to explain, though they may ultimately be solved by further research.

5. HISTORICAL AGREEMENTS:

It is noteworthy, however, that in the first verse of Genesis 14 Amraphel is mentioned first, which, if he be really the Babylonian Hammurabi, is
easily comprehensible, for his renown to all appearance exceeded that of Chedorlaomer, his suzerain. In 14:4 and 5, however, it is Chedorlaomer alone who is referred to, and he heads the list of eastern kings in verse 9, where Tidal comes next (a quite natural order, if Goiim be the Babylonian Gute, i.e. the Medes). Next in order comes Amraphel, king of Babylonia and suzerain of Arioch of Ellasar (Eri-Aku of Larsa), whose name closes the list. It may also be suggested, that Amraphel led a Babylonian force against Sodom, as the ally of Chedorlaomer, before he became king, and was simply crown prince. In that case, like Belshazzar, he was called “king” by anticipation. For further details see ARIOCH and CHEDORLAOMER, and compare ERI-AKU and HAMMURABI; for the history of Babylonia during Hammurabi’s period, see that article.

T. G. Pinches

AMULET

<am’-u-let> (קְמִית qemia, לְחַשִּֽים lehashim, מְזוּזָה mezuzah, תֶּפֶלִין tephillin, תֵּסִיסִים tsitsith; φυλακτήριον, phulakterion): Modern scholars are of opinion that our English word amulet comes from the Latin amuletum, used by Pliny (Naturalis Historia, xxviii, 28; xxx, 2, etc.), and other Latin writers; but no etymology for the Latin word has been discovered. The present writer thinks the root exists in the Arabic himlat, “something carried” (see Dozy, Supplement aux Dictionnaires Arabes, I, 327), though there is no known example of the use of the Arabic word in a magical sense. Originally “amulet” denoted any object supposed to have the power of removing or warding noxious influences believed to be due to evil spirits, etc., such as the evil eye, etc. But in the common usage it stands for an object worn on the body, generally hung from the neck, as a remedy or preservative against evil influences of a mystic kind. The word “amulet” occurs once in the Revised Version (British and American) (< Isaiah 3:20) but not at all in the King James Version.

1. CLASSES OF AMULETS:

The substances out of which amulets have been made and the forms which they have taken have been various.
The commonest have consisted of Amulets of pieces of stone or metal, strips of parchment with or without inscriptions from sacred writings (Bible, Koran, etc.). The earliest Egyptian amulets known are pieces of green schist of various shapes — animal, etc. These were placed on the breast of a deceased person in order to secure a safe passage to the under-world. When a piece of stone is selected as an amulet it is always portable and generally of some striking figure or shape (the human face, etc.). The use of such a stone for this purpose is really a survival of animism.

Gems, rings, etc. It has been largely held that all ornaments worn on the person were originally amulets.

Certain herbs and animal preparations; the roots of certain plants have been considered very potent as remedies and preservatives.

The practice of wearing amulets existed in the ancient world among all peoples, but especially among Orientals; and it can be traced among most modern nations, especially among peoples of backward civilization. Nor is it wholly absent from peoples of the most advanced civilization of today, the English, Americans, etc. Though the word charm (see CHARM) has a distinct meaning, it is often inseparably connected with amulets, for it is in many cases the incantation or charm inscribed on the amulet that gives the latter its significance. As distinguished from talisman (see TALISMAN) an amulet is believed to have negative results, as a means of protection: a talisman is thought to be the means of securing for the wearer some positive boon.

2. AMULETS IN THE BIBLE:

Though there is no word in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures denoting “amulet,” the thing itself is manifestly implied in many parts of the Bible. But it is remarkable that the general teaching of the Bible and especially that of the Old Testament prophets and of the New Testament writers is wholly and strongly opposed to such things.

(1) The Old Testament.

The golden ear-rings, worn by the wives and sons and daughters of the Israelites, out of which the molten calf was made (Exodus 32:2 f), were
undoubtedly amulets. What other function could they be made to serve in the simple life of the desert? That the women’s ornaments condemned in Isaiah 3:16-26 were of the same character is made exceedingly likely by an examination of some of the terms employed. We read of moonlets and sunlets (verse 18), i.e. moon and sun-shaped amulets. The former in the shape of crescents are worn by Arab girls of our own time. The “ear-drops,” “nose-rings,” “arm chains” and “foot chains” were all used as a protection to the part of the body implied, and the strong words with which their employment is condemned are only intelligible if their function as counter charms is borne in mind. In Isaiah 3:20 we read of [lechashim] rendered “ear-rings” (the King James Version) and “amulets” (Revised Version (British and American)). The Hebrew word seems to be cognate with the word for “serpent” ([nechashim]; “l” and “r” often interchange), and meant probably in the first instance an amulet against a serpent bite (see Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews and Their Neighbours, by the present writer, 50 f, 81; compare Jeremiah 8:7; Ecclesiastes 10:11; Psalm 58:5). Crescent-shaped amulets were worn by animals as well as human beings, as Judges 8:21,26 shows.

At Bethel, Jacob burned not only the idols (“strange gods”) but also the ear-rings, the latter being as much opposed to Yahwism as the former, on account of their heathen origin and import.

In Proverbs 17:8 the Hebrew words rendered “a precious stone” (Hebrew “a stone conferring favor”) mean without question a stone amulet treasured on account of its supposed magical efficacy. It is said in Proverbs 1:9 that wisdom will be such a defense to the one who has it as the head amulet is to the head and that of the neck to the neck. The words rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) “a chaplet of grace unto thy head” mean literally, “something bound to the head conferring favor,” the one word for the latter clause being identical with that so rendered above ([chen]). The Talmudic word for an amulet ([qemia\']) denotes something tied or bound (to the person).

We have reference to the custom of wearing amulets in Proverbs 6:21 where the reader is urged to “bind them (i.e. the admonitions of father and mother) .... upon thy heart” and to “tie them about thy neck” — words
implying a condemnation of the practice of trusting to the defense of mere material objects.

Underneath the garments of warriors slain in the Maccabean wars amulets were found in the shape apparently of idols worshipped by their neighbors (2 Macc 12:40). It is strange but true that like other nations of antiquity the Jews attached more importance to amulets obtained from other nations than to those of native growth. It is probable that the signet ring referred to in Song 8:6; Jeremiah 22:24; Haggai 2:23 was an amulet. It was worn on the heart or on the arm.

(2) The Phylacteries and the Mezuzah.

There is no distract reference to these in the Old Testament. The Hebrew technical term for the former ([tephillin]) does not occur in Biblical. Hebrew, and although the Hebrew word [mezuzah] does occur over a dozen times its sense is invariably “door-(or “gate-”) post” and not the amulet put on the door-post which in later Hebrew the word denotes.

It is quite certain that the practice of wearing phylacteries has no Biblical support, for a correct exegesis and a proper understanding of the context put it beyond dispute that the words in Exodus 13:9,16, Deuteronomy 6:8 f; 11:18-20 have reference to the exhortations in the foregoing verses: “Thou shalt bind them (the commands previously mentioned) for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontiers between thy eyes. And thou shalt write them upon, the door-posts of thy house, and upon thy gates” (Deuteronomy 6:8 f). The only possible sense of these words is that they were to hold the precepts referred to before their minds constantly as if they were inscribed on their arms, held in front of their eyes, and written on the door-posts or gate-posts which they daily passed. That the language in Exodus 13:9,16 does not command the use of phylacteries is obvious, and that the same is true of Proverbs 3:3; 6:21; 7:3 where similar words are used is still more certain. Yet, though none of the passages enjoin the use of phylacteries or of the [mezuzah], they may all contain allusions to both practices as if the sense were, “Thou shalt keep constantly before thee my words and look to them for safety and not to the phylacteries worn on head and arm by the heathen.” If, however, phylacteries were in use among the Jews thus early, it is strange that there is not in the Old Testament a single instance in
which the practice of wearing phylacteries is mentioned. Josephus, however, seems to refer to this practice (Ant., IV, viii, 13), and it is frequently spoken of in the Mishna ([Berakhoth], i, etc.). It is a striking and significant fact that the Apocrypha is wholly silent as to the three signs of Judaism, phylacteries, the [mezuzah] and the [tsitsith] (or tassel attached to the corner of the prayer garment called [Tallith]; compare Matthew 9:20; 14:36 the King James Version where “hem of the garment” is inaccurate and misleading).

It is quite evident that phylacteries have a magical origin. This is suggested by the Greek name phulakterion (whence the English name) which in the 1st century of our era denoted a counter charm or defense (phulasso, “to protect”) against evil influences. No scholar now explains the Greek word as denoting a means of leading people to keep (phulasso) the law. The Hebrew name [tephillin] (= “prayers”) meets us first in post-Bib. Hebrew, and carries with it the later view that phylacteries are used during prayer in harmony with the prayers or other formulas over the amulet to make it effective (see Budge, Egyptian Magic, 27).

See more fully under CHARM.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the literature given in the course of the foregoing article, the following may be mentioned. On the general subject see the great works of Tyler (Early History of Mankind, Primitive Culture) and Frazer, Golden Bough; also the series of articles under “Charms and Amulets” in Hastings’ Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics and the excellent article “Amulet” in the corresponding German work, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. See further the article “Amulet” in Jewish Encyclopedia, and on Egyptian amulets, Budge, Egyptian Magic, 25 ff.

T. Witton Davies

AMZI

<am’-zi> (אָמָץ [’amtsi], “my strength”):

(1) A Levite of the family of Merari ( Chronicles 6:46).
A priest of the family of Adaiah in the second temple. His father’s name was Zechariah (Nehemiah 11:12).

**ANAB**

<\textit{a’-nab}> ([\textit{anabh}], “grapes”; Codex Vaticanus, [\textit{Avóv}, Anon] or [\textit{Avóβ}, Anob]): Mentioned in the list of cities which fell to Judah (Joshua 15:50). In the list it follows Debir, from which it was a short distance to the Southwest. It lay about twelve males to the Southwest of Hebron. It was a city of the Anakim, from whom Joshua took it (Joshua 11:21). Its site is now known as the rum [Anab].

**ANAEL**

<\textit{an’-a-el}> ([\textit{Avαηλ}, Anael]): A brother of Tobit mentioned once only (Tobit 1:21) as the father of Achiacharus, who was an official in Nineveh under Esar-haddon.

**ANAH**

<\textit{a’-na}> ([\textit{anah}], meaning uncertain; a Horite clan-name (Genesis 36)):

(1) Mother of Aholibamah, one of the wives of Esau and daughter of Zibeon (compare Genesis 36:2,14,18,25). The Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Peshitta read “son,” identifying this Anah with number 3 (see below); Genesis 36:2, read (\textit{ha-chori}), for (\textit{ha-chiwwi}).

(2) Son of Seir, the Horite, and brother of Zibeon; one of the chiefs of the land of Edom (compare Genesis 36:20,21 = 1 Chronicles 1:38). Seir is elsewhere the name of the land (compare Genesis 14:6; Isaiah 21:11); but here the country is personified and becomes the mythical ancestor of the tribes inhabiting it.

(3) Son of Zibeon, “This is Anah who found the hot springs in the wilderness” (compare Genesis 36:24 = 1 Chronicles 1:40,41) The word [ha-yemim], occurs only in this passage and is probably
corrupt. Ball (Sacred Books of the Old Testament, Genesis, critical note 93) suggests that it is a corruption of \[\text{we-hemam}\] (compare Genesis 36:22) in an earlier verse. Jerome, in his commentary on Genesis 36:24, assembles the following definitions of the word gathered from Jewish sources.

1. “seas” as though \[\text{yammim}\];
2. “hot springs” as though \[\text{hammim}\];
3. a species of ass, \[\text{yemim}\];
4. “mules.” This last explanation was the one most frequently met with in Jewish lit; the tradition ran that Anah was the first to breed the mule, thus bringing into existence an unnatural species. As a punishment, God created the deadly water-snake, through the union of the common viper with the Libyan lizard (compare Genesis Rabbah 82 15, Yer. Ber 1 12b; Babylonian Pes 54a, Ginzberg, Monatschrift, XLII, 538-39).

The descent of Anah is thus represented in the three ways pointed out above as the text stands. If, however, we accept the reading \[\text{ben}\] [ben], for \[\text{bath}\], in the first case, Aholibamah will then be an unnamed daughter of the Anah of Genesis 36:24, not the Aholibamah, daughter of Anah of 36:25 (for the Anah of this verse is evidently the one of 36:20, not the Anah of 36:24). Another view is that the words, “the daughter of Zibeon,” are a gloss, inserted by one who mistakenly identified the Anah of 36:25 with the Anah of 36:24; in this event, Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, will be the one mentioned in 36:25.

The difference between (2) and (3) is to be explained on the basis of a twofold tradition. Anah was originally a sub-clan of the clan known as Zibeon, and both were “sons of Seir” — i.e. Horites.

H. J. Wolf
ANAHARATH

\(<a-na’-ha-rath>\) (אנהראת, meaning unknown): A place which fell to the tribe of Issachar in the division of the land (Joshua 19:19). Located in the valley of Jezreel toward the East, the name and site being preserved as the modern [en-Na`-ura]. BDB is wrong in assigning it to the tribe of Naphtali.

ANAIAH

\(<an-a-i’-a>, <a-ni’-a>\) (אנהיה, “Yah has answered”):

(1) a Levite who assisted Ezra in reading the law to the people (Nehemiah 8:4), perhaps the person called Ananias in Esdras 9:43.

(2) One of those who sealed the covenant (Nehemiah 10:22). He may have been the same as Anaiah (1).

ANAK

\(<an’-nak>\).

See ANAKIM.

ANAKIM

\(<an’-a-kim>\) (اناקים, Enakim, or Enakeim]; also called “sons of Anak” (Numbers 13:33), and “sons of the Anakim” (Deuteronomy 1:28)): The spies (Numbers 13:33) compared them to the Nephilim or “giants” of Genesis 6:4, and according to Deuteronomy 2:11 they were reckoned among the Rephaim (which see). In Numbers 13:22 the chiefs of Hebron are said to be descendants of Anak, while “the father of Anak” is stated in Joshua (15:13; 21:11) to be Arba after whom Hebron was called “the city of Arba.” Joshua “cut off the Anakim .... from Hebron, from Debir, from Anab, .... and from all the hill-country of Israel,” remnants of them being left in the Philistine cities of Gaza, Gath and Ashdod (Joshua 11:21,22). As compared with the Israelites, they were tall like giants (Numbers 13:33), and it would therefore seem that the “giant” Goliath and his family
were of their race. At Hebron, at the time of the Israelite conquest, we may gather that they formed the body-guard of the Amorite king (see \textit{Joshua} 10:5) under their three leaders Sheshai, Ahiman and Talmai (\textit{Numbers} 13:22; \textit{Joshua} 15:14; \textit{Judges} 1:20). Tell el-Amarna Letters show that the Canaanite princes were accustomed to surround themselves with bodyguards of foreign mercenaries. It appears probable that the Anakim came from the Aegean like the Philistines, to whom they may have been related. The name Anak is a masculine corresponding with a feminine which we meet with in the name of the goddess Onka, who according to the Greek writers, Stephanus of Byzantium and Hesychius, was the “Phoen,” i.e. Syrian equivalent of Athena. Anket or Anukit was also the name of the goddess worshipped by the Egyptians at the First Cataract. In the name Ahi-man it is possible that “-man” denotes a non-Semitic deity.

\begin{center}
\textit{A. H. Sayce}
\end{center}

\textbf{ANAMIM}

\textit{\textless an’-a-mim\textgreater} (עָנָם הָיוּ [	extit{anamim}]): Descendants of Mizraim (\textit{Genesis} 10:13; \textit{1 Chronicles} 1:11).

\textit{See TABLE OF NATIONS.}

\textbf{ANAMMELECH}

\textit{\textless a-nam’-e-lek\textgreater} (אָנָם מְלָכָה = Assyrian Anu-malik, “Anu is the prince”): A Babylonian (?) deity worshipped by the Sepharvites in Samaria, after being transported there by Sargon. The worship of Adrammelech (who is mentioned with Anammelech) and Anammelech is accompanied by the sacrifice of children by fire: “The Sepharvites burnt their children in the fire to Adrammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim” (\textit{2 Kings} 17:31). This passage presents two grave difficulties. First, there is no evidence in cuneiform literature that would point to the presence of human sacrifice, by fire or otherwise, as part of the ritual; nor has it been shown that the sculptures or bas-reliefs deny this thesis. Much depends upon the identification of “Sepharvaim”; if, as some scholars hold, Sepharvaim and Sippar are one and the same cities, the two deities referred to are Babylonian. But there are several strong objections
to this theory. It has been suggested that Sepharvaim (Septuagint, seppharin, sepphareimi) is rather identical with “Shabara’in,” a city mentioned in the Babylonian Chronicle as having been destroyed by Shalmaneser IV. As Sepharvaim and Arpad and Hamath are grouped together (<sup>2</sup> Kings 17:24; 18:34) in two passages, it is probable that Sepharvaim is a Syriac city. Sepharvaim may then be another form of “Shabara’in,” which, in turn, is the Assyrian form of Sibraim (<sup>40</sup>Ezekiel 47:16), a city in the neighborhood of Damascus (of Halevy, ZA, II, 401 ff). One objection to this last is the necessity for representing “c” by “sh”; this is not necessarily insurmountable, however. Then, the attempt to find an Assyrian etymology for the two god-names falls to the ground. Besides, the custom of sacrifice by fire was prevalent in Syria. Secondly, the god that was worshipped at Sippar was neither Adrammelech nor Anammelech but Samas. It is improbable, as some would urge, that Adrammelech is a secondary title of the tutelary god of Sippar; then it would have to be shown that Anu enjoyed special reverence in this city which was especially consecrated to the worship of the Sun-god. (For “Anu” see &ASSYRIA.) It may be that the text is corrupt.

*See also* ADRAMMELECH.

*H. J. Wolf*

**ANAN**

<\textit{a'-nan} (אָנָן) [anan], “cloud”):

(1) One of those who, with Nehemiah, sealed the covenant (<sup>10</sup>Nehemiah 10:26).

(2) A returned exile (1 Esdras 5:30). He is called Hanan in <sup>2</sup>Ezra 2:46 and <sup>7</sup>Nehemiah 7:49.

**ANANI**

<\textit{a-na'-ni} (אָנָנִי) [anani], perhaps a shortened form of Ananiah, “Yah has covered”): A son of Elioenai of the house of David, who lived after the captivity (<sup>2</sup>1 Chronicles 3:24).
ANANIAH

<an-a-ni’-a> יַנַּנְיַנְיָה [yanayah], “Yah has covered”):

(1) Grandfather of Azariah. He assisted in repairing the walls of Jerusalem after his return from the exile (Nehemiah 3:23).

(2) A town of Benjamin mentioned in connection with Nob and Hazor (Nehemiah 11:32). It is commonly identified with Beit Hanina, between three and four miles North-Northwest from Jerusalem.

ANANIAS

<an-a-ni’-as> (אנהייא, Ananias; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, אנהייא, Hananias; חנניה [chananyah], “Yah has been gracious”): The name was common among the Jews. In its Hebrew form it is frequently found in the Old Testament (e.g. Chronicles 25:4; Jeremiah 28:1; Daniel 1:6).

See HANANIAH.

1. A DISCIPLE AT JERUSALEM:

Husband of Sapphira (Acts 5:1-10). He and his wife sold their property, and gave to the common fund of the church part of the purchase money, pretending it was the whole. When his hypocrisy was denounced by Peter, Ananias fell down dead; and three hours later his wife met the same doom. The following points are of interest.

(1) The narrative immediately follows the account of the intense brotherliness of the believers resulting in a common fund, to which Barnabas had made a generous contribution (Acts 4:32-37). The sincerity and spontaneity of the gifts of Barnabas and the others set forth in dark relief the calculated deceit of Ananias. The brighter the light, the darker the shadow.

(2) The crime of Ananias consisted, not in his retaining a part, but in his pretending to give the whole. He was under no compulsion to give all, for the communism of the early church was not absolute, but purely voluntary (see especially Acts 5:4) Falsehood and hypocrisy
(“lie to the Holy Spirit” Acts 5:3), rather than greed, were the sins for which he was so severely punished.

(3) The severity of the Judgment can be justified by the consideration that the act was “the first open venture of deliberate wickedness” (Meyer) within the church. The punishment was an “awe-inspiring act of Divine church-discipline.” The narrative does not, however, imply that Peter consciously willed their death. His words were the occasion of it, but he was not the deliberate agent. Even the words in Acts 5:9b are a prediction rather than a judicial sentence.

2. A DISCIPLE AT DAMASCUS:

A disciple in Damascus, to whom the conversion of Saul of Tarsus was made known in a vision, and who was the instrument of his physical and spiritual restoration, and the means of introducing him to the other Christians in Damascus (Acts 9:10-19). Paul makes honorable mention of him in his account of his conversion spoken at Jerusalem (Acts 22:12-16), where we are told that Ananias was held in high respect by all the Jews in Damascus, on account of his strict legal piety. No mention is made of him in Paul’s address before Agrippa in Caesarea (Acts 26). In late tradition, he is placed in the list of the seventy disciples of Jesus, and as having died a martyr’s death.

3. A HIGH PRIEST AT JERUSALEM:

A high priest in Jerusalem from 47-59 AD. From Josephus (Ant., XX, v, 2; vi, 2; ix, 2; BJ, II, xvii, 9) we glean the following facts: He was the son of Nedebaeus (or Nebedaeus) and was nominated to the high-priestly office by Herod of Chalcis. In 52 AD he was sent to Rome by Quadratus, legate of Syria, to answer a charge of oppression brought by the Samaritans, but the emperor Claudius acquitted him. On his return to Jerusalem, he resumed the office of high priest. He was deposed shortly before Felix left the province, but continued to wield great influence, which he used in a lawless and violent way. He was a typical Sadducee, wealthy, haughty, unscrupulous, filling his sacred office for purely selfish and political ends, anti-nationalist in his relation to the Jews, friendly to the Romans. He died an ignominious death, being assassinated by the popular zealots (sicarii) at
the beginning of the last Jewish war. In the New Testament he figures in
two passages.

(1) Acts 23:1-5, where Paul defends himself before the Sanhedrin. The
overbearing conduct of Ananias in commanding Paul to be struck
on the mouth was characteristic of the man. Paul’s ire was for the
moment aroused, and he hurled back the scornful epithet of “whited
wall.” On being called to account for “reviling God’s high priest,” he
quickly recovered the control of his feelings, and said “I knew not,
brethren, that he was high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak
evil of a ruler of thy people.” This remark has greatly puzzled the
commentators. The high priest could have been easily identified by his
position and official seat as president of the Sanhedrin. Some have
wringly supposed that Ananias had lost his office during his trial at
Rome, but had afterward usurped it during a vacancy (John Lightfoot,
Michaelis, etc.). Others take the words as ironical, “How could I know
as high priest one who acts so unworthily of his sacred office?” (so
Calvin). Others (e.g. Alford, Plumptre) take it that owing to defective
eyesight Paul knew not from whom the insolent words had come.
Perhaps the simplest explanation is that Paul meant, “I did not for the
moment bear in mind that I was addressing the high priest” (so Bengel,
Neander, etc.).

(2) In Acts 24:1 we find Ananias coming down to Caesarea in
person, with a deputation from the Sanhedrin, to accuse Paul before
Felix.

D. Miall Edwards

ANANIAS

(Apocrypha), <an-a-ni’-as>:

(1) [ ἀνανίας, Ananias], the Revised Version (British and American)
Annis, the Revised Version, margin, Annias (1 Esdras 5:16). See
ANNIS.

(2) A son of Emmer (1 Esdras 9:21) = Hanani, son of Immer in Ezra
10:20.
D. Miall Edwards

ANANIEL

<α-nan’-i-el> ([ Ἄνανιήλ, Ananiel], “God is gracious”): An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit 1:1).

ANATH

<α’-nath> (ἀνάθ, [ anath]): Father of Shamgar ( Judges 3:31; 5:6). This name is connected with the Phoenician and Canaanite goddess `Anat, which was also worshipped in Egypt. She is mentioned in monuments of the 18th Dynasty, coupled with the war-goddess Astart (Moore, Judges, 105-896; DB; EB).

ANATHHEMA

<α-nath’e-ma> ([ἀνάθεμα, anathema]): This word occurs only once in the King James Version, namely, in the phrase “Let him be anathema. Maranatha” ( 1 Corinthians 16:22); elsewhere the King James Version renders anathema by “accursed” ( Romans 9:3; 1 Corinthians 12:3; Galatians 1:8,9), once by “curse” ( Acts 23:12). Both words —
anathema and anathema — were originally dialectical variations and had the same connotation, namely, offering to the gods. The non-Attic form — anathema — was adopted in the Septuagint as a rendering of the Hebrew [cherem] (see ACCURSED), and gradually came to have the significance of the Hebrew word — ”anything devoted to destruction.” Whereas in the Greek Fathers anathema — as [cherem] in rabbinic Hebrew — came to denote excommunication from society, in the New Testament the word has its full force. In common speech it evidently became a strong expression of execration, and the term connoted more than physical destruction; it invariably implied moral worthlessness. In Romans 9:3 Paul does not simply mean that, for the sake of his fellow-countrymen, he is prepared to face death, but to endure the moral degradation of an outcast from the kingdom of Christ. In 1 Corinthians 12:3 the expression, “Jesus is anathema” — with its suggestion of moral unfitness — reaches the lowest depths of depreciation, as the expression, “Jesus is Lord,” reaches the summit of appreciation.

Thomas Lewis

ANATHOTH

<an’-a-thoth> ([anathoth]; [ Ἄναθωθός, Anathoth]): A town which lay between Michmash and Jerusalem (Isaiah 10:30), in the territory of Benjamin, assigned to the Levites (Joshua 21:18). It was the native place of Abiathar (1 Kings 2:26), and of the prophet Jeremiah (Jeremiah 1:1; 11:21 ff, etc.). Here lay the field which, under remarkable circumstances, the prophet purchased (Jeremiah 32:7 ff). Two of David’s distinguished soldiers, Abiezer (2 Samuel 23:27) and Jehu (1 Chronicles 12:3), also hailed from Anathoth. It was again occupied by the Benjamites after the return from the Exile (Nehemiah 11:32, etc.). It is identified with [Anata], two and a quarter miles Northeast of Jerusalem, a small village of some fifteen houses with remains of ancient walls. There are quarries in the neighborhood from which stones are still carried to Jerusalem. It commands a spacious outlook over the uplands to the North, and especially to the Southeast, over the Jordan valley toward the Dead Sea and the mountains of Moab. There is nothing to shelter it from the
withering power of the winds from the eastern deserts (Jeremiah 4:11; 18:17, etc.).

W. Ewing

ANATHOTHITE

<an’-a-thoth-it> (ha-‘annethothi): the Revised Version (British and American) form of the King James Version Anethothite, Anetothite, Antothite. An inhabitant of Anathoth, a town of Benjamin assigned to the Levites. The Anathothites are

(1) Abiezer, one of David’s thirty heroes (2 Samuel 23:27; 1 Chronicles 11:28; 27:12), and

(2) Jehu who came to David at Ziklag (1 Chronicles 12:3).

ANCESTORS

<an’-ses-ters> (ri’shonim), “first ones”): The word ancestor appears in the English Bible only once (Leviticus 26:45). The Hebrew word, the ordinary adjective “first,” occurs more than 200 times, and in a few places might fairly be rendered ancestors (e.g. Deuteronomy 19:14; Jeremiah 11:10). In speaking of ancestors the Old Testament ordinarily uses the word for “fathers” (’abhoth).

ANCHOR

<an’-ker>.

See SHIPS.

ANCIENT

<an’-shent>: This word renders several Hebrew words:

(1) qedhem, which denotes “beforetime,” “yore”; generally the remote past (compare Deuteronomy 33:15, “ancient mountains”; Judges 5:21, Kishon, the “ancient river”; Isaiah 19:11 “ancient kings”).
(2) וַיֵּאָגָז [zaqen], “old” in years. Whereas the King James Version generally renders the word by “old” (or “elders” when the plural form is found) in six cases “ancient” is used and “ancients” in nine cases. See &ANCIENTS.

(3) וֹאֵלָם [`olam], which denotes “long duration” — past or future. In regard to the past it suggests remote antiquity. The connotation may be discovered in such expressions as: “the years of ancient times” (Psalm 77:5); “ancient land-mark” or “paths” (Proverbs 22:28; Jeremiah 18:15); “ancient people” or “nation” (Isaiah 44:7; Jeremiah 5:15); “ancient high places” (Ezekiel 36:2).

(4) אֲנָטִיק [`attiq]. This word — really Aramaic — comes from a stem which means “to advance,” i.e. in age; hence old, aged (1 Chronicles 3:22).

(5) יָשָׁש [yashish], literally, “weak,” “impotent,” hence decrepit aged; a rare and poetical word, and found only in Job. It is rendered “ancient” only in one instance (Job 12:12 the King James Version). Thomas Lewis

ANCIENT OF DAYS

(אֲנָטִיק יוֹמִין [`attiq yomin], = Aramaic): On אֲנָטִיק [`attiq], see ANCIENT (4). The expression is used in reference to God in Daniel (7:9,13,22) and is not intended to suggest the existence of God from eternity. It was the venerable appearance of old age that was uppermost in the writer’s mind. “What Daniel sees is not the eternal God Himself, but an aged man, in whose dignified and impressive form God reveals Himself (compare Ezekiel 1:26)” (Keil).

ANCIENTS

<an-shents>: This word (except in one instance) renders the Hebrew word יֵאָגָז [zeqenim], (pl of וַיֵּאָגָז [zaqen]), which should always be translated “old men” or “elders.” The Hebrew word never has the connotation which “ancients” has in modern English. The words “I understand more than the
ancients” (Psalm 119:100 the King James Version) do not mean that the Psalmist claims greater wisdom than his distant forbears but than his contemporaries with all their age and experience. In the parallel clause “teachers” is the corresponding word. In such phrases as “ancients of the people” (Jeremiah 19:1 the King James Version), “ancients of the house of Israel” (Ezekiel 8:12), “elders” would obviously be the correct rendering, as in the Revised Version (British and American). Even in Isaiah 24:23 (“before his ancients gloriously” the English Revised Version) “elders” is the right translation (American Revised Version). The writer probably alludes to the Sinaitic; theophany witnessed by the “seventy .... elders” (Exodus 24:9-18) Generally speaking the word suggests the experience, insight and practical acquaintance with life which age ought to bring with it (Psalm 119:100; Ezekiel 7:26). In one instance (1 Samuel 24:13) “ancients” is the right rendering for the Hebrew word [qadhmonim], which means “men of former times.”

Thomas Lewis

ANCLE

<an’-k’-l>.

See ANKLE.

ANDREW

<an’-droo> ([Ἀνδρέας, Andreas], i.e. “manly.” The name has also been interpreted as “the mighty one, or conqueror”): Andrew was the first called of the Twelve Apostles.

I. IN NEW TESTAMENT.

1. Early History and First Call:

Andrew belonged to Bethsaida of Galilee (compare John 1:44). He was the brother of Simon Peter and his father’s name was John (compare John 1:42; 21:15,16,17). He occupies a more prominent place in the Gospel of John than in the synoptical writings, and this is explicable at least in part from the fact that Andrew was Greek both in language and
sympathies (compare infra), and that his subsequent labors were intimately connected with the people for whom John was immediately writing. There are three stages in the call of Andrew to the apostleship. The first is described in John 1:35-40. Andrew had spent his earlier years as a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee, but on learning of the fame of John the Baptist, he departed along with a band of his countrymen to Bethabara (the Revised Version (British and American) “Bethany”) beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing (John 1:28). Possibly Jesus was of their number, or had preceded them in their pilgrimage. There Andrew learned for the first time of the greatness of the “Lamb of God” and “followed him” (John 1:40). He was the means at this time of bringing his brother Simon Peter also to Christ (John 1:41). Andrew was probably a companion of Jesus on his return journey to Galilee, and was thus present at the marriage in Cana of Galilee (John 2:2), in Capernaum (John 2:12), at the Passover in Jerusalem (John 2:13), at the baptizing in Judea (John 3:22), where he himself may have taken part (compare John 4:2), and in Samaria (John 4:5).

2. Second Call and Final Ordination:

On his return to Galilee, Andrew resumed for a time his old vocation as fisherman, till he received his second call. This happened after John the Baptist was cast into prison (compare Mark 1:14; Matthew 4:12) and is described in Mark 1:16-18; Matthew 4:18,19. The two accounts are practically identical, and tell how Andrew and his brother were now called on definitely to forsake their mundane occupations and become fishers of men (Mark 1:17). The corresponding narrative of Luke varies in part; it does not mention Andrew by name, and gives the additional detail of the miraculous draught of fishes. By some it has been regarded as an amalgamation of Mark’s account with John 21:1-8 (see JAMES, SON OF ZEBEDEE). After a period of companionship with Jesus, during which, in the house of Simon and Andrew, Simon’s wife’s mother was healed of a fever (Mark 1:29-31; compare Matthew 8:14,15; Luke 4:38,39); the call of Andrew was finally consecrated by his election as one of the Twelve Apostles (Matthew 10:2; Mark 3:18; Luke 6:14; Acts 1:13).
3. Subsequent History:

Further incidents recorded of Andrew are: At the feeding of the five thousand by the Sea of Galilee, the attention of Jesus was drawn by Andrew to the lad with five sequent barley loaves and two fishes (John 6 History 8.9). At the feast of the Passover, the Greeks who wished to “see Jesus” inquired of Philip, who turned for advice to Andrew, and the two then told Jesus (John 12:20-36). On the Mount of Olives, Andrew along with Peter, James and John, questioned Jesus regarding the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world (Mark 13:3-23; compare also Matthew 24:3-28; Luke 21:5-24).

2. IN APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE.

The name of Andrew’s mother was traditionally Joanna, and according to the “Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles” (Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 49) he belonged to the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of his father. A fragment of a Coptic gospel of the 4th or 5th century tells how not only Thomas (John 20:27), but also Andrew was compelled, by touching the feet of the risen Saviour, to believe in the bodily resurrection (Hennecke, Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, etc., 38, 39). Various places were assigned as the scene of his subsequent missionary labors. The Syriac Teaching of the Apostles (ed Cureton, 34) mentions Bithynia, Eusebius gives Scythia (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, i, 1), and others Greece (Lipsius, Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, I, 63). The Muratorian Fragment relates that John wrote his gospel in consequence of a revelation given to Andrew, and this would point to Ephesus (compare Hennecke id, 459). The Contendings of the Twelve Apostles (for historicity, authorship, etc., of this work, compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, Intro; Hennecke, Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 351-58; RE, 664-66) contains several parts dealing with Andrew:

1) “The Preaching of Andrew and Philemon among the Kurds” (Budge, II 163 ff) narrates the appearance of the risen Christ to His disciples, the sending of Andrew to Lydia and his conversion of the people there.

2) The “Preaching of Matthias in the City of the Cannibals” (Budge, II, 267 ff; REH, 666) tells of how Matthias, on being imprisoned and
blinded by the Cannibals, was released by Andrew, who had been brought to his assistance in a ship by Christ, but the two were afterward again imprisoned. Matthias then caused the city to be inundated, the disciples were set free, and the people converted.

(3) “The Acts of Andrew and Bartholomew” (Budge, II, 183 ff) gives an account of their mission among the Parthians.

(4) According to the “Martyrdom of Andrew” (Budge, II, 215) he was stoned and crucified in Scythia.

According to the surviving fragments of “The Acts of Andrew,” a heretical work dating probably from the 2nd century, and referred to by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, ii, 5), the scene of Andrew’s death was laid in Achaia. There he was imprisoned and crucified by order of the proconsul Eges (or Aegeates), whose wife had been estranged from him by the preaching of Andrew (compare Hennecke, 459-73; Pick, Apocryphal Acts, 201-21; Lipsius, I, 543-622). A so-called “Gospel of Andrew” mentioned by Innocent I (Ep, I, iii, 7) and Augustine (Contra Advers. Leg. et Prophet., I, 20), but this is probably due to a confusion with the above-mentioned “Acts of Andrew.”

The relics of Andrew were discovered in Constantinople in the time of Justinian, and part of his cross is now in Peter’s, Rome. Andrew is the patron saint of Scotland, whither his arm is said to have been transferred by Regulus. The ascription to him of the decussate cross is of late origin.

3. CHARACTER.

There is something significant in Andrew’s being the first called of the apostles. The choice was an important one, for upon the lead given by Andrew depended the action of the others. Christ perceived that the soul’s unrest, the straining after higher things and a deeper knowledge of God, which had induced Andrew to make the pilgrimage to Bethany, gave promise of a rich spiritual growth, which no doubt influenced Him in His decision. His wisdom and insight were justified of the after event. Along with a keenness of perception regarding spiritual truths was coupled in Andrew a strong sense of personal conviction which enabled him not only to accept Jesus as the Messiah, but to win Peter also as a disciple of
Christ. The incident of the Feeding of the Five Thousand displayed Andrew in a fresh aspect: there the practical part which he played formed a striking contrast to the feeble-mindedness of Philip. Both these traits — his missionary spirit, and his decision of character which made others appeal to him when in difficulties — were evinced at the time when the Greeks sought to interview Jesus. Andrew was not one of the greatest of the apostles, yet he is typical of those men of broad sympathies and sound common sense, without whom the success of any great movement cannot be assured.

C. M. Kerr

ANDRONICUS

<an-dro-ni’-kus> ([ Ἀνδρόνικος, Andronikos]):

(1) A deputy of Antiochus Epiphanes, who, while ruling at Antioch, excited the Jews by the murder of Onias, and, upon their formal complaint, was executed by his superior (2 Macc 4:32-38); generally distinguished from another officer of the same name, also under Antiochus (2 Macc 5:23).

(2) A kinsman of Paul, residing at Rome (Romans 16:7). He had been converted to Christianity before Paul, and, like Paul, had suffered imprisonment, although when and where can only be surmised. When he and Junias, another kinsman of Paul, are referred to as “of note among the apostles,” this may be interpreted as either designating the high esteem in which they were held by the Twelve, or as reckoning them in the number of apostles. The latter is the sense, if “apostle” be understood here in the more general meaning, used in Acts 14:14 of Barnabas, in 2 Corinthians 8:23 of Titus, in Philippians 2:25 of Epaphroditus, and in the Didache of “the traveling evangelists or missionaries who preached the gospel from place to place” (Schaff, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 67; see also Lightfoot on Philippians, 196). On this assumption, Andronicus was one of the most prominent and successful of the traveling missionaries of the early church.

H. E. Jacobs
ANEM

<ə'-nem> (אַנֵּם [‘anem], “two springs”; [ ‘Aváµ, Anam]): Anem is mentioned with Ramoth among the cities of Issachar assigned to the priests, the sons of Gershom (<1 Chronicles 6:73>). In the parallel list (<Joshua 21:29>), there are mentioned Jarmuth and En-gannim, corresponding to Ramoth and Anim, therefore Anim and En-gannim (Jenin) are identical. As the name denotes (Anem = “two springs”; En-gannim = “the spring of gardens”), it was well watered. Anem is identified by Eusebius with Aner, but Conder suggests the village of “Anim,” on the hills West of the plain of Esdraelon which represents the Anea of the 4th century AD (Onom under the word “Aniel” and “Bethara”), a city lying 15 Roman miles from Caesarea, which had good baths.

M. O. Evans

ANER (1)

<ə'-ner> (אַנֵּר [‘aner]; Septuagint [Αὐνάν, Aunan]; Samaritan Pentateuch, `anram, “sprout,” “waterfall”): One of the three “confederates” of Abraham in his pursuit after the four kings (<Genesis 14:13,14>). Judging from the meanings of the two other names, Mamre being the name of the sacred grove or tree (Jahwist) and synonymous with Hebron (Priestly Code); and Eschol — a name of a valley (lit. “grape cluster”) from which the personal names are derived — it may be expected to explain the name Aner in a similar way. Dillmann suggested the name of a range of mountains in that vicinity (Comm. at the place and Rosen in ZDMG, XII, 479; Skinner, Genesis, 365).

S. Cohon

ANER (2)

<ə'-ner> (אַנֵּר [‘aner], meaning doubtful): A Levitical town in Manasseh, West of the Jordan (<1 Chronicles 6:70>). Gesenius and others identified it with Taanach of <Joshua 21:25>. There is, however, no agreement as to its location.
ANETHOTHITE

<an’-e-thoth-it>: the King James Version form of Anathothite (thus the Revised Version (British and American) 2 Samuel 23:27).

ANETOTHITE

<an’-e-toth-it>: the King James Version form of Anathothite (thus the Revised Version (British and American) 1 Chronicles 27:12).

ANGEL

<an’-jel> (ûlûmal’akh]; Septuagint and New Testament, [αγγελός, aggelos]):

1. DEFINITION AND SCRIPTURE TERMS.

The word angel is applied in Scripture to an order of supernatural or heavenly beings whose business it is to act as God’s messengers to men, and as agents who carry out His will. Both in Hebrew and Greek the word is applied to human messengers (1 Kings 19:2; Luke 7:24); in Hebrew it is used in the singular to denote a Divine messenger, and in the plural for human messengers, although there are exceptions to both usages. It is applied to the prophet Haggai (Haggai 1:13), to the priest (Malachi 2:7), and to the messenger who is to prepare the way of the Lord (Malachi 3:1). Other Hebrew words and phrases applied to angels are [bene ha-’elohim] (Genesis 6:2,4; Job 1:6; 2:1) and [bene ‘elim] (Psalm 29:1; 89:6), i.e. sons of the [’elohim] or [’elim]; this means, according to a common Hebrew usage, members of the class called [’elohim] or [’elim], the heavenly powers. It seems doubtful whether the word [’elohim], standing by itself, is ever used to describe angels, although Septuagint so translates it in a few passages. The most notable instance is Psalm 8:5; where the Revised Version (British and American) gives, “Thou hast made him but little lower than God,” with the English Revised Version, margin reading of “the angels” for “God” (compare Hebrews 2:7,9); [qedhoshim] “holy ones” (Psalm 89:5,7), a name suggesting the fact that they belong to God; [’ir], [’irim], “watcher,” “watchers” (Daniel 4:13,17,23). Other expressions are used to designate angels collectively: [codh], “council” (Psalm 89:7), where the reference may be to an inner group of exalted
angels; [\`edhah] and [qahal], “congregation” (Psalms 82:1; 89:5); and finally [tsabha’], [tsebha’oth], “host,” “hosts,” as in the familiar phrase “the God of hosts.”

In New Testament the word aggelos, when it refers to a Divine messenger, is frequently accompanied by some phrase which makes this meaning clear, e.g. “the angels of heaven” (Matthew 24:36). Angels belong to the “heavenly host” (Luke 2:13). In reference to their nature they are called “spirits” (Hebrews 1:14). Paul evidently referred to the ordered ranks of supra-mundane beings in a group of words that are found in various combinations, namely, archai, “principalities,” exousiai, “powers,” thronoi, “thrones,” kuriotetes, “dominions,” and dunameis, also translated “powers.” The first four are apparently used in a good sense in Colossians 1:16, where it is said that all these beings were created through Christ and unto Him; in most of the other passages in which words from this group occur, they seem to represent evil powers. We are told that our wrestling is against them (Ephesians 6:12), and that Christ triumphs over the principalities and powers (Colossians 2:15; compare Romans 8:38; 1 Corinthians 15:24). In two passages the word archaggelos, “archangel” or chief angel, occurs: “the voice of the archangel” (1 Thessalonians 4:16), and “Michael the archangel” (Jude 1:9).

2. ANGELS IN OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Nature, Appearances and Functions:

Everywhere in the Old Testament the existence of angels is assumed. The creation of angels is referred to in Psalm 148:2,5 (compare Colossians 1:16). They were present at the creation of the world, and were so filled with wonder and gladness that they “shouted for joy” (Job 38:7). Of their nature we are told nothing. In general they are simply regarded as embodiments of their mission. Though presumably the holiest of created beings, they are charged by God with folly (Job 4:18), and we are told that “he putteth no trust in his holy ones” (Job 15:15). References to the fall of the angels are only found in the obscure and probably corrupt passage Genesis 6:1-4, and in the interdependent passages 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 1:6, which draw their inspiration from the Apocryphal book of
Enoch. Demons are mentioned (see DEMONS); and although Satan appears among the sons of God (Job 1:6; 2:1), there is a growing tendency in later writers to attribute to him a malignity that is all his own (see SATAN).

As to their outward appearance, it is evident that they bore the human form, and could at times be mistaken for men (Ezekiel 9:2; Genesis 18:2,16). There is no hint that they ever appeared in female form. The conception of angels as winged beings, so familiar in Christian art, finds no support in Scripture (except, perhaps Daniel 9:21; Revelation 14:6, where angels are represented as “flying”). The cherubim and seraphim (see CHERUB; SERAPH) are represented as winged (Exodus 25:20; Isaiah 6:2); winged also are the symbolic living creatures of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 1:6; compare Revelation 4:8).

As above stated, angels are messengers and instruments of the Divine will. As a rule they exercise no influence in the physical sphere. In several instances, however, they are represented as destroying angels: two angels are commissioned to destroy Sodom (Genesis 19:13); when David numbers the people, an angel destroys them by pestilence (2 Samuel 24:16); it is by an angel that the Assyrian army is destroyed (2 Kings 19:35); and Ezekiel hears six angels receiving the command to destroy those who were sinful in Jerusalem (Ezekiel 9:1,5,7). In this connection should be noted the expression “angels of evil,” i.e. angels that bring evil upon men from God and execute His judgments (Psalm 78:49; compare 1 Samuel 16:14). Angels appear to Jacob in dreams (Genesis 28:12; 31:11). The angel who meets Balaam is visible first to the ass, and not to the rider (Numbers 22 ff). Angels interpret God’s will, showing man what is right for him (Job 33:23). The idea of angels as caring for men also appears (Psalm 91:11 f), although the modern conception of the possession by each man of a special guardian angel is not found in Old Testament.

2. The Angelic Host:

The phrase “the host of heaven” is applied to the stars, which were sometimes worshipped by idolatrous Jews (Jeremiah 33:22; 2 Kings 21:3; Zephaniah 1:5); the name is applied to the company of angels because of their countless numbers (compare Daniel 7:10) and their glory. They are represented as standing on the right and left hand of
Yahweh (1 Kings 22:19). Hence God, who is over them all, is continually called throughout Old Testament “the God of hosts,” “Yahweh of hosts,” “Yahweh God of hosts”; and once “the prince of the host” (Daniel 8:11). One of the principal functions of the heavenly host is to be ever praising the name of the Lord (Psalm 103:21; 148:1 f). In this host there are certain figures that stand out prominently, and some of them are named. The angel who appears to Joshua calls himself “prince of the host of Yahweh” (Joshua 5:14 f). The glorious angel who interprets to Daniel the vision which he saw in the third year of Cyrus (Daniel 10:5), like the angel who interprets the vision in the first year of Belshazzar (Daniel 7:16), is not named; but other visions of the same prophet were explained to him by the angel Gabriel, who is called “the man Gabriel,” and is described as speaking with “a man’s voice” (Daniel 9:21; 8:15 f). In Daniel we find occasional reference made to “princes”: “the prince of Persia,” “the prince of Greece” (10:20). These are angels to whom is entrusted the charge of, and possibly the rule over, certain peoples. Most notable among them is Michael, described as “one of the chief princes,” “the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people,” and, more briefly, “your prince” (Daniel 10:13; 12:1; 10:21); Michael is therefore regarded as the patron-angel of the Jews. In Apocrypha Raphael, Uriel and Jeremiel are also named. Of Raphael it is said (Tobit 12:15) that he is “one of the seven holy angels who present the prayers of the saints” to God (compare Revelation 8:2, “the seven angels that stand before God”). It is possible that this group of seven is referred to in the above-quoted phrase, “one of the chief princes”. Some (notably Kosters) have maintained that the expressions “the sons of the ['elohim],” God’s “council” and “congregation,” refer to the ancient gods of the heathen, now degraded and wholly subordinated to Yahweh. This rather daring speculation has little support in Scripture; but we find traces of a belief that the patron-angels of the nations have failed in establishing righteousness within their allotted sphere on earth, and that they will accordingly be punished by Yahweh their over-Lord (Isaiah 24:21 f; Psalm 82; compare Psalm 58:1 f the Revised Version, margin; compare Jude 1:6).
3. The Angel of the Theophany:

This angel is spoken of as “the angel of Yahweh,” and “the angel of the presence (or face) of Yahweh.” The following passages contain references to this angel: Genesis 16:7 ff — the angel and Hagar; Genesis 18 — Abraham intercedes with the angel for Sodom; Genesis 22:11 ff — the angel interposes to prevent the sacrifice of Isaac; Genesis 24:7,40 — Abraham sends Eliezer and promises the angel’s protection; Genesis 31:11 ff — the angel who appears to Jacob says “I am the God of Bethel”; Genesis 32:24 ff — Jacob wrestles with the angel and says, “I have seen God face to face”; Genesis 48:15 f — Jacob speaks of God and the angel as identical; Exodus 3 (compare Acts 7:30 ff) — the angel appears to Moses in the burning bush; Exodus 13:21; 14:19 (compare Numbers 20:16) — God or the angel leads Israel out of Egypt; Exodus 23:20 ff — the people are commanded to obey the angel; Exodus 32:34 through 33:17 (compare Isaiah 63:9) — Moses pleads for the presence of God with His people; Joshua 5:13 through 6:2 — the angel appears to Joshua; Judges 2:1-5 — the angel speaks to the people; Judges 6:11 ff — the angel appears to Gideon.

A study of these passages shows that while the angel and Yahweh are at times distinguished from each other, they are with equal frequency, and in the same passages, merged into each other. How is this to be explained? It is obvious that these apparitions cannot be the Almighty Himself, whom no man hath seen, or can see. In seeking the explanation, special attention should be paid to two of the passages above cited. In Exodus 23:20 ff God promises to send an angel before His people to lead them to the promised land; they are commanded to obey him and not to provoke him “for he will not pardon your transgression: for my name is in him.” Thus the angel can forgive sin, which only God can do, because God’s name, i.e. His character and thus His authority, are in the angel. Further, in the passage Exodus 32:34 through 33:17 Moses intercedes for the people after their first breach of the covenant; God responds by promising, “Behold mine angel shall go before thee”; and immediately after God says, “I will not go up in the midst of thee.” In answer to further pleading, God says, “My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest.” Here a clear distinction is made between an ordinary angel, and the angel who carries with him God’s presence. The conclusion may be summed up in
the words of Davidson in his Old Testament Theology: “In particular providences one may trace the presence of Yahweh in influence and operation; in ordinary angelic appearances one may discover Yahweh present on some side of His being, in some attribute of His character; in the angel of the Lord He is fully present as the covenant God of His people, to redeem them.” The question still remains, Who is theophanic angel? To this many answers have been given, of which the following may be mentioned:

(1) This angel is simply an angel with a special commission;

(2) He may be a momentary descent of God into visibility;

(3) He may be the Logos, a kind of temporary preincarnation of the second person of the Trinity. Each has its difficulties, but the last is certainly the most tempting to the mind. Yet it must be remembered that at best these are only conjectures that touch on a great mystery. It is certain that from the beginning God used angels in human form, with human voices, in order to communicate with man; and the appearances of the angel of the Lord, with his special redemptive relation to God’s people, show the working of that Divine mode of self-revelation which culminated in the coming of the Saviour, and are thus a fore-shadowing of, and a preparation for, the full revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Further than this, it is not safe to go.

3. ANGELS IN NEW TESTAMENT.

1. Appearances:

Nothing is related of angels in New Testament which is inconsistent with the teaching of Old Testament on the subject. Just as they are specially active in the beginning of Old Testament history, when God’s people is being born, so they appear frequently in connection with the birth of Jesus, and again when a new order of things begins with the resurrection. An angel appears three times in dreams to Joseph (Matthew 1:20; 2:13,19). The angel Gabriel appears to Zacharias, and then to Mary in the annunciation (Luke 1). An angel announces to the shepherds the birth of Jesus, and is joined by a “multitude of the heavenly host,” praising God in celestial song (Luke 2:8 ff). When Jesus is tempted, and again during the
agony at Gethsemane, angels appear to Him to strengthen His soul (Matthew 4:11; Luke 22:43). The verse which tells how an angel came down to trouble the pool (John 5:4) is now omitted from the text as not being genuine. An angel descends to roll away the stone from the tomb of Jesus (Matthew 28:2); angels are seen there by certain women (Luke 24:23) and (two) by Mary Magdalene (John 20:12). An angel releases the apostles from prison, directs Philip, appears to Peter in a dream, frees him from prison, smites Herod with sickness, appears to Paul in a dream (Acts 5:19; 8:26; 10:3; 12:7 ff; 12:23; 27:23). Once they appear clothed in white; they are so dazzling in appearance as to terrify beholders; hence they begin their message with the words “Fear not” (Matthew 28:2-5).

2. The Teaching of Jesus about Angels:

It is quite certain that our Lord accepted the main teachings of Old Testament about angels, as well as the later Jewish belief in good and bad angels. He speaks of the “angels in heaven” (Matthew 22:30), and of “the devil and his angels” (Matthew 25:41). According to our Lord the angels of God are holy (Mark 8:38); they have no sex or sensuous desires (Matthew 22:30); they have high intelligence, but they know not the time of the Second Coming (Matthew 24:36); they carry (in a parable) the soul of Lazarus to Abraham’s bosom (Luke 16:22); they could have been summoned to the aid of our Lord, had He so desired (Matthew 26:53); they will accompany Him at the Second Coming (Matthew 25:31) and separate the righteous from the wicked (Matthew 13:41,49). They watch with sympathetic eyes the fortunes of men, rejoicing in the repentance of a sinner (Luke 15:10; compare 1 Peter 1:12; Ephesians 3:10; 1 Corinthians 4:9); and they will hear the Son of Man confessing or denying those who have confessed or denied Him before men (Luke 12:8 f). The angels of the presence of God, who do not appear to correspond to our conception of guardian angels, are specially interested in God’s little ones (Matthew 18:10). Finally, the existence of angels is implied in the Lord’s Prayer in the petition, “Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth” (Matthew 6:10).
Paul refers to the ranks of angels (“principalities, powers” etc.) only in order to emphasize the complete supremacy of Jesus Christ. He teaches that angels will be judged by the saints (1 Corinthians 6:3). He attacks the incipient Gnosticism of Asia Minor by forbidding the, worship of angels (Colossians 2:18). He speaks of God’s angels as “elect,” because they are included in the counsels of Divine love (1 Timothy 5:21). When Paul commands the women to keep their heads covered in church because of the angels (1 Corinthians 11:10) he probably means that the angels, who watch all human affairs with deep interest, would be pained to see any infraction of the laws of modesty. In Hebrews 1:14 angels are (described as ministering spirits engaged in the service of the saints. Peter also emphasizes the supremacy of our Lord over all angelic beings (1 Peter 3:22). The references to angels in 2 Peter and Jude are colored by contact with Apocrypha literature. In Revelation, where the references are obviously symbolic, there is very frequent mention of angels. The angels of the seven churches (Revelation 1:20) are the guardian angels or the personifications of these churches. The worship of angels is also forbidden (Revelation 22:8 f). Specially interesting is the mention of elemental angels — ”the angel of the waters” (Revelation 16:5), and the angel “that hath power over fire” (Revelation 14:18; compare Revelation 7:1; 19:17). Reference is also made to the “angel of the bottomless pit,” who is called ABADDON or APOLLYON (which see), evidently an evil angel (Revelation 9:11 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “abyss”). In Revelation 12:7 ff we are told that there was war between Michael with his angels and the dragon with his angels.

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

In the childhood of the race it was easy to believe in God, and He was very near to the soul. In Paradise there is no thought of angels; it is God Himself who walks in the garden. A little later the thought of angels appears, but, God has not gone away, and as “the angel of Yahweh” He appears to His people and redeems them. In these early times the Jews believed that there were multitudes of angels, not yet divided in thought into good and bad; these had no names or personal characteristics, but were simply embodied messages. Till the time of the captivity the Jewish angelology shows little
development. During that dark period they came into close contact with a polytheistic people, only to be more deeply confirmed in their monotheism thereby. They also became acquainted with the purer faith of the Persians, and in all probability viewed the tenets of Zoroastrianism with a more favorable eye, because of the great kindness of Cyrus to their nation. There are few direct traces of Zoroastrianism in the later angelology of the Old Testament. It is not even certain that the number seven as applied to the highest group of angels is Persian in its origin; the number seven was not wholly disregarded by the Jews. One result of the contact was that the idea of a hierarchy of the angels was more fully developed. The conception in Daniel of angels as “watchers,” and the idea of patron-princes or angel-guardians of nations may be set down to Persian influence. It is probable that contact with the Persians helped the Jews to develop ideas already latent in their minds. According to Jewish tradition, the names of the angels came from Babylon. By this time the consciousness of sin had grown more intense in the Jewish mind, and God had receded to an immeasurable distance; the angels helped to fill the gap between God and man.

The more elaborate conceptions of Daniel and Zechariah are further developed in Apocrypha, especially in 2 Esdras, Tobit and 2 Macc.

In the New Testament we find that there is little further development; and by the Spirit of God its writers were saved from the absurdly puerile teachings of contemporary Rabbinism. We find that the Sadducees, as contrasted with the Pharisees, did not believe in angels or spirits (Acts 23:8). We may conclude that the Sadducees, with their materialistic standpoint, and denial of the resurrection, regarded angels merely as symbolical expressions of God’s actions. It is noteworthy in this connection that the great priestly document (Priestly Code, P) makes no mention of angels. The Book of Revelation naturally shows a close kinship to the books of Ezekiel and Daniel.

Regarding the rabbinical developments of angelology, some beautiful, some extravagant, some grotesque, but all fanciful, it is not necessary here to speak. The Essenes held an esoteric doctrine of angels, in which most scholars find the germ of the Gnostic eons.
5. THE REALITY OF ANGELS.

A belief in angels, if not indispensable to the faith of a Christian, has its place there. In such a belief there is nothing unnatural or contrary to reason. Indeed, the warm welcome which human nature has always given to this thought, is an argument in its favor. Why should there not be such an order of beings, if God so willed it? For the Christian the whole question turns on the weight to be attached to the words of our Lord. All are agreed that He teaches the existence, reality, and activity of angelic beings. Was He in error because of His human limitations? That is a conclusion which it is very hard for the Christian to draw, and we may set it aside. Did He then adjust His teaching to popular belief, knowing that what He said was not true? This explanation would seem to impute deliberate untruth to our Lord, and must equally be set aside. So we find ourselves restricted to the conclusion that we have the guaranty of Christ’s word for the existence of angels; for most Christians that will settle the question.

The visible activity of angels has come to an end, because their mediating work is done; Christ has founded the kingdom of the Spirit, and God’s Spirit speaks directly to the spirit of man. This new and living way has been opened up to us by Jesus Christ, upon whom faith can yet behold the angels of God ascending and descending. Still they watch the lot of man, and rejoice in his salvation; still they join in the praise and adoration of God, the Lord of hosts, still can they be regarded as “ministering spirits sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation.”
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All Old Testament and New Testament theologies contain discussions. Among the older books Oehler’s Old Testament Theology and Hengstenberg’s Christology of Old Testament (for “angel of Yahweh”) and among modern ones Davidson’s Old Testament Theology are specially valuable. The ablest supporter of theory that the “sons of the Elohim” are degraded gods is Kosters. “Het onstaan der Angelologie onder Israel,” TT 1876. See also articles on “Angel” in HDB (by Davidson), EB, DCG, Jew Encyclopedia, RE (by Cremer). Cremer’s Biblico-Theological New Testament Lexicon should be consulted under the word “aggelos.” For

*John Macartney Wilson*

**ANGEL OF GOD**

*See ANGEL.*

**ANGEL OF YAHWEH**

*See ANGEL (II, 3).*

**ANGELS OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES**

It is evident from the contexts of the various Biblical passages in which the word “angel” appears, that the word does not always represent the same idea. In such passages as Daniel 12:1 and Acts 12:15 it would seem that the angel was generally regarded as a superhuman being whose duty it was to guard a nation or an individual, not unlike the jenei of the Arabs. However, in Malachi 2:7 and 3:1 (Hebrew) the word is clearly used to represent men. In the New Testament also, there are passages, such as James 2:25 (Greek), in which the word seems to be applied to men. The seven angels of the seven churches (Revelation 1:20) received seven letters, figurative letters, and therefore it would seem that the seven angels are also figurative and may refer to the seven bishops who presided over the seven churches of Asia. Or the angels may be regarded as the personifications of the churches.

*E. J. Banks*

**ANGER**

*<an’-ger>*: In the Old Testament, the translation of several Hebrew words, especially of [’aph] (lit. “nostril,” “countenance”), which is used some 45 times of human, 177 times of Divine, anger (OHL). The word occurs rarely in the New Testament (Mark 3:5; Ephesians 4:31; Colossians 3:8; Revelation 14:10), its place being taken by the word...
“wrath” (see WRATH). As a translation of words denoting God’s “anger,” the English word is unfortunate so far as it may seem to imply selfish, malicious or vindictive personal feeling. The anger of God is the response of His holiness to outbreaking sin. Particularly when it culminates in action is it rightly called Has “wrath.” The Old Testament doctrine of God’s anger is contained in many passages in the Pentateuch, Psalms and the Prophets. In Proverbs men are dissuaded from anger (15:1; 27:4), and the “slow to anger” is commended (15:18; 16:32; 19:11). Christians are enjoined to put away the feeling of self-regarding, vindictive anger (Ephesians 4:31; Colossians 3:8), and to cherish no desire of personal revenge (Ephesians 4:26).

F. K. Farr

ANGLE

<an’-g’-l>: Used in Isaiah 19:8 for a Hebrew noun that is rendered “hook” in Job 41:1: “The fishers shall lament, and all they that cast angle (hook) into the Nile shall mourn.” For a striking figurative use of it see Habakkuk 1:15 where, speaking of the wicked devouring the righteous, “making men as the fishes of the sea,” the prophet says: “They take up all of them with the angle, they catch them in their net” (the Revised Version (British and American) uses singular).

ANGLING

<an’-gling>: Angling, i.e. fishing with a hook or angle, was little known among the ancients. The fish were chiefly taken by casting nets, etc. (see Matthew 13:47). Compare e.g. “Then did Deucalion first the art invent of angling” (Davors, Secret of Angling, I).

See NET.

ANGLO-SAXON VERSIONS

<an-glo-sax’-on vur’-shuns>.

See ENGLISH VERSIONS.
ANGuish

<an’-gwish>: Extreme distress of body, mind or spirit; excruciating pain or suffering of soul, e.g. excessive grief, remorse, despair. Chiefly expressed in Old Testament, by four derivatives of צוּק [tsaq], “straitened,” “pressed,” and צַרכ [tsar], and two derivatives signifying “straitness,” “narrowness,” hence distress; also שַׁבָּחֲתַים [shabhats], “giddiness,” “confusion of mind”; הָלָל [hul] “to twist” with pain, “writhe.” So in the New Testament, θλιψίας, thlipsis], “a pressing together,” hence affliction, tribulation, στενοχωρία, stenochoria], “narrowness of place,” hence extreme affliction; συνοχή, sunoche], “a holding together,” hence distress. The fundamental idea in these various terms is pressure — being straitened, compressed into a narrow place, or pain through physical or mental torture. Used of the physical agony of child-birth (Jeremiah 4:31; 6:24; 49:24; 50:43; John 16:21); of distress of soul as the result of sin and wickedness (Job 15:24; Proverbs 1:27; Romans 2:9); of anguish of spirit through the cruel bondage of slavery (Exodus 6:9) and Assyrian oppression (Isaiah 8:22); of the anxiety and pain of Christian love because of the sins of fellow-disciples (2 Corinthians 2:4).

Dwight M. Pratt

ANIAM

<a-ni’-am> (אָנִיָּם [ani’am], “lament of the people”): A son of Shemidah of Manasseh (1 Chronicles 7:19).

ANIM

<a’-nim> (אֲנִי [anim], “springs”): One of the cities of the hill country of Judah mentioned immediately after Eshtemoa (Joshua 15:50). It is probably represented by the double ruin of el Ghuwein situated South of es Semu’a. The surface remains are Byzantine — a Christian town called Anem was here in the 4th century, but it is clearly an ancient site of importance (PEF, III, 408, Sh, XXV).
ANIMAL

<an’-i-mal>:

See under the various names and also the general article on &ZOOLOGY.

ANISE; DILL

<an’-is>, or <dil>; (RVm, ἀνηθοῦν, anethon]): Not the true anise, Pimpinella anisum, as was supposed by the King James Version translators, but Dill, Anethum graveolens. This is an annual or biennial herb of NO Umbelliferae, growing from one to three feet high, with small yellow flowers and brownish, flattened, oval fruits 1/5 inch long. It grows wild in lands bordering on the Mediterranean. The seeds have an aromatic flavor and are used as condiment in cooking, as carminative in medicine. “Dill water” is a favorite domestic remedy. Jesus said (Matthew 23:23): “Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law,” etc. In the tract, [Ma` aseroth] (4 5) it is mentioned that this plant (Hebrew [shabhath]), its stem, leaves and seed, was subject to tithe.

See CUT.

E. W. G. Masterman

ANKLE

<an’-k’-l> (in older editions of the King James Version, ancle): From Hebrew מֵעַפְחֶיִם [me’aphecayim] literally, “water of ankles,” i.e. shallow water (Ezekiel 47:3); “anklebones” (Acts 3:7) from σφοδρόν, sphudron] “ankle chains” (the King James Version “chains”), from a Hebrew root meaning “to walk about proudly” (Numbers 31:50). The same Hebrew word is translated “bracelet” (2 Samuel 1:10), but in Isaiah 3:20 another word from the same root “ankle chains” (the King James Version “ornaments of the legs”). Compare ANKLET (Isaiah 3:18).
ANKLET, ANKLE-CHAIN

<an’-klet>, <an’-k’-l-chan>: “ Anklets” is rightly found in Isaiah 3:18 the Revised Version (British and American), and “ ankle-chains” in Numbers 31:50 the Revised Version (British and American). A cognate word of essentially the same meaning is used in Isaiah 3:20, and is rendered by the King James Version “ ornaments of the legs.” It was these “ anklets” that Isaiah represented the ladies of Jerusalem as “ rattling” as they walked (Isaiah 3:16 to end), “ making a tinkling with their feet”; and a part of the punishment threatened is, “ The Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet” (Isaiah 3:16 the King James Version).

ANNA

<an’-a> ([’Avva, Anna] (Westcott-Hort, Hanna; see Intro, 408); Hebrew equivalent [channah], signifying “ grace” 1 Samuel 1:2):

(1) The wife of Tobit (Tobit 1:9).

(2) A “ prophetess,” daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher, and thus a Galilean, living in Jerusalem at the time of Jesus’ birth (Luke 2:36-38). “ Of a great age,” she must have been considerably over 100 years, having been a widow 84 years after a short married life of seven (see the Revised Version (British and American)). Exceptionally devout and gifted in spirit, she worshipped so constantly “ with fastings and supplications night and day,” that she is said to have “ departed not from the temple.” Some have mistakenly supposed that this signified permanent residence in the temple. The fact that her lineage is recorded indicates the distraction of her family. Tradition says that the tribe of Asher was noted for the beauty and talent of its women, who for these gifts, were qualified for royal and high-priestly marriage. While the tribe of Asher was not among the tribes that returned from the Babylonian exile to Palestine, many of its chief families must have done so as in the case of the prophetess. The period of war and national oppression, through which Anna’s early life was passed, created in her, as in the aged Simeon, an intense longing for the “ redemption” promised through the Messiah. See SIMEON. This hope of national deliverance sustained her through more than four decades of patient
waiting. In the birth of Jesus her faith was abundantly rewarded, and she became a grateful and ceaseless witness “to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem,” that the day of their spiritual deliverance had come.

LITERATURE.

See Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, I, 200-201, Gelkie, Life and Words of Christ, I, 133-34.

Dwight M. Pratt

ANNAAS

<an’-a-as> ([Σανάας, Sanaas], 1 Esdras 5:23, the Revised Version (British and American) SANAAS): The Senaah of Ezra 2:35.

ANNAS

<an’-as> (["Ἀννάς, Annas]; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Hannas; Josephus Ananos, the Greek form of Hebrew [חנן] [chanan]; “merciful,” “gracious”; compare Nehemiah 8:7, etc.):

(1) A high priest of the Jews, the virtual head of the priestly party in Jerusalem in the time of Christ, a man of commanding influence. He was the son of Seth (Josephus: Sethi), and was elevated to the high-priesthood by Quirinius, governor of Syria, 7 AD. At this period the office was filled and vacated at the caprice of the Roman procurators, and Annas was deposed by Valerius Gratus, 15 AD. But though deprived of official status, he continued to wield great power as the dominant member of the hierarchy, using members of his family as his willing instruments. That he was an adroit diplomatist is shown by the fact that five of his sons (Ant., XX, ix, 1) and his son-in-law Caiaphas (John 18:13) held the high-priesthood in almost unbroken succession, though he did not survive to see the office filled by his fifth son Annas or Ananus II, who caused James the Lord’s brother to be stoned to death (circa 62 AD). Another mark of his continued influence is, that long after he had lost his office he was still called “high priest,” and his name appears first wherever the names of the chief members of the sacerdotal faction are given. Acts 4:6, “And Annas
the high priest was there, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest.” Annas is almost certainly called high priest in John 18:19,22, though in 18:13,24 Caiaphas is mentioned as the high priest. Note especially the remarkable phrase in Luke 3:2, “in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas,” as if they were joint holders of the office. The cases in which Josephus gives the title “high-priest” to persons who no longer held the office afford no real parallel to this. The explanation seems to be that owing to age, ability and force of character Annas was the virtual, though Caiaphas the titular, high priest. He belonged to the Sadducean aristocracy, and, like others of that class, he seems to have been arrogant, astute, ambitious and enormously wealthy. He and his family were proverbial for their rapacity and greed. The chief source of their wealth seems to have been the sale of requisites for the temple sacrifices, such as sheep, doves, wine and oil, which they carried on in the four famous “booths of the sons of Annas” on the Mount of Olives, with a branch within the precincts of the temple itself. During the great feasts, they were able to extort high monopoly prices for theft goods. Hence, our Lord’s strong denunciation of those who made the house of prayer “a den of robbers” (Mark 11:15-19), and the curse in the Talmud, “Woe to the family of Annas! Woe to the serpent-like hisses” (Pes 57a). As to the part he played in the trial and death of our Lord, although he does not figure very prominently in the gospel narratives, he seems to have been mainly responsible for the course of events. Renan’s emphatic statement is substantially correct, “Annas was the principal actor in the terrible drama, and far more than Caiaphas, far more than Pilate, ought to bear the weight of the maledictions of mankind” (Life of Jesus). Caiaphas, indeed, as actual high priest, was the nominal head of the Sanhedrin which condemned Jesus, but the aged Annas was the ruling spirit. According to John 18:12,13, it was to him that the officers who arrested Jesus led Him first. “The reason given for that proceeding (“for he was father-in-law of Caiaphas”) lays open alike the character of the man and the character of the trial” (Westcott, in the place cited). Annas (if he is the high priest of John 18:19-23, as seems most likely) questioned Him concerning His disciples and teaching. This trial is not mentioned by the synoptists, probably because it was merely informal and preliminary and of a private nature, meant to gather material for the subsequent trial. Failing to elicit anything to his purpose from Jesus, “Annas therefore sent
him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest” (John 18:24 the King James Version is incorrect and misleading) for formal trial before the Sanhedrin, “but as one already stamped with a sign of condemnation” (Westcott). Doubtless Annas was present at the subsequent proceedings, but no further mention is made of him in New Testament, except that he was present at the meeting of the Sanhedrin after Pentecost when Peter and John defended themselves for preaching the gospel of the resurrection (Acts 4:6).

(2) Head of a family who returned with Ezra (1 Esdras 9:32), called “Harim” in Ezra 10:31.

D. Miall Edwards

annis

<an’-is> (the King James Version Ananias; the Revised Version, margin Annias, [ʾAḇneiṯ, Anneis] Codex Vaticanus, [ʾAḇniiṯ, Annias] Codex Alexandrinus): The name of a family in the list of the returning exiles (1 Esdras 5:16). The name is not given in the parallel list in Ezra and Nehemiah.

Annul, disannul

<a-nul’>, <dis-a-nul’>: God, as the Supreme Ruler, can disannul His covenant for cause (Isaiah 28:18); man, through willfulness and transgression, as party of the second part, may break the contract and thus release Yahweh, as party of the first part (Job 40:8; Isaiah 14:27), though there are some purposes and laws which the Almighty will carry out in spite of ungodly rage and ravings (Galatians 3:15 the King James Version); or an old law or covenant might be conceived as disannulled by a new one (Galatians 3:17), or because of its becoming obsolete and ineffective (Hebrews 7:18). For the first idea, the Hebrew employs הָפַר [kaphar] = “to cover,” “to expiate,” “condone,” “placate,” “cancel,” “cleanse,” “disannul,” “purge,” “put off” (Isaiah 28:18); and the Greek (Galatians 3:15), ἀθέτεω = “to set aside,” “disesteem,” “neutralize,” “violate,” “frustrate.” One covenant disannulling another by “conflict of laws” is expressed by akuroo, “to invalidate,” “disannul,”
“make of no effect.” Atheteo is employed to express also the disannulling through age and disuse (Hebrews 7:18).

Frank E. Hirsch

ANNUS

<an’-us> (A, Ἄννους, Annous], B, Anniouth; the King James Version Anus = Bani, Nehemiah 8:7): One of the Levites who interpreted the law to the people (1 Esdras 9:48).

ANNUUS

<an’-u-us> ([’Ἀννουνος, Announos]): Returned with Ezra from Babylon to perform the functions of a priest in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:48). Omitted in Ezra 8:19.

ANOINT; ANOINTED

<a-noint’>, <a-noint’-ed> ([ἄλείφω, aleipho], [χρίω, chrio]): Refers to a very general practice in the East. It originated from the relief from the effect of the sun that was experienced in rubbing the body with oil or grease. Among rude people the common vegetable or animal fat was used. As society advanced and refinement became a part of civilization, delicately perfumed ointments were used for this purpose. Other reasons soon obtained for this practice than that stated above. Persons were anointed for health (Mark 6:13), because of the widespread belief in the healing power of oil. It was often employed as a mark of hospitality (Luke 7:46); as a mark of special honor (John 11:2); in preparation for social occasions (Ruth 3:3; 2 Samuel 14:2; Isaiah 61:3). The figurative use of this word (chrio) has reference strictly to the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the individual (Luke 4:18; Acts 4:27; 10:38). In this sense it is God who anoints (Hebrews 19; 2 Corinthians 1:21). The thought is to appoint, or qualify for a special dignity, function or privilege. It is in this sense that the word is applied to Christ (John 1:41 m; Acts 4:27; 10:38; Hebrews 1:9; compare Psalm 2:2; Daniel 9:25).

See also ANOINTING.

Jacob W. Kapp
ANOINTING

<a-noint’-ing>: A distinction was made by the ancient Hebrews between anointing with oil in private use, as in making one’s toilet (û\]Ws [cukh]), and anointing as a religious rite (שָׁחַך [mashach]).

1. ORDINARY USE:

(1) As regards its secular or ordinary use, the native olive oil, alone or mixed with perfumes, was commonly used for toilet purposes, the very poor naturally reserving it for special occasions only (Ruth 3:3). The fierce protracted heat and biting lime dust of Palestine made the oil very soothing to the skin, and it was applied freely to exposed parts of the body, especially to the face (Psalm 104:15).

(2) The practice was in vogue before David’s time, and traces of it may be found throughout the Old Testament (see Deuteronomy 28:40; Ruth 3:3; 2 Samuel 12:20; 14:2; 2 Chron 28:15; Ezekiel 16:9; Micah 6:15; Daniel 10:3) and in the New Testament (Matthew 6:17, etc.). Indeed it seems to have been a part of the daily toilet throughout the East.

(3) To abstain from it was one token of mourning (2 Samuel 14:2; compare Matthew 6:17), and to resume it a sign that the mourning was ended (2 Samuel 12:20; 14:2; Daniel 10:3; Judith 10:3). It often accompanied the bath (Ruth 3:3; 2 Samuel 12:20; Ezekiel 16:9; Susanna 17), and was a customary part of the preparation for a feast (Ecclesiastes 9:8; Psalm 23:5). One way of showing honor to a guest was to anoint his head with oil (Psalm 23:5; Luke 7:46); a rarer and more striking way was to anoint his feet (Luke 7:38). In James 5:14, we have an instance of anointing with oil for medicinal purposes, for which see OIL.

2. RELIGIOUS USE:

Anointing as a religious rite was practiced throughout the ancient East in application both to persons and to things.

(1) It was observed in Canaan long before the Hebrew conquest, and, accordingly, Weinel (Stade’s Zeitschrift, XVIII, 50 ff) holds that, as the
use of oil for general purposes in Israel was an agricultural custom borrowed from the Canaanites, so the anointing with sacred oil was an outgrowth from its regular use for toilet purposes. It seems more in accordance with the known facts of the case and the terms used in description to accept the view set forth by Robertson Smith (Religion of the Semites, 2nd ed., 233, 383 ff; compare Wellhausen, Reste des arabischen Heidenthums, 2nd ed., 125 ff) and to believe that the [cukh] or use of oil for toilet purposes, was of agricultural and secular origin, and that the use of oil for sacred purposes, [mashach], was in origin nomadic and sacrificial. Robertson Smith finds the origin of the sacred anointing in the very ancient custom of smearing the sacred fat on the altar ([matstsebhah]), and claims, rightly it would seem, that from the first there was a distinct and consistent usage, distinguishing the two terms as above.

(2) The primary meaning of [mashach] in Hebrew, which is borne out by the Arabic, seems to have been “to daub” or “smear.” It is used of painting a ceiling in Jeremiah 22:14, of anointing a shield in Isaiah 21:5, and is, accordingly, consistently applied to sacred furniture, like the altar, in Exodus 29:36 and Daniel 9:24, and to the sacred pillar in Genesis 31:13: “where thou anointedst a pillar.”

(3) The most significant uses of [mashach], however, are found in its application, not to sacred things, but to certain sacred persons. The oldest and most sacred of these, it would seem, was the anointing of the king, by pouring oil upon his head at his coronation, a ceremony regarded as sacred from the earliest times, and observed religiously not in Israel only, but in Egypt and elsewhere (see Judges 9:8,15; 1 Samuel 9:16; 10:1; 2 Samuel 19:10; 1 Kings 1:39,45; 2 Kings 9:3,6; 11:12). Indeed such anointing appears to have been reserved exclusively for the king in the earliest times, which accounts for the fact that “the Lord’s anointed” became a synonym for “king” (see 1 Samuel 12:3,5; 26:11; 2 Samuel 1:14; Psalm 20:6). It is thought by some that the practice originated in Egypt, and it is known to have been observed as a rite in Canaan at a very early day. Tell el-Amarna Letters 37 records the anointing of a king.

(4) Among the Hebrews it was believed not only that it effected a transference to the anointed one of something of the holiness and virtue of the deity in whose name and by whose representative the rite was
performed, but also that it imparted a special endowment of the spirit of Yahweh (compare 1 Samuel 16:13; Isaiah 61:1). Hence the profound reverence for the king as a sacred personage, “the anointed” (Hebrew, [meshiach] YHWH), which passed over into our language through the Greek Christos, and appears as “Christ”.

(5) In what is known today as the Priestly Code, the high priest is spoken of as “anointed” (Exodus 29:7; Leviticus 4:3; 8:12), and, in passages regarded by some as later additions to the Priestly Code, other priests also are thus spoken of (Exodus 30:30; 40:13-15). Elijah was told to anoint Elisha as a prophet (1 Kings 19:16), but seems never to have done so. 1 Kings 19:16 gives us the only recorded instance of such a thing as the anointing of a prophet. Isaiah 61:1 is purely metaphorical (compare Dillmann on Leviticus 8:12-14 with ICC on Numbers 3:3; see also Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebraischen Archaologie, II, 124).

**LITERATURE.**

Jewish Encyclopedia, article “Anointing”; BJ, IV, ix, 10, DB, article “Anointing,” etc.

*George B. Eager*

**ANON**

*a-non’* ([ευθεως, eutheos], [ευθς, euthus]): In the King James Version of Mark 1:30; Matthew 13:20, for “straightway” of the Revised Version (British and American), i.e. “without delay,” “immediately.”

**ANOS**

*a’-nos* ([’Anως, Anos] = Vaniah (Ezra 10:36): A son of Bani who put away his “strange wife” (1 Esdras 9:34).

**ANSWER**

*an’-ser*: In our English Bible the word “answer” does not always mean a simple reply to a question.
1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

Six different words are translated by answer.

(1) It is frequently used where no question has been asked and in such cases it means a word, a statement.

(2) It also means a response (Job 21:34; 34:36).

(3) It often means a declaration or proclamation from God where no question has been asked. See the many passages that read: “The Lord answered and said.”

(4) The other words translated “answer” or “answered” in the Old Testament are unimportant shadings and variations.

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The words translated “answer” are not so varied.

(1) It sometimes means an apology, a defense (1 Peter 3:15; Acts 24:10,25).

(2) It may mean simply “to say” (Mark 9:6).

(3) It may mean a revelation from God (Romans 11:4).

(4) It is also used to apply to unspoken thoughts of the heart, especially in the sayings of Jesus; also by Peter to Sapphira (Acts 5:8).

G. H. Gerberding

ANSWERABLE

<an’-ser-a-бл>: This word is found in the Old Testament only. Moses and Ezekiel alone use it (Exodus 38:18; Ezekiel 40:18; 45:7; 48:13,18). It is used in the Old English sense of “corresponding to,” “in harmony with.” Bunyan uses it in the same sense (Holy War, Clar. Press ed., 92).
ANT

(نملة = Arabic [namalah]): The word occurs only twice in the Bible, in the familiar passages in Proverbs (6:6; 30:25) in both of which this insect is made an example of the wisdom of providing in the summer for the wants of the winter. Not all ants store up seeds for winter use, but among the ants of Palestine there are several species that do so, and their well-marked paths are often seen about Palestinian threshing-floors and in other places where seeds are to be obtained. The path sometimes extends for a great distance from the nest.

Alfred Ely Day

ANTEĐILUVIAN PATRIARCHS

<an-te-di-lu’-vi-an pa’-tri-arks>.

1. THE TEN ANTEDILUVIAN PATRIARCHS:

Ten patriarchs who lived before the Flood are listed in the genealogical table of Genesis 5, together with a statement of the age of each at the birth of his son, the number of years that remained to him till death, and the sum of both periods or the entire length of his life. The first half of the list, from Adam to Mahalalel inclusive, together with Enoch and Noah is the same in the three texts, except that the Septuagint has 100 years more in the first column in each case save that of Noah, and 100 years less in the second column.

See CHRONOLOGY OF OLD TESTAMENT.

2. DIVERGENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TEXTS:

Divergence exists in the case of Jared, Methuselah and Lamech only. Even here the longevity of Jared and Methuselah is given similarly in the Hebrew and the Septuagint; and probably represents the reading of the source, especially since the different data in the Samaritan text bear evidence of adjustment to a theory. The customary excess of 100 years in the Septuagint over the other texts for the age of the patriarch at the birth of the son, and the variously divergent data for the total age of Jared, Methuselah and Lamech are, therefore, the matters that await explanation.
The general superiority of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch as a whole to the Samaritan text and the Septuagint is no longer questioned by Biblical scholars. But whether the superiority obtains in this particular passage has given rise to long and earnest discussion. Keil and Delitzsch in their commentaries on Genesis, Preuss (Zeitrechnung der Septuaginta, 1859, 30ff), Noldeke (Untersuchung zur Kritik des Altes Testament, 1869, 112), and Eduard Konig (ZKW, 1883, 281 ff), hold to the originality of the Hebrew data. Bertheau (Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theologie, XXIII, 657 ff) and Dillmann ascribe prior authority to the Samaritan numbers in Genesis 5, but to the Hebrew numbers in Genesis 11. Klostermann argues for the originality of the Septuagint (Pentateuch, Neue Folge, 1907, 37-39).

3. DIVERGENCES NOT ACCIDENTAL:

It is agreed by all that the divergences between the texts are mainly due, not to accidental corruption, but to systematic alteration. Accordingly, two tasks devolve upon the investigator, namely

1. the removal of accidental corruptions from the numerical data in the several texts and

2. the discovery of a principle that underlies and explains the peculiarities in each one or in two of the three sets of data.

4. DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS:

On the interpretation that the names denote individuals and that no links have been omitted in the genealogy, readers of the Septuagint noticed that according to its data Methuselah survived the flood, and in order to avoid this incongruity a scribe changed the 167 years, ascribed to his age at the birth of his son, to 187 years. This reading was early in existence, and was followed by Josephus. Holding the same theory regarding the genealogy, the Samaritans noticed that by their data three men, Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech, survived the Flood. To correct the apparent mistake, without tampering with the age of these three men at parenthood, their longevity was reduced sufficiently to enable them to die in the year of the Deluge. If the Hebrew text in its present form is not original, and is to be emended from the Samaritan and Septuagint, the same difficulty inherited in it. To overcome this difficulty, perhaps, 100 years were borrowed from the
years that elapsed between parenthood and death and were added to the age of the three men at the time of begetting a son. This relieved the matter as far as Jared was concerned and perhaps in the case of Lamech also, and the borrowing of an additional 20 years set Methuselah right also. If the original number for Lamech was 53 in the Hebrew, as in the Samaritan, then it was necessary to increase the time between Methuselah’s birth and the Flood not 20, but 49 years. These 49 years could not be added directly to either Methuselah’s or Lamech’s age at begetting a son without making this age exceed 200 years, and thus be out of proportion; and accordingly the 49 years were distributed.

The difference of a century in the age assigned to the patriarchs at the son’s birth which distinguishes the data of the Hebrew in most cases from the Septuagint, and likewise from the Samaritan in several instances, in Genesis 5 and regularly until Nahor in Genesis 11:10-26, is commonly explained in the following manner or in a similar way: namely, when any of these long-lived patriarchs was found recorded as having begotten a son at a more youthful age than 150 years, the translators of the Septuagint added 100 years; on the other hand the Samaritan struck off 100 years when necessary in order that no one save Noah might be recorded as reaching 150 years of age before entering upon parenthood, and added 100 years when the record made a patriarch become father of a son before attaining even 50 years. A different explanation is, however, attempted, and the reason for the constant variant is sought in the purpose to construct an artificial chronology; for on interpreting the names as denoting individual persons and the genealogy as proceeding from father to son without break, a method employed as early as the 1st century of the Christian era (Ant., I, iii, 3), the time that elapsed between the creation of man and the Deluge was 1,656 years according to the Hebrew text, 1,307 according to the Samaritan text, and 2,242 according to the Septuagint; and numerous attempts have been made to bring one or other of these totals into arithmetical relation with some conceivable larger chronological scheme. A conspectus of these studies is furnished by Delitzsch (Neuer Commentar uber die Genesis, 136-39), Dillmann (Genesis, 6te Aufl, 111-13), and most recently by Skinner (Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, 135, 136, 234). The different explanations that are offered naturally vary in
plausibility; but all possess the common fault of lacking cogency at critical points and somewhere doing violence to the data.

5. THE RELATION OF THE CAINITE AND SETHITE GENEALOGIES:

In Genesis 4 there are two distinct genealogies, one proceeding through Cain and the other through Seth. Since Hupfeld, the representative critics who partition Genesis have generally reached the conclusion that both of these genealogies were found in the primary document of J or in an ancient recension of it (Wellhausen, Composition des Hexateuchs 3, 8-14; Delitzsch, Neuer Commentar, etc., 126; Kautzsch und Socin; Dillmann, Genesis 6, 104, 116; Budde, Urgeschichte, 182, 527-31; Driver, Introduction 10, 14, 21; Strack, Genesis 2, 23; Gunkel, Genesis, 49; Skinner, Genesis, 2, 14, 99 (4); Stade on the other hand regards Genesis 4:25,26; 5:29 as the compilation of a redactor, ZATW, XIV, 281). In Genesis 5 there is also a genealogy through Seth to Noah.

6. RESEMBLANCES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE TWO LISTS:

By removing Genesis 4:25 and 26 from their present position and placing them before 4:1 or, as Guthe does, before 4:17; and by excising the word “Eve” from 4:1 and understanding “the man” ([ha-’adham]) to be Enosh; and by excising from 4:25 the words “again,” “another,” and “instead of Abel, for Cain slew him”; and by introducing the words “and Lamech begat” before “a son” in Genesis 5:28,29 and inserting this material in between Genesis 4:18 and 4:19 or after 4:24: then the two genealogies of chapter 4 are reduced to one and, so far as the names are concerned, have become almost identical with the Sethite genealogy contained in Genesis 5. In fact the resemblances between the six names in 4:17,18 with six in chapter 5 have from the first been the basis of every attempt to identify the two genealogies (Buttmann, Mythologus, 170-72). The procedure is violent (see strictures, Skinner, Genesis, 99). It is a serious objection also that the work of reconstruction has been conducted without thought of the possible bearing of the tribal theory of the genealogies on this problem.
It is important to note that the number of links in the two genealogies may indicate that Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain, who mark stages of developing culture, lived several generations before Noah. It was ancient Semitic belief that civilization was far advanced before the Flood, and was continued in its various forms by the survivors (Berosus; and inscription 13, col. i. 18 in Lehmann’s Shamash-shumukin). However, for the sake of comparison, the six links in the genealogical chain of the Cainites are placed side by side with those of the Sethites so as the better to reveal the resemblances and differences

Of these names two, Enoch and Lamech, occur in each genealogy, though Enoch does not occupy the same place in both lists. Kenan is readily derived from the same root as Cain. Instead of `Irad the original Hebrew text may have been `Idad, as was read by the Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus and Lucian. But, accepting `Irad as original, `Irad and Jared may conceivably have been distorted in the oral tradition; yet as they stand they are radically different, and one might as well compare Prussia and Russia, Swede and Swiss, Austria and Australia. Methushael is written in the Septuagint exactly as is Methuselah; but both names are fully established by textual evidence and are fine Semitic names. Methushael particularly is of good Babylonian form, meaning “man of God”; archaic in Hebrew or smacking of the northern dialect, but quite intelligible to the Israelite.

7. THE NEED OF CAUTION:

The resemblance between the six consecutive names in the two lists is indeed striking, but the differences are also great; and the wisdom of caution in pronouncing judgment is suggested and emphasized by a comparison of two lists from the later history of the people of Israel. The twelve kings of Judah compared with their nineteen contemporaries in northern Israel show almost as many resemblances as the ten Cainites to the twelve Sethites, Adam as the common ancestor not being reckoned. The two series begin with Rehoboam and Jeroboam, names as similar externally as `Irad and Jared. Ahaziah of Israel was almost contemporary with Ahaziah of Judah; Jehoram was on the throne of Judah while Jehoram ruled over Israel, the reign of Jehoash of Judah overlapped that of Jehoash of Israel, and Jehoahaz of Israel preceded about half a century Ahaz, or, as
his name appears in Assyrian inscriptions, Jehoahaz of Judah. If there can be two contemporary dynasties with these coincidences, surely there could be two antediluvian races with an equal similarity in the names. Then, too, the material differences between the Cainite and Sethite lines are great. Cain is the son of Adam; whereas Kenan is the third remove, being descended through Seth and Enosh. The two Enochs seem to have nothing in common save the name (Genesis 4:17,18; 5:22,23). The character of the two Lamechs is quite different, as appears from their speeches (Genesis 4:19,23; 5:28,29). The line of Cain terminated in Lamech and his four children, of whom the three sons became of note in the annals of civilization; whereas the line of Seth continued through Noah, the hero of the Flood, and his three sons who were known only as the ancestors of peoples. Moreover, even excluding the section of Genesis assigned to the Priestly Code (P), the two lines were distinguished from each other, and most of the characteristic differences between them were clearly set forth, in the most ancient form of the Hebrew tradition, as it is actually known (Green, Unity of Genesis, 43-49; Delitzsch, Neuer Commentar, etc., 126, 127, 132, 140; Strack, Genesis 2, 22, 23, section III).

The order of narration in the Book of Genesis is also significant. It indicates the writer’s perception of a profound difference between the two races. The narrative regarding Cain and his descendants is completed, according to invariable custom in the Book of Genesis, before the line of Seth, in which eventually Abraham appeared, is taken up and its history recorded (Green, Unity of Genesis, 49; Delitzsch, Neuer Commentar, etc., 126). Thus at each stage of the history the story of the branch line is told before the fortunes are recited of the direct line of promise.

8. THE REGISTER OF GENESIS 5 AND BEROUS’ LIST OF ANTEDILUVIAN KINGS:

Berosus, a priest of Marduk’s temple at Babylon about 300 BC, in the second book of his history tells of the ten kings of the Chaldeans who reigned before the Deluge. He says that

The first king was Aloros of (the city) Babylon, a Chaldean. (He gave out a report about himself that God had appointed him to be shepherd of the people.) He reigned ten sars. (A sar is thirty-six hundred years.)
And afterward Alaparos (his son reigned three sars).

And (after him) Amelon (a Chaldean), who was of (the city of) Pautibibla (reigned thirteen sars).

Then Ammenon the Chaldean (of Pautibibla reigned twelve sars).

Then Megalaros of the city of Pautibibla, and he reigned eighteen sars.

And after him Daonos the shepherd of Pautibibla reigned ten sars.

Then Euedorachos of Pautibibla reigned eighteen sars.

Then Amempsinos, a Chaldean of Laraucha, reigned; and he, the eighth, was king ten sars. Next Otiartes a Chaldean of Laraucha, reigned; and he (the ninth) was king eight sars.

And (last of all), upon the death of Otiartes, his son Xisouthros reigned eighteen sars. In his time the great deluge occurred. Thus, when summed up, the kings are ten; and the sars are one hundred and twenty (or four hundred and thirty-two thousand years, reaching to the Flood1).

*** (NOTE: 1 Syncellus quoting Alexander Polyhistor. 2 Syncellus quoting Apollodorus. 3 Syncellus quoting Abydenus. 4 Syncellus quoting Abydenus concerning the deluge. 5 Eusebius, Armenian Chronicle, quoting Alexander Polyhistor. 6 Eusebius, Armenian Chronicle, quoting Abydenus. The royal names have been transmitted with substantial uniformity, except the third, fifth, seventh and ninth. Amelon (2) is given as Amillaros (3) and Almelon (5, 6); Megalaros (2, 3) appears also as Amegalarus (5, 6); Euedorachos (2) as Eudoreschos (3), Edoranchus (5), and Edoreschus (6); and Ardates (1) as Otiartes (2, 5). For texts and readings see Richter, Berosi Chaldaeorum Historiae, 52-56; Migne, Patrologia Graeca, XIX, “Eusebii Chronicorum,” Lib. I, cap. i et vi, pp. 106, 121; Schoene, Eusebii Chronicorum, Lib. I, pp. 7, 31.)

The original Babylonian form of seven of these ten names has been determined with a fair degree of certainty. Alaparos is in all probability a misreading by a copyist of the Greek Adaparos (Hommel, PSBA, XV, 243 ff; Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff), and accordingly represents Adapa, followed perhaps by another element beginning with the letter “r”; Amelon and Ammenon are equivalent to the Babylonian nouns amelu (Delitzsch Wo lag
Several of these names are well known in Babylonian literature: Adapa was a human being, a wise man, a wizard, who failed to obtain immortality. He was an attendant at the temple of Ea in the town of Eridu, prepared bread and water for the sanctuary and provided it with fish. Perhaps it was his connection with the temple that led to his being called son of Ea, and described as created or built by Ea (Schrader, Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, VI, 91-101). Similarly King Esarhaddon calls himself the faithful son, child of Beltis; and Ashurbanipal claims to have been created or built by the gods Ashur and Sin in the womb of his mother (compare Adam, the son of God, Luke 3:38). Enmeduranki, whose name has been interpreted as possibly meaning chief priest of Duranki, the meeting place of sky and earth, was a king of Sippar, a city whose patron deity was the sun-god Shamash. He was a notable wise man who, it seems, was reputed to have been taken by the gods Shamash and Ramman into their fellowship and made acquainted with the secrets of heaven and earth (KAT3, 530 f). As among the Hebrews the priests were descended from Aaron, so among the Babylonians Enmeduranki was regarded as the ancestor of the wizards and sooth-sayers or the founder of their guild. Amel-Sin is elsewhere mentioned as the wise one of Ur (KAT3, 537). In the Babylonian account of the Flood the hero is addressed as son of Ubara-Tutu. It is worth mention that legends grew up about the hero of the Flood, as they have about other historical personages since; and he even appears like some ancient kings, with the determinative for god before his name. Adapa also, who was classed with the wizards, early came to have a place in story.
9. CORRESPONDENCES:

The first name in the list of Berosus is Aloros. Professor Hommel would understand the original Babylonian form to have been Aruru, a goddess. The identification is precarious, to say the least; and evidently it was not the conception of the Babylonian priest, for it makes his line of kings begin with a goddess. He should have called Aloros a queen. Professor Hommel regards Adapa also as a deity, contrary to the statements of the tale itself; thus holding that the second Babylonian king like the first was a Divine being. On such an interpretation the Babylonian and Hebrew lists are not identical, for the Hebrew genealogy commences in Adam, human being. With the third name, however, certain remarkable correspondences begin to appear. The third Babylonian king is Amelu, man, and the third patriarch is Enosh, also meaning man; the fourth king is Ummanu, artificer, and the fourth patriarch is Kenan, a name derived from a root meaning to form or fabricate. The seventh king is Enmeduranki, who apparently was reputed to have been summoned by the gods Shamash and Ramman into their fellowship and made acquainted with the secrets of heaven and earth; and the seventh patriarch was Enoch who walked with God (like Noah, Genesis 6:9; see KAT3, 540). The tenth king, like the tenth patriarch, was the hero of the Flood. These facts are capable of two interpretations: either the two catalogues are fundamentally different, having been constructed for different purposes, yet as they deal with prominent persons belonging to the same period of history and to the same country, cross each other at various points and culminate in the same individual (as do the genealogies of Matthew 1 and Luke 3); or else when the unexplained names of both lists shall have been finally interpreted, the two catalogues will be found to represent the same tradition.

10. DIFFERENCES:

Differences between the catalogues exist, which in some instances may be more apparent than real.

(1) In the Babylonian hat the descent of the government from father to son is asserted in two instances only, namely, from the first king to the second and from the ninth to the tenth. The Hebrew asserts kinship, however remote, between the successive links. Yet the two records are
quite compatible with each other in this respect on theory (see below) that the Hebrew genealogy was shortened by omissions in order to name but ten generations.

(2) Each of the ten patriarchs is assigned a long life; each of the ten kings has a greatly longer reign. The contrast is twofold: between the number of years in corresponding cases, and between length of life and length of reign. But instead of this difference indicating non-identity of the two lines, it may be found, when the Semitic tradition is fully known, to afford the explanation for the duration of life which is assigned to the patriarchs.

(3) There is no arithmetical ratio between the years connected with the corresponding names of the two lists. And the symmetry of the numbers in the Bah transmission is open to the suspicion of being artificial. The number of kings is ten; the sum of their united reigns is one hundred and twenty sars, a multiple of ten and of the basal number of the Babylonian duodecimal system. There are three reigns of ten sars each, and three successive reigns which taken together, 3 plus 13 plus 12, make ten and eighteen sars. Taking the reigns in the order in which they occur, we have as their duration the series 10, 18 plus 10, 18, 10, 18, 10, 8, and 18 (Davis, Genesis and Semitic Tradition, 96-100; Strack, Genesis 2, 24).

11. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE GENEALOGY IN GENESIS 5:

Three explanations of the genealogy in Genesis 5 may be mentioned.

(1) An interpretation, current at the time of Josephus (Ant., I, iii, 4) and adopted by Archbishop Usher in 1650 in his attempt to fix the dates of the events recorded in the Scriptures, assumes an unbroken descent from father to son, during ten generations, from Adam to Noah. On this theory the time from the creation of man to the Flood is measured by the sum of the years assigned to the patriarchs at the birth of the son and successor, together with Noah’s age when he entered the Ark; so that all the years from the creation of Adam to the Flood were 1,656 years. The extraordinary longevity of these patriarchs is accounted for by the known physical effects of sin. Sin
works disease and death. Man was not as yet far removed from his state of sinlessness. The physical balance between man sinless and man the sinner had not been attained (compare Delitzsch, Genesis 3, 139; see Ant, I, iii, 9). But after all are we really justified in supposing that the Hebrew author of these genealogies designed to construct a chronology of the period? He never puts them to such a use himself. He nowhere sums these numbers. No chronological statement is deduced from them. There is no computation anywhere in Scripture of the time that elapsed from the Creation or from the Deluge, as there is from the descent into Egypt to the Exodus (Exodus 12:40), or from the Exodus to the building of the temple (1 Kings 6:1; Green, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1890, 296).

(2) A second method of interpretation assumes that links of the genealogy have been intentionally omitted in order that exactly ten may be named. It is based on the phenomena presented by other Hebrew genealogical registers. Matthew, for example, has outlined the lineage of Christ from Abraham. The history naturally divides into three sections, and to give the tabulation symmetry Matthew names twice seven generations in each division, in one instance omitting three famous kings of Judah and saying “Joram begat Uzziah.” As Joram is said to have begotten Uzziah, his grandson’s grandson, so Enoch may be said to have begotten Methuselah, although the latter may have been Enoch’s great-grandson or remoter descendant. The book of Genesis is divided by its author into ten sections, each introduced by the same formula (Genesis 2:4; 5:1; 6:9, etc.). In the period from the creation of man to the birth of Abraham the crisis of the history was the Flood. Twice ten generations are named in the symmetrical register, ten before the Flood, Adam to Noah, and ten after the Flood, Shem to Abraham; and the latter period in its turn is divided into two equal parts, and five generations are named for the time to, and five for the time after, the birth of Peleg, in whose days ‘the earth was divided’ (Genesis 11:10-26; 10:25; compare perhaps 11:1-9). On this conception of the tables, which is fully justified, there is no basis in the genealogy from Adam to Noah for the calculation of chronology. The table was constructed for a different purpose, and the years are noted for another reason than chronology (Green, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1890, 285-303;
Warfield, Princeton Theological Review, 1911, 2-11; compare Dillmann, Genesis 6, 106 “dritte Absicht”). The longevity is explained as it is on Usher’s interpretation of the data (see above).

(3) A third method of interpretation understands the patriarchal name to denote the individual and his family spoken of collectively. The person and tribe form one conception. This method also agrees with the phenomena presented by Hebrew genealogical registers. Thus, Keturah bears to Abraham Jokshan, and Jokshan begat Sheba and Dedan, tribes and the countries they inhabited (Genesis 25:1-5). Mizraim, as Egypt was called by the Hebrews, begat the Lydians and other ancient peoples (Genesis 10:13); and Canaan begat the town of Sidon and such famous tribes as the Jebusite and the Amorite (Genesis 10:15-18). Similarly, countries like Media, Ionia (Javan), Tubal and Meshech, and peoples named by Gentile adjectives in the plural number, like Kittim and Dodanim, are hated as sons of Japheth; and Ethiopia, Egypt, Punt and Canaan, and districts in Arabia like Sheba and Havilah are recorded as descendants of Ham (Genesis 10:2-7). Moreover, outside of genealogies, in common parlance Israel denotes a man and the tribe that sprang from him; David, the king of that name and the dynasty he founded (1 Kings 12:16; compare Jeremiah 30:9); Nebaioth, a people and its prince (Genesis 25:13,16; 28:9). Sometimes the family takes its name from its progenitor or later leading member; sometimes the name of the tribe or of the country it inhabits is given to its chief representative, as today men are constantly addressed by their family name, and nobles are called by the name of their duchy or county. It is quite in accordance with usage, therefore, that Noah, for example, should denote the hero of the Flood and the family to which he belonged. The longevity is the period during which the family had prominence and leadership; the age at the son’s birth is the date in the family history at which a new family originated that ultimately succeeded to the dominant position. If no links have been omitted in constructing the register, the period from the creation of man to the Flood is measured by the sum of the ages of Adam and his successors to Noah and 600 years of the life of Noah, amounting to 8,225 years. Thus, the family of Seth originated when Adam was 130 years old (Genesis 5:3). Adam and his direct line
were at the head of affairs for 930 years (5), when they were
superseded by the family of Seth. In Seth, 105 years after it attained
headship, the family of Enosh took Its rise (6). Seth, after being at the
head of affairs for 912 years
(8) was succeeded by the family of Enosh, in the year of the world
1842. And so on.

John D. Davis

ANTEDILUVIANS

<an-te-di-lu’-vi-ans>.

1. CHRONOLOGY UNCERTAIN:

According to the ordinary interpretation of the genealogical tables in
Genesis 5 the lives of the antediluvians were prolonged to an extreme old
age, Methuselah attaining that of 969 years. But before accepting these
figures as a basis of interpretation it is important to observe that the
Hebrew, the Samaritan and the Septuagint texts differ so radically in their
sums that probably little confidence can be placed in any of them. The
Septuagint adds 100 years to the age of six of the antediluvian patriarchs at
the birth of their eldest sons. This, taken with the great uncertainty
connected with the transmission of numbers by the Hebrew method of
notation, makes it unwise to base important conclusions upon the data
accessible. The most probable interpretation of the genealogical table in
Genesis 5 is that given by the late Professor William Henry Green, who
maintains that it is not Intended to give chronology, and does not give it,
but only indicates the line of descent, as where (<132624> 1 Chronicles 26:24) we
read that “Shebuel the son of Gershom, the son of Moses, was ruler over
the treasures”; whereas, while Gershom was the immediate son of Moses,
Shebuel was separated from Gershom by several generations. According to
the interpretation of Professor Green all that we can certainly infer from
the statement in Hebrew that Adam was 130 years old when he begat Seth,
is that at that age the line branched off which culminated in Seth, it being
permitted, according to Hebrew usage, to interpolate as many intermediate
generations as other evidence may compel.
2. MEANING OF GENEALOGIES:
As in the genealogies of Christ in the Gospels, the object of the tables in Genesis is evidently not to give chronology, but the line of descent. This conclusion is supported by the fact that no use is made afterward of the chronology, whereas the line of descent is repeatedly emphasized. This method of interpretation allows all the elasticity to prehistoric chronology that any archaeologist may require. Some will get further relief from the apparent incredibility of the figures by the Interpretation of Professor A. Winchell, and T. P. Crawford (Winchell, Pre-adamites, 449 ff) that the first number gives the age of actual life of the individual while the second gives that of the ascendance of his family, the name being that of dynasties, like Caesar or Pharaoh.

3. THE NEPHILIM:
The [nephilim] (giants) and the mighty men born of “the sons of God” and the “daughters of men” (Genesis 6:4,5) are according to the best interpretation “giants in wickedness,” being the fruit of intermarriage between the descendants of Seth (“sons of God” who called on the name of Yahweh, Genesis 4:26), and the “daughters of men.” The idea that “sons of God” refers to angels or demigods has no support in Scripture. On this familiar designation of the worshippers of the true God see Exodus 4:22; Deuteronomy 14:1; 32, repeatedly; Isaiah 1:2; 43:6; 45:11; Hosea 1:10; 11:1. Intermarriage with depraved races such as is here intimated produced the results which were guarded against in the Mosaic law prohibiting marriages with the surrounding idolatrous nations. The word Nephilim in Genesis 6:4 occurs again only in Numbers 13:33 (the King James Version “giants”). But the word is more probably a descriptive term than the name of a race. In the older Greek versions it is translated “violent men.”

4. THE ICE AGE:
The antediluvians are, with great probability, identified by some geologists (Sir William Dawson, e.g.) with glacial or paleolithic man, whose implements and remains are found buried beneath the deposits of glacial floods in northern France, southern England, southern Russia, and in the
valleys of the Delaware, Ohio and Missouri rivers in America. The remains of “paleolithic” men reveal only conditions of extreme degradation and savagery, in which violence reigned. The sparse population which was spread over the northern hemisphere during the closing floods of the Glacial period lived in caves of the earth, and contended with a strange variety of gigantic animals which became extinct at the same time with their human contemporaries.

See DELUGE.
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George Frederick Wright

ANTELOPE

<an-te-lop> (RV; the King James Version “wild ox,” עָרְעָן [te’o] (Deuteronomy 14:5), and “wild bull,” [to] (Isaiah 51:20); ὀροῦξ, orux] (The Septuagint in Codex Vaticanus has ὁς σευτλίον ἡμίεφθον, literally, “like a half-cooked beet-root”): The dorcas gazelle (Gazella dorcas) is widely distributed in Syria, Palestine and Arabia. The recently discovered Merrill’s gazelle (Gazella Merrilli) inhabits the hilly country near Jerusalem and is not commonly distinguished from the dorcas gazelle. Probably the only other antelope within this range is the Arabian oryx (Oryx beatrix). Tristram cites two African species (the bubaline antelope, Bubalis mauretanica, and the addax, Addax nasomaculatus) as existing in the Sinaitic peninsula, southern Palestine and Arabia, but he did not collect specimens of either and was probably misled by statements of the Arabs which in both cases really referred to the oryx. The only naturalist who has ever penetrated into Northwest Arabia is Mr. Douglas Carruthers, who went in 1909 on a collecting expedition for the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut, his object
being to obtain the oryx and any other large antelopes which might be found there. Through observation and repeated inquiry he became convinced that neither the addax nor the bubaline antelope is found in Arabia. Tristram says the addax is called maha’ and the bubaline antelope [baqar-ul-wachsh], both of which names are in fact used by the Arabs for the oryx, which is also according to Doughty called [wadichah].

[Tsebhi] in the list of clean animals in Deuteronomy 14:5 (the King James Version “roebuck”; the Revised Version (British and American) “gazelle”) is quite certainly gazelle, Arabic zabi (which see), so it is quite possible that [te’o] may be the oryx. It is noteworthy that it is rendered oryx ([ὤρυξ, orux]) in the Septuagint. It must be borne in mind that [re’m] or [re’em], rendered “unicorn” (which see) in the King James Version and “wild ox” in the Revised Version (British and American), may perhaps also be the oryx. That the oryx should be called by two names in the Bible need not be considered strange, in view of the indefiniteness of Semitic ideas of natural history, which is directly evidenced by the three names now used for this animal by the Arabs.

The slightly different form [to’] (the King James Version “wild bull”; the Revised Version (British and American) “antelope”) found in Isaiah 51:20 (“Thy sons have fainted, they lie at the head of all the streets, as an antelope in a net”) may quite as well refer to the oryx as to any other animal. According to Gesenius the word is derived from the verb [ta’ah], “to outrun,” which would be appropriate for this or any antelope.

The accompanying illustration is from a photograph of a well-grown female oryx in the zoological gardens at Cairo, which is 35 inches high at the shoulder and whose horns are 21 inches long. An adult male measures 40 inches at the shoulders, 59 inches from tip of nose to root of tail, and the longest horns known measure 27 1/4 inches. The color is pure white with dark brown or black markings. It is a powerful animal and its horns may inflict dangerous wounds. It inhabits the deserts of Arabia and its remarkably large hoofs seem well adapted to traversing the sands. It feeds upon grasses and upon certain succulent roots, and the Bedouin declare that never drinks. Under its name of maha’ it is celebrated in Arabic poetry for the beauty of its eyes. Compare the Homeric “ox-eyed goddess Hera” ([βοώπις πότνια Ἡρη, Boopis potnia Ere]). [Baqar-ul-wachsh], the
name most commonly used by the Bedouin, means “wild cow” or “wild ox,” which is identical with the translation of [te’o] in the King James Version.

*Alfred Ely Day*

**ANTHEDON**

<an-the’-don>: A city of Palestine, rebuilt along with Samaria, Ashdod, Gaza, and other cities, at Gabinius’ command (Josephus, Ant, XIV, v, 3).

**ANTHOTHIJAH**

<an-tho-thi’-ja> (אַנְתּוֹתיָה [anthothiyah], “belonging to Anathoth”(?)): A son of Shasak of Benjamin ( Chronicles 8:24), written in the King James Version Antothijah.

**ANTHROPOLOGY**

<an-thro-pol’-o-ji>: Under this heading is grouped whatever the Bible has to say regarding man’s origin, nature, destiny and kindred topics. No systematized doctrine concerning man is found in Scripture; but the great facts about human nature and its elements are presented in the Bible in popular language and not in that of the schools. Delitzsch has well said: “There is a clearly defined psychology essentially proper to Holy Scripture, which underlies all the Biblical writers, and intrinsically differs from that many formed psychology which lies outside the circle of revelation. .... We do not need first of all to force the Biblical teaching: it is one in itself” (Biblical Psychology, 17, 18). What is said of the psychology of Scripture may with good reason be applied to its anthropology.

**I. TERMS EMPLOYED.**

Several words are used in the Old Testament for our word “Man.”
1. ‘Adham:

[ʼadham], either as the name of the first man, (compare Luke 3:38; Romans 5:14; 1 Corinthians 15:45); or as an appellative — the man; or, as the generic name of the human race (Septuagint: anthropos; Vulgate: homo). The origin of the name is obscure. In Genesis 2:7 Adam is connected with [ʼadhamah], from the earthly part of man’s nature (dust out of the [ʼadhamah]), as the earth-born one. The derivation of Adam from [ʼadhamah], however, is disputed — among others by Dillmann: “Sprachlich lasst sicch die Ableitung aus Adamah nicht vertheidigen” (Genesis, 53). Delitzsch refers to Josephus (Ant., I, i, 2), who maintained that Adam really meant purrhos (“red as fire”), in reference to the redness of the earth, out of which man was formed. “He means,” adds Delitzsch, “the wonderfully fruitful and aromatic red earth of the Hauran chum of mountains, which is esteemed of marvelously strong and healing power, and which is believed to be self-rejuvenescent” (N. Commentary on Gen, 118). The connection with Edom in Genesis 25:30 may perhaps point in the same direction. A connection has also been sought with the Assyrian admu (“child”), especially the young of the bird, in the sense of making or producing (Delitzsch; Oxford Dictionary); while Dillmann draws attention to an Ethiopic root adma, “pleasant,” “agreeable,” “charming” — a derivation, however, which he rejects. Suffice it to say, that no certain derivation has yet been found for the term (thus Dillmann, “ein sicheres Etymon fur Adam ist noch nicht gefunden,” Gen, 53). Evidently in the word the earthly side of man’s origin is indicated.

2. Son of Man:

The phrase [ben-ʼadham], “son of man” (Numbers 23:19; Job 25:6; Ezekiel 2:3) is frequently found to denote man’s frailty and unworthiness in the sight of God. So in the much-disputed passage in Genesis 6:2, where the “sons of God” are contrasted with the degenerate “daughters of men” ([benoth ha-adham]). See also Psalm 11:4; 12:1,8; 14:2. On the other hand the dignity of man is sometimes indicated in the word Adam. Thus in Ecclesiastes 7:28, “One man ([ʼadham]) among a thousand have I found: but a woman among all those have I not found.”
3. ‘Enosh:

[enosh] (Psalm 8:4; 10:18; 90:3; 103:15; frequently in Job and Ps), man in his impotence, frailty, mortality (like the Greek brotos) as against [‘ish], man in his strength and vigor. In Genesis 4:26 the word becomes a proper name, applied to the son of Seth. Delitzsch derives it from a root [‘anash] (related to the Arabic and Assyrian), signifying “to be or become frail.” To intensify this frailty, we have the phrase in Psalm 10:18, “[‘enosh] (man) who is of the earth.”

4. ‘Ish:

([ish]), Septuagint aner, Vulg, vir, male as against female, even among lower animals (Genesis 7:2); husband as contrasted with wife ([‘ishshah], Genesis 2:23,24); man in his dignity and excellence (Jeremiah 5:1: “seek, .... if ye can find a man”); persons of standing (Proverbs 8:4, where [‘ish] is contrasted with [bene ‘adham], “Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of men”) — ”like the Attic andres and anthropoi, wisdom turning her discourse to high and low, to persons of standing and to the proletariat” (Delitzsch on Prov). Delitzsch maintains, that [‘ish] points to a root [‘osh] “to be strong,” and [‘ishshah] to [‘anash], as designating woman in her weakness (compare 1 Peter 3:7: “the weaker vessel”). “Thus [‘ishshah] and [‘enosh] come from a like verbal stem and fundamental notion” (Delitzsch, A New Commentary on Gen, 145). The term [‘ish] is sometimes used generally, as the Greek tis, the French on, to express “anyone,” as in Exodus 21:14; 16:29.

5. Gebher:

[gebher], [gibbor], man in his strength. The term is applied to men as contrasted with women and children (Job 3:3), “a male child,” in opposition to a female (Septuagint: arsen); also in contrast to non-combatants (Exodus 10:11) and in New Testament, see Matthew 8:9; John 1:6, where anthropos is used. Thus we read: “Neither shall a man ([gebher]) put on a woman’s garment” (Deuteronomy 22:5). Heroes and warriors are specially indicated by the term in such phrases as “mighty man of valor” (Judges 6:12). Sometimes animals are denoted by the term, as in Proverbs 30:30 (“mightiest among beasts”); sometimes it is
applied to God (Isaiah 10:21) and to the Messiah (Isaiah 9:6). In combination with ['ish] it gives intensity to the meaning, as in 1 Samuel 14:52 “any mighty man.”

6. Anthropos:

Of the Greek terms anthropos stands for man(kind) generally — a human being (Matthew 12:12; Mark 10:27); though it is sometimes used to indicate man in his imperfection and weakness (1 Corinthians 3:3,4), in such expressions as “to speak as a man” (Romans 3:5 the King James Version), gospel “after man” (Galatians 1:11), “after the manner of men” (1 Corinthians 15:32) etc.; or as showing the contrast between the perishable and the imperishable (2 Corinthians 4:16, where the “outward man” is represented as slowly dying, while the “inward man” is being renewed from day to day). Thus Paul contrasts the “natural man” (1 Corinthians 2:14), the “old man,” with the “new” (Romans 6:6; Colossians 3:9,10).

7. Aner:

Aner, Latin: vir — man in his vigor as contrasted with woman in her weakness (1 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Peter 3:7): sometimes, however, standing for “men in general” (Mark 6:44: “They that ate the loaves were five thousand men” — andres).

II. THE NATURE OF MAN: BIBLICAL CONCEPTION:

1. Biblical Terms:

The Biblical idea of man’s nature may be summed up in the words of Paul, “of the earth, earthy” (1 Corinthians 15:47), as compared and contrasted with the statement in Genesis 1:27: “God created man in his own image.” This act of creation is described as the result of special deliberation on the part of God — the Divine Being taking counsel with Himself in the matter (verse 26). Man therefore is a creature, formed, fashioned, shaped out of “earth” and made after the “image of God.” More than one word is employed in the Old Testament to express His idea:

(1) [bara’], “create,” a word of uncertain derivation, occurring five times in Genesis 1, to indicate the origin of the universe (verse 1), the
origin of life in the waters (verse 24), the origin of man (verse 27), and always in connection with God’s creative work, never where “second causes” are introduced.

(2) [yatsar], “fashion,” “form,” “knead” (Genesis 2:7), “of the dust of the ground.”

(3) banah, “build,” in special reference to the creation of woman, “built out of the rib” (Genesis 2:22).

By God’s special interposition man becomes a [nephesh chayyah] (“a living soul”), where evidently there is a reference to the breath of life, which man shares with the animal world (Genesis 1:20, 21, 24); yet with this distinction, that “God Himself breathed into man’s nostrils the breath of life” (literally, “breath of lives,” [nishmath chayyim]). With a single exception, that of Genesis 7:22, the word [neshamah], “breath,” is confined to man. In Job reference is made to his creative act, where Elihu says: “There is a spirit in man, and the breath ([nishmath]) of the Almighty ([shaddai]) giveth them understanding” (Job 32:8); compare also Isaiah 42:5: “He .... giveth breath ([neshamah]) unto the people.” Man therefore is a being separated from the rest of creation and yet one with it.

2. Image and Likeness:

This distinction becomes more clear in the declaration that man was made in the “image” ([tselem], eikon, imago), and after the likeness (demuth, homoiosis, similitudo) of God. The question has been asked whether the two terms differ essentially in meaning; some maintaining that “image” refers to the physical, “likeness” to the ethical side of man’s nature; others holding that “image” is that which is natural to man, was created with him, was therefore as it were stamped upon him (concreata), and “likeness” that which was acquired by him (acquisita); while others again declare that “image” is the concrete and “likeness” the abstract for the same idea. There is very little scriptural ground for these assertions. Nor can we accept the interpretation of the older Socinians and some of the Remonstrants, that God’s image consisted in dominion over all creatures, a reference to which is made in Genesis 1:28.
3. Meaning of Terms:

Turning to the narrative itself, it would appear that the two terms do not denote any real distinction. In Genesis 1:27 [tselem] ("image") alone is used to express all that separates man from the brute and links him to his Creator. Hence, the expression “in our image.” In 1:26, however, the word demuth ("similitude") is introduced, and we have the phrase “after our likeness,” as though to indicate that the creature bearing the impress of God’s “image” truly corresponded in “likeness” to the original, the ectype resembling the archetype. Luther has translated the clause: “An image which is like unto us” — ein Bild das uns gleich sei — and in the new Dutch (Leyden) of the Old Testament by Kuenen, Hooijkaas and others, it is rendered: “as our image, like unto us” — als ons evenbeeld ons gelijkende. The two words may therefore be taken as standing to each other in the same relation in which copy or model stands to the original image. “The idea in [tselem] — says Delitzsch — is more rigid, that of demuth more fluctuating and so to speak more spiritual: in the former the notion of the original image, in the latter that of the ideal predominates.” At any rate we have scriptural warrant (see especially, Genesis 9:6; James 3:9) for the statement, that the image is the inalienable property of the race (Laidlaw), so that offense against a fellow-man is a desecration of the Divine image impressed upon man. Calvin has put it very clearly: Imago Dei est integra naturae humanae praestantia ("The image of God is the complete excellence of human nature").

4. Subsidiary Questions:

Other questions have been asked by early Church Fathers and by Schoolmen of later days, which may here be left out of the discussion. Some, like Tertullian, considered the “image” to be that of the coming Christ (Christi futuri); others have maintained that Adam was created after the image of the Logos (the Word, the second person in the Trinity), which was impressed upon man at his creation. Of all this Scripture knows nothing. There man is represented as made after the image of “Elohim,” of the Godhead and not of one person of the Trinity. Paul calls man “the image and glory ([eikon kai doxa] of God” (1 Corinthians 11:7). We may safely let the matter rest there. The strange theory, that the image of God indicates the sphere or element into which man was created, may be
mentioned without further discussion (on this see Bohl, Dogmatik, 154 and Kuijper, Deuteronomy vleeschwording des Woords).

5. Constituents of Image:

In what then does this image or likeness consist? Certainly in what is inalienably human — a body as the temple of the Holy Ghost (the “earthly house” of 2 Corinthians 5:1), and the rational, inspiring, inbreathed spirit. Hence man’s personably, linking into to what is above, separating him from what is beneath, constitutes him a being apart — a rational, self-conscious, self-determining creature, intended by his Creator for fellowship with Himself. “The animal feels the Cosmos and adapts himself to it. Man feels the Cosmos, but also thinks it” (G. H. Lewes, Problems of Life and Mind). Light is thrown on the subject by the New Testament, and especially by the two classical texts: Ephesians 4:24 and Colossians 3:10, where the “new man” is referred to as “after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth” and “renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him.” Knowledge, righteousness and holiness may fully be considered elements in the character of man as originally designed by God. Likeness to God therefore is man’s privilege above all created beings. What was said of the Son of God absolutely, “He is the express image (character) of God,” is applied to man relatively the created son is not the only-begotten Son. The created son was “like unto God” (homoiosis; I John 3:2), and even in his degradation there is the promise of renewal after that image: the eternal, only-begotten Son is God’s equal (Philippians 2:6,7), though he became a servant and was made in the likeness (homoiomati) of men.

This likeness of man with God is not merely a Scriptural idea. Many ancient nations seem to have grasped this thought. Man’s golden age was placed by them in a far-off past, not in a distant future. Paul quotes a pagan poet in Acts 17:28, “We are also his offspring” (Aratus of Soli, in Cilicia, a countryman of the apostle). This statement also occurs in the beautiful hymn to Jupiter, ascribed to Cleanthes, a Stoic native of Assos in the Troad, and contemporary of Aratus. Psychologically and historically therefore, the Bible view is justified.
3. ORIGIN OF MAN FROM SCRIPTURE ACCOUNT: NARRATIVES OF CREATION.

The Divine origin of man is clearly taught in the early chapters of Gen, as has just been seen.

1. Scriptural Account:

Two narratives from different sources are supposed to have been combined by an unknown editor to form a not very harmonious whole. It is the purpose of criticism to determine the relationship in which they stand to each other and the dates of their composition. In both accounts man is the crowning glory of creation. The first account (Genesis 1:1 through 2:3) is general, the second particular (Genesis 2:4-25); in the first we have an account of man’s appearance on a prepared platform — a gradual rise in the scale of organized existence from chaos upward to the climax, which is reached in man. There is recognized order in the whole procedure, represented by the writer as a process which occupied six days, or periods, measured by the appearance and dissipation of darkness. In the first period, chaotic disturbance is succeeded by the separation of light from darkness, which in its turn is followed by the separation of water from dry land, and to this a second period is assigned. Then gradually in the next four periods we have in orderly sequence the rise of vegetable life, the formation of the creatures of the deep, of the air, of the dry land. When all is prepared man is called into being by a special fiat of the Almighty. Moreover, while other creatures were produced “after their kind,” man alone as a unique conception of the Divine Intelligence is made to appear upon the scene, called into existence by direct Divine interposition, after a Divine type, and in distinction of sex; for both man and wife, in a later chapter, are called by the same name: Adam (Genesis 5:2). Such is the scope of the first narrative. No wonder, then, that Scripture elsewhere calls the first man “the son of God” (Luke 3:38). It need not be determined here, whether the account is strictly chronological, whether the “days” are interludes between successive periods of darkness and not periods of twenty-four hours regulated by the rising and setting of the sun, or whether the whole narrative is but a prose poem of creation, not strictly accurate, or strictly scientific.
2. The Two Narratives:

In the second narrative (Genesis 2:2-25) the order of procedure is different. Man here is not the climax, but the center. He is a creature of the dust, but with the breath of God in his nostrils (Genesis 2:7), holding sway over all things, as God’s vice-gerent upon earth, creation circling around him and submitting to his authority. To this is added a description of man’s early home and of his home-relationships. The second narrative therefore seems on the face of it to be supplementary to the first, not contradictory of it: the agreements indeed are far greater than the differences. “The first may be called typical, the second, physiological. The former is the generic account of man’s creation — of man the race, the ideal; the latter is the production of the actual man, of the historic Adam” (Laidlaw).

3. Contrasts:

The differences between the two narratives have been magnified by supporters of the various documentary hypotheses. They are supposed to differ in style — the first “displaying clear marks of study and deliberation,” the second being “fresh spontaneous, primitive” (Driver, Genesis). They differ also in representation, i.e. in detail and order of events — the earth, in the second narrative not emerging from the waters as in the first, but dry and not fitted for the support of vegetation, and man appearing not last but first on the scene, followed by beasts and birds and lastly by woman. The documents are further supposed to differ in their conception of Divine interposition and a consequent choice of words, the first employing words, like “creating,” “dividing,” “making,” “setting,” which imply nothing local, or sensible in the Divine nature, the second being strongly anthropomorphic — Yahweh represented as “moulding,” “placing,” “taking,” “building,” etc — and moreover locally determined within limits, confined apparently to a garden as His accustomed abode. Without foreclosing the critical question, it may be replied that the first narrative is as anthropomorphic as the second, for God is there represented as “speaking,” “setting,” (Genesis 1:17; 2:17), “delighting in” the work of His hands (Genesis 1:31), “addressing” the living creatures (Genesis 1:22), and “resting” at the close (Genesis 2:2). As to the home of Yahweh in a limited garden, we are expressly told, not that
man was admitted to the home of his Maker, but that Yahweh specially “planted a garden” for the abode of man. The order of events may be different; but certainly the scope and the aim are not.

4. Objections:

More serious have been the objections raised on scientific grounds. The cosmogony of Genesis has been disputed, and elaborate comparisons have been made between geological theories as to the origin of the world and the Mosaic account. The points at issue are supposed to be the following: geology knows of no “periods” corresponding to the “days” of Genesis; “vegetation” in Genesis appears before animal life, geology maintains that they appear simultaneously; “fishes and birds” in Genesis preceded all land animals; in the geological record “birds” succeed “fishes” and are preceded by numerous species of land animals (so Driver, Genesis). To this a twofold reply has been given:

(1) The account in Genesis is not scientific, or intended to be so: it is a prelude to the history of human sin and of Divine redemption, and gives a sketch of the world’s origin and the earth’s preparation for man as his abode, with that one object in view. The starting-point of the narrative is the creation of the universe by God; the culminating point is the creation of man in the image of God. Between these two great events certain other acts of creation in orderly sequence are presented to our view, in so far as they bear upon the great theme of sin and redemption discussed in the record. The aim is practical, not speculative; theological, not scientific. The whole creation-narrative must be judged from that point of view. See COSMOGONY.

(2) What has struck many scientists is not so much the difference or disharmony between the Mosaic and the geological record, as the wonderful agreements in general outline apart from discrepancies in detail. Geologists like Dana and Dawson have expressed this as clearly as Haeckel. The latter, e.g., has openly given utterance to his “just and sincere admiration of the Jewish lawgiver’s grand insight into nature and his simple and natural hypothesis of creation .... which contrasts favorably with the confused mythology of creation current among most of the ancient nations” (History of Creation, I, 37, 38). He draws attention to the agreement between the Mosaic account, which accepts
“the direct action of a constructive Creator,” and the non-miraculous theory of development, inasmuch as “the idea of separation and differentiation of the originally simple matter and of a progressive development” is to be found in the “Jewish lawgiver’s” record.

5. Babylonian Origin:

Latterly it has been maintained that Israel was dependent upon Babylon for its creation-narrative; but even the most serious supporters of this view have had to concede that the first introduction of Babylonian myth into the sacred narrative “must remain a matter of conjecture,” and that “it is incredible, that the monotheistic author of Genesis 1, at whatever date he lived, could have borrowed any detail, however slight, from the polytheistic epic of Marduk and Tiamat” (Driver, Gen, 31). The statement of Bauer in his Hebraische Mythologie, 1802: “Esther ist heut zu Tage ausser allen Zweifel gesetzt, dass die ganze Erzahlung ein Mythus ist” (It is beyond all doubt, that the whole narrative is a myth), can no longer be satisfactorily maintained; much less the assertion that we have here an introduction of post-exilic Babylonian or Persian myth into the Hebrew narrative (compare Van Leeuwen, Anthropologie).

6. Later Critical Views:

Whether the division of the narrative into Elohistic and Jehovistic documents will stand the test of time is a question which exercises a great many minds. Professor Eerdmans of Leyden, the present occupant of Kuenen’s chair, has lately maintained that a “thorough application of the critical theories of the school of Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen leads to highly improbable results,” and that “the present Old Testament criticism has to reform itself” (HJ, July, 1909). His own theory is worked out in his Alttestamentliche Studien, to which the reader is referred.

4. UNITY OF THE RACE: VARIOUS THEORIES.

1. Its Solidarity:

The solidarity of the race may be said to be as distinctly a doctrine of science as it is of Scripture. It is implied in the account of the Creation and of the Deluge. It is strongly affirmed by Paul in his address to the Athenians (Acts 17:26), and is the foundation of the Biblical scheme of
redemption (John 3:16). The human race in the Old Testament is described as “sons of Adam” (Deuteronomy 32:8 the King James Version), as derived from one pair (Genesis 1:27; 3:20), as having its origin in one individual (Genesis 2:18; cf, 1 Corinthians 11:8, where woman is described as derived `from man’). Hence the term “Adam” is applied to the race as well as to the individual (Genesis 1:26; 2:5,7; 3:22,24; 5:2); while in the New Testament this doctrine is applied to the history of redemption — Christ as the “second Adam” restoring what was lost in the “first Adam” (1 Corinthians 15:21,22,47-49).

2. Various Theories:

Outside of Holy Scripture various theories have been held as to the origin, antiquity and primeval condition of the human race. That of polygenism (plurality of origin) has found special favor, partly as co-Adamitism, or descent of different races from different progenitors (Paracelsus and others), partly as pre-adamitism, or descent of dark-colored races from an ancestor who lived before Adam — the progenitor of the Jews and the light-colored races (Zanini and especially de la Peyrere). But no serious attempts have yet been made to divide the human race among a number of separately originated ancestors.

3. Evolutionary View:

The Biblical account, however, has been brought into discredit by modern theories of evolution. Darwinism in itself does not favor polygenism; though many interpreters of the evolutionary hypothesis have given it that application. Darwin distinctly repudiates polygenism. He says: “Those naturalists who admit the principle of evolution will feel no doubt, that all the races of man are descended from a single primitive stock” (Descent of Man, second ed., 176); and on a previous page we read: “Man has been studied more carefully than any other animal, and yet there is the greatest possible diversity amongst capable judges, whether he should be classed as a single species, or race, or as two (Verey), as three (Jacquinot), as four (Kant), five (Blumenbach), six (Buffon), seven (Hunter), eight (Agassiz), eleven (Pickering), fifteen (Bory Vincent), sixteen (Desmoulins), twenty-two (Morton), sixty (Crawford), or as sixty-three, according to Burke” (p. 174).
5. EVOLUTIONARY THEORY AS TO ORIGIN OF MAN.

Modern science generally accepts theory of evolution. Darwin gave to the hypothesis a character it never had before; but since his day its application has been unlimited. “From the organic it is extended to the inorganic world; from our planet and the solar system to the cosmos, from nature to the creations of man’s mind — arts, laws, institutions, religion. We speak in the same breath of the evolution of organic beings and of the steam engine, of the printing-press, of the newspaper, now even of the atom” (Orr, God’s Image in Man, 84). And yet, in spite of this very wide and far-reaching application of theory, the factors that enter into the process, the method or methods by which the great results in this process are obtained, may still be considered as under debate. Its application to the Bible doctrine of man presents serious difficulties.

1. Darwinism:

Darwin’s argument may be presented in the following form. In Nature around us there is to be observed a struggle for existence, to which every organism is exposed, whereby the weaker ones are eliminated and the stronger or best-fitted ones made to survive. Those so surviving may be said metaphorically to be chosen by Nature for that purpose — hence the term “natural selection,” assisted in the higher forms of life by “sexual selection,” under the influence of which the best-organized males are preferred by the females, and thus as it were selected for propagation of the species. The properties or characteristics of the organisms so chosen are transmitted to their descendants, so that with indefinite variability “from a few forms or from one, into which life has been originally breathed, endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, or are being evolved” (Origin of Species, 6th ed., 429). Applying this mode of procedure to the origin of man, the strength of the argument is found to lie in the analogies between man and the brute, which may be summed up as follows:

(1) morphological peculiarities in the structure of the bodily organs, in their liability to the same diseases, in their close similarity as regards tissues, blood, etc.;
(2) embryological characteristics, in the development of the human being, like the brute, from an ovule, which does not differ from and passes through the same evolutionary process as that of any other animal;

(3) the existence of rudimentary organs, which are considered to be either absolutely useless, in some cases harmful, often productive of disease, or in any case of very slight service to the human being, pointing back therefore — so it is maintained — to an animal ancestry, in which these organs may have been necessary;

(4) mental peculiarities of the same character, but perhaps not of the same range, in the brute as in man though the differences between the two may be as great as between “a terrier and a Hegel, a Sir William Hamilton, or a Kant”;

(5) paleontological agreements, to show that a comparison of fossil remains brings modern civilized man and his primeval, anthropoid ancestor into close correspondence. Latterly Friedenthal’s experiments, in regard to blood-transfusion between man and the ape, have been introduced into the argument by evolutionists.

2. Difficulties:

The difficulties which beset theory are so great that naturalists of repute have subjected it to very severe criticism, which cannot be disregarded. Some, like Du Bois-Reymond, have openly declared that supernaturalism has gained the day (“es scheint keine andere Ausnahme ubrig zu sein, als sich dem Supranaturalismus in die Arme zu werfen” (compare Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatik, II, 548). Others, like Virchow, have to the last pronounced against Darwinism as an established hypothesis, and a simian ancestry as an accepted fact (“auf dem Wege der Speculation ist man zu der Affen-Theorie gekommen: man hatte eben so gut zu anderen theromorphischen Theorien kommen konnen, z. B. zu einer Elefanten-Theorie, oder zu einer Schaf-Theorie” — i.e. one might as well speak of an elephant-theory or a sheep-theory or any other animal-theory as of an ape-theory). This was in 1892. When two years later the discovery of the so-called pithecanthropus erectus, supposed to be the “missing link” between man and the lower animals, came under discussion, Virchow held
as strongly, that “neither the pithecanthropus nor any other anthropoid ape showed any of the characteristics of primeval man.” This was in 1896.

The difference of opinion among scientists on this point seems to be great. While Darwin himself uncompromisingly held to the simian ancestry of man, several of his followers reject that line of descent altogether. This may be seen in the Cambridge volume, dedicated to the memory of the British naturalist. Schwalbe, while instancing Cope, Adloff, Klaatsch and others as advocating a different ancestry for man, acknowledges, though reluctantly, that “the line of descent disappears in the darkness of the ancestry of the mammals,” and is inclined to admit that “man has arisen independently” (Darwinism and Modern Science, 134). Two things therefore are clear, namely, that modern science does not endorse the favorite maxim of Darwin, Natura non facit saltum, “Nature does not make a jump,” with which according to Huxley he “has unnecessarily hampered himself” (Lay Sermons, 342), and that “man probably arose by a mutation, that is, by a discontinuous variation of considerable magnitude” (J. A. Thomson, Darwinism and Human Life, 123). Granted therefore an ascent in the scale of evolution by “leaps” or “lifts,” the words of Otto (Naturalism and Religion, 133) receive a new meaning for those who accept as historic the tradition recorded in the early chapters of Genesis: “There is nothing against the assumption, and there is much to be said in its favor, that the last step, or leap, was such an immense one, that it brought with it a freedom and richness of psychical life incomparable with anything that had gone before.”

3. Objections:

The objections raised against the Darwinian theory are in the main threefold:

(1) its denial of teleology, for which it substitutes natural selection;

(2) its assumption, that the evolutionary process is by slow and insensible gradations;

(3) its assertion, that organic advance has been absolutely continuous from the lowest form to the highest (Orr, God’s Image in Man, 108). This may be illustrated a little more fully:
(1) Chance Versus Creation.

The denial of teleology is clear and distinct, though Professor Huxley has spoken of a “wider teleology,” by which however he simply meant (Critiques and Addresses, 305) that the teleologist can defy his opponent to prove that certain changes in structure were not intended to be produced. In Darwinism the choice seems to lie between chance and creation. Mind, purpose, forethought, intention, Divine guidance and super-intendence are banished from the evolutionary process. Darwin himself, though originally inclined to call in the aid of a creator (Origin of Species, 6th edition, 429), regretted afterward, that he “had truckled to public opinion and used the pentateuchal term, by which he really meant appearance by some wholly unknown process” (Life and Letters, III, 18).

Admittedly, Darwin attributed too great a power to natural selection. He himself in the Descent of Man considered it “one of the greatest oversights” in his work, that “he had not sufficiently considered the existence of many structures which are neither beneficial nor injurious,” and that he had “probably attributed too much to the action of natural selection on the survival of the fittest” (Descent of Man (2nd ed.), 61). Dr. A. R. Wallace, though like Darwin acknowledging the potency of natural selection, considers its operations to be largely negative. Writing to his friend he says: “Nature does not so much select special varieties, as exterminate unfavorable ones” (Darwin’s Life and Letters, III, 46). It is this very insistence on a method of advance by slow and imperceptible gradations that has met with strong opposition from the very beginning. “Natural selection” Darwin writes, “acts solely by accumulating slight, successive, favorable variations; it can produce no great or sudden modifications; it can only act by short and slow steps” (Origin of Species (6th ed.), chapter 15). The process therefore according to Darwin is wholly fortuitous. This non-teleological aspect of Darwinism is characteristic of many treatises on evolution. Weismann states with great clearness and force, that the philosophical significance of theory lies in the fact that “mechanical forces” are substituted for “directive force” to explain the origin of useful structures. Otto speaks of its radical opposition to teleology. And yet an ardent supporter of Darwinism, Professor J. A. Thomson, admits that “there is no logical proof of the doctrine of descent” (Darwinism and Human Life, 22) — a statement
which finds its counterpart in Darwin’s letters: “We cannot prove that a single species has changed” (Life and Letters, III, 25). Still more clearly, almost epigrammatically this is endorsed by Professor J. A. Thomson: “The fact of evolution forces itself upon us: the factors elude us” (Bible of Nature, 153), and again: “Natural selection explains the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fit” (ib 162). Still more extraordinary is the view expressed by Korchinsky that struggle “prevents the establishment of new variations and in reality stands in the way of new development. It is rather an unfavorable than advantageous factor” (Otto, Nature and Religion, 182). We are in fact being slowly led back to the teleology which by Darwin was considered fatal to his theory. Scientists of some repute are fond of speaking of directive purpose. “Wherever we tap organic nature,” says Professor J. A. Thomson, “it seems to flow with purpose” (Bible of Nature, 25); and again, “If there is Logos at the end (of the long evolutionary process ending in man) we may be sure it was also at the beginning” (ib 86). Where there is purpose there must be mind working with purpose and for a definite end; where there is mind there may be creation at the beginning; where creation is granted, an overruling Providence may be accepted. If natural selection “prunes the growing tree”; if it be “a directive, not an originative factor” (J. A. Thomson, Darwinism and Human Life, 193); if it produces nothing, and the evolutionary process is dependent upon forces which work from within and not from without, then surely the Duke of Argyll was right in maintaining (Unity of Nature, 272) that “creation and evolution, when these terms have been cleared from intellectual confusion, are not antagonistic conceptions mutually exclusive. They are harmonious and complementary.” The ancient narrative, therefore, which posits God at the beginning, and ascribes the universe to His creative act, is after all not so unscientific as some evolutionists are inclined to make out.

(2) Variability Indefinite.

Indefinite variability, assumed by theory, is not supported by fact. Development there doubtless is, but always within carefully defined limits: at every stage the animal or plant is a complete and symmetrical organism, without any indication of an everlasting progression from the less to the more complex. Reversion to type seems ever to have a development proceeding indefinitely, and the sterility of hybrids seems to
be Nature’s protest against raising variability into a law of progression. It has been repeatedly pointed out, that variations as they arise in any organ are not of advantage to its possessor: “A very slight enlarged sebaceous follicle, a minute pimple on the nose of a fish, a microscopic point of ossification or consolidation amongst the muscles of any animal could (hardly) give its possessor any superiority over its fellows” (Elam, Winds of Doctrine, 128).

(3) Existing Gaps.

Nor can it be denied that no theory of evolution has been able to bridge the chasms which seem to exist between the various kingdoms in Nature. A gradual transition from the inorganic to the organic, from the vegetable to the animal kingdom, from one species of plant or animal to another species, from the animal to man, is not found in Nature. This is acknowledged by scientists of repute. Du Bois-Reymond has maintained that there are seven great enigmas, indicating a sevenfold limit to investigation, namely,

(a) the existence of matter and force;
(b) the origin of motion;
(c) the origin of life;
(d) the appearance of design in Nature;
(e) the existence of consciousness;
(f) intelligent thought and the origin of speech;
(g) the question of freewill.

Others have found equally serious difficulties in a theory of descent which ignores the existence of such gaps. Thus, Dr. A. R. Wallace — a strong upholder of theory of natural selection — allows that “there are at least three stages in the development of the organic world, when some new cause or power must necessarily have come into action,” namely, at the introduction of life, at the introduction of sensation and consciousness and at the introduction of man” (Darwinism, 474-75).

(4) Applied to Man.
When theory is applied to the human species the difficulties are enormously increased. Psychically, man is akin to, yet vastly different from, the brute. Consciousness, thought, language (called by Max Muller “the Rubicon” between the human and the animal world), morality, religion cannot easily be explained under any theory of evolution. The recognition of moral obligations, the freedom of choice between moral alternatives, the categorical imperative of conscience, the feeling of responsibility and the pain of remorse are unaccounted for by the doctrine of descent. Man stands apart, forming psychologically a kingdom by himself, “infinitely divergent from the simian stirps” (Huxley, Man’s Place in Nature, 103) — the riddle of the universe, apart from the Biblical narrative. In the very nature of things the conscious and the unconscious he far apart. “The assertion of the difference between them does not rest on our ignorance, but on our knowledge of the perceived distinction between material particles in motion and internal consciousness related to a self” (Orr, Homiletic Review, August, 1907). There can be no transition from the one to the other. The “gulf” remains in spite of all attempts to bridge it. Strong supporters of Darwinism have acknowledged this. Thus Dr. A. R. Wallace, though vigorously maintaining the “essential identity of man’s bodily structure with that of the higher mammals and his descent from some ancestral form common to man and the anthropoid apes,” discards theory that “man’s entire nature and all his faculties, moral, intellectual, spiritual, have been derived from their rudiments in lower animals” — a theory which he considers unsupported by adequate evidence and directly opposed to many well-ascertained facts (Darwinism, 461; Natural Selection, 322 ff).

(5) Transitional Forms Absent.

The absence of transitional forms is another difficulty which strikes at the very root of Darwinism. Zittel, a paleontologist of repute, endorsed the general opinion, when in 1895 at Zurich he declared, that the extinct transitional links are slowly not forthcoming, except in “a small and ever-diminishing number.” The derivation of the modern horse from the “Eohippus,” on which great stress is sometimes laid, can hardly be accepted as proved, when it is maintained by scientists of equal repute, that no “Eohippus,” but Palaeotherium was the progenitor of the animal whose ancestry is in dispute. And as for man, the discovery by Dr. E. Du
Bois, in the island of Java, of the top of a skull, the head of a leg bone, few teeth of an animal supposed to be a man-like mammal, does not convey the absolute proof demanded. From the very first, opinion was strangely divided among naturalists. Virchow doubted whether the parts belonged to the same individual, and considered Du Bois’ drawings of the curves of a skull-outline to prove the gradual transition from the skull of a monkey to that of a man as imaginary. Of twenty-four scientists, who examined the remains when originally presented, ten thought they belonged to an ape, seven to a man, seven to some intermediate form (Otto, Naturalism and Religion, 110). At the Anthropological Congress held at Lindau in September, 1899, “Dr. Bumiller read a paper in which he declared that the supposed ‘pithecanthropus erectus’ is nothing but a gibbon, as Virchow surmised from the first” (Orr, in The Expositor, July, 1910).

4. The New Evolutionism:

Evolutionism apparently is undergoing a great change. Among others Fleischmann, and Dennert in Germany have submitted Darwinism to a keen and searching criticism. The latter especially, as a scientist, raises a strong protest against the acceptance of the Darwinian theory, He closes his researches with the remarkable words: “The theory of descent is accepted by nearly all naturalists. But in spite of assertions to the contrary, theory has not yet been fully (ganz unzweifelhaft) proved. .... Darwinism on the other hand, i.e. the doctrine of natural selection through struggle for existence, has been forced back all along the line” (vom Sterbelager des Darwinismus, 120). With equal vigor Professor Hugo de Vries, of Amsterdam, has recently taught a “theory of mutation,” a term applied by him to “express the process of origination of a new species, or of a new specific character, when this takes place by the discontinuous method at a single step” (Lock, Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, 113). New species, according to Deuteronomy Vries, may arise from old ones by leaps, and this not in long-past geological times, but in the course of a human life and under our very eyes. This theory of “halmatogenesis,” or evolution by leaps and not by insensible gradations, was not unknown to scientists. Lyell, who was a slow convert to Darwinism, in his Antiquity of Man, admitted the possibility of “occasional strides, breaks in an otherwise continuous series of psychical changes, mankind clearing at one bound the space which separated the highest stage of the
unprogressive intelligence of inferior animals from the first and lowest form of improvable reason of man.” Even Professor Huxley, one of the staunchest supporters of Darwinism, acknowledged that “Nature does make jumps now and then,” and that “a recognition of the fact is of no small importance in disposing of many minor objections to the doctrine of transmutation” (Orr, God’s Image in Man, 116). Less conciliatory than either Deuteronomy Vries or Huxley is Eimer, who, while repudiating the “chance” theory of Darwinism, sets against it “definitely directed evolution,” and holds that “natural selection is insufficient in the formation of species” (Otto, Naturalism and Religion, 174). Evidently the evolution theory is undergoing modifications, which may have important bearing on the interpretation of the Mosaic narrative of creation and especially on the descent of man. Man may therefore, from a purely scientific point of view, be an entirely new being, not brought about by slow and gradual ascent from a simian ancestry. He may have been introduced at a bound, not as a semi-animal with brute impulses, but as a rational and moral being, “internally harmonious, with possibilities of sinless development, which only his free act annulled.” If the new theory of “mutational” evolution be accepted, the scriptural view of man’s origin will certainly not be discredited.

5. Evolution and Genesis:

This much may fairly be granted, that within certain limits Scripture accepts an evolutionary process. In regard to the lower animals the creating (Genesis 1:21), or making (Genesis 1:28), is not described as an immediate act of Almighty Power, but as a creative impulse given to water and earth, which does not exclude, but rather calls into operation the powers that are in the sea and dry land (Genesis 1:11,20,24 the King James Version): “And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass .... Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature.” It is only in the creation of man that God works immediately: “And God said, Let us make man in our image .... And God created man” (Genesis 1:26,27). The stride or jump of Lyell and Huxley, the “halmatogenesis” of Deuteronomy Vries are names which in the simple narrative disappear before the pregnant sentence: “And God said.” Theologians of repute have given a theistic coloring to the evolution theory (compare Flint, Theism, 195 ff), inasmuch as development cannot be purposeless or causeless, and because
“Nature is but effect whose cause is God.” The deathblow which, according to Professor Huxley, the teleological argument has received from Darwin, may after all not be so serious. At any rate Lord Kelvin (Sir William Thomson) in 1871 before the British Association openly pleaded for “the solid and irrefragable argument so well put forward by Paley .... teaching us, that all living things depended upon an everacting Creator and Ruler.”

See EVOLUTION.

6. PRIMITIVE AND PRESENT CONDITIONS OF MAN: ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

1. The Time-Distance of Man’s Origin:

The newer anthropology has carried the human race back to a remote antiquity. Ordinary estimates range between 100,000 and 500,000 years. Extraordinary computations go far beyond these numbers. Haeckel, e.g. speaks of “Sirius distances” for the whole evolutionary process; and what this means may easily be conjectured. The sun is 92,700,000 miles away from the earth, and Sirius is a million times as far from us as we are from the sun, so that the time-distance of man from the very lowest organisms, from the first germ or seed or ovule, is according to Haeckel almost incalculable. The human race is thus carried back by evolutionists into an immeasurable distance from the present inhabitants of the earth. Several primeval races are by some declared to have existed, and fossil remains of man are supposed to have been found, bringing him into touch with extinct animals. The time-computations of evolutionists, however, are not shared by scientists in general. “These millionaires in time have received a rude blow, when another Darwin, Sir G. H. Darwin of Cambridge, demonstrated that the physical conditions were such that geology must limit itself to a period of time inside of 100,000 years” (Orr, God’s Image, etc., 176). Professor Tait of Edinburgh limited the range to no more than 10,000,000 years and he strongly advised geologists to “hurry up their calculations.” “I dare say,” he says, “many of you are acquainted with the speculations of Lyell and others, especially of Darwin, who tells us, that even for a comparatively brief portion of recent geological history, three hundred millions of years
will not suffice! We say, so much the worse for geology as at present understood by its chief authorities” (Recent Advances in Physical Science, 168). Recently, however, attention has been drawn to new sources of energy in the universe as the result of radio-activity. Duncan, in The New Knowledge, contrasts the old conception, according to which God made the universe and started it at a definite time to run its course, with the need, which though it does not distinctly teach, at least is inclined to maintain, that the universe is immortal or eternal, both in the future and the past (p. 245). If this view be correct the Darwinian “eons” of time may be considered restored to the evolutionist. On the other hand it appears that Lord Kelvin seriously doubted the validity of these speculations. Professor Orr writes: “In a personal communication Lord Kelvin states to me that he thinks it `almost infinitely improbable’ that radium had any appreciable effects on the heat and light of the earth or sun, and suggests it as `more probable that the energy of radium may have come originally in connection with the excessively high temperatures’ produced by gravitational action” (Homiletic Review, August, 1906).

2. Antiquity of Primeval Man:

In regard to primeval man there is no agreement among scientists. Some, like Delaunay, de Mortillet, Quatrefages, believed that man existed in the Tertiary; while others, such as Virchow, Zittel, Prestwich, Dawson, maintain that man appeared on the scene only in the Quaternary. As the limits between these periods are not well defined a decision is by no means easy. Even if man be found to have been a contemporary of extinct animals, such as the mammoth, the inference from this fact would be equally just, not that man is as old as the extinct animal, but that the animal is as young as man and that the period assigned to these fossil remains must be brought considerably nearer to present-day life.

3. Various Calculations:

Calculations based on the gravels of the Somme, on the cone of the Tiniere, on the peat-bogs of France and Denmark, on fossil bones discovered in caves of Germany and France, on delta-formations of great rivers like the Nile and the Mississippi, on the “kitchen middings” of Denmark, and the lake-dwellings of Switzerland, must be carefully scrutinized. Sir J. W. Dawson, a geologist of great repute, has made the deliberate statement,
that “possibly none of these reach farther back than six or seven thousand years, which according to Dr. Andrews have elapsed since the close of the boulder-clay in America,” and that “the scientific pendulum must swing backward in this direction” (Story of the Earth and Man, 293). The “ice-age,” formerly hypothetically calculated, has latterly been brought within calculable distance. G. F. Wright, Winchell and others have arrived at the conclusion that the glacial period in America, and consequently in Europe, does not lie more than some eight or ten thousand years behind us. If such be the case, the antiquity of man is brought within reasonable limits, and may consequently not be in contradiction to the Biblical statements on this point. If the careful and precise calculations of Dr. Andrews on the raised beaches of Lake Michigan are accepted, then North America must have risen out of the waters of the Glacial period some 5,500 or 7,500 years ago; and if so, the duration of the human period in that continent is fixed and must be considerably reduced (Dawson, Story, etc., 295). One of the latest deliverances on this subject is that of Professor Russell of the University of Michigan (1904), who maintains that “we find no authentic and well-attested evidence of the presence of man in America either previous to or during the Glacial period.” He is confident, that “all the geological evidence thus far gathered bearing on the antiquity of man in America points to the conclusion that he came after the Glacial epoch.” Where all is vague and experts differ great caution is necessary in the arrangement of dates and periods of time. If moreover a comparatively rapid post-glacial submergence and reelevation is accepted, as some naturalists hold, and man were then on the earth, the question may fairly be asked, whether this subsidence did not “constitute the deluge recorded in that remarkable `log-book’ of Noah preserved to us in Gen” (Dawson, op. cit., 290).

4. Chronology:

The chronology of ancient nations — China, Babylon, Egypt — has been considered as subversive of the scriptural view as to the age of the human race. But it is a well-known fact, that experts differ very seriously upon the point. Their calculations range, for Egypt — starting from the reign of King Menes — from 5,867 (Champollion) to 4,455 (Brugsch), and from 3,892 (Lepsius) to 2,320 (Wilkinson). As to Babylon Bunsen places the starting-point for the historic period in 3,784, Brandis in 2,458, Oppert in
3,540 — a difference of thousands of years (compare Bavinck, Geref. Dogmatik, II, 557). Perhaps here, too, future research will bring the scientific and the Biblical view into fuller harmony. At any rate, Hommel’s words on all these calculations require careful study: “The chronology for the first thousand years before Christ is fairly fixed: in the second thousand BC some points seem to be fixed: in the third thousand, i.e. before 2000 BC, all is uncertain.” In this connection it may be mentioned, that attempts have frequently been made to cast discredit on the chronology of the early chapters of Genesis. Suffice it to say that the calculations are based on the genealogies of the patriarchs and their descendants, and that the generally accepted dates assigned to them by Archbishop Ussher and introduced into the margins of some editions of the Bible are not to be trusted. The Septuagint differs in this respect from the Hebrew text by more than 1,500 years: precise chronological data are not and cannot be given. The basis of calculation is not known. Perhaps we are not far wrong in saying that, “if we allow, say, from 12,000 to 15,000 years since the time of man’s first appearance on the earth, we do ample justice to all the available facts” (Orr, God’s Image, etc., 180).

See CHRONOLOGY.

5. Man’s Primitive Condition:

That all these discussions have a bearing upon our view of man’s primitive conditions can easily be understood. According to Scripture man’s destiny was to `replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over fish, fowl and every living thing’ (Genesis 1:28), as God’s steward (oikonomos, Titus 1:7), as fellow-laborer with God (sunergos, 1 Corinthians 3:9). Hence he was placed by God in the garden of Eden ([gan be`edhen]; Septuagint paradeisos tes trophes; Vulgate paradisus voluptatis, “paradise of delight”). The situation of that garden is carefully described, though the proper site remains unknown (Genesis 2:14,15). Some, like Driver, consider this an ideal locality (Genesis, 57); others take a very wide range in fixing upon the true site. Every continent has been chosen as the cradle of the race — Africa, among others, as the home of the gorilla and the chimpanzee — the supposed progenitors of humanity. In America, Greenland and the regions around the North Pole have had their supporters. Certain parts of Europe have found favor in some quarters. An
imaginary island — Lemuria — situated between the African and Australian continents — has been accepted by others. All this, however, lies beyond the scope of science, and beyond the range of Scripture. Somewhere to the east of Palestine, and in or near Babylonia, we must seek for the cradle of humanity. No trace of primeval man has been found, nor has the existence of primeval races been proved. The skulls which have been found (Neanderthal, Engis, Lansing) are of a high type, even Professor Huxley declaring of the first, that “it can in no sense be regarded as the intermediate between Man and the Apes,” of the second, that it is “a fair, average skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage” (Man’s Place in Nature, 156, 157). Of the Lansing skeleton found in Kansas, in 1902, this may at least be said — apart from the question as to its antiquity — that the skull bears close resemblance to that of the modern Indian. Even the skull of the Cro-Magnon man, supposed to belong to the paleolithic age, Sir J. W. Dawson considers to have carried a brain of greater size than that of the average modern man (Meeting-Place of Geology and History, 54).

Primeval man can hardly be compared to the modern savage; for the savage is a deteriorated representative of a better type, which has slowly degenerated. History does not know of an unaided emergence from barbarism on the part of any savage tribe; it does know of degradation from a better type. Whatever view we take of the original state of man, the following points must be borne in mind: we need not suppose him to have been a humanized ape, rising into true manhood by a slow and gradual process; nor need we picture him either as a savage of pronounced type, or as in every sense the equal of modern man, “the heir of all the ages.” Scripture represents him to us as a moral being, “with possibilities of sinless development, which his own free act annulled.” There the matter may rest, and the words of a non-canonical Scripture may fitly be applied to him: “God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of His own eternity” (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:23, the King James Version).

See also PSYCHOLOGY.
ANTHROPOMORPHISM

<an-thro-po-mor'-fiz'-m>:

1. DEFINITION OF THE TERM:

By this term is meant, conformably with its etymological signification, i.e. as being in the form or likeness of man, the attribution to God of human form, parts or passions, and the taking of Scripture passages which speak of God as having hands, or eyes, or ears, in a literal sense. This anthropomorphic procedure called forth Divine rebuke so early as Psalm 50:21: “Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself.”

2. OLD TESTAMENT ANTHROPOMORPHISMS:

Fear of the charge of anthropomorphism has had a strangely deterrent effect upon many minds, but very needlessly so. Even that rich storehouse of apparently crude anthropomorphisms, the Old Testament, when it ascribes to Deity physical characters, mental and moral attributes, like those of man, merely means to make the Divine nature and operations
intelligible, not to transfer to Him the defects and limitations of human character and life.

3. IN WHAT SENSES AN ANTHROPOMORPHIC ELEMENT IS NECESSITY:

In all really theistic forms of religion, there is an anthropomorphic element present, for they all presuppose the psychological truth of a certain essential likeness between God and man. Nor, perfect as we may our theistic idea or conception of Deity, can we, in the realm of spirit, ever wholly eliminate the anthropomorphic element involved in this assumption, without which religion itself were not. It is of the essence of the religious consciousness to recognize the analogy subsisting between God’s relations to man, and man’s relations to his fellow. We are warned off from speaking of “the Divine will” or “the Divine purpose,” as too anthropomorphic — savoring too much of simple humanity and human psychology — and are bidden speak only of “the Divine immanence” or “the Divine ground of our being.”

4. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND THE EXIGENCIES OF HUMAN THINKING:

But these speculative objections really spring from a shallow interpretation of the primary facts of human consciousness, which, in the deepest realm of inner experience, claims the indefeasible right to speak of the Divine nature in human terms, as may best be possible to our being. The proper duty or function of philosophy is to take due account of such direct and primary facts of our nature: the basal facts of our being cannot be altered to suit her convenience.

5. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND THEISM:

If we were to interpret the impalpable and omni-present Energy, from which all things proceed, in terms of force, then, as Flake said, “there is scarcely less anthropomorphism lurking in the phrase `Infinite Power,’ than in the phrase `Infinite Person.’” Besides which, the soul of man could never be content with the former phrase, for the soul wants more than dynamics. But if we have ascribed to God certain attributes in keeping with the properties of the one Protean force behind all nature-
manifestations, it has been to help purge our conception of God of objectionable anthropomorphic elements. The exigencies of human thinking require us to symbolize the nature of Deity in some psychical way whereby He shall have for us some real meaning; hence those quasi-personal or anthropomorphic forms of expression, which inhere in the most perfected conceptions of Deity, as well as in the crude ideas of unreflective spiritism. And if all anthropomorphism could be dissipated by us, we should in the process have demolished theism — a serious enough issue for religion.

6. SYMBOLIC FORMS OF THOUGHT:

Even speech has been declared to be a sensuous symbol, which makes knowledge of God impossible. To such an extent have the hyper-critical objections to anthropomorphism been pressed. Symbol of the Divine, speech may, in this sense, be; but it is a symbol whereby we can mark, distinguish or discern the super-sensible. Thus our abstract conceptions are by no means sensuous, however the language may originally have set out from a sensuous significance. Hence, it would be a mistake to suppose that our knowledge of God must remain anthropomorphic in content, and cannot think the Absolute Being or Essence save in symbolic form. It is a developmental law of religion — as of spirit in general — that the spiritual grows always more clearly differentiated from the symbolic and sensuous. The fact that our knowledge of God is susceptible of advance does not make the idea of God a merely relative one. God’s likeness to man, in respect of the attributes and elements essential to personal spirit, must be presupposed as a fundamental reality of the universe. In this way or sense, therefore, any true idea of God must necessarily be anthropomorphic.

7. PHILOSOPHIC PANTHEISM:

We cannot prove in any direct manner — either psychological or historical — that man was really made in God’s image. But there is no manner of doubt that, on the other hand, man has always made God in his (man’s) own image. Man can do no otherwise. Because he has purged his conceptions of Deity after human pattern, and no longer cares much to speak of God as a jealous or repentant or punitive Deity, as the case may be, it yet by no means follows that “the will of God” and “the love of
God” have ceased to be of vital interest or primary importance for the religious consciousness. All man’s constructive powers — intellectual, aesthetical, ethical, and spiritual — combine in evolving such an ideal, and believing in it as the personal Absolute, the Ideal-Real in the world of reality. Even in the forms of philosophic pantheism, the factors which play in man’s personal life have not ceased to project themselves into the pantheistic conceptions of the cosmic processes or the being of the world.

8. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND PERSONALIZED OR MEDIATED KNOWLEDGE:

But man’s making of God in his (man’s) own image takes place just because God has made man in His own image. For the God, whom man makes for himself, is, before all things, real — no mere construction of his intellect, no figure or figment of his imagination, but the prius of all things, the Primal, Originative Reality. Thus we see that any inadequacy springing out of the anthropomorphic character of our religious knowledge or conceptions is not at all so serious as might at first sight be supposed, since it is due merely to the necessarily personalized or mediated character of all our knowledge whatsoever. For all our experience is human experience, and, in that sense, anthropomorphic. Only the most pitiful timidity will be scared by the word “anthropomorphism,” which need not have the least deterrent effect upon our minds, since, in the territory of spirit, our conceptions are purged of anthropomorphic taint or hue, the purer our human consciousness becomes.

9. FROM GREEK POLYTHEISM TO MODERN ETHICAL MONOTHEISM.

To say, as we have done, that all knowledge is anthropomorphic, is but to recognize its partial, fallible, progressive or developmental character. It is precisely because this is true of our knowledge of God that our improved and perfected conceptions of God are the most significant feature in the religious progress of humanity. Only in course of the long religious march, wherein thought has shot up through the superincumbent weight of Greek polytheism into monotheism, and emerged at last into the severely ethical monotheism of our time, has religion been gradually stripped of its more crude anthropomorphic vestments. It cannot too clearly be understood
that the religious ideal, which man has formed in the conception of the Absolute Personality, is one which is rooted in the realm of actuality. Not otherwise than as a metaphysical unity can God be known by us — intelligible only in the light of our own self-conscious experience.

10. GREEK THOUGHT:

It is a mere modern — and rather unillumined — abuse of the term anthropomorphic which tries to affix it, as a term of reproach, to every hypothetical endeavor to frame a conception of God. In the days of the Greeks, it was only the ascription to the gods of human or bodily form that led Xenophanes to complain of anthropomorphism. This Xenophanes naturally took to be an illegitimate endeavor to raise one particular kind of being — one form of the finite — into the place of the Infinite. Hence he declared, “There is one God, greatest of all gods and men, who is like to mortal creatures neither in form nor in mind.”

11. ANTHROPOMORPHISM OF ISRAEL:

But the progressive anthropomorphism of Greece is seen less in the humanizing of the gods than in the claim that “men are mortal gods,” the idea being, as Aristotle said, that men become gods by transcendent merit. In this exaltation of the nature of man, the anthropomorphism of Greece is in complete contrast with the anthropomorphism of Israel, which was prone to fashion its Deity, not after the likeness of anything in the heavens above, but after something in the earth beneath. Certain professors of science have been mainly responsible for the recent and reprehensible use of the term, so familiar to us, for which we owe them no particular gratitude.

12. TWOFOLD NATURE OF THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC DIFFICULTY:

The anthropomorphic difficulty is a twofold one. Religion, as we have just shown, must remain anthropomorphic in the sense that we cannot get rid of imputing to the universe the forms of our own mind or life, since religion is rooted in our human experience. As we have already hinted, however, religion is in no worse case in that respect than science. For nothing is more idle than the pretension that science is less
anthropomorphic than religion — or philosophy either — as if science were not, equally with these, an outcome and manifestation of human thinking! It is surely most obvious that the scientist, in any knowledge of reality he may gain, can, no more than the religionist — or the metaphysician — jump off his own shadow, or make escape from the toils of his own nature and powers. For knowledge of any sort — whether religious or scientific or philosophical — a certain true anthropomorphism is necessary, for it is of the essence of rationality. Nature, of which science professes a knowledge, is really a man-made image, like unto its human maker. Say what science will, this is the objectively real of science — a cognition which, critically viewed, is only subjectively valid. There is no other way by which science can know the being of the world than after the human pattern. It is, however, a serious issue that this human element or factor has often unduly penetrated the realm of the Divine, subordinating it and dragging it down to human aims and conceptions.

13. NEED OF RISING HIGHER:

Hence arises the second aspect of the anthropomorphic difficulty, which is, the need of freeing religion from anthropomorphic tendency, since it can be no satisfactory revealer of truth, so long as its more or less unrefined anthropomorphism contracts or subjugates reality to the conditions of a particular kind of being. It is perfectly clear that religion, whose every aim is to raise man beyond the limitations of his natural being, can never realize its end, so long as it remains wholly within the human sphere, instead of being something universal, transcendent, and independent. This is precisely why religion comes to give man’s life the spiritual uplift whereby it rises to a new center of gravity — a true center of immediacy — in the universe, rises, indeed, beyond time and its own finitude to a participation in the universal and transcendent life of the Eternal. It does so without feeling need to yield to the anthropomorphic tendency in our time to attribute a necessity in God for an object to love, as if His egoistic perfection were not capable of realizing love’s infinite ideal in itself, and without dependence upon such object.
14. **GOD IN CHRIST THE TRUE SOLUTION:**

We affirm that God in Christ, in revealing the fact of the likeness of man being eternal in God, disclosed the true anthropomorphism of our knowledge of God — it is with respect to the essential attributes and elements of personal spirit. It is easy to see how the early ascriptions to God of the form and members of the human body, and other non-essential accompaniments of personality, arose. The scriptural representations as to God’s hand, eye, and ear, were declared by Calvin to be but adaptations to the slow spiritual progress of men — an infantile mode of talk, as Calvin puts it, like that of nurses to children. But we have got finely clear of essential anthropomorphism, if, with Isaiah 55:8, we fully recognize that God’s “thoughts are not” our “thoughts,” nor God’s “ways” our “ways.”

**LITERATURE.**


*James Lindsay*

**ANTICHRIST**

<an’-ti-krist> ([ἀντιχριστός, antichristos]):

The word “antichrist” occurs only in 1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 1:7, but the idea which the word conveys appears frequently in Scripture.

**1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.**

*Antichrist in the Old Testament:*

As in the Old Testament the doctrine concerning Christ was only suggested, not developed, so is it with the doctrine of the Antichrist. That the Messiah should be the divine Logos, the only adequate expression of God, was merely hinted at, not stated: so Antichrist was exhibited as the
opponent of God rather than of His anointed. In the historical books of the Old Testament we find “Belial” used as if a personal opponent of Yahweh; thus the scandalously wicked are called in the King James Version “sons of Belial” (Judges 19:22; 20:13), “daughter of Belial” (1 Samuel 1:16), etc. The the Revised Version (British and American) translates the expression in an abstract sense, “base fellows,” “wicked woman.” In Daniel 7:7,8 there is the description of a great heathen empire, represented by a beast with ten horns: its full antagonism to God is expressed in a little eleventh horn which had “a mouth speaking great things” and “made war with the saints” (Daniel 7:8,21). Him the ‘Ancient of Days’ was to destroy, and his kingdom was to be given to a ‘Son of Man’ (Daniel 7:9-14). Similar but yet differing in many points is the description of Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel 8:9-12,23-25.

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. The Gospels:

In the Gospels the activity of Satan is regarded as specially directed against Christ. In the Temptation (Matthew 4:1-10; Luke 4:1-13) the Devil claims the right to dispose of “all the kingdoms of the world,” and has his claim admitted. The temptation is a struggle between the Christ and the Antichrist. In the parable of the Tares and the Wheat, while He that sowed the good seed is the Son of Man, he that sowed the tares is the Devil, who is thus Antichrist (Matthew 13:37-39). our Lord felt it the keenest of insults that His miracles should be attributed to Satanic assistance (Matthew 12:24-32). In John 14:30 there is reference to the “Prince of the World” who “hath nothing” in Christ.

2. Pauline Epistles:

The Pauline epistles present a more developed form of the doctrine. In the spiritual sphere Paul identifies Antichrist with Belial. “What concord hath Christ with Belial?” (2 Corinthians 6:15). 2 Thessalonians, written early, affords evidence of a considerably developed doctrine being commonly accepted among believers. The exposition of 2 Thessalonians 2:3-9, in which Paul exhibits his teaching on the ‘Man of Sin,’ is very difficult, as may be seen from the number of conflicting attempts at its interpretation. See MAN OF SIN. Here we would only
indicate what seems to us the most plausible view of the Pauline doctrine. It had been revealed to the apostle by the Spirit that the church was to be exposed to a more tremendous assault than any it had yet witnessed. Some twelve years before the epistle was penned, the Roman world had seen in Caligula the portent of a mad emperor. Caligula had claimed to be worshipped as a god, and had a temple erected to him in Rome. He went farther, and demanded that his own statue should be set up in the temple at Jerusalem to be worshipped. As similar causes might be expected to produce similar effects, Paul, interpreting “what the Spirit that was in him did signify,” may have thought of a youth, one reared in the purple, who, raised to the awful, isolating dignity of emperor, might, like Caligula, be struck with madness, might, like him, demand Divine honors, and might be possessed with a thirst for blood as insatiable as his. The fury of such an enthroned maniac would, with too great probability, be directed against those who, like the Christians, would refuse as obstinately as the Jews to give him Divine honor, but were not numerous enough to make Roman officials pause before proceeding to extremities. So long as Claudius lived, the Antichrist manifestation of this “lawless one” was restrained; when, however, the aged emperor should pass away, or God’s time should appoint, that “lawless one” would be revealed, whom the Lord would “slay with the breath of his mouth” (<2 Thessalonians 2:8>).

3. Johannine Epistles:

Although many of the features of the “Man of Sin” were exhibited by Nero, yet the Messianic kingdom did not come, nor did Christ return to His people at Nero’s death. Writing after Nero had fallen, the apostle John, who, as above remarked, alone of the New Testament writers uses the term, presents us with another view of Antichrist (<1 John 2:18,22; 4:3; <2 John 1:7>). From the first of these passages (“as ye have heard that antichrist cometh”), it is evident that the coming of Antichrist was an event generally anticipated by the Christian community, but it is also clear that the apostle shared to but a limited extent in this popular expectation. He thought the attention of believers needed rather to be directed to the antichristian forces that were at work among and around them (“even now have .... arisen many antichrists”). From <1 John 2:22; 4:3; <2 John 1:7> we see that the apostle regards erroneous views of the person of Christ as the real Antichrist. To him the Docetism (i.e. the doctrine that Christ’s
body was only a seeming one) which portended Gnosticism, and the elements of Ebionism (Christ was only a man), were more seriously to be dreaded than persecution.

4. Book of Revelation:

In the Book of Revelation the doctrine of Antichrist receives a further development. If the traditional date of the Apocalypse is to be accepted, it was written when the lull which followed the Neronian persecution had given place to that under Domitian — "the bald Nero." The apostle now feels the whole imperial system to be an incarnation of the spirit of Satan; indeed from the identity of the symbols, seven heads and ten horns, applied both to the dragon (Revelation 12:3) and to the Beast (Revelation 13:1), he appears to have regarded the raison d`étre of the Roman Empire to be found in its incarnation of Satan. The ten horns are borrowed from Daniel 7, but the seven heads point, as seen from Revelation 17:9, to the "seven hills" on which Rome sat. There is, however, not only the Beast, but also the "image of the beast" to be considered (Revelation 13:14,15). Possibly this symbolizes the cult of Rome, the city being regarded as a goddess, and worshipped with temples and statues all over the empire. From the fact that the seer endows the Beast that comes out of the earth with "two horns like unto a lamb" (Revelation 13:11), the apostle must have had in his mind some system of teaching that resembled Christianity; its relationship to Satan is shown by its speaking "as a dragon" (Revelation 13:11). The number 666 given to the Beast (Revelation 13:18), though presumably readily understood by the writer’s immediate public, has proved a riddle capable of too many solutions to be now readily soluble at all. The favorite explanation Neron Qecar (Nero Caesar), which suits numerically, becomes absurd when it implies the attribution of seven heads and ten horns. There is no necessity to make the calculation in Hebrew; the corresponding arithmogram in the Sib Or, 1 32830, in which 888 stands for Iesous, is interpreted in Greek. On this hypothesis Lateinos, a suggestion preserved by Irenaeus (V, 30) would suit. If we follow the analogy of Daniel, which has influenced the Apocalyptist so much, the Johannine Antichrist must be regarded as not a person but a kingdom. In this case it must be the Roman Empire that is meant.
3. IN APOCALYPTIC WRITINGS.

Antichrist in the Apocalyptic Writings:

Although from their eschatological bias one would expect that the Jewish Apocalyptic Writings would be full of the subject, mention of the Antichrist occurs only in a few of the apocalypses. The earliest certain notice is found in the Sibylline books (1 167). We are there told that “Beliar shall come and work wonders,” and “that he shall spring from the Sebasteni (Augusti)” a statement which, taken with other indications, inclines one to the belief that the mad demands of Caligula, were, when this was written, threatening the Jews. There are references to Beliar in the XII the Priestly Code (P), which, if the date ascribed to them by Dr. Charles, i.e. the reign of John Hyrcanus I, be assumed as correct, are earlier. Personally we doubt the accuracy of this conclusion. Further, as Dr. Charles admits the presence of many interpolations, even though one might assent to his opinions as to the nucleus of the XII the Priestly Code (P), yet these Beliar passages might be due to the interpolator. Only in one passage is “Beliar” antichristos as distinguished from antitheos; Daniel 5:10,11 (Charles’ translation), “And there shall rise unto you from the tribe of Judah and of Levi the salvation of the Lord, and he shall make war against Beliar, and execute everlasting vengeance on our enemies, and the captivity shall he take from Beliar and turn disobedient hearts unto the Lord.” Dr. Charles thinks he finds an echo of this last clause in Luke 1:17; but may the case not be the converse?

The fullest exposition of the ideas associated with the antichrist in the early decades of Christian history is to be found in the Ascension of Isaiah. In this we are told that “Beliar” (Belial) would enter into “the matricide king” (Nero), who would work great wonders, and do much evil. After the termination of 1,332 days during which he has persecuted the plant which the twelve apostles of the Beloved have planted, “the Lord will come with his angels and with armies of his holy ones from the seventh heaven, with the glory of the seventh heaven, and he will drag Beliar into Gehenna and also his armies” (Daniel 4:3,13, Charles’ translation). If the date at which Beliar was supposed to enter into Nero was the night on which the great fire in Rome began, then the space of power given to him is too short by 89 days. From the burning of Rome till
Nero’s death was 1,421 days. It is to be noted that there are no signs of the writer having been influenced either by Paul or the Apocalypse. As he expected the coming of the Lord to be the immediate cause of the death of Nero, we date the writing some months before that event. It seems thus to afford contemporary and independent evidence of the views entertained by the Christian community as to Antichrist.

4. IN PATRISTIC WRITINGS.

Patristic References to Antichrist:

Of the patristic writers, Polycarp is the only one of the Apostolic Fathers who refers directly to Antichrist. He quotes John’s words, “Whosoever doth not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is Antichrist” (7), and regards Docetism as Antichrist in the only practical sense. Barnabas, although not using the term, implies that the fourth empire of Daniel is Antichrist; this he seems to identify with the Roman Empire (4:5). Irenaeus is the first-known writer to occupy himself with the number of the Beast. While looking with some favor on Lateinos, he himself prefers Teitan as the name intended (5:30). His view is interesting as showing the belief that the arithmogram was to be interpreted by the Greek values of the letters. More particulars as to the views prevailing can be gleaned from Hippolytus, who has a special work on the subject, in which he exhibits the points of resemblance between Christ and Antichrist (On Christ and Antichrist, 4.14.15. 19.25). In this work we find the assertion that Antichrist springs from the terms of Jacob’s blessing to Dan. Among other references, the idea of Commodian (250 AD) that Nero risen from the dead was to be Antichrist has to be noticed. In the commentary on Revelation attributed to Victorinus of Petau there is, inserted by a later hand, an identification of Genseric with the “Beast” of that book. It is evident that little light is to be gained on the subject from patristic sources.

5. MEDIEVAL VIEWS.

Much time need not be spent on the medieval views of Antichrist in either of the two streams in which it flowed, Christian and Jewish.
1. Christian:

The Christian was mainly occupied in finding methods of transforming the names of those whom monkish writers abhorred into a shape that would admit of their being reckoned 666. The favorite name for this species of torture was naturally Maometis (Mohammed). Gregory IX found no difficulty in accommodating the name of Frederic II so as to enable him to identify his great antagonist with “the beast coming up out of the sea”: this identification the emperor retorted on the pope. Rabanus Maurus gives a full account of what Antichrist was to do, but without any attempt to label any contemporary with the title. He was to work miracles and to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem. The view afterward so generally held by Protestants that the papacy was Antichrist had its representatives among the sects denounced by the hierarchy as heretical, as the Kathari. In various periods the rumor was spread that Antichrist had been already born. Sometimes his birthplace was said to be Babylon, sometimes this distinction was accorded to the mystical Babylon, Rome.

2. Jewish:

The Jewish views had little effect on Christian speculation. With the Talmudists Antichrist was named Armilus, a variation of Romulus. Rome is evidently primarily intended, but Antichrist became endowed with personal attributes. He makes war on Messiah, son of Joseph, and slays him, but is in turn destroyed by Messiah, Son of David.

6. POST-REFORMATION VIEWS.

Post-Reformation Theories of Antichrist:

In immediately post-Reformation times the divines of the Romish church saw in Luther and the Reformed churches the Antichrist and Beast of Revelation. On the other hand the Protestants identified the papacy and the Roman church with these, and with the Pauline Man of Sin. The latter view had a certain plausibility, not only from the many undeniably antichristian features in the developed Roman system, but from the relation in which the Romish church stood to the city of Rome and to the imperial idea. The fact that the Beast which came out of the earth (Revelation 13:11) had the horns of a lamb points to some relation to...
the lamb which had been slain (Revelation 5:6). Futurist interpreters have sought the Antichrist in historical persons, as Napoleon III. These persons, however, did not live to realize the expectations formed of them. The consensus of critical opinion is that Nero is intended by the Beast of the Apocalypse, but this, on many grounds, as seen before, is not satisfactory. Some future development of evil may more exactly fulfill the conditions of the problem.

**LITERATURE.**
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**ANTILOGEMENA**

<an-ti-le-gom’-e-na>.

*See BIBLE; CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; DEUTERO-CANONICAL BOOKS.*

**ANTI-LIBANUS**

<an-ti-lib’-a-nus>.

*See LEBANON.*

**ANTIMONY**

<an’-ti-mo-ni>.

*See COLOR.*
ANTIOCH, OF PISIDIA

<an’-ti-ok>, <pi-sid’-i-a> ([ Ἀντιόχεια πρὸς Πισιδία, Antiocheia pros Pisidia], or [ Ἀντιόχεια ἡ Πισιδία, Antiocheia he Pisidia] = “Pisidian”).

1. HISTORY:

(1) Antioch of Pisidia was so called to distinguish it from the many other cities of the same name founded by Seleucus Nicator (301-280 BC) and called after his father Antiochus. It was situated in a strong position, on a plateau close to the western bank of the river Anthios, which flows down from the Sultan Dagh to the double lake called Limnai (Egerdir Gol). It was planted on the territory of a great estate belonging to the priests of the native religion; the remaining portions of this estate belonged later to the Roman emperors, and many inscriptions connected with the cult of the emperors, who succeeded to the Divine as well as to the temporal rights of the god, have survived. (See Sir W. M. Ramsay’s paper on “The Tekmoreian Guest-Friends” in Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Roman Provinces, 1906.) The plateau on which Antioch stood commands one of the roads leading from the East to the Meander and Ephesus; the Seleucid kings regularly founded their cities in Asia Minor at important strategical points, to strengthen their hold on the native tribes. There is no evidence that a Greek city existed on the site of Antioch before the foundation of Seleucus. Ramsay must be right in connecting Strabo’s statement that Antioch was colonized by Greeks from Magnesia on the Meander with the foundation by Seleucus; for it is extremely unlikely that Greeks could have built and held a city in such a dangerous position so far inland before the conquest of Alexander. Pre-Alexandrian Greek cities are seldom to be found in the interior of Asia Minor, and then only in the open river valleys of the west. But there must have been a Phrygian fortress at or near Antioch when the Phrygian kings were at the height of their power. The natural boundary of Phrygian territory in this district is the Pisidian Mts., and the Phrygians could only have held the rich valley between the Sultan Dagh and Egerdir Lake against the warlike tribes of the Pisidian mountains on condition that they had a strong settlement in the neighborhood. We shall see below that the Phrygians did occupy this side of the Sultan Dagh, controlling the road at a critical point.
The Seleucid colonists were Greeks, Jews and Phrygians, if we may judge by the analogy of similar Seleucid foundations. That there were Jews in Antioch is proved by Acts 13:14,50, and by an inscription of Apollonia, a neighboring city, mentioning a Jewess Deborah, whose ancestors had held office in Antioch (if Ramsay’s interpretation of the inscription, The Cities of Paul, 256, is correct). In 189 BC, after the peace with Antiochus the Great, the Romans made Antioch a “free city”; this does not mean that any change was made in its constitution but only that it ceased to pay tribute to the Seleucid kings. Antony gave Antioch to Amyntas of Galatia in 39 BC, and hence it was included in the province Galatia (see GALATIA) formed in 25 BC out of Amyntas’ kingdom. Not much before 6 BC, Antioch was made a Roman colony, with the title Caesarea Antiocheia; it was now the capital of southern Galatia and the chief of a series of military colonies founded by Augustus, and connected by a system of roads as yet insufficiently explored, to hold down the wild tribes of Pisidia, Isauria and Pamphylia.

2. PISIDIAN ANTIOCH:

Much controversy has raged round the question whether Antioch was in Phrygia or in Pisidia at the time of Paul. Strabo defines Antioch as a city of Phrygia toward Pisidia, and the same description is implied in Acts 16:6, and 18:23. Other authorities assign Antioch to Pisidia, and it admittedly belonged to Pisidia after the province of that name was formed in 295 AD. In the Pauline period it was a city of Galatia, in the district of Galatia called Phrygia (to distinguish it from other ethnical divisions of Galatia, e.g. Lycaonia). This view is certain on a study of the historical conditions (see Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, 25 f); and is supported by the fact that Phrygian inscriptions (the surest sign of the presence of a Phrygian population, for only Phrygians used the Phrygian language) have been found around Antioch. See PISIDIA. This corner of Phrygia owed its incorporation in the province Galatia to the military situation in 39 BC, when Amyntas was entrusted with the task of quelling the disorderly Pisidian tribes. No scheme of military conquest in the Pisidian mountains could omit this important strategical point on the Northwest. This fact was recognized by Seleucus when he rounded Antioch, by Antony when he gave Antioch to Amyntas, and by Augustus
when he made Antioch the chief of his military colonies in Pisidia. A
military road, built by Augustus, and called the Royal Road, led from
Antioch to the sister colony of Lystra. According to the story preserved in
the legend of “Paul and Thekla,” it was along this road that Paul and
Barnabas passed on their way from Antioch to Iconium (Acts 13:51;
compare 2 Timothy 3:11; see Ramsay, The Church in the Roman
Empire, 27-36).

3. LANGUAGE AND RELIGION:

Latin continued to be the official language of Antioch, from its foundation
as a Roman colony until the later part of the 2nd century AD. It was more
thoroughly Romanized than any other city in the district; but the Greek
spirit revived in the 3rd century, and the inscriptions from that date are in
Greek. The principal pagan deities were Men and Cybele. Strabo mentions
a great temple with large estates and many hierodouloi devoted to the
service of the god.

4. PAUL AT ANTIOCH:

Antioch, as has been shown above, was the military and administrative
center for that part of Galatia which comprised the Isaurian, Pisidian and
Pamphylian mountains, and the southern part of Lycaonia. It was hence
that Roman soldiers, officials, and couriers were dispatched over the whole
area, and it was hence, according to Acts 13:49, that Paul’s mission
radiated over the whole region. (On the technical meaning of “region” here,
see PISIDIA.) The “devout and honorable women” (the King James
Version) and the “chief men” of the city, to whom the Jews addressed
their complaint, were perhaps the Roman colonists. The publicity here
given to the action of the women is in accord with all that is known of their
social position in Asia Minor, where they were often priestesses and
magistrates. The Jews of Antioch continued their persecution of Paul
when he was in Lystra (Acts 14:19). Paul passed through Antioch a
second time on his way to Perga and Attalia (Acts 14:21). He must have
visited Antioch on his second journey (Acts 16:6; Ramsay, The Church
in the Roman Empire, 74 ff), and on his third (Acts 18:23; ibid., 96).
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W. M. Calder

ANTIOCH, IN SYRIA

<an’-ti-ok>, ([Ἀντιόχεια, Antiocheia]).

(2) Antioch in Syria. — In 301 BC, shortly after the battle of Ipsus, which made him master of Syria, Seleucus Nicator rounded the city of Antioch, naming it after his father Antiochus. Guided, it was said, by the flight of an eagle, he fixed its site on the left bank of the Orontes (the El-`Asi) about 15 miles from the sea. He also rounded and fortified Seleucia to be the port of his new capital. The city was enlarged and embellished by successive kings of the Seleucid Dynasty, notably by Seleucus Callinicus (246-226 BC), and Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 BC). In 83 BC, on the collapse of the Seleucid monarchy, Antioch fell into the hands of Tigranes, king of Armenia, who held Syria until his defeat by the Romans fourteen years later. In 64 BC the country was definitely annexed to Rome by Pompey, who granted considerable privileges to Antioch, which now became the capital of the Roman province of Syria. In the civil wars which terminated in the establishment of the Roman principate, Antioch succeeded in attaching itself constantly to the winning side, declaring for Caesar after the fall of Pompey, and for Augustus after the battle of Actium. A Roman element was added to its population, and several of the emperors contributed to its adornment. Already a splendid city under the Seleucids, Antioch was made still more splendid by its Roman patrons and masters. It was the “queen of the East,” the third city, after Rome and
Alexandria, of the Roman world. About five miles distant from the city was the suburb of Daphne, a spot sacred to Apollo and Artemis. This suburb, beautified by groves and fountains, and embellished by the Seleucids and the Romans with temples and baths, was the pleasure resort of the city, and “Daphnic morals” became a by-word. From its foundation Antioch was a cosmopolitan city. Though not a seaport, its situation was favorable to commercial development, and it absorbed much of the trade of the Levant. Seleucus Nicator had settled numbers of Jews in it, granting them equal rights with the Greeks (Ant., XII, iii, 1). Syrians, Greeks, Jews, and in later days, Romans, constituted the main elements of the population. The citizens were a vigorous, turbulent and pushing race, notorious for their commercial aptitude, the licentiousness of their pleasures, and the scurrility of their wit. Literature and the arts, however, were not neglected.

In the early history of Christianity, Antioch occupies a distinguished place. The large and flourishing Jewish colony offered an immediate field for Christian teaching, and the cosmopolitanism of the city tended to widen the outlook of the Christian community, which refused to be confined within the narrow limits of Judaism. Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch, was one of the first deacons (Acts 6:5). Antioch was the cradle of Gentile Christianity and of Christian missionary enterprise. It was at the instance of the church at Antioch that the council at Jerusalem decided to relieve Gentile Christians of the burden of the Jewish law (Acts 15). Antioch was Paul’s starting-point in his three missionary journeys (Acts 13:1 ff; 15:36 ff; 18:23), and thither he returned from the first two as to his headquarters (Acts 14:26 ff; 18:22). Here also the term “Christian,” doubtless originally a nickname, was first applied to the followers of Jesus (Acts 11:26). The honorable record of the church at Antioch as the mother-church of Gentile Christianity gave her a preeminence which she long enjoyed. The most distinguished of her later sons was John Chrysostom. The city suffered severely from earthquakes, but did not lose its importance until the Arab conquest restored Damascus to the first place among Syrian cities. Antioch still bears its ancient name (Antakiyeh), but is now a poor town with a few thousand inhabitants.

C. H. Thomson
ANTIOCHIANS

<an-ti-o’-ki-ans> ([ Ἀντιοχεῖς, Antiocheis], peculiar to the Apocrypha, 2 Macc 4:9,19): Antiochus Epiphanes was on the throne of Syria from 175 to 164 BC. His determined policy was to Hellenize his entire kingdom. The greatest obstacle to his ambition was the fidelity of the Jews to their historic religion. Many worldly Hebrews, however, for material advantage were willing to apostatize, among them, Jason, the brother of the faithful high priest Onias III. With a large sum of money (2 Macc 4:7-10) he bribed Antiochus to appoint him high priest in his brother’s stead. This office, being, since Ezra’s time, political as well as religious, made him virtually the head of the nation. He promised, on condition the king would permit him to build a Greek gymnasium at Jerusalem, “to train up the youth of his race in the fashions of the heathen,” and to enrol the Hellenized people as Antiochians, i.e. to give all Jews who would adopt Greek customs and the Greek religion the rights and privileges of citizens of Antioch. The granting of this request made Jason the head of the Greek party at Jerusalem. “Such was the height of Greek fashions, and the increase of heathenish manners” under his perverted high-priesthood, that the priests under him lost courage to “serve any more at the altar, but despising the temple and neglecting the sacrifices, hastened” to ally themselves with the Grecians. When the sacrifice of Hercules was observed in connection with the Grecian games at Tyre “Jason sent special messengers from Jerusalem, who were Antiochians” (2 Macc 4:19) with a large contribution of money. This Hellenizing program was supported by a decree of Antiochus which enjoined uniformity of worship throughout his dominions. He forbade the further observance of Jewish festivals, Sabbath, sacrifices in the temple and the rite of circumcision. His ambition included the like subjugation of Egypt, but being thwarted in his expedition thither by Roman envoys, he returned to Jerusalem to vent his anger on the Jews who refused to deny the faith of their fathers. The persecutions inflicted by the king upon these devout Jews abounded in every atrocity. All sacred books of the law that could be found were burned. This attempt to Hellenize the Jews was pushed to every remote rural village of Palestine. The universal peril led the Samaritans, eager for safety, to repudiate all connection and kinship with the Jews. They sent ambassadors and an epistle asking to be recognized as belonging to the Greek party, and to have their temple on
Mt. Gerizim named “The Temple of Jupiter Hellenius.” The request was granted. This was evidently the final breach between the two races indicated in John 4:9, “For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans.”

Among those who refused to be enrolled as Antiochians was Mattathias, an aged priest of the order of Joarib. Mourning the terrible profanation of the holy city and temple he retired with his five sons to his ancestral estates among the mountains Northwest of Jerusalem. The emissaries of Antiochus followed him thither and commanded him to offer sacrifices upon a heathen altar. He was promised special royal favor in case of obedience. The indignant priest not only “had no ear for the temptations of an abhorred Hellenism,” but in his fury instantly slew the apostate priest who attempted to comply with the command. He killed also the king’s commissioner and tore down the detested altar.

This act of heroism became the dawn of a new era. The people rallied to Mattathias’ support. The rebellion grew in power. After a year of inspiring leadership “the venerable priest-captain” died, having first committed “the cause of the law” to his sons, henceforth called Maccabees, from Judas Maccabeus, the son to whom he committed his work. Their victorious career brought to an end the Hellenizing process and the Greek party to which the Antiochians belonged.

See also ANTIOCHUS IV.
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Dwight M. Pratt

ANTIOCHIS

<an-ti’-o-kis> ([Ἀντιοχίς, Antiochis]): A concubine of Antiochus Epiphanes who had presented her with the two Cilician cities, Tarsus and Mallus. Dissatisfied with this the cities made insurrection (2 Macc 4:30).
ANTIOCHUS

<an-’i-o-kus> ([ Ἀντίοχος, Antiochos]; A, [ Ἀντίμαχος, Antimachos] (1 Macc 12:16)): The father of Numenius, who in company with Antipater, son of Jason, was sent by Jonathan on an embassy to the Romans and Spartans to renew “the friendship” and “former confederacy” made by Judas (1 Macc 12:16; 14:22; Ant, XIII, vi; 8).

ANTIOCHUS I

<an-’i-o-kus> ([ Ἀντίοχος Σωτήρ, Antiochos Soter], “savior”): born 323 BC; died 261, son of Seleucus Nicator. He fell in love with his stepmother, Stratonike, and became very ill. His father, when he discovered the cause of his son’s illness, gave her to him in 293, and yielded to him the sovereignty over all the countries beyond the Euphrates, as well as the title of king. When Seleucus returned to Macedonia in 281, he was murdered by Ptolemeus Ceraunus. Antiochus thus became ruler of the whole Syrian kingdom. He waged war on Eumenes of Pergamum, but without success. For the victories of his elephant corps over the Gauls, who had settled in Asia Minor, he received the surname of Soter (“Deliverer”). It was in a battle with these inveterate foes of his country that he met his death (261 BC).

See also SELEUCIDAE.

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS II

Surnamed Theos ([Θεός, Theos], “god”): Son and successor of Antiochus (261-246 BC). He made a successful war on Ptolemy Philadelphus of Egypt, but was obliged to buy peace in 250 by divorcing his wife, Laodice, and by marrying Ptolemy’s daughter, Berenice. After the death of Ptolemy, “the king of the south” (Daniel 11:6) 248 BC, he recalled Laodice and named her eldest son (Seleucus Kallinikos) as his successor to the throne; but Laodice (probably because she feared a second repudiation) had Berenice, her child, and Antiochus all murdered (246 BC). The Milesians gave him the surname of Theos in gratitude for his liberating
them from the tyranny of Timarchus. (See Arrian, I, 17, 10, and 18, 2; Josephus, Ant, XII, iii, 2; Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscr. Graec, 166-71.)

**J. E. Harry**

**ANTIOCHUS III**

(Μέγας, Megas), “The Great,” mentioned in 1 Macc 1:10; 8:6-8): Son of Seleucus Kallinikos; succeeded to the throne of Syria in 222 BC; put to death his general, Hermeas, and then led an army against Egypt. Theodotus surrendered to him Tyre, Ptolemais and his naval fleet. Rhodes and Cyzicus, as well as Byzantium and Aetolia, desired peace, but Antiochus declined to accept their terms. He renewed the war, but was defeated at Raphia in 217, and was obliged to give up Phoenicia and Coelesyria; Seleucia, however, he retained. He undertook to bring under his sway again all the territory of the Far East. His expedition against Bactria and Parthia gained for him the surname of “The Great.” In 209 he carried away the treasure of the goddess Aine in Ecbatana, defeated the Parthians, and in 208 marched against the Bactrians. Later he made a treaty with an Indian rajah, and then returned to the West by way of Arachosia and Carmania, forcing the Gerraean Arabs to furnish him with frankincense, myrrh and silver. Then he took Ephesus, which he made his headquarters. In 196 he had crossed the Hellespont and rebuilt Lysimachia. Hannibal visited Antiochus in Ephesus the next year and became one of the king’s advisers. He sought the friendship also of Eumenes of Pergamum, but without success. Rome now requested the king not to interfere in Europe, or to recognize the right of the Romans to protect the Greeks in Asia. A war broke out in 192, and Antiochus was persuaded to come to Greece. The Aetolians elected him their general, who asked the Acheans to remain neutral. But the patriotic Philopoemen decided that an alliance with Rome was to be preferred. Antiochus first captured Calchis; then succeeded in gaining a footing in Boeotia, and later made an effort to get possession of Thessaly, but retired on the approach of the Macedonian army. In 191 the Romans made a formal declaration of war on Antiochus, who, being at that time in Acarnania, returned to Calchis, and finally sailed back to Ephesus. The Romans regained possession of Boeotia, Euboea and Sestus; but Polyxenidas defeated the Roman fleet near Samos, which island, together with Cyme and Phocaea, fell into the hands of Antiochus. The victorious
Polyxenidas, however, soon sustained a crushing defeat at the hands of the Romans, and Antiochus abandoned Lysimachia, leaving an open road to Asia to the Romans. He was finally defeated at Magnesia and sent word to Scipio, who was at Sardis, that he was willing to make peace; but Scipio ordered him to send envoys to Rome. A decision was reached in 189; the Asiatic monarch was obliged to renounce everything on the Roman side of the Taurus; give up all his ships of war but ten and pay 15,000 talents to Rome, and 500 to Eumenes. Antiochus marched against the revolted Armenians in 187. In order to replenish his exhausted treasury, he attempted to plunder a temple and both he and his soldiers were slain by the Elymeans.
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J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS IV
([Επιφανής, Epiphanes], <e-pif”-a-naz>, “Illustrious”): Son of Antiochus III who became king after his brother, Seleucus IV, had been murdered by Heliodorus. As a boy Antiochus lived at Rome as a hostage. The Pergamene monarchs, Eumenes and Attalus, succeeded in placing upon the throne the brother of Seleucus, although Heliodorus had wished to ascend the throne himself. The young king was even more enterprising than his father. He was called in to settle a quarrel between Onias III and his brother, Jason, the leader of the Hellenizing faction in Jerusalem, and Onias was driven out (2 Macc 4:4-6). Jason became high priest in his stead (2 Macc 4:9-16; 1 Macc 1:10-15; Ant, XII, v, 1). Antiochus himself afterward visited Jerusalem and was signally honored (2 Macc 4:22). On the death of Ptolemy VI in 173, Antiochus laid claim to Coelesyria, Palestine and Phoenicia; whereupon war broke out between Syria and Egypt. In this war Antiochus was victorious. Ptolemy Philometor was taken prisoner, and Antiochus had himself crowned king of Egypt (171-167 BC) at Memphis; whereupon Alexandria revolted and chose
Ptolemy’s brother as their king. The Roman ambassador, Popilius Laenas, demanded the surrender of Egypt and the immediate withdrawal of its self-constituted king. Antiochus yielded; gave up Pelusium and withdrew his fleet from Cyprus, but retained Coelesyria, Palestine and Phoenicia.

While Antiochus was on a second campaign in Egypt, he heard of the siege of Jerusalem. He returned immediately, slew many thousands of the inhabitants and robbed the temple of its treasures (1 Macc 1:20-24; 2 Macc 5:11-21). By his prohibition of the Jewish worship and his introduction or substitution of the worship of the Olympian Zeus (1 Macc 1:54; 2 Macc 6:2; Ant, XII, v, 4) he brought about the insurrection of the Jews, under the Maccabees, upon whom he made an unsuccessful war in 167-164 BC. After this war Antiochus retired to the eastern provinces and died, after having failed in an attack on the temple of the Sun in Elymais, in Persia.

See also ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION; &ANTIOCHIANS.

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS V

([Εὐπάτωρ, Eupator], “Nobleborn”): Son and successor to Antiochus Epiphanes, ascended the throne as a mere boy (163-161 BC) under the guardianship of Lysias, who led an expedition to the relief of Jerusalem, which had been besieged by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 6:18-30; Ant, XII, ix, 4), who was defeated (1 Macc 6:42). Antiochus then besieged Jerusalem. Peace was finally concluded on the condition that the Jews should not be compelled to change any of their national customs (1 Macc 6:55-60; Ant, XII, ix, 7). Philip, the king’s foster-brother (2 Macc 9:29), was defeated at Antioch, but soon afterward Lysias and Antiochus were themselves defeated by Demetrius Soter, son of Seleucus Philopator (1 Macc 7:4; 2 Macc 14:2; Ant, XII, x, 1; Polyb. xxxi.19; Livy Epit. 46).

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS VI

(Surnamed Theos ([Θεός, Theos]), or, according to coins, Dionysus Epiphanes): Was the son of Alexander Balas, who claimed to be the son of
Antiochus Epiphanes. Alexander left the throne to his son in 146 BC. The young king retired to Arabia — perhaps through compulsion. The shrewd diplomatist and skillful general, Tryphon, succeeded first in winning over to his side the two leaders of the Jews, Jonathan and Simon, and then, by force of arms, in making the Syrians recognize his protege. As soon as the monarchy had been firmly established, Tryphon unmasked his projects: he had been ambitious only for himself; Antiochus had been only an instrument in his hands. In 143; after a reign of a little more than three years, Antiochus was assassinated by Tryphon, who ascended the throne himself (1 Macc 13:31; Ant, XIII, vii, 1; Livy Epit. 55).

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS VII

(Surnamed Sidetes, [Σίδητης, Sidetes], after Sida in Pamphylia, where he was educated): Younger son of Demetrius Soter and brother of Demetrius Nicator, whose wife, Cleopatra, he married when Demetrius was taken prisoner by the Parthians. Antiochus overthrew the usurper, Tryphon, and ascended the throne himself and reigned from 139 to 130 BC. He defeated John Maccabeus and besieged Jerusalem (Ant., XIII, viii, 2), but concluded a favorable peace (Ant., XIII, viii, 3) from fear of Rome. Later he waged war with the Parthians and was slain in battle (1 Macc 15:2-9,28-31).

J. E. Harry

ANTIPAS

<an’-ti-pas> ([Ἀντίπας, Antipas]): The name is an abbreviation of Antipater:

(1) A name of Herod “the tetrarch” (in Jos), son of Herod the Great, the brother of Archelaus (Matthew 14:1; Luke 3:1; 9:7; Acts 13:1). See HEROD.

(2) A martyr of the church of Pergamum, described as “my witness, my faithful one” (Revelation 2:13).
ANTIPATER

<an-tip’-a-ter> ([Ἀντίπατρος, Antipatros]): One of two envoys sent by the senate of the Jews to the Romans and Spartans (1 Macc 12:16; 14:22).

ANTIPATRIS

<an-tip’-a-tris> ([Ἀντίπατρις, Antipatris]): Is mentioned in Scripture only once, in connection with the descent of Paul from Jerusalem to Caesarea (Acts 23:31). References will be found in Ant, XIII, xv 1; XVI, v, 2; BJ, I, xxi, 9. It was a town built by Herod the Great, and called after his father Antipater. It is probably identical with the modern [Ras el-`Ain], “fountain head,” a large mound with ruins at the source of [Nahr el`Aujeh], in the plain to the Northeast of Jaffa. There are remains of a crusading castle which may be the Mirabel of those times.

W. Ewing

ANTIQUITY

<an-tik’-wi-ti> ([qadham], from qadham, “to precede in time,” “to be old’): In Ezekiel 16:55; 36:11, rendered “former”; in Psalm 129:6, “before.” Translated “antiquity” only in Isaiah 23:7 to indicate the primeval age of Tyre, which Strabo terms, “after Sidon,” the oldest Phoenician city. Delitzsch renders it “whose origin is from the days of the olden time.”

ANTONIA

<an-to’-ni-a>.

See JERUSALEM.

ANTOTHIJAH

<an-to-thi’-ja>.

See ANTHOTHIJAH.
ANTOTHITE

<an’-toth-it>: the King James Version form of ANATHOTHITE (which see) (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (1 Chronicles 11:28; 12:3).

ANUB

<a’-nub> (לֵעֵב [anubh], “ripe”): A descendant of Judah and son of Hakkoz (the King James Version Coz) 1 Chronicles 4:8.

ANUS

<a’-nus>.

See ANNUS (Apocrypha).

ANVIL

<an’-vil> (нные [pa`am]): The word is used only once to mean anvil. The passage (Isaiah 41:7) refers to the custom still very common of workmen encouraging each other at their work. See CRAFTS. Just how pretentious the anvil of the ancients was we do not know. Most work requiring striking or beating, from the finest wrought jewelry to the largest copper vessels, is now done on an anvil shaped like an inverted letter L which is driven into a block of wood, or into the ground, or into a crack between two of the stone slabs of the workman’s floor. The only massive anvils seen in the country today are modern and of foreign make.

James A. Patch

APACE

<a-pas’> (“at a pace”): With “come,” 2 Samuel 18:25; “flee,” Jeremiah 46:5, for “rapidly,” “hastily,” “fast,” corresponding to a Hebrew idiom that adds emphasis or intensity to an idea by repetition of the word or its equivalent.
APAME

<ap-me>, <ap-me> ([Ἀπάμη, Apame]): A concubine of Darius and a daughter of Bartacus the Illustrious, whose behavior to the king is referred to in a speech of Zerubbabel before the king to prove to him the great power of women (1 Esdras 4:29).

See BARTACUS; ILLUSTRIOUS.

APART

<apart> (בְּדָה [badh], “separation,” i.e. alone, by oneself; נִדָּה [niddah], “uncleanness” i.e. something put away: “an abomination”): In Zechariah 12:12-14 the former word is used eleven times with powerful effect to indicate the separation of families and the isolation of wives through excessive grief in Jerusalem on account of the slain Messiah. The latter word signifies removal from ceremonial uncleanness (Leviticus 15:19; 18:19; Ezekiel 22:10). In Greek, κατ’ ἑαυτῶν, kat’ idian, “by themselves,” of marked significance as expressing Christ’s desire for privacy in prayer, alone or with His disciples; either in a desert (Matthew 14:13); a mountain (Matthew 14:23); or a high mountain, at the time of the transfiguration (Matthew 17:1,19), thus suggestive of the secrecy of prayer and communion with God. Used with reference also to Christ’s disclosures of His purpose and of the purport of His teaching in private to His disciples (Matthew 20:17).

Dwight M. Pratt

APE

<ap> ([קוף [qoph]]: The word occurs only in the two parallel passages (1 Kings 10:22; 2 Chronicles 9:21) in which the magnificence of Solomon is illustrated by the things which are brought to him from foreign countries. Apes are mentioned with gold, silver, ivory and peacocks. Peacocks are natives of India and Ceylon. Apes and ivory may have been brought from India or Africa. Gold and silver may have come from these or other quarters. An Indian origin may be inferred from the fact that the Hebrew [qoph], the Greek [κῆβος, kebos] and the English “ape” are akin to the Sanskrit “kapi”, which is referred to the root kap, kamp, “to
tremble”; but the question of the source of these imports depends upon what is understood by Tarsish and Ophir (which see). Canon Cheyne in Encyclopedia Biblica (s.v. “Peacock”) proposes a reading which would give “gold, silver, ivory and precious stones” instead of “gold, silver, ivory, apes and peacocks.” Assuming, however, that animals are here referred to, the word ape should be understood to mean some kind of monkey. The word “ape” is sometimes used for the tail-less apes or anthropoids such as the gorilla, the chimpanzee and the orangutang, as opposed to the tailed kinds, but this distinction is not strictly held to, and the usage seems formerly to have been freer than now.

Alfred Ely Day

APELLES

<apel’-ez> ([’Ἀπελλῆξ, Apelles]): A Christian at Rome to whom Paul sends greetings (Romans 16:10). He is described by Paul as “the, approved in Christ,” i.e. “that approved Christian” (Denney). In some way unknown to us Apelles had been tested and he had proved faithful (compare James 1:12; 2 Timothy 2:15). It is a common name. Many commentators refer to Horace (Satires, i.5.100): “Credat Judaeus Apella, non ego.”

APHAEREMA

<affer’-e-ma> ([’Ἀφαιρεμα, Aphairema] and Apherema; the King James Version Apherema). One of three districts taken from Samaria and added to Judea by Demetrius Nicator (1 Macc 11:34). Compare Ant., XIII, iv, 9.

APHARSATHCHITES; APHARSACHITES

<af-ar-sath’-kits>, <af-ar’-sak-its> (אפים שבקים) [’apharcathkhaye’]): A tribe living in Samaria that protested against the rebuilding of the Temple, and brought their complaint to Darius (Ezra 4:9; 5:6; 6:6). The tribe has not yet been recognized with any certainty in the inscriptions. Rawlinson identifies them with the Persians; other scholars deny that any Assyrian king was ever so situated as to have been able to obtain colonists from Persia. Some maintain with Marquardt that the term is not the name of a tribe, but the title of certain officers under
Darius. Fred. Delitzsch suggests the inhabitants of one of the two great Medean towns “Partakka” and “Partukka” mentioned in Esarhaddon’s inscriptions. Andreas plausibly connects it with the Assyrian suparsak (Muss-Arnolt, Assyrian Dict., 1098), saqu (3) “general”; Scheft takes it from an old Iranian word aparasarka, “lesser ruler.”

H. J. Wolf

**APHARSITES**

\(<a\text{-}far\text{-}sits>\) (αφάρσιτες, ['apharcaye’]): A tribe transferred to Samaria by Asnappar of Assyria (\textit{Ezra} 4:9). Rawlinson identifies them with the APHARSACHITES (which see), taking Apharsites to be an accidental repetition of the same word. He understands “the Persians” to be meant in both cases. Others identify them with a Median tribe mentioned in the inscriptions of Sennacherib as dwellers in the district of Parsua.

**APEK**

\(<a\text{-}fek>\) (אפק, ['aphiq], “fortress”; \(\text{Ἀφέκ, Aphek}\)):

(1) In Joshua 12:18 we should probably read with the Septuagint “the king of Aphek in Sharon.” This may correspond to Aphek in \textit{Samuel} 4:1. It was a royal city of the Canaanites whose king was slain by Josh. Probably it is the Aphek mentioned by Josephus as being near to Antipatris (BJ, II, xix, 1). Kakon, a strong position commanding the main entrance to Samaria might suit; but the name has perished.

(2) (Greek Taphek or Apheka): A city in the lot of Asher (\textit{Joshua} 13:4). The inhabitants were not ejected by Asher, nor is it said that they became tributary (\textit{Judges} 1:31). In this passage it is written [’aphiq] (Hebrew). It may be represented by [’Afqa] on [Nahr Ibrahim], although this is probably farther north than we should expect.

(3) To this place the Philistines gathered their hosts, while the Israelites pitched by the fountain which is in Jezreel (\textit{1 Samuel} 29:1). It has been generally supposed that these two positions were over against each other, and that therefore Aphek must be sought in the plain of Esdraelon. No place answering this description has been found here. Fuqu‘ah on Mount
Gilboa is plainly impossible. If, however, this was only the rallying point of the Philistines from which they went up to Jezreel (1 Samuel 29:11), it may be identical with the Aphek in the plain of Sharon (compare 29:1 above).

(4) A city on the plateau east of the Jordan, where disaster befell Benhadad (1 Kings 20:26,30). The same place may be intended in 2 Kings 13:17. The modern Fiq or Afiq (for both forms are heard) on the brow of the hill beyond Qal‘at el-Chucn, east of the Sea of Galilee, probably represents this ancient city.

W. Ewing

**APHEKAH**

<\textit{a-fe’-ka}> (א’פֶּקא) [‘apheqah], “force” or “strength”): An unidentified city in the hill country of Judah (Joshua 15:53).

**APHEREMA**

<\textit{a-fer’-e-ma}>.

\textit{See APHAEREMA (Apocrypha).}

**APHERRA**

<\textit{a-fer’-a}> ([‘Aφέρρα, Apherra]): Head of a family of children of Solomon’s servants in the post-exilic list, one of eight listed in 1 Esdras 5:34 after Pochereth-hazzebaim of Ezra 2:57 = Nehemiah 7:59.

**APHIAH**

<\textit{a-fi’-a}> (אָפִּיא ח) [‘aphiach]: A Benjaminate and an ancestor of King Saul (1 Samuel 9:1).

**APHIK**

<\textit{a’-fik}>: Variant of APHEK (which see).
APHRAH

<af’-ra>: the King James Version form for the Revised Version (British and American) BETH-LEAPHRAH (Micah 1:10).

APHSES

<af’-sez>: the King James Version form for the Revised Version (British and American) HAPPIZEZ (1 Chronicles 24:15).

APOCALYPSE

<a-pok’-a-lips>.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; REVELATION OF JOHN.

APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH

<ba’-ruk>.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

<a-pok-a-lip’-tik lit’-er-a-tur>:

A series of pseudepigraphic works, mainly of Jewish origin, appeared during the period between 210 BC and 200 AD. They have many features in common. The most striking is the resemblance they all bear to the Book of Daniel. Following this model, most of them use “vision” as a literary device by which to introduce their conceptions of the remote future. A side product of this same movement was the composition, mainly in Alexandria, of the Sibylline books. The literary device of “vision” was one used in the Aeneid by Virgil, the classical contemporary of a large number of these works. One peculiarity in regard to the majority of these documents is the fact that while popular among the Christian writers of the first Christian centuries, they disappeared with the advent of the Middle Ages, and remained unknown until the first half of the 19th century was well on in its course.
INTRODUCTORY

I. Background of Apocalyptic.

1. Judaism and Hellenism:

When the Jews came back from Babylon to Palestine, though surrounded by heathen of various creeds, they were strongly monotheistic. The hold the Persians had of the empire of Southwest Asia, and their religion — Zoroastrianism — so closely akin to monotheism, prevented any violent attempts at perverting the Jews. With the advent of the Greek power a new state of things emerged. Certainly at first there does not seem to have been any direct attempt to force them to abandon their religion, but the calm contempt of the Hellene who looked down from the superior height of his artistic culture on all barbarians, and the influence that culture had in the ruling classes tended to seduce the Jews into idolatry. While the governing orders, the priests and the leaders of the Council, those who came in contact with the generals and governors of the Lagids of Egypt, or the Seleucids of Syria, were thus inclined to be seduced into idolatry, there was a large class utterly uninfluenced by Hellenic culture, and no small portion of this class hated fanatically all tampering with idolatry. When the dominion over Palestine passed out of the hands of the Ptolemies into that of the house of Seleucus, this feeling was intensified, as the Syrian house regarded with less tolerance the religion of Israel. The opposition to Hellenism and the apprehension of it naturally tended to draw together those who shared the feeling. On the one side was the scribist legal party, who developed into the Pharisaic sect; on the other were the mystics, who felt the personal power of Deity. These afterward became first the Chasidim, then later the Essenes. These latter gradually retired from active participation in national life. As is natural with mystics their feelings led them to see visions and to dream dreams. Others more intellectual, while they welcomed the enlightenment of the Greeks, retained their faith in the one God. To them it seemed obvious that as their God was the true God, all real enlightenment must have proceeded from Him alone. In such thinkers as Plato and Aristotle they saw many things in harmony with the Mosaic law. They were sure that there must have been links which united these thinkers to the current of Divine revelation, and were led to imagine of what sort these links necessarily were. The names of poets such as
Orpheus and Linus, who survived only in their names, suggested the source of these links — these resemblances. Hence, the wholesale forgeries, mainly by Jews, of Greek poems. On the other hand, there was the desire to harmonize Moses and his law with the philosophical ideas of the time. Philo the Alexandrian, the most conspicuous example of this effort, could not have been an isolated phenomenon; he must have had many precursors. This latter movement, although most evident in Egypt, and probably in Asia Minor, had a considerable influence in Judea also.

2. Political Influences:

Political events aided in the advance of both these tendencies. The distinct favor that Antiochus the Great showed to the Greeks and to those barbarians who Hellenized, became with his son Antiochus Epiphanes a direct religious persecution. This emphasized the protest of the Chasidim on the one hand, and excited the imagination of the visionaries to greater vivacity on the other. While the Maccabees and their followers were stirred to deeds of valor, the meditative visionaries saw in God their refuge, and hoped for deliverance at the hand of the Messiah. They pictured to themselves the tyrant smitten down by the direct judgment of Yahweh. After the death of Epiphanes, the Maccabeans had become a power to be reckoned with, and the visionaries had less excitement from external events till the Herodian family found their way into supreme power. At first the Herodians favored the Pharisaiic party as that which supported John Hyrcanus II, the friend of Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, and the Essenes seem to have taken Herod at first into their special favor. However, there was soon a change. In consequence of the compliance with heathen practices, into which their connection with the Romans forced the Herodians, the more religious among the Jews felt themselves compelled to withdraw all favor from the Idumean usurper, and to give up all hope in him. This naturally excited the visionaries to new expectation of Divine intervention. Behind the Herodians was the terrible iron power of Rome. The Romans had intervened in the quarrel between John Hyrcanus and his brother Aristobulus. Pompey had desecrated the temple by intruding into the Holy of Holies. The disastrous overthrow that he suffered at the hands of Caesar and his miserable end on the shores of Egypt seemed to be a judgment on him for his impiety. Later, Nero was the especial mark for the Apocalyptists, who by this time had become mainly Christian. Later
Roman emperors impressed the imagination of the Apocalyptists, as the Flavians.

II. General Characteristics of Apocalyptic.

1. Differences from Prophecy in Content:

Both in matter and form apocalyptic literal and the writings associated with it differ from the prophetic writings of the preceding periods. As already mentioned, while the predictive element as present in Apocalypses, as in Prophecy, it is more prominent and relates to longer periods and involves a wider grasp of the state of the world at large. Apocalypse could only have been possible under the domination of the great empires. Alike in Prophecy and in Apocalypse there is reference to the coming of the Messiah, but in the latter not only is the Messianic hope more defined, it has a wider reference. In the Prophets and Psalmists the Messiah had mainly to do with Israel. “He will save his people”; “He will die for them”; “His people shall be all righteous.” All this applies to Israel; there is no imperial outlook. In the Apocalypses the imperial outlook is prominent, beginning with Daniel in which we find the Messianic kingdom represented by a “son of man” over against the bestial empires that had preceded (Daniel 7:13) and reaching the acme of Apocalypse, if not its conclusion, in the Revelation of John: “The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ” (Revelation 11:15). While the prophet was primarily a preacher of righteousness, and used prediction either as a guarantee, by its fulfillment, of his Divine mission, or as an exhibition of the natural result of rebellion against God’s righteous laws, to the Apocalyptic prediction was the thing of most importance, and in the more typical Apocalypse there is no moral exhortation whatever.

2. Differences from Prophecy in Literary Form:

In the literary form employed there are marked differences between Apocalyptic and Prophecy. Both make use of vision, but in Prophecy, in the more restricted sense of the word, these visions are as a rule implied, rather than being described. Although Isaiah calls the greater part of his Prophecy “vision,” yet in only one instance does he describe what he sees; as a rule he assumes throughout that has audience knows what is visible to
him. The only instance (Isaiah 6) in which he does describe his vision is not at all predictive; the object is exhortation. In the case of the Apocalypses the vision is the vehicle by which the prediction is conveyed. In Ezekiel there are visions, but only one of these — “the valley of dry bones” — is predictive. In it the symbols used are natural, not, as always in Apocalypses, arbitrary. Compare in Daniel’s vision of the Ram and the He-goat (Daniel 8). In Ezekiel the dry bones naturally suggest death, and the process by which they are revivified the reader feels is the natural course such an event would take did it come within the sphere of ordinary experience; while in what is told of the horns on the head of the Greek goat there is no natural reason for the changes that take place, only a symbolical one. This is still more marked in the vision of the Eagle in 4 Esdras 11.

What may be regarded as yet more related to the form is the fact that while the Prophets wrote in a style of so elevated prose that it always hovered on the border of poetry — indeed, frequently passed into it and employed the form of verse, as Isaiah 26:1 — the apocalyptists always used pure prose, without the elaborate parallelism or cadenced diction of Hebrew poetry. The weird, the gorgeous, or the terrible features of the vision described are thrown into all the higher relief by the baldness of the narrative.

III. Authorship of Jewish Apocalyptic Works.

1. Pseudepigraphic Authors not Known Individually:

In most cases the question of authorship is one that has to be discussed in regard to each work individually. A number of the characteristics of the works render such a procedure impossible in regard to them. If we put to the one side the two Apocalypses that form part of the canon, they are all pseudonymous, as Enoch and Baruch, or anonymous, as the Book of Jubilees. Many of them in addition show traces of interpolation and modification by later hands. If we had a full and clear history of the period during which they were written, and if its literature had to a great extent been preserved to us we might have been in a position to fix on the individual; but as matters stand, this is impossible. At the same time, however, from internal evidence, we may form some idea of the surroundings of those who have written these works.
2. General Resemblance and Mutual Dependence Show Them Products of One Sect:

From the striking resemblance in general style which they exhibit, and from the way in which some of them are related to the others, many of these works seem to have been the product of similar circumstances. Even those most removed from the rest in type and general attitude are nearer them than they are to any other class of work. All affirmative evidence thus points to these works having been composed by authors that were closely associated with each other. The negative evidence for this is the very small traceable influence these works had on later Jewish thought. Many of them are quoted by the Christian Fathers, some of them by New Testament writers. The whole of these works have been preserved to us through Christian means. A large number have been preserved by being adopted into the Old Testament canon of the Ethiopian church; a considerable number have been unearthed from Ambrosian Library in Milan; most of them have been written in Palestine by Jewish writers; yet no clear indubitable sign of the knowledge of these books can be found in the Talmud.

3. Three Jewish Sects Comprise Whole Literary Class:

The phenomenon here noted is a striking one. Works, the majority of which are written in Hebrew by Jews, are forgotten by the descendants of these Jews, and are retained by Gentile Christians, by nations who were ignorant of Hebrew and preserved them in Greek, Latin or Ethiopian translations. A characteristic of the Judaism during the period in which these books were appearing was the power exercised by certain recognized sects. If one takes the most nearly contemporary historian of the Jews, Josephus, as one's authority, it is found how prominent the three sects, Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, were. To a certain extent this is confirmed by the Gospels and the Acts, with this noticeable exception — the Essenes are never mentioned by name.

4. Not the Product of the Sadducees:

The scribes, the literary class among the Jews, all belonged to one or other of these ruling sects. Consequently these works must have proceeded from members of one of those sects. Their mutual resemblance precludes their
authors from belonging some to one sect and some to another. We know pretty exactly from Josephus and the New Testament what the character and tenets of the Sadducees were. They were the priestly sacerdotal class, and were above all, political schemers. They received only the Pentateuch as authoritative, and had no share in the Messianic hopes of which the Prophets were full. They believed neither in angel nor spirit, and had no hope of immortality (Acts 23:8). Josephus compares them with the followers of Epicurus among the Greeks. Nothing could be farther removed from the spirit and doctrines of the Apocalypses than all this. The Messianic hopes bulk largely; angels are prominent, then, hierarchies are described and their names given. The doctrine of immortality is implied, and the places of reward and punishment are described. The Apocalypses cannot therefore be attributed to the Sadducees.

5. Nor of the Pharisees:

There is greater plausibility in attributing them to the Pharisees. So far as doctrines are concerned, there is no doubt that the agreement is relatively close. There are, however, difficulties in accepting this view of their origin. With the fall of the Jewish state, the Sadducees disappeared when there was no field for political activity, and when with the destruction of the temple there were no more sacrifices to require the services of Aaronic priests. Nearly contemporaneously the Essenes disappeared in Christianity. The Pharisees alone remained to carry on the traditions of Judaism. We have in the Talmud the result of Pharisaic literary activity. The Mishna is the only part of this miscellaneous conglomeration which is at all nearly contemporary with the works before us. It has none of the characteristics of the apocalyptic writings. The later Hagadah Midrash have more resemblance to some of these, noticeably to the Book of Jubilees. Still, the almost total want of any references to any of the Apocalypses in the recognized Pharisaic writings, and the fact that no Jewish version of any of these books has been preserved, seems conclusive against the idea that the Apocalypses owed their origin to the Pharisaic schools. The books that form the ordinary Apocrypha are in a different position. The majority, if not the whole of them, were received into the Jewish canon of Alexandria. Some of them are found in Hebrew or Aramaic, as Ecclesiasticus, Tobit and Judith. None of the Apocalypses have been so
found. This leads necessarily to the conclusion that the Pharisees did not write these books.

6. Probably Written by the Essenes:

By the method of exclusions we are led thus to adopt the conclusion of Hilgenfeld, that they are the work of the Essenes. We have, however, positive evidence. We know from Josephus that the Essenes had many secret sacred books. Those books before us would suit this description. Further, in one of these books (4 Esdras) we find a story which affords an explanation of the existence of these books. 2 (4) Esdras 14:40-48 tells how to Ezra there was given a cup of water as it were fire to drink, and then he dictated to five men. These men wrote in characters which they did not understand “for forty days” until they had written “four score and fourteen books” (Revised Version (British and American)). He is commanded, “The first that thou hast written publish openly, and let the worthy and unworthy read it: but keep the seventy last that thou mayest deliver them to such as be wise among thy people.” While the twenty-four books of the ordinary canon would be open to all, these other seventy books would only be known by the wise — presumably, the Essenes. This story proceeds on the assumption that all the biblical books had been lost during the Babylonian captivity, but that after he had his memory quickened, Ezra was able to dictate the whole of them; but of these only twenty-four were to be published to all; there were seventy which were to be kept by a society of wise men. This would explain how the Books of Enoch and Noah, and the account of the Assumption of Moses could appear upon the scene at proper times and yet not be known before. In the last-named book there is another device. Moses tells Joshua to embalm (hedriare) the writing which gives an account of what is coming upon Israel. Books so embalmed would be liable to be found when Divine providence saw the occasion ripe. These works are products of a school of associates which could guard sacred books and had prepared hypotheses to explain at once how they had remained unknown, and how at certain crises they became known. All this suits the Essenes, and especially that branch of them that dwelt as Coenobites beside the Dead Sea. We are thus driven to adopt Hilgenfeld’s hypothesis that the Essenes were the authors of these books. Those of them that formed the Community of Engedi by their very dreamy seclusion would be especially ready to see visions and
dream dreams. To them it seem no impossible thing for one of the brotherhood to be so possessed by the spirit of Enoch or of Noah that what he wrote were really the words of the patriarch. It would not be inconceivable, or even improbable, that Moses or Joshua might in a dream open to them books written long before and quicken their memories so that what they had read in the night they could recite in the day-time. As all the Essenes were not dwellers by the shores of the Dead Sea, or “associates with the palms of Engedi,” some of the writings of this class as we might expect, betray a greater knowledge of the world, and show more the influence of events than those which proceeded from the Coenobites. As to some extent corroborative of this view, there is the slight importance given to sacrifice in most of these works.

WORKS ENTITLED APOCALYPTIC

Classes of Books:

In the classification of plants and animals in natural science the various orders and genera present the observer with some classes that have all the features that characterize the general Mass prominent and easily observable, while in others these features are so far from prominent that to the casual observer they are invisible. This may be seen in the apocalyptic writings: there are some that present all the marks of Apocalypses, such as the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses and the Apocalypse of Baruch. They all claim to be revelations of the future — a future which begins, however, from the days of some ancient saint — and then, passing over the time of its actual composition, ends with the coming of the Messiah, the setting up of the Messianic kingdom and the end of the world. There are others, like the Book of Jubilees, in which the revelation avowedly looks back, and which thus contain an amount of legendary matter. One of the books which are usually reckoned in this class, has, unlike most of the Apocalypses, which are in prose, taken the Book of Psalms as its model — the Psalter of Solomon. A very considerable number of the works before us take the form of farewell counsels on the part of this or that patriarch. The most famous of these is the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. Although the great masonry have been written in Hebrew or Aramaic by Jews resident in Palestine, the Sibylline books,
composed to a great extent by Jews of Alexandria, present an exception to this.

We shall in the remainder of the art consider these sub-classes in the order now mentioned:

(1) Typical Apocalypses;
(2) Legendary Testaments;
(3) Psalmic;
(4) Testaments;
(5) Sibylline Oracles.

I. Apocalypses Proper.

As above indicated, all these take the Book of Daniel as their model, and imitate it more or less closely. One peculiarity in this connection must be referred to. While we have already said these later Apocalypses were practically unknown by the Jews of a couple of centuries after the Christian era, the Book of Daniel was universally regarded as authoritative alike by Jews and Christians. In considering these works, we shall restrict ourselves to those Apocalypses that, whether Jewish or Christian by religion, are the production of those who were Jews by nation.

1. Enoch Books:

The most important of these is the Book, or rather, Books of Enoch. After having been quoted in Jude and noticed by several of the Fathers, this work disappeared from the knowledge of the Christian church.

(1) History of the Books.

Fairly copious extracts from this collection of books had been made by George Syncellus, the 8th century chronographer. With the exception of those fragments, all the writings attributed to Enoch had disappeared from the ken of European scholars. In the last quarter of the 18th century. Bruce, the Abyssinian traveler, brought to Europe three copies of the Book of Enoch in Ethiopic, which had been regarded as canonical by the Abyssinian church, and had consequently been preserved by them. Of
these three copies, one he retained in Kinnaird House, another he presented to the Bodleian Library in Oxford, the third he gave to the Royal Library in Paris. For more than a quarter of a century these manuscripts remained as unknown as if they had still been in Abyssinia. In the year 1800 Sylvestre de Sacy published an article on Enoch in which he gave a translation of the first sixteen chapters. This was drawn from the Parisian copy. Twenty-one years after Archbishop Laurence published a translation of the whole work from the manuscript in the Bodleian. Seventeen years after he published the text from the same MS. The expedition to Magdala under Lord Napier brought a number of fresh manuscripts to Europe; the German missionaries, for whose release the advance had been undertaken, brought a number to Germany, while a number came to the British Museum. Some other travelers had brought from the East manuscripts of this precious book. Flemming, the latest editor of the text, claims to have used 26 manuscripts. It needs but a cursory study of the Ethiopic text to see that it is a translation from a Greek original. The quotations in George Syncellus confirmed this, with the exception of a small fragment published by Mai. Until the last decade of last century. Syncellus’ fragments formed the only remains of the Greek text known. In 1892 M. Bouriant published from manuscripts found in Gizeh, Cairo, the Greek of the first 32 chapters. More of the Greek may be discovered in Egypt. Meantime, we have the Greek of chapters 1 — 32, and from the Vatican fragment a portion of chapter 89. A study of the Greek shows it also to have been a translation from a Hebrew original. Of this Hebrew original, however, no part has come down to us.

As we have it, it is very much a conglomeration of fragments of various authorship. It is impossible to say whether the Greek translator was the collector of these fragments or whether, when the mass of material came into his hands, the interpolations had already taken place. However, the probability, judging from the usual practice of translators, is that as he got the book, so he translated it.

(2) Summary.

The first chapter gives an account of the purpose of the book, Enoch 2 through 5 an account of his survey of the heavens. With Enoch 6 begins the book proper. Chapters 6 through 19 give an account of the fallen angels
and Enoch’s relation to them. Chapters 20 through 36 narrate Enoch’s wanderings through the universe, and give an account of the place of punishment, and the secrets of the West and of the center of the earth. This may be regarded as the First Book of Enoch, the Book of the Angels. With chapter 37 begins the Book of Similitudes. The first Similitude (chapters 37 through 44) represents the future kingdom of God, the dwelling of the righteous and of the angels; and finally all the secrets of the heavens. This last portion is interesting as revealing the succession of the parts of this conglomeration — the more elaborate the astronomy, the later; the simpler, the earlier. The second Similitude (chapters 46 through 57) brings in the Son of Man as a superhuman if not also superangelic being, who is to come to earth as the Messiah. The third Similitude occupies chapters 58 through 71, and gives an account of the glory of the Messiah and of the subjugation of the kings of the earth under Him. There is interpolated a long account of Leviathan and Behemoth. There are also Noachian fragments inserted. The Book of the Courses of the Luminaries occupies the next eleven chapters, and subjoined to these are two visions (chapters 83 through 90), in the latter of which is an account of the history of the world to the Maccabean Struggle. Fourteen chapters which follow may be called “The Exhortations of Enoch.” The exhortations are emphasized by an exposition of the history of the world in 10 successive weeks. It may be noted here that there is a dislocation. The passage Enoch 91:12 contains the 8, 9, and 10 weeks, while chapter 93 gives an account of the previous 7. After chapter 104 there are series of sections of varying origin which may be regarded as appendices. There are throughout these books many interpolations. The most observable of these are what are known as “Noachian Fragments,” portions in which Noah and not Enoch is the hero and spokesman. There are, besides, a number of universally acknowledged interpolations, and some that are held by some to be interpolated, are regarded by others as intimately related to the immediate context. The literary merit of the different portions is various: of none of them can it be called high. The Book of Similitudes, with its revelations of heaven and hell, is probably the finest.

(3) Language.

We have the complete books only in Ethiopic. The Ethiopic, however, is not, as already observed, the original language of the writings. The
numerous portions of it which still survive in Greek, prove that at all
events our Ethiopic is a translation from the Greek. The question of how
far it is the original is easily settled. The angels assemble on Mt. Hermon,
we are told (En 6), and bind themselves by an oath or curse: “and they
called it Mount Hermon because they had sworn and bound themselves by
mutual imprecation upon it.” This has a meaning only in Hebrew or
Aramaic, not in Greek. A very interesting piece of evidence of the original
language is obtained from a blunder. In Enoch 90:38 we are told that “they
all became white bullocks, and the first was the Word” (nagara). As for
the appearance of this term, from its connection it is obvious that some
sort of bullocks is intended. In Hebrew the wild ox is called [re’em]
(Aramaic [rima]). The Greek translators, having no Greek equivalent
available, transliterated as rem or rema. This the translators confused with
Tema, “a word.” It is impossible to decide with anything like certainty
which of the two languages, Hebrew or Aramaic, was the original, though
from the sacred character ascribed to Enoch the probability is in favor of
its being Hebrew.

(4) Date.

The question of date is twofold. Since Enoch is really made up of a
collection of books and fragments of books, the question of the temporal
relation of these to each other is the primary one. The common view is
that chapters 1 through 36 and 72 through 91 are by the same author, and
form the nucleus of the whole. Although the weighty authority of Dr.
Charles is against assigning these portions to one author, the resemblances
are numerous and seem to us by no means so superficial as he would
regard them. He, with most critics, would regard the Book of Similitudes as
later. Nevertheless, we venture to differ from this view, for reasons which
we shall assign.

(5) Internal Chronology: The Book of Noah.

The fragments of the Book of Noah above alluded to present an intrusive
element in the Book of Enoch. These, though fairly numerous, are not so
numerous as Dr. Charles would claim. Those that show clear traces not
only of being interpolations, but also of being interpolations from this
Book of Noah, are found only in those portions of the Book that appear to
be written by the author of Enoch 37 through 71. In them and in the
Noachian fragments there are astronomical portions, as there are also in the
portion that seems to proceed from another hand, chapters 1 through 36;
72 through 91. When these are compared, the simplest account of the
phenomena of the heavens is found in the non-Noachian portions, the first
noted chapters 37 through 71; 92 through 107; the next in complexity is
that found in the Noachian interpolations; the most complex is that
contained in chapters 72 through 91. This would seem to indicate that the
earliest written portion was chapters 37 through 71; 92 through 107. Our
view of the date of this middle portion of En, the Book of Similitudes, is
opposed by Dr. Stanton (Jewish and Christian Messiah, 60 through 63;
241 through 44), who maintains that it is post-Christian. For this decision
he rests mainly on the use of the title “Son of Man.” This title, he says, as
applied to the Messiah, is unknown in rabbinic literature. Rabbinic
literature is all so late as to be of no value. The Mishna has few traces of
Messianic belief, and was not committed to writing till the end of the 2nd
century, when the difference between church and synagogue was
accentuated. He further states that it was not understood by the Jews who
heard our Lord, and brings as proof John 12:34, “The Son of Man must
be lifted up. Who is this — the Son of Man?” Dr. Stanton (Jewish and
Christian Messiah, 241) so translates the passage. To us, the last clause is
a mistranslation. The Greek usage in regard to houtos ho would lead us to
translate: “Who is this peculiar kind of Son of Man?” This is the meaning
which suits the context. our Lord had not in all the preceding speech used
the title “Son of Man” of Himself. This sentence really proves that the
multitude regarded the title as equivalent to Messiah or Christ. It might be
paraphrased, “The Christ abideth ever; how sayest thou then, the Christ
must be lifted up? Who is this Christ?” In fact, our Lord’s adoption of the
title is unintelligible unless it were understood by His audience as a claim
to being Messiah. It had the advantage that it could not be reported to the
Romans as treasonable. There are supplementary portions of Enoch which
may be neglected. At first sight 10:1-3 appear to declare themselves as
Noacinan, but close inspection shows this to be a misapprehension. If we
take the Greek text of Syncellus, Uriel the angel sent to Noah. The
Ethiopic and Gizeh Greek are at this point clearly corrupt. Then the
introduction of Raphael implies that the first portion of this chapter and
this Raphael section are by the same author. But the Raphael section has
to do with the binding of Azazel, a person intimately connected with the earlier history of the Jews. Should it be objected that according to the Massoretic reckoning, as according to that of the Septuagint, Noah and Enoch were not living together, it may be answered that according to the Samaritan they were for 180 years contemporaries. In chapter 68 Noah speaks of Enoch as his grandfather, and assumes him to be a contemporary of himself. Moreover, we must not expect precise accuracy from Apocalyptists.

(6) External chronology.

When the internal chronology of the book is fixed, the way is open for considering the relation of external chronology. Dr. Charles has proved that the Book of Jubilees implies the Noachian portion in the Enoch Books. There are notices of the existence of a Book of Noah (Jub 10:13). There is reference also to a Book of Enoch (Jub 21:10). Dr Charles would date the Book of Jubilees between 135 and 105 BC. If, then, the Book of Noah was already known, and, as we have seen, the Book of Enoch was yet older, it would be impossible to date Enoch earlier than 160 BC. Personally we are not quite convinced of the correctness of Dr. Charles’ reasonings as to the date of the Book of Jubilees, as will be shown at more length later. There appears to us a reference in Enoch 66:5 to the campaign of Antiochus the Great against the Parthians and the Medes. Early in his reign (220 BC) he had made an expedition to the East against the revolted provinces of Media and Persia, which he subdued. This was followed (217 BC) by a campaign in Palestine, which at first successful, ended in the defeat of Raphia. In the year 212 BC he made a second expedition to the East, in which he invaded India, and subdued into alliance the formidable Parthian and Bactrian kingdoms. The expectation was natural that now, having gained such an access of power and reputation, Antiochus would desire to wipe out the dishonor of Raphia. It was to be anticipated that along with the nationalities from which ordinarily the Syriac armies were recruited, the Parthians would be found, and the earlier subdued Medes. The description of the treading down of the land of the Elect is too mild for a description of the desecration wrought by Epiphanes. If we are right, we may fix on 205 BC, as the probable date of the nucleus. The Book of the Lummaries of the Heavens which we feel inclined to attribute to the same hand as Enoch 1 through 36 contains a history of Israel that terminates with the Maccabean
Struggle still proceeding. Dr. Charles would date this portion at 161 BC. Personally, we should be inclined to place it a few years earlier. He would place chapters 1 through 36 before the Maccabean Struggle. According to our thinking the genuine Noachian fragments fall between these. The Book of Noah seems to have existed as a separate book in the time when the Book of Jubilees was written. It is dependent on Enoch, and therefore after it. The use of portions taken from it to interpolate in the Enoch Books must have taken place before the Maccabean Struggle. There are other passages that have every appearance of being interpolations, the date of which it is impossible to fix with any definiteness.

(7) Slavonic Enoch.

In the year 1892 the attention of Dr. Charles was directed to the fact that a Book of Enoch was extant in Slavonic. Perusal proved it not to be a version of the book before us, but another and later pseudepigraphic book, taking, as the earlier had done, the name of Enoch. It is totally independent of the Ethiopic Enoch Book, as is seen by the most cursory consideration. It begins by giving an account of Enoch’s instruction to his descendants how he had been taken up to the seventh heaven. Another manuscript adds other three heavens. In the third (?) heaven Enoch is shown the place of the punishment of the wicked. In the description of the fourth heaven there is an account of the physical conditions of the universe, in which the year is said to be 365 1/4 days; but the course of the sun is stated as a course of 227 days; which appears to be all that is accounted for. Here the independence of the Slavonic Enoch is clear, as the Ethiopic Enoch makes the year 364 days. There are many points of resemblance which show that the writer of the Slavonic Enoch had before him the book which has come down to us in Ethiopic, but the relationship is not by any means so close as to be called dependence. The definite numbering of the heavens into seven or ten is a proof of its later date. It is related to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and also to the Ascension of Isaiah. We cannot quite acknowledge the cogency of the proofs that any portion of this Book has been composed in Greek: hence, we cannot agree with Dr. Charles that it was composed in Alexandria. The resemblances to Philo are too few and slight to be convincing. That some of it was originally Hebrew Dr. Charles admits. The date Dr. Charles assigns to it — 1-50 AD — seems reasonable, with this qualification, that it seems nearer the later than the
earlier of these dates. A double translation, with the certainty of some interpolations and the probability of many more, makes any decided Judgment as to date hazardous, so much has to depend on resemblances between books in cases where it is impossible to decide which is dependent on which. It is at once an interesting and a valuable addition to our knowledge of the mind of the age preceding the publication of the gospel.

(8) Secrets of Enoch.

In imitation of this Book and in some sense in dependence on it was written a rabbinic Book of the Secrets of Enoch. It is attributed to Rabbi Ishmael, who was a prominent figure in the rebellion of Barcochba. Enoch is there noted as Metatron. It follows to some extent the course of the Slavonic Book of Enoch. It is this book that is referred to in the Talmud, not the more important book quoted by Jude.

2. Apocalypse of Baruch:

Though not without its value in estimating the trend of pre-Christian speculation, the Apocalypse of Baruch did not influence thought in the way that the Books of Enoch have done. It is neither quoted nor referred to by any of the Christian Fathers. Irenaeus (V, 33) quotes a saying which he attributes to our Lord on the authority of Papias, who claims to have in this attribution the authority of John behind him. This saying we find in the Apocalypse before us, though considerably expanded. In regard to this, in the first place we have only the Latin version of Irenaeus, not the Greek original. In the next place, even though the Latin may be a faithful translation of the Greek, still it is only a quotation from a lost book, which itself records traditions. The fact that it is in the shortest form in the book before us would seem to indicate that it is the original. If that is so, we may regard it as having a certain vogue among the Essenian school and their sympathizers. In the Syriac Apocrypha published by Lagarde there is a small book entitled “The Epistle of Baruch the Scribe.” This occurs at the end of our Apocalypse of Baruch. In Cyprian’s Test. contra Jud., III, 29 we have a passage of considerable length attributed to Bar, a few words of which agree with a passage in this Apocalypse. Hippolytus quotes an oath used by certain Gnostics which he says is found in the Book of Baruch.
There are features in the passage thus quoted which seem to be echoes of the book before us. This was all that was known of the Apocalypse of Baruch until the last half-century, when Ceriani discovered a Syriac version of it in the Arabroaian Library in Milan, nearly complete.

(1) Summary.

It begins after the model of a prophecy: “The word of the Lord came to Baruch, the son of Neriah, saying.” In this he follows the phraseology of Jeremiah. He and Jeremiah are commanded to leave Jerusalem as God is about to pour forth His judgment upon it. Baruch entreats God for his city, and God shows him that the punishment will be temporary. Then the Chaldeans come to fulfill what God has threatened, but Baruch is shown the angel ministers of Divine vengeance saving the sacred vessels by calling upon the earth to swallow them up. Then the angels helped the Chaldeans to overthrow the walls of Jerusalem. Notwithstanding that in the canonical Book of Jeremiah (43:6,7) and in 2 Kings the prophet goes down to Egypt, Baruch declares that Jeremiah is sent to comfort the captives in Babylon, while he, Baruch, is to remain in Judea. He mourns over Jerusalem and denounces woes in Babylon (chapters 1 through 12). While he is standing upon Mt. Zion he is called into colloquy with God as to the method of Divine dealing with Judah, and a revelation is promised him (chapters 13 through 20). This revelation is introduced by a prayer of Baruch followed by a colloquy with the Almighty. Baruch asks, “Will that tribulation continue a long time?” He is answered that there will be twelve successive different forms of judgment which shall come. Then follows an enigmatic sentence, “Two parts weeks of seven weeks” are “the measure and reckoning of the time” which probably means that each of the parts is a jubilee or half a century. At the termination of this period the Messiah is to appear. Here a description is given of the glories of the Messianic kingdom in the course of which occurs the passage already referred to as quoted by Papias (chapters 21 through 30). The writer, forgetting what he has already said of the desolation of Jerusalem, makes Baruch assemble the Elders of Jerusalem and announce that he is going to retire into solitude. In his retirement he has a vision of a wooded hill, and at the foot of it is a vine growing and beside the vine a spring of water. This fountain swelled and became tempestuous, sweeping away all the forest on the hill but one great cedar. It, too, falls at length. The interpretation is given The forest is the
fourth Empire of Daniel — the Roman — the many magistracies being symbolized by the numerous trees of the forest. The Messiah is the vine and the fountain. It is probable that Pompey is the leader referred to (Baruch 31 through 40). Then follows a colloquy of Baruch first with God, then with his son and the Elders of the people. A long prayer with God’s answer which includes a description of the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous — the latter is next given with greater fullness (Baruch 41 through 52). Mother vision is given to Baruch of twelve showers of rain alternately bright and dark and a final torrent blacker than anything else and closed by a bright light. The angel Runnel comes to Baruch to interpret the vision. It represents the history of Israel to the return to Judea under the decree of Cyrus. The last dark waters represent the Maccabean Struggle. It would seem as if the vision carried the conflict on to the fratricidal conflict between John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus (Baruch 53 through 77). Then follows the epistle to the nine and a half tribes (Baruch 78 through 87).

(2) Structure.

Preliminary to anything further is the discussion of the state of the book — how far it is one, how far it is composite or interpolated. That it contains different portions is obvious on the slightest careful study. The first portion that the reader marks off is the “epistle to the nine tribes and a half.” As has already been mentioned this portion appears independently and is preserved by Lagarde in his Libri Vet. Test. Apocryphi, in which collection it precedes the ordinary apocryphal Book of Baruch. The last section, which relates how this epistle was sent to the nine tribes and a half by an eagle, is omitted. The last section (chapter 79) has been added, and has been modified in order to introduce this epistle. It is not at all in the spirit of the rest of this Apocalypse that the tribes carried away captive by “Salmanasser, king of Assyria” have any share in the blessings revealed in the vision. The epistle itself merely narrates the capture of the city, and the help of the angels who hid the sacred vessels. It is to be noted that in the earlier portion of this Apocalypse it is the earth that opens her mouth and swallows down the sacred vessels. Another division reveals itself on further scrutiny. From the beginning to the end of chapter 30 the course of the narrative is fairly continuous. A revelation is promised, and in the end we have a picture of the glory and plenty of the times of the
Messiah. The next section begins with an exhortation which has little bearing on what has preceded. Then follows the vision of the forest and the surviving tree. The colloquy and the prayers that follow, to chapter 52, are all connected, though not closely. But close connection is not to be expected from an oriental and an Apocalyptist. Then follow the sections connected with the vision of the twelve showers of rain, and its interpretation. There are thus five independent sections exclusive of interpolations which may be due to different writers.

(3) Language.

In the first place it is clear that the Syriac in which the work has come down to us is itself a translation from Greek. The manuscript of Ceriani states this in its title. This is confirmed by Graecisms filtering through, as ho Manasseh in Baruch 65:1, where ho represents the Greek article. In some cases the readings that are unintelligible can be explained by translation back into Greek, as shown by Dr. Charles. The most convincing is the use made of this book by the writer of the “Rest of the Words of Baruch,” who wrote in Greek. Although not a few scholars have followed Langen in maintaining that Greek was the original tongue, careful investigation proves that behind the Greek was Hebrew. The strongest of these proofs is that the echoes of Scriptural texts are almost invariably from the Hebrew as against the Septuagint. Thus, in 6:8, Jeremiah three times addresses the earth and calls upon it to hear the word of the Lord. So it is in the Massoretic Text and in the Vulgate, but not in the Septuagint, where the word “earth” is only given twice. There are several other instances. Dr. Charles has carefully compared the idiomatic phrases and sees proof that usages of the Massoretic Text have been preserved in the Greek, and thence conveyed to the Syriac. The most interesting of these is the peculiar Hebrew idiom of infinitive with finite verb to emphasize the action narrated. This is rendered in Septuagint sometimes by cognate noun and verb, and sometimes by participle and verb. The examples chosen by Dr. Charles have the disadvantage that none of them show the effect on this idiom of passing through the two languages, Greek and Syriac. In Paulus Tellensis there are examples — e.g. 2 Kings 18:33. He is scarcely accurate in saying that this idiom never occurs in the Peshitta unless it is in the Greek. See Luke 1:22; John 13:29, etc., as examples to the contrary. The proof seems conclusive that Hebrew was the original
language of this Apocalypse, and that it was first translated into Greek, and from that into Syriac. From this it follows almost necessarily that its place of origin was Palestine. That it has had practically no effect on Jewish literature, and was potent enough among the Christians to lead a Christian about the middle of the 2nd Christian century to compose an addition to it, proves to our thinking its Essenian origin.

(4) Date.

Although the writer assumes the destruction of Jerusalem by the army of the Chaldeans, he evidently has no conception of what such a catastrophe would really mean. He has no conception of the length of time occupied by a siege, the terrors of famine, or the desolation that follows the capture of a city. Josephus tells us (BJ, VII, i, 1) that save a portion of the west wall and three towers, the city was utterly razed to the ground — ”there was nothing left to make those who came there believe that ever it had been inhabited.” Yet, when endeavoring to realize the similar destruction which had befallen the city under Nebuchadnezzar, he speaks of himself sitting “before the gates of the temple” (Baruch 10:5), when the gates had wholly disappeared. Again, he assembles the people and their elders “after these things” “in the valley of the Kedron.” The Apocalypse must be dated at all events considerably before 70 AD. On the other hand, it is subsequent to the first part of En; it assumes it as known (Baruch 56:10-13). But a closer discrimination may be reached. In the vision of the wood and the one tree that survives we have Pompey pointed out clearly. The multitude of trees points to the numerous magistracies of Rome. (Compare description of Senate of Rome in 1 Macc 8:15.) The seer in his vision sees all these swept away and one remaining. It could not be an emperor, as that title was regarded as equivalent to “king,” as Nero in the Ascension of Isaiah is called “the matricide king.” The only other besides Pompey likely to be pointed to would be Julius Caesar. But the fall of the great desecrator of the temple, which the seer foresaw, would not have failed to be noted as succeeded by that of Caesar who had conquered him. It is difficult for us to realize the position Pompey occupied in the eyes especially of the eastern world before the outbreak of the civil war. Cicero’s letters and his oration Pro lege Manilia show the way Pompey filled the horizon even in republican Rome, in a society most of the prominent members of which claimed a descent that would have enabled them to look down on Pompey.
But in the East he had enjoyed dictatorial powers. His intervention in the contest between the brothers John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus could not fail to impress the Jews, and his desecration of the temple would mark him off for a very special destruction. The date is so far before the death of Pompey (48 BC) — though after the desecration of the temple — that the possibility of anyone entering into conflict with him is not dreamed of. When we turn to the twelve showers, we are led to the time of this struggle also as that which shall immediately precede the coming of the Messiah. Another note of time is to be found in Baruch 28 — ”The measure and reckoning of the time are two parts, weeks of seven weeks.” This we regard as two jubilees — i.e. approximately a century. The point to be fixed is the time from which this century is to be reckoned. To our idea it must be from some event connected with the temple. Such an event was the dedication of the temple by Judas Maccabeus in the 148th year of the Seleucid era — that is, 163 BC. A century brings us exactly to the year of Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem and desecration of the temple. Thus three different lines converge in pointing to 60 or 59 BC as the date at which this book was written.

(5) Relation to Other Books.

The strange mingling of knowledge of Scripture and ignorance of it is a phenomenon to be observed. The very first clause contains a gross anachronism, whatever explanation may be given of the statement. Taken with what follows, the statement is that Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, “in the 25th year of Jeconiah, king of Judah.” This naturally ought to mean the 25th year of the reign of Jeconiah, but he only reigned three months. Whether the date is reckoned from his life or his captivity, it will not suit the date of the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Another strange blunder appears in the subjoined “Epistle of Baruch”; the number of northern tribes who rebelled against Rehoboam is confused, with that of the tribes settled on the west of Jordan, and that of the tribes following the House of David with that of those on the east of Jordan. Yet the general course of Biblical history is quite understood. The author seems fairly well acquainted with Jeremiah and Ps, as there are frequent echoes of these books. Most marked is the connection between this Apocalypse and the other books of the same class. This connection is not so obvious in quotable sentences as in the general atmosphere. This is
very marked in regard to the Enoch books, Ethiopic and Slavonic. In the case of the latter, of course, the resemblance is not imitation on the part of the writer of this Apocalypse. One marked distinction, one that precludes any thought of direct imitation, is the elaborate angelology of the Enoch books as compared with the one name which appears in the Apocalypse of Baruch. The book with which the present Apocalypse has closest relation is 2 (4) Esdras. Dr. Charles has given at the end of his translation of the work before us (Apoc of Baruch, 171) a long list of resemblances, not always of equal value. Sometimes the references are inaccurate. The main thing to be observed is that while 2 Esdras as we have it has on the one hand a markedly Christian coloring, which it seems impossible to attribute to interpolation, and on the other, to have seen the desolation of Jerusalem under the Romans, there is no Christian element in the genuine Baruch, and the desolation is more sentimental as proved by the inability to realize the conditions consequent on the capture of the city by victorious enemies.

(6) The Rest of the Words of Baruch.

One of the evidences of the influence our Apocalypse had in the Christian community is the composition by a Christian of “The Rest of the Words of Baruch” (or Jer). This was found, like so many other treasures, by Ceriani in the Ambrosian Library, Milan. Jeremiah is the principal spokesman in the book. It is revealed to him that Jerusalem is to be given into the hands of the Chaldeans, and he announces this to Baruch. He is desirous to save Abimelech (Ebedmelech), and prays God for him, and Abimelech is sent away out of the city while the angels are overturning it. He goes to the vineyard of Agrippa and falls asleep. His sleep continues sixty years. When, arising from sleep, he enters Jerusalem again he does not recognize it. An angel leads him to Baruch who had made his abode in a tank. Baruch writes to Jeremiah, who has departed to Babylon. His letter is conveyed by an eagle. Jeremiah on receipt of this epistle collects all the captives and leads them back to Jerusalem. Certain of them would not submit to the law in all its strictness, but, turning aside, founded Samaria. After some time Jeremiah dies, rises again on the third day and preaches Christ as the Son of God, and is stoned by the Jews. A noticeable thing is the relatively accurate account of the date of Christ’s appearance after the return from the captivity, 477 years, only it must be calculated from the
reign of Artaxerxes and to the resurrection. This, however, would make Jeremiah nearly two hundred years old. Such a thing, however, is not a matter that would disturb a Jewish chronologer. “The Rest of the Words of Baruch” seems to have been written by a Christian Jew in Palestine before the rebellion of Barcochba.

3. The Assumption of Moses:

In the Epistle of Jude is a reference to a conflict between the archangel Michael and Satan, when they “disputed about the body of Moses.” Origen (de Princip, iii.2) attributes this to a book he calls Ascensio Mosis. Clement Alexandrinus gives an account of the burial of Moses quoted from the same book. There are several references to the book up to the 6th century, but thereafter it disappeared till Ceriani found the fragment of it which is published in the Acta Sacra et Profana (Vol I). This fragment is in Latin. It is full of blunders, some due to transcription, proving that the last scribe had but an imperfect knowledge of the tongue in which he wrote. Some of the blunders go farther back and seem to have been due to the scribe who translated it from Greek. Even such a common word as *thilpsis* (“affliction”) he did not know, but attempted, by no means with conspicuous success, to transliterate it as *clipsis*. So with *allophuloi* “foreigners,” the common Septuagint equivalent of “Philistine,” and yet commoner *skene* (“a tent”) and several others. It probably was dictated, as some of the blunders of the copyist may be better explained as mistakes in hearing, as *fynicis* for *Phoenices*, and venient for veniet. Some, however, are due to blunders of sight on the part of the translator, as monses for *moyses*. From this we may deduce that he read from a manuscript in cursive characters, in which “n” and “u” were alike. This Milan manuscript has been frequently edited. Dr Charles has suggested with great plausibility that there were two works, a Testament of Moses, and an Assumption, and that these have been combined; and, while *Jude 1:9* is derived from the Assumption, as also the quotation in Clement of Alexandria, he thinks that *Jude 1:16* is derived from separate clauses of the Testament. It may be observed that in the fragment which has been preserved to us, neither the passages in Clement nor that referred to in *Jude 1:16* are to be found.

(1) Summary.
Moses, now in the plain of Moab, calls Joshua to him and gives him commands for the people. He had already blessed them tribe by tribe. Now he calls his successor to him and urges him to be of good courage. He tells him that the world has been created for Israel, and that he, Moses, had been ordained from before the foundation of the world to be the mediator of this covenant. These commands are to be written down and preserved in clay jars full of cedar oil. This sentence is added to explain the discovery and publication. A rapid summary of the history of Israel to the fall of the Northern Kingdom follows. The successive reigns are called years — eighteen years before the division of the kingdom, 15 Judges and Saul, David and Solomon, and nineteen after, the kings from Jeroboam to Hoshea. The Southern Kingdom has twenty years or reigns. The Southern Kingdom was to fall before Nebuchadnezzar, the king from the East who would cover the land with his cavalry. When they are in captivity one prays for them. Here follows a prayer modeled on Daniel 9:4-19 — almost a version of it. In this connection it may be noted that of the ten tribes it is asserted they will multiply among the Gentiles. There is a sudden leap forward to the time of the Greek domination. Singularly, the period of the Maccabees does not appear in this sketch of history. The times of Judas Maccabeus are not mentioned, but the kings of his house, the descendants of Simon, are referred to as “Kings ruling shall rise from them, who shall be called priests of the Most High God.” To them follows Herod, rex petulans, “who will not be of the race of the priests.” He will execute judgment on the people like those of Egypt. Herod is to leave children who will reign after him for a short period. The Roman emperor is to put an end to their rule and to burn up Jerusalem. Then comes a mutilated chapter, which, while following in the narrative, may yet be only another aspect of the oppression. The Roman officials figure duly as the source of this, and the Sadducean high-priestly party as their instruments. The resemblance to the terms in which our Lord denounces the Pharisees leads one to think that they, too, are meant by the Essene authors. We have noted above that the Maccabean period is completely omitted. The persecution under Antiochus appears in Assumption of Moses 8 and 9. With Dr. Charles we are inclined to think they have been displaced. In chapter 9 occurs the reference to the mysterious Taxo with his seven sons. Dr. Charles is quite sure the reference is to the seven sons of the widow who suffered before Antiochus Epiphanes as related in 2 Macc
8 through 17), but the “mother” is the prominent person in all the forms of the story, while in no form of it is their father mentioned. It is to be noted that if T of this mysterious name, represents taw (t) in the Hebrew (= 400), and xi represents the letter camek (c) (= 60) which occupies the same place in the Hebrew alphabet, and if the O represents waw (w) (= 6), adding those numbers together we have the number 466, which is the sum of the letters of Shimeon. But nothing in the history of the second son of Mattathias resembles the history of the mysterious Taxo. On this subject the reader is recommended to study Charles, Assumption of Moses, 32 through 34. Taxo recommends his sons, having fasted to retire into a cave, and rather to die than to transgress the commands of God. In this conduct there is a suggestion of the action of several of the pious in the beginning of the Antiochus persecutions. Taxo then breaks into a song of praise to God, in the course of which he describes the final discomfiture of the enemies of God and of His people. The establishment of the Messianic kingdom is to be 250 times after the Assumption of Moses. The interpretation of this is one of the difficulties in regard to this Apocalypse. Langen takes the times as equivalent to decades, and Dr. Charles as year-weeks. The latter seems a more probable meaning of “time,” as more in the line of Jewish thought. It should be noted that Dr. Charles thinks illius adventum refers not to the Messiah’s coming, but to the last judgment. In answer to the declaration of Moses as to his approaching death, Joshua rends his garments and breaks forth into lamentations, wondering who will lead on the people when his master has departed. There is one phrase that seems to imply a tincture of classical culture. Joshua says of Moses, “All the world is thy Sepulchre,” which seems to be a reminiscence of Pericles’ funeral oration (Thucyd. ii.4), “The whole earth is the monument of men of renown.” He then casts himself at the feet of Moses. His master encourages him and promises him success. At this point the fragment ends. It is to be expected that shortly after this would occur the passage quoted by Clement of Alexandria, and still later that quoted in Jude.

(2) Structure.

It seems to have been united with one, if not two other books, a “Testament of Moses” and our Book of Jubilees. It would seem that in the present work we have mostly the “Testament.” The insertion of the word receptione after morte in Assumption of Moses 10:12 indicates that when
this copy was made the two writings were united. As above remarked, there appears to have been a displacement of chapters 8 and 9; they ought to have been placed between chapters 4 and 5.

(3) Language.

As already mentioned, the manuscript found by Ceriani in the Ambrosian Library is in Latin. No one, however, has maintained that this was the language in which it was originally written. It is evidently a translation from the Greek. A number of Greek words are transliterated, some of them common enough. So clearly does the Greek shine through, that Hilgenfeld has reproduced what he imagines the Greek text to have been. That having been settled, a further question rises, Is the Greek the original tongue, or was it, too, a translation from a Sere original? The first alternative is that adopted by Hilgenfeld. His arguments from the alleged impossibility of certain grammatical constructions being found in Hebrew are due to mistake. The presence of such words as Allofile and Deuteronomion simply prove that in translating a book which claimed to be written about Moses, the writer followed the diction used by the Septuagint, just as Archbishop Laurence in translating Enoch used the diction of the King James Version of the Bible. These questions have been ably investigated by Dr. Charles in his edition of the Assumption of Moses (42 through 45). He shows a number of Semitic idioms which have persisted through the Greek — some cases in which the meaning can only be got by reconstructing the Hebrew text. Again, corruption can only be explained by means of a Semitic text. It might be suggested that a falsarius writing in Greek would naturally employ the diction of the Septuagint as has been done frequently in English; the diction of the King James Version is used to cover the imitation of a sacred book. The fact that style was so little regarded as a means of settling dates and authorship renders this unlikely. The more delicate question of which of the two Sere tongues — Aramaic or Hebrew — is employed, is more difficult to settle. There are, however, one or two cases in which we seem to see traces of the waw conversive — a construction peculiar to Hebrew — e.g. 8:2, “Those who conceal (their circumcision) he will torture and has delivered up to be led to prison.” The ignorance of the scribe may, however, be revoked to explain this. On the other hand the change of tense is so violent that even an ignorant scribe would not be likely to make it by mistake. Over and above, a narrative
attributed to Joshua and asserted to be written down by him at the
dictation of Moses, would necessarily be in Hebrew. From this we would
deduce that Hebrew rather than Aramaic has been the Semitic original.

(4) Date.

The identification of the rex petulans with Herod and the statement that he
should be succeeded by his sons who should reign a short time, fix the date
of the composition of the work before us within narrow limits. It must
have been written after the death of Herod and also after the deposition of
Archelaus, 6 AD, and before it was seen that Antipas and Philip were
secure on their thrones. Thus we cannot date it later than 7 or 8 AD. The
intense hatred of the Herodians was a characteristic of this time. Later they
came to be admired by the patriotic party.

(5) Relation to Other Books.

The most striking phrase is the name given to Moses — arbiter testamenti,
“the mediator of the covenant,” which we find repeatedly used in the
Epistle to the Hebrews: mesites is the Greek translation of [mokhiach] in
Job 9:33, but in translating the Epistle to the Hebrews into Hebrew
Delitzsch uses [carcor], a purely rabbinic word. Another rendering is
[menatseach]. There are several echoes in this book of passages in the Old
Testament, as the address to Joshua (1:1 ff) is parallel with
Deuteronomy 31:7 f. The prayer in Assumption of Moses 4, as before
observed, is modeled on Daniel 9:4-19. There are traces of acquaintance
with the Psalter of Solomon in Assumption of Moses 5 as compared with
Psalm 4. In these there appear to be echoes of the present work in our
Lord’s description of the Pharisees, when we compare Matthew 23 with
Assumption of Moses 5.

There is a fragment published by Ceriani entitled “History and Life
(diegesis kai politeia) of Adam, Which, Was Revealed by God to Moses,
His Servant.” It is an account of the life of our first parents after the death
of Abel to their own death. It has been composed to all appearance in
Greek, and really belongs not to Mosaic literature, but to that connected
with Adam. It is to be noted that to Cain and Abel other names are given
besides those so well known. They are called Adiaphotos and Amilabes,
names of no assignable origin. There are no evidences of Christian
influence; from this one would be led to regard it as a Jewish writing; as the middle of it has been lost, any decision is to be made with caution.

4. The Ascension of Isaiah:

The Ascension of Isaiah was often referred to by name in the works of early Christian Fathers, especially by Origen. It is called by him “The Apocryphon of Isaiah.” Epiphanes gives it the title by which it is more commonly known. Now that we have the book, we find numerous echoes of it. Indeed, Origen claims that Hebrews 11:37 contains a reference to it in speaking of saints who were sawn asunder. Justin Martyr speaks of the death of Isaiah in terms that imply an acquaintance with this book. It had disappeared till Archbishop Laurence found a copy of it in Ethiopic on a London book-stall. The capture of Magdala brought home more manuscripts. A portion of it had been printed in Venice from a Latin version.

(1) Summary.

In the 26th year of his reign Hezekiah calls Isaiah before him to deliver certain writings into his hand. Isaiah informs him that the devil Sammael Malkira would take possession of his son Manasseh, and that he, Isaiah, will be sawn asunder by his hand. On hearing this, Hezekiah would order his son to be killed, but Isaiah tells him that the Chosen One will render his counsel vain. On the death of his father, Manasseh turned his hand to serve Berial Matanbukes. Isaiah retired to Bethlehem, and thence, with certain prophets — Micah, Joel and Habakkuk — and also Hananiah and his own son Joab, he removed to a desert mountain. Balkira, a Samaritan, discovered their hiding-place. They are brought before Manasseh, and Isaiah is accused of impiety because he has said that he has seen God, yet God had declared to Moses, “There shall no flesh see my face.” He had also called Jerusalem, Sodom, and its rulers, those of Gomorrah. For Berial (Belial) had great wrath against Isaiah because he had revealed the coming of Christ and the mission of the apostles. At this point there appears to be a confusion between the first coming of Christ and His second. Lawless elders and shepherds are referred to as appearing, and it is assumed the elders of the church and the pastors are intended, though this is not necessarily so. There certainly was much contention in the churches, as we
know, concerning the question of circumcision. The reference, however,
may be to the rulers and elders of Israel who crucified our Lord. Then
follows the account of the incarnation of Beliar in Nero, “the matricide
monarch,” and the persecution of the twelve apostles, of whom one will be
delivered into his hand — the reference here being probably to the
martyrdom of Peter. If it is Paul, then It is a denial of Peter’s martyrdom
at Rome altogether; if it is Peter, it means the denial of Paul’s apostleship.
The reign of the Antichrist is to be “three years, seven months and
twenty-seven days,” that is, on the Roman reckoning, 1,335 days. This
would seem to be calculated from Nero’s persecution of the Christians. He
makes a singular statement: “The greater number of those who have been
associated together in order to receive the Beloved he will turn aside after
him” — a statement that implies a vastly greater apostasy under the stress
of persecution than we have any record of from other sources. A good deal
is to be said for the insertion of 1,000 in the number 332 in 4:14, so as to
make it read 1,332. At the end of this period “the Lord will come with His
angels and will drag Beliar into Gehenna with his armies.” Then follows a
reference to the descent of the Beloved into Sheol. The following chapter
gives an account of the martyrdom of Isaiah, how he was “sawn in sunder
with a wooden saw,” and how Balkira mocked him, and strove to get Isaiah
to recant. With Ascension of Isaiah 6 begins the Ascension proper. This
chapter, however, is merely the introduction. It is in chapter 7 that the
account is given of how the prophet is carried up through the firmament
and then through heaven after heaven to the seventh. A great angel leads
him upward. In the firmament he found the angels of the devil envying one
another. Above this is the first heaven where he found a throne in the
midst, and angels on the right and the left, the former of whom were the
more excellent. So it was in the second, third, fourth and fifth heavens.
Each heaven was more glorious than that beneath. In the sixth heaven there
was no throne in the midst nor was there any distraction between angels
on the right and left; all were equal. Be is then raised to the seventh heaven
— the most glorious of all — where he sees not only God the Father, but
also the Son and the Holy Spirit. As to the Son we are told that he should
descend, and having assumed human form should be crucified through the
influence of the Prince of this World. Baring descended into Sheol, he
spoiled it, and ascended up on high. In chapter 10 there is a more detailed
account of the descent of the Son through the successive heavens, how in
each He assumed the aspect of the angels that dwelt therein, so that they did not know Him. In the Firmament, the quarreling and envying appeared at first to hinder Him. In chapter 11 we have a semi-docetic account of the miraculous birth With the declaration that it was on account of these revelations that he, Isaiah, was sawn in sunder, the Apocalypse ends.

(2) Structure.

Dr. Charles has maintained that three works are incorporated — the Testament of Hezekiah, the Martyrdom of Isaiah and the Vision of Isaiah. The names have been taken from those given to this work in patristic literature, and are not strictly descriptive of the contents, at least of the first. The confused chronology of the work as we have it may to some extent be due to transcription and translation. From the opening paragraph, there appears to have been an Apocryphon attributed to Hezekiah. Manasseh is called into his father’s presence in order that here may be delivered into words, of righteousness “which the king himself had seen” “of eternal judgment, the torments of Gehenna and the Prince of this World and his angels and of his principalities and powers” — a phrase which implies a knowledge of the Epistle to the Ephesians on the part of the writer. The contents given thus summarily are not further detailed. The Vision of Isaiah does not give any account of the powers and principalities of Satan’s kingdom. It would seem better to regard the present work as composed of two — the Martyrdom of Isaiah and the Vision or Ascension proper. The references backward and forward seem to imply a similarity of authorship in both parts. This would seem to suggest that the editor and author were one and the same person. There is a knowledge of Roman affairs at the time of Nero’s fall so much beyond what anyone living in Palestine could attain that Rome would seem to be the place of composition.

(3) Language.

The immediate original from which the translation, Ethiopic, Latin and Slavonic were made appears to have been Greek. It is clear in regard to the Ethiopic where the proper names which end in Hebrew in “h” and in the Greek transcription end in “s”, as Bezekias, Isaias, the latter is followed, but Manasseh is Manassa. An interesting case is to be found in Ascension
Isaiah 2:12: Mikayas is called “son of Amida,” where “Amida” stands for Imlah. In the Ethiopic transliteration ‘aleph is generally used for the initial yodh as a vowel, as it is in “Israel” (Ethiopic Asreal), hence “Imida” might as correctly represent the name. Then as delta (d) and lambda (l) are like each other the change is explained. Although certainly as said above, Greek has been the immediate original, it is possible if not even probable that behind the Greek there was Hebrew. The structure of the sentences suggests the same thing (see 2:5 Gr). The mysterious name given to Berial, Mattanbukus — which, unfortunately, we have not in Greek — seems to be intelligible only in the idea that it has a Hebrew etymology, [mattan buqah], “the gift of emptiness,” the latter word being equivalent to “the void,” “the abyss.” The title given to Sammael, Malkira, seems naturally to mean king of “the watchers” — [‘irim], the angels who, as related in Enoch 10:5, did not continue in their first estate, but defiled themselves with women. So Belkira is “Lord of the fort” — [ba`al qir]. There thus seems to be a probability that like so many others of this class, the “Ascension” was originally written in Hebrew.

(4) Date.

No one reading the “Ascension” can fail to feel that he has to do with a Christian document, and one belonging to the very beginning of Christian history. There may have been an earlier Jewish Apocalypse behind, though to our thinking that does not seem necessary. It is made up of two documents, but the Christian element appears to be woven into the structure of both portions. That it is to be dated early in the history of the church may be seen from the expectation of Christ’s speedy reappearance in the world in His parousia. The conflict in the church between elders and shepherds gives a picture of the struggle between Judaizers and the Pauline Christians on the other side. The emphasis laid on the twelve, the omission of all reference to Paul, indicates that it was Judaizing. The docetic account of the birth of Jesus, its independence of the canonical Gospels, all speak of an early date. The date, however, it seems to us, can be fixed with great certainty. The reign of Berial, who has come down upon Nero and incarnated himself in him is to be three years, seven months and twenty-seven days, in all 1,335 days (Asc Isaiah 4:12), the number in the end of Daniel (Daniel 12:12). This number, it may be noted, is reached by reckoning the years and months according to the Julian Calendar, proving
this Apocalypse to have been written in Rome. But the number is singularly near the actual duration of Nero’s reign after the persecution had begun. From the burning of Rome (July 19, 64) to the death of Nero (June 9, 68) was 1,421 days — that is, 86 days more. It was at least a month after the conflagration that the persecution began, and longer till the mad orgy of cruelty when Christians wrapt in pitch and set on fire illuminated Nero’s gardens. If a Christian in Rome saw the persecution, he might hope for the end of this reign of terror, and fix on the number he found in Daniel. It would seem that already the 1,290 days had been overpassed, so he hopes that the 1,335 days will see the end of the tyrant. There is a difficulty in the 332 days of Ascension of Isaiah 4:14. The temptation is great to hold with Lucke, Dillmann and Charles that 1,000 has dropped out, and that the last figure ought to be 5; then we have the same number. In that case, this Apocalypse must have been written after the news of the rebellion of Vindex had reached Rome, but before the death of Nero. If we may adopt this — though the fact that the shorter number is found in all three Ethiopic manuscripts makes this method of adding a figure necessary to an explanation one to be avoided — this would point to the time immediately preceding Nero’s death. The difficulty is, where did the author get the number? If it is correct, it is probably the arithmogram of some name of Satan. Berial gives 322 by gematria. It would seem that another mark of time is given in the martyrdom of Peter, which may be dated 64 AD. Another negative note is the absence of any reference to the fall of Jerusalem. Had it happened, Jew though the writer was, his love for his crucified Master would have led him to see the vengeance of heaven on the city which had put Him to death, and exult in it. It must have been written in the course of the year 68.

5. The Fourth Book of Esdras:

Unlike the books we have been discussing hitherto, 4 Esdras has never disappeared from the knowledge of the church. It has, however, come down to us primarily in a Latin translation of a Greek original. Archbishop Laurence discovered an Ethiopic version of it. Later an Armenian version with Latin translation was published in Venice. An Arabic version is also in existence. It was received into the Apocrypha of the Anglican church, though excluded from that of Germany; by the Council of Trent, 1 Esdras
and 2 Esdras of our Apocrypha were excluded from the Roman Catholic canon, and placed after Revelation, along with Proverbs Man.

(1) Summary.

The first two chapters contain a prophecy after the model of Isaiah. Not a few passages show the influence of the New Testament on it. Compare 2 (4) Esdras 1:30 with Matthew 23:37, and 2 (4) Esdras 2:45 with Revelation 7:13. With 2 (4) Esdras 3 there is a new beginning. This opens with a prayer which occupies the whole chapter. In answer, Uriel is sent from God and reveals to Ezra by various symbols the plan of God in regard to Israel. This goes on to the middle of 2 (4) Esdras 5, and forms the first vision. After fasting seven days, a new communication is made by Uriel to Ezra. It begins as the former did with a prayer. Then follows a series of questions intended to bring out the limited understanding of man. When these are finished, Uriel gives an account of the history of the world from the creation. This vision ends with 2 (4) Esdras 6:35. The third vision is very interesting, as a large section of 70 verses had been lost, and were recovered only comparatively recently. This vision contains an account of Creation as it is in Genesis, only rhetorical expansions occur, and a full description is given of Leviathan and Behemoth. Ezra is shown the heavenly Zion in vision as difficult of access. The portion recently discovered contains an account of the place of punishment, and there is mention of Paradise. The end of this is a prayer of Ezra, which seems an independent composition (2 (4) Esdras 8:20). The fourth vision begins with 4 Esdras 9:26. In it Ezra is shown a woman weeping, who is interpreted to be Zion. She is transformed into a city (2 (4) Esdras 10:27). The fifth vision is the most important. It begins with an eagle appearing, which has three heads and twelve wings. This is interpreted as referring to the Roman empire. It would seem that this had been added to, as in addition to the twelve wings, eight other wings are spoken of. A lion appears who rebukes and destroys the eagle with the twelve wings. This lion is the Messiah and his kingdom. The sixth vision begins with chapter 13 and contains an account of the coming of Christ. In the seventh we have an account of the re-writing of the books at the dictation of Ezra, and the retention of the seventy secret sacred books. In what has preceded we have followed the scheme of Fritzsche. The last chapter proceeds from the
same pen as do the opening chapters, and is combined with them by Fritzsche and called the Fifth Book of Esdras.

(2) Structure.

As has been indicated above, 4 Esdras is marked off into several distinct portions, preceded by Ezra fasting, and introduced by a prayer on the part of the prophet. Kabisch has a more elaborate scheme than Fritzsche. Like him, he recognizes seven visions, and like him he separates off the first chapter and the last 17, 15, 16, as by a different hand from the rest of the book. But in addition, he recognizes additions made by a R throughout the book. To us the scheme appears too elaborate.

(3) Language.

As above mentioned, the immediate source of the Latin text appears to have been Greek. There is very little to enable us to settle the question whether Greek was the language in which this book was composed, or whether even the Greek is a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic. There are many echoes of the other Scriptures, but no direct quotations, so there is nothing to show whether the author used the Hebrew text or the Septuagint. The proper names do not supply any clue. Although there are so many versions of the Greek, they are all so paraphrastic that the Greek in most cases is not by any means certain. The few verses quoted in Greek by Clemens Alexandrinus do not afford space enough to discover through them if there is any other language behind. It possibly was written in Hebrew, as it seems to have been written in Palestine.

(4) Date.

From the tone of the book there is no doubt that it was written after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Had it been due to the later cataclysm, when the rebellion of Barcochba was overthrown, a Christian Jew would not have manifested such sorrow. The break between the church and the synagogue was complete by that time. Further, had this book been written under Hadrian, the previous disaster would have been referred to. Over and above the distinctly and avowedly Christian passages, there are numerous echoes of the New Testament Scriptures. The fifth vision affords notes of time which would be more unambiguous if there had not been additions
made. The eagle with the three heads and twelve wings is declared to be the fourth monarchy of Daniel, and by the context this is shown to be imperial Rome. The question that has exercised critics is the portion of the Roman history referred to. Lucke regarded the reference to be to rulers prominent in the time of Sulla, and the three heads to be the first triumvirate. This view implies a knowledge of Roman politics not possessed by any Jew of the pre-Christian period. Further, the echoes of New Testament language which occur (compare 2 (4) Esdras 5:1 with Luke 18:8; 2 (4) Esdras 6:5 with Revelation 7:3, etc.) determine the decision against any idea that it was pre-Christian. The realization of the horrors of the overthrow of Jerusalem is too vivid to be the result merely of imagination. Another theory would see in the three heads the three Septimians, Severus and his sons Caracalla and Geta. This would find a place for the eight under-wings, as that is exactly the number of emperors between Domitian and Severus, if one neglects the short reign of Didius Julianus. The destruction of “the two under wings that thought to have reigned” (2 (4) Esdras 11:31) would be fulfilled in the defeat and death of Pescennius Niger and Clodius Albinus. The fact that it is the right-hand head that devours the head to the left fits the murder of Geta the younger son, by Caracalla, the elder. Against this view is the fact that the book is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus. Further, the eight under-wings are said to be kings “whose times shall be small, and their years swift” (2 (4) Esdras 12:20). Though might be said of Nerva, it could not be affirmed of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Plus or Marcus Aurelius. We are thus restricted to the view which maintains that the three heads are the three Flavians. The twelve wings are the first emperors, beginning with Julius Caesar. The reign of Augustus is longer than any of the monarchs that succeeded him, and it is noted that the second wing was to have that distinction (2 (4) Esdras 12:15). The date then may be placed between the death of Titus and that of Domitian — that is, from 81 to 96. The Lion who rebukes the Eagle for his unrighteousness is the Messiah — the Christ — in His second coming, when He shall come in the glory of His kingdom. The Christians had begun to doubt the speedy coming of the Master, hence He is spoken of as “kept unto the end of days” (2 Esdras 12:32). Such are the Apocalypses, strictly speaking.
II. Legendary Works.

The Book of Jubilees:

The Book of Jubilees is the only one which survives of this class of composition. The portion of Ascension of Isaiah which contains the account of his martyrdom has much of this character. It, however, has been conjoined to the Apocalyptic “Ascension.” It would seem that in some copies the Assumption of Moses was added to this work as a supplement. It is frequently cited as lepto Genesis — sometimes lepto-genesis, and again micro-genesis, “the little Genesis.” This title cannot be meant to refer to its actual size, for it is considerably longer than the canonical book. It may either mean that this book is to be less regarded than the canonical Genesis or that it is taken up with lepta — ”minutiae.” Another, and possibly more plausible explanation is to be found in the Hebrew or Aramaic. There is a rabbinic book known as [Bere’shith Rabba’], in which the whole of Genesis is expanded by Midrashic additions, amplifications and explanations, to many times the size of the work before us, which, in comparison, would be [Bere’shith ZuTa’] — ”the small Genesis.” The main difficulty is that the Jewish work, B. Rabbah, cannot well be dated earlier than 300 AD. We owe the work before us mainly — in its complete form — like so many others, to its inclusion in the canon of the Ethiopic church. Portions of it in Latin and Syriac have been found in the second main source of apocalyptic literature in recent times, the Ambrosian Library of Milan. There have been several editions of the Ethiopic text.

(1) Summary.

It is difficult to give anything like a summary of the Book of Jubilees in the ordinary sense of the word. Roughly speaking, the canonical Book of Genesis is the summary. The writer has omitted many features and incidents, but these have been more than compensated for by additions and expansions. Most of these omissions have an apologetic aim. The acts of deception of which Abraham was guilty in Egypt and toward Abimelech in regard to Sarah, the similar act of Isaac, would involve matters difficult to palliate. The way Simeon and Levi entrapped the Shechemites into being circumcised and then took advantage of their condition to murder them, is omitted also. Jacob’s devices to increase his flocks at Laban’s expense are
also passed over in silence. The most marked omission is the blessing of Jacob in Genesis 49. This is to be explained by the way the writer has praised Simeon and Levi earlier which Jacob’s denunciation of them flatly contradicts. Many of the additions have a similar apologetic intention, as the statement that Dinah was twelve years old at the time of the rape, the presents Jacob gave to his parents four times a year, etc. When Jacob deceives his father, he does not say he is Esau, but only “I am thy son.” There are longer additions, chiefly ceremonial. Two incidents narrated at length are the warfare of the Amorites against Jacob (34:1-9), and the war of Esau (37 and 38).

(2) Structure.

The most marked characteristic of the book is that from which it has its most common name, “The Book of Jubilee,” the dating of events by successive Jubilees. The whole history of the world is set in a framework of Jubilees and every event is dated by the Jubilee of the world’s history in which it had occurred, and the year-week of that Jubilee and the year of that week. The writer has carried his septenary principle into the year and made the days in it, as did the writer of one of the Enoch books, a multiple of seven, \(364 = 7 \times 52\) days. It does not seem to have been interpolated.

(3) Language.

Like so many more of the pseudepigrapha, the Ethiopic, from which our modern translations have been made, has been translated from a Greek original, which in turn has had a Semitic source. It is somewhat difficult to form a decision as to which of the two Semitic languages in use in Palestine was that in which it was composed. Certainly some, as Frankel, have maintained that it was written in Greek first of all. This is contrary to ancient evidence, as Jerome refers to the use of rissah, “a stadium,” as used in the Book of Jubilees. More can be said for an Aramaic original The use of Mastema for Satan, and the plurals in “in,” point in that direction. Dr. Charles’ arguments seem to us to settle the matter in favor of Hebrew. Compare the case of Jubilees 47:9, in which [bath], “a daughter,” is confused with [bayith], “a house.” One of his arguments is not so conclusive: 2:9 [wahaba], “gave,” appears where “appointed” is the meaning — a confusion of meanings only possible from the double
meaning of nathan, as the Aramaic [yahabh] has the same double force: “See I have made thee ([yehebhetakh]) a God to Pharaoh” (compare Peshitta Ex. 7:1). These indications are few, but they seem sufficient.

(4) Date.

The formidable authority of Dr. Charles and that of Littmann are in favor of an early date — before the quarrel of John Hyrcanus with the Pharisees. Our reading of the history is different from that of either of these scholars. The Hassidh party had been lukewarm to the Maccabees from the latter portion of the pontificate of Judas Maccabeus; the insult offered to Hyrcanus at his own table was the enmity reaching its height. If with Dr. Charles we assume the author to be a Pharisee, then the date is impossible. The Pharisaic party were never enthusiastic supporters of the Maccabees, except when Alexandra threw herself into their arms. Two characteristics of this book strike the reader — its apologetic tone, and its hatred of Edom. During the time of John Hyrcanus the nation did not assume an apologetic attitude. It had thrown off the Syrian-Greek domination and repelled the attempt to Helenize its religion. It would be only Greeks, or those under Greek influences, that would necessitate the apologetic attitude. We are driven to the Herodian period when Romans abounded in the court and Greeks and Graeculi were frequent, when those who, being Jews and knowing Hebrew, yet had imbibed Hellenic culture, and readily saw the points where assault might be made on their faith and its sacred literature. This date would explain the hatred of Edom. We therefore would place it about the death of Herod — from 5 BC to 6 AD.

Unlike the other books of this class, much of it has been found in the Talmud; hence, though we still think the author to have been an Essene, we think that he had much sympathy with the Pharisaic school in its latest development.

III. Psalmic Pseudepigrapha.

1. The Psalter of Solomon:

The Psalter of Solomon is the one of all the pseudepigrapha which seems to have hovered most nearly on the border of deuto-canonicity. Even 4
Esdras, since not being found in Greek, scarcely can be counted an exception, as it was never admitted into the canon of Alexandria. The famous Codex Alexandrinus, as its table of contents proves, originally contained the book before us. In several catalogues of books that were acknowledged, by some at least, to be authoritative, it is named — sometimes to be declared uncanonical. Like so many other books — Jewish and Christian — during the Middle Ages, sank into oblivion. A manuscript of it was first noticed by Hoeschel the librarian in the Library at Augsburg, in the beginning of the 17th century, and published by de la Cerda in 1626. This manuscript has since been lost. More recently, four other Greek manuscripts have been brought to light. From these, with the assistance of de la Cerda’s text, it has repeatedly been published. The name given to it, “The Psalter of Solomon,” seems purely gratuitous; the writer makes no claim, direct or indirect, to be the Son of David.

(1) Summary.

The present collection consists of 18 psalms closely modeled as to line of thought and diction on the canonical Psalms. The first psalm announces the declaration of war, but is occupied with the denunciation of hypocrites. The second describes a siege of Jerusalem and acknowledges that the distresses of the siege have been deserved, but ends by the description of the death of the besieger on the coast of Egypt. The third psalm is one of thanksgiving on the part of the righteous. In the fourth we have the description and denunciation of a hypocrite in terms which suggest strongly our Lord’s words against the Pharisees. It is evidently directed against a prominent individual member of the Sanhedrin. On the generally received date, Antipater may be the person denounced. The fifth psalm is a prayer for mercy from God and an appeal to His loving-kindness. The sixth is occupied with a description of the blessedness of the righteous. The short psalm which follows is a prayer of Israel under chastisement, entreating God not to remove His tabernacle from their midst. The eighth psalm describes the siege of the temple and denounces the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, which had brought the Smiter from afar against them, and a prayer for restoration to favor. Israel, a captive, prays to God for forgiveness in the ninth psalm. In the tenth we have the blessedness of the man who submits to the chastening of the Lord. The theme of the eleventh is the return of the captives. The idea of the
following psalm is not unlike the middle stanza of Psalm 120 of the canonical Psalter. The next has as its theme the blessedness of the righteous and the evil estate of the wicked. The fourteenth has a similar subject. The next begins with the sentiment so frequent in the canonical Ps: “When I was in trouble I called upon the Lord.” The psalm which follows is experimental in the sense of the old Puritans. The seventeenth psalm is the most important, as it is Messianic, and exhibits the hopes prevalent among the Jews at the time when it was written. The eighteenth gives a description of the blessedness of the return of the Jews to Divine favor. Messrs. Ryle and James would divide this psalm into two, as there seems to be a conclusion at the tenth verse with the sign diapsalma. Moreover, a slightly different theme is introduced at this point, but there is a reference in the Pistis Sophia to the 19th ps, and this is not the one implied. There seems to be some probability that a Latin translation once existed from references, though few, in the Latin Fathers; but no manuscript of it has yet been discovered. A Syriac translation has been discovered by Dr. Rendel Harris, along with a number of other psalms also attributed to Solomon, which he has called “Odes.” Of these more will be said below.

(2) Language.

That the Greek of these psalms is a translation from the Hebrew may be proved by what seem to have been errors in translation, as tou eipein, “to say,” where sense implies “to destroy,” from the double meaning of [dabhar], “to say,” and later “to destroy”; heos enikese, “till he conquered,” where the meaning must be “forever” or “continuously,” equivalent to [adh], [la-netsach], which might be taken as in Aramaic, and translated as in the Greek. Further, the general character, the frequent occurrence of en in senses strained in Greek but suiting thoroughly the Hebrew preposition “b-”, the omission of the substantive verb, the general simplicity in the structure of the sentences, serve to confirm this. For fuller elucidation the reader is directed to Ryle and James edition of this book (lxxviii-lxxxiv). Hilgenfeld has urged some arguments in favor of Greek being the original language. These really prove that the translator was very much influenced in making his translation by the Septuagint version of the canonical Psalter.
(3) Date.

While Ewald would place it back in the time of Epiphanes, if not even earlier, and Movers and Delitzsch would place it about the time of Herod, the description of the siege does not suit any siege but that of Pompey. Still more the death of the proud oppressor who besieged the Temple suits down to the minutest detail the death of Pompey, and suits that of no other. This is the opinion of Langen, Hilgenfeld, Drummond, Stanton, Schurer, Ryle and James. The psalms, however, were written at various dates between 64 BC, the year preceding the Pompeian siege, and the death of Pompey 46 BC. The common critical idea is that it is the Psalter of the Pharisees. The singular thing is that though the writer reverences the Temple, he speaks nothing of the sacrifices, and shows no horror at the dishonor of the high priests — the attitude one would expect, not from a Pharisee, but from an Essene.

(4) Christology.

The main interest of this pseudepigraphon is its Christology, which is principally to be seen in the 17th psalm. The Messiah is to be of the seed of David: He is to come on the downfall of the Asmoneans, to overthrow the Romans in turn. He is to gather the dispersed of Israel, and is to subject the Gentiles to His rule. The character of this rule is to be spiritual, holy, wise and just. All these features indicate a preparation for the coming of Him who fulfilled the expectation of the Jews in a way which they had so little dreamed of.

2. The Odes of Solomon:

The students of Gnosticism in perusing the Pistis Sophia, one of the few literary remains left us by those bizarre heresies, found repeated quotations from the Psalter of Solomon, not one of which was to be found in the received collection. There was one numbered reference, but it was to the 19th psalm, whereas only eighteen were known to exist. Lactantius has a quotation from the Psalter of Solomon which, like those in Pistis Sophia, has no place in the “eighteen.” It was obvious that there were more Solomonic writings that were called Psalms than those ordinarily known. In the beginning of 1909 the learned world was startled by the information that Dr. Rendel Harris had found on his shelves the missing Psalter of
Solomon in a Syriac translation. The manuscript was defective both at the beginning and end, but there was, after all, little missing of the whole book. The title and the colophon were of course wanting. It begins with the new Psalms, or, to give them Dr. Harris’ title, “Odes,” which are followed by those till now known.

(1) Relation to Pistis Sophia and Summary.

This cannot have been the order of the time when Pistis Sophia was published, as the first of these odes is quoted as the 19th. There are forty-two of them. They are the work of a Christian. The doctrine of the Trinity is present; very prominent is the miraculous birth of the Saviour; the descent upon Mary of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove; the crucifixion, and the descent into Hades; and, though less clearly, the resurrection. One striking thing is the resemblance of the account of the virgin birth to that we find in the Ascension of Isaiah.

(2) Date.

Dr. Rendel Harris dates these Christian odes in the last quarter of the 1st century, and there seems every reason to agree with this. The relation the 19th psalm (Ode 37) bears to the Ascension of Isaiah is not discussed by him, but to our thinking, the Ascension of Isaiah seems the more primitive.

IV. Testaments.

Although, strictly speaking, Jewish law had no place for “testimonial dispositions” by those about to die — ”the portion of goods” that fell to each being prescribed — yet the dying exhortations of Jacob addressed to his sons, the farewell song of Moses, David’s deathbed counsels to Solomon, were of the nature of spiritual legacies. Under Greek and Roman law testaments were the regularly understood means of arranging heritages; with the thing the name was transferred, as in the Mishna, [Babha’ Bathra’] 15 26 f, [dayytike], so also in Syriac. The idea of these pseudepigrapha is clearly not drawn from the “Last Will and Testament,” but the dying exhortations above referred to.
1. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs:

Genesis 49 in which Jacob addresses his sons gathered round his dying bed furnished the model for a number of pseudepigraphic writings. Of these the longest known is Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. In it the writer imagines each of the sons of Jacob following his father’s example and assembling his descendants in order that he might give his dying charge. While Jacob addressed each of his sons separately, the sons of none of his sons, save those of Joseph, became at all prominent; so in the case of the sons of Jacob they each address their descendants as a whole. These Testaments are occupied with moral advices mainly. The sin most warned against is incontinence.

(1) Summary.

(a) Reuben:

The first Patriarch whose Testament is given is Reuben. While he bewails the sin that deprived him of his birthright, he gives an account of the various propensities that tend to sin, and accommodates each of these with an evil spirit — spirits of deceit. He gives details of his sin, which, resembling those given in the Book of Jubilees, differs in an apologetic direction. This apologetic effort is carried farther in the Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan. In it Reuben is declared to have disordered the bed of Bilhah because it was put beside his mother’s, and he was accused of impurity with her; but the Spirit revealed to Jacob that he was not guilty.

(b) Simeon:

The next Testament is that of Simeon. The crime that seems to have most affected Jacob, if we may judge by Genesis 49:5-7, was the murder of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi. That, however, is not touched upon in the Testament; his envy of Joseph is what he most repents of. A stanza, however, is inserted, warning against fornication (Genesis 49:3).

(c) Levi:

The Testament of Levi follows. It is mainly apocalyptic. The murder of the Shechemites is regarded as a wholly estimable action, and is commended by God. The treachery of the circumcision is not mentioned at
all. He tells how he was admitted in dream to the third heaven. In another vision he is clothed with the garments of the priesthood. After a piece of autobiography followed by general admonitions Levi tells what he had learned from the writing of Enoch. He tells how his descendants will fall away and become corrupt. It is to be noted that fornication becomes very prominent in the picture of the future. The destruction of Jerusalem is foretold, and the captivity of Judah among all nations. This cannot refer to the setting up of the “Abomination of Desolation” by Epiphanes. The Temple was not laid waste, although it was desecrated; and there did not follow on the desecration by Epiphanes the scattering of the Jews unto all nations. It seems necessary to understand by this wasting the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Consequently, the “new priest” of XII P 18 seems to us the priest “after the order of Melchizedek” according to the New Testament interpretation.

(d) Judah:

Judah is the next whose Testament is given. He first declares his own great personal prowess, slaying a lion, a bear, a boar, a leopard and a wild bull. When the Canaanite kings assailed Jacob as related in the Book of Jubilee, he showed his courage. Several warlike exploits, of which we only learn here, he relates. The assault made by the descendants of Esau upon the sons of Jacob and Jacob’s victory is related in the manner and nearly in the terms of the account in the Book of Jubilees. He mentions with a number of explanatory and excusatory details his sin in the matter of Tamar. He denounces covetousness, drunkenness and fornication. Then he commands his descendants to look to Levi and reverence him. Then follows a Messianic passage which seems most naturally to bear a Christian interpretation.

(e) Issachar:

The Testament of Issachar is much shorter than either of the two preceding ones. After telling the story of the mandrakes, he dwells on husbandry. As is noted by Dr. Charles, this is at variance with the rabbinic representation of the characteristics of the tribe. He, too, denounces impurity and drunkenness.

(f) Zebulun:
Zebulun’s Testament is little longer than that of Issachar. This Testament is greatly occupied with the history of the sale of Joseph in which Zebulun protests he took only the smallest share and got none of the price.

(g) Dan:
The Testament of Daniel also is short. He confesses his rage against Joseph, and so warns against anger. Here also are warnings against whoredom. The Messiah is to spring from Judah and Levi. Dr. Charles thinks the first of these was not in the original, because it would naturally have been “tribes,” not “tribe,” as it is. This somewhat hasty, as in Kings 12:23 (Septuagint) we have the precisely similar construction pros panta oikon Iouda kai Beniamin, a sentence which represents the construction of the Hebrew. In this there is a Messianic passage which describes the Messiah as delivering the captives of Beliar.

(h) Naphtali:
The Testament that follows, that of Naphtali, has apocalyptic elements in it. It opens with the genealogy of Bilhah, his mother, whose father is said to be Rotheus. His vision represents Levi seizing the sun and Judah the moon. The young man with the twelve palm branches seems to be a reference to the Apostles. Joseph seizes a bull and rides on it. He has a further dream in which he sees a storm at sea and the brethren being separated. Again there is a reference to the recurrent theme of sexual relation (XII P 8).

(i) Gad:
The subject of the Testament of Gad is hatred. Gad is associated with Simeon as being most filled with wrath against Joseph.

(j) Asher:
Asher urges whole-hearted obedience to righteousness, as the apostle James does in his epistle.

(k) Joseph:
One of the most important of these Testaments is that of Joseph. The opening is occupied with a prolonged description of the temptation of
Joseph by Potiphar’s wife. There is in that connection the unhealthy dwelling on sexual matters which is found in monkish writers. There are not a few resemblances to the language of the Gospels (compare XII P 1:6 and Matthew 25:36). There is a more important passage (XII P 19:8): “And I saw that from Judah was born a virgin wearing a linen garment, and from her was born a lamb, and on his left hand there was, as it were, a lion: and all the beasts rushed against him, and the lamb overcame them, and destroyed them, and trod them under foot.” This to us is clearly Christian. Dr. Charles, without apocalyptic credence to support him, would amend it and change the reading.

(1) Benjamin:

The Testament of Benjamin is very much an appendix to that of Joseph. It opens with the account Joseph gave Benjamin of how he was sold to the Ishmaelites. He exhorts his descendants against deceit, but, as all his brethren, he warns them against fornication. There is a long Christian passage which certainly seems an interpolation, as it is not found in some of the texts, though others have all verses. The text concerning Paul (XII P 11:1,2) appears in varying forms in all versions.

(2) Structure.

That these “Testaments” have been interpolated is proved by the variations in the different texts. Dr. Charles has, however, gone much farther, and wherever there is a Christian clause has declared it an obvious interpolation. For our part, we would admit as a rule those passages to be genuine that are present in all the forms of the text. The Greek text was first in, so to say, recent times edited by Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, in the 13th century. Since then other manuscripts have been found, and a Slavonic and an Aramaic version. We are thus able to check the interpolations. In essence the Christian passage in T Josephus is found in all versions.

(3) Language.

Dr. Charles makes a very strong case for Hebrew being the original language. His numerous arguments are not all of equal value. While some of the alleged Hebraistic constructions may be actually so, not a few may be
explained by imitation of the language of the Septuagint. As an example of
the first, compare T Judges (XII P 7): *ochlos barus* = [chel kabhedh], “a
numerous host.” On the other hand T Reub XII P 3:8: “understanding in
the Law,” is a turn of expression that might quite well be common among
Greek-speaking Jews. Of passages that are only explicable by
retranslation, as in T Josephus 11:7, “God .... increased him in gold and
silver and in work,” this last turn is evidently due to the translator’s
rendering ["abhuddah], “servant,” as if it were ["abhodhah], “work.” On
the whole, we are prepared to amend the decision elsewhere, and admit
that the probability is that this book, like so many more of the same class,
has been translated from Hebrew.

(4) Date and authorship.

Dr. Charles declares the author to have been a Pharisee who wrote in the
early part of the reign of John Hyrcanus I. The initial difficulty with this,
as with the other pseudepigrapha in attributing a Pharisaic authorship, is
the preservation of the book among the Christian communities, and the
ignorance or the ignoring of it among the Jews. The only sect of the Jews
that survived the destruction of Jerusalem was that of the Pharisees. The
Sadducees, who were more a political than a religious party, disappeared
with the cessation of the Jewish state. When Judaism became merely a
religion — a church — not a nation, their function was gone. The third
sect, the Essenes, disappeared, but did so into the Christian church. If the
writer had been an Essene, as we suppose he was, the preservation of this
writing by the Christians is easily explicable. If it were the work of a
Pharisee, its disappearance from the literature of the synagogue is as
inexplicable as its preservation by the Christians. The constant harping on
the sin of fornication — in T Naph XII P 8:8 even marital intercourse is
looked at askance — indicates a state of mind suitable to the tenets of the
Essenes. The date preferred by Dr. Charles, if the author is a Pharisee,
appears to us impossible. The Pharisees had, long before the final break,
been out of sympathy with the Maccabees. The Chasidim deserted Judas
Maccabeus at Elasa, not improbably in consequence of the alliance he had
made with the heathen Romans, and perhaps also his assumption of the
high-priesthood. Further, the temple is laid waste and the people driven
into captivity unto all nations (T Levi 15:1). This does not suit the
desecration of the temple under Epiphanes. During that time the temple
was not laid waste. The orgies of the worship of Bacchus and of Jupiter Olympius dishonored it, but that is a different thing from its being laid waste. The scattering unto all nations did not take place then. Some were taken captive and enslaved, but this was not general. The description would only apply to destruction of the temple by Titus and the enslaving and captivity of the mass of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The “New Priest” cannot refer to the Maccabees, for they were Aaronites as much as Alcimus or Onias, though not of the high-priestly family. This change of the priesthood only has point if it refers to the priesthood of Christ as in Hebrews 7:12. If Dr. Charles is right in maintaining that 2 Macc in its account of Menelaus is to be preferred to Josephus, the change of the priesthood was not unprecedented, for Menelaus was a Benjamite, not a Levite. Yet 1 Macc takes no notice of this enormity. Further, there are the numerous passages that are directly and indirectly Christian. Dr. Charles certainly marks them all as interpolations, but he gives no reason in most of the cases for doing so. That the omission of such passages does not dislocate the narrative arises from the simpler construction of Semitic narrative, and is therefore not to be regarded as conclusive evidence of interpolation. The reference to Paul in T Ben XII P 11, occurring in all the sources, although with variations, also points to a post-Christian origin. For these reasons, we would venture to differ from Dr. Charles and regard the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs as post-Christian, and to be dated in the first quarter of the 2nd century AD.

(5) Relation to Other Books.

From the decision we have reached in regard to the date of these Testaments, it follows that all the many resemblances which have been noted between them and the books of the New Testament are due to imitation on the part of the Testaments, not the reverse. A case in point is T Josephus XII P 1:6 where the resemblance to Matthew 25:31-36 is close; only, whereas in the Gospel the judge approves of the righteous on account of their visiting the sick and the imprisoned, and condemns the wicked because they did not do so, in T Josephus God minsters to His servants. The Testament is really an imitation of the passage in the Gospel. The direct visiting of the afflicted, whatever the form of the affliction, was a thing of everyday occurrence. To think of the Almighty doing so is the result of a bold metaphor. One familiar with the Gospel
narrative might not unnaturally think of God’s dealings with the saints in terms drawn from our Lord’s description of the Last Judgment. In T Naph XII P 2:2 the figure of the potter and the clay is, as in Romans 9:21, applied to God’s power over His creatures. The passage in the T Naph is expanded, and has not the close intimate connection with the argument that the Pauline passage has. While none of the other resemblances give one any ground to decide, these instances really carry the others with them. We may thus regard the resemblances to the New Testament in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs as due to the latter’s copying of the former.

2. Testament of Adam:

The Testament of Adam survives merely in a group of fragments published first by Renan in the Journal Asiatique (1853). A Greek fragment was published by M. R. James. A portion of it is apocalyptic, and gives an account of the adoration offered by all the different classes of God’s creatures. More strictly of the nature of a Testament is a Syriac fragment entitled “More of Adam Our Father.” It contains a prophecy of the incarnation, and appears to be of late date. It was used by the Sethires.

3. Testament of Abraham:

The Testament of Abraham is a late document. It opens with representing Abraham at his tent door. One recension declares his age then to be 995 years. Michael comes to him. The purpose for which Michael has been sent is to reveal to Abraham that he must die. He hesitates to do this. When, however, the fatal message is revealed, Abraham will not yield up his spirit at first. He is after a while persuaded, and as reward, before his death he has a revelation: there is given to him a vision of the whole world in the widest sense — the world of spirits as well. Seeing a soul, which, weighed in the balance, is nearly being found wanting, by his intercession the soul is admitted to Paradise. There are several traces of Christian influence; many of the thoughts and phrases are similar to those to be found in the Gospels. At the same time, although to one who had read John’s Gospel the statement of our Lord that Abraham had seen His day “and was glad” (John 8:55,56) would inevitably have led a Christian writer to have exhibited Abraham as seeing in vision the day of Christ. The writer’s failure to do so seems to show that he was not a Christian. The echoes of the Gospel in the language and the want of that distinctive
Christian mark is to be explained if we regard the translator as a Christian, while the original Midrash was the work of a Jew. The language was probably Aramaic. There are two Greek recensions, one longer than the other. There is an Arabic version which appears to be a translation direct from Aramaic. As there is no reference to the coming of Christ, this Testament is probably pre-Christian. The translation may be dated early in the 2nd century, as Origen knew it.

In Arabic there is a manuscript of the Testaments of Isaac and Jacob. They are late and Christian. The latter is founded on the last chapter of Genesis.

4. Testament of Job:

More interesting is the Testament of Job published in Anecdota Apocrypha by M. R. James in 1897. It purports to be an account of his sufferings related by Job himself. It appears to be the work of a Jew, translated by a Christian. The position of Satan in the Midrash is not so subordinate as in the drama. Elihu, when not confused with Eliphaz, is regarded as inspired by Satan.

(1) Summary.

It begins with Job, “who is called Jobab,” summoning his seven sons and three daughters. The list of the sons forms a singular assemblage of names, most probably of Semitic origin. Most of them are certainly Greek words, though not Greek proper names — Choros and Nike, “dance” and “victory,” Huon, “of pigs,” Phoros, “tribute.” The other names are Tersi, Phiphi, Phrouon. He tells his descendants how he had been called in the night and had had it revealed to him that the sacrifices that had been offered previously in the great temple near him were not offered to God, but to Satan. He was ordered to destroy the temple thus devoted to false worship. He did so, but knew that Satan would seek him, to take his revenge. Satan came disguised as a beggar, and Job, recognizing him, ordered his porteress to give him a burned cake of bread, all ashes. Satan reveals himself and threatens Job. With XII P 9 begins an account of Job’s wealth and lordly beneficence founded on the canonical book. It continues to XII P 16. This portion is an expansion of the canonical Job. In some portions there are marked variations. Job is a king, and since this is so, the power of Persia is invoked to overthrow him. After twenty years his
friends come to condole with him. They also are kings. Sitis his wife is bemoaning her children. Job declares he sees them crowned with heavenly beauty. On learning this, Sitis dies, and so rejoins her children. The speeches of the friends are much condensed, and scarcely of the same character as those in the canonical book. Lyric passages are introduced. The most singular difference from the canonical book is the role assigned to Elihu. Job says, “Elihu inspired by Satan addressed to me rash words” (XII P 42). God then speaks to Job in the whirlwind and blames Elihu. Job sacrifices for the three friends, and Eliphaz in a lyric piece congratulates himself and his friends, and declares that the lamp and glory of Elihu will be quenched (XII P 43). By a second wife we are told Job had the seven sons and three daughters who are summoned to his bedside. Closing his narrative (XII P 44) Job exhorts kindness to the poor. In the end of the book his successive daughters speak. He had divided his property, now double what it had originally been, among his seven sons and had left the daughters unprovided for. He, however, bestows upon them other gifts. Three golden vessels are brought him and given them, three cords besides, and each one has a several endowment. The first daughter, called, as in the Septuagint, Hemera, (Jemima in the canonical Job), had another heart given her, and she spoke in the tongue of the angels. Casia (Keziah), the second daughter, also had a changed heart, and it was given to her to speak in the dialect of the principalities (archon). Then the third daughter girded herself, and with the changed heart it was given her to speak in the language of the Cherubim. This daughter is called Amaltheias Keras, the rather strange translation of [Keren Haphukh] adopted by the Septuagint. All the names are transferred from that source. A brother of Job named Nereus (or Nereias) is introduced, who records further gifts to these daughters — a lyre to the first, a censer to the second and a drum to the third. This brother is a relative of whose existence we have no hint elsewhere. He is introduced to supply the conclusion to the narrative.

(2) Structure.

It would appear that from XII P 1 to 45 is the original Testament in which Job is the speaker. In XII P 46 through 51 a new state of matters comes into prominence, in which Nereus is the speaker. The last two chapters seem decidedly to be additions: the new gifts to the daughters seem
unexplained. Of course, oriental authors do not look so strictly to the unity of parts as do Occidentals.

(3) Language.

The dependence on the Septuagint would suggest that Greek was the original tongue. One or two phenomena point to a Semitic tongue being behind the Greek. The names of Job’s daughters are taken from the Septuagint; those of the seven sons have been invented. As we have seen, they are not Greek names, but are probably really Hellenized versions of some Semitic appellations. At the same time, they do not seem to be Hebrew, but rather Aramaic. It would seem to have been translated by one familiar with the New Testament.

(4) Date and authorship.

It has no direct references to Christian doctrines or the facts of Christian history. This seems conclusive against its having a Christian origin. The reason that would lead a Christian to compose such a document would be to give a further prophetic evidence for the mission of his Master. He would have no object in making Job out to be a connection of Israel, unless he were so himself. Dr. James thinks the writer to have been a Jewish Christian of the 2nd century resident in Egypt. By the 2nd century few Jews passed from Judaism to the faith of Jesus: the break between church and synagogue had become complete. That Job is made king of all Egypt (XII P 28) may indicate some relationship to that country, as if the writer had identified Job with Psammeticus, the Egyptian king overthrown by Cambyses. This, however, may have been due to the translator. If the original language were Semitic — Aramaic or Hebrew — the probability is that the author wrote in Palestine. There are no direct signs to indicate the date. There is no appearance of knowledge of Rome. The fire of the opposition to the Seleucids had died down. It may have been written in the reign of Alexander.

V. Sibylline Oracles.

The burning of the Capitol (83 BC) and the destruction of the famous Sibylline books led Sulla to search in Italy and Greece for any Oracles that might replace the contents of the volumes which had been burnt. About
half a century later Augustus revived the search for Oracles. Such a demand would naturally produce a supply. It would seem that certain Jews of Alexandria, eager to propagate the faith of their fathers, invented verses in the shape in which these Oracles had been preserved, as we learn from Herodotus — i.e. in hexameter lines and in the epic dialect in which Homer and Hesiod had written. Those in Herodotus are mainly from the Oracle of Delphi. From Pausanias, who quotes several of them, we learn that the Oracles attributed to the various Sibyls were delivered in a similar style. Hence these Jewish forgeries were written in epic hexameters. Later, this industry was pursued with even greater zeal by Christians. These have been collected into several books — some 15 are named — of which some have been lost. The books are made up of fragments of different ages. The first book begins with the creation, and narrates the history of the race to the flood and the going out of Noah from the ark. Then the history of our Lord is given succinctly, the miracle of the loaves, the crucifixion, and the destruction of Jerusalem. In it Hades is derived from “Adam.” Reference is made to the sin of the watchers, as in En, and an arithmograph is given which seems to be fulfilled in Theos Soter. The second book is modeled largely on our Lord’s eschatological discourses, many passages bearing a distinct echo of it. It may be noted that the four archangels of the Book of Enoch — Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel — are introduced. The third is by much the longest, but it is a confused mass of fragments. There is early reference to the conquest of Egypt by Rome; the building of the tower of Babel, the siege of Troy, the conquest of Alexander and many other events appear. The fourth book is Christian throughout. After praise to the Christians, there is a sketch of the history of the great empires, beginning with the Assyrians and ending with Alexander; then an account of Nero appearing from the East and doing evil fills the end of all things. The fifth book begins with an account of the successive emperors from Julius Caesar to the Antonines. Then a new song begins with Egypt, and wanders off indefinitely, referring to Xerxes crossing the Hellespont, the impurities of Rome, and ending with Egypt and the burning up of all things. The sixth is short — 28 lines in praise of the Cross; and the seventh is fragmentary. In the eighth is the arithmogram and acrostic: [ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ, Iesous christos theou huios soter stauros]. The remaining books have similar characteristics. The place of composition is evidently Egypt, as, whatever
The immediate context may be, the writer gravitates to Egypt; and the authors are Jews or Jewish Christians. The dates of the various fragments of which this collection is composed fall between the first triumvirate and the age of Diocletian.

VI. Conclusion.

There are many points in which theology of the Apocalyptic prepared the way for that of Christianity. These, however, are more naturally taken up under their special headings. Angelology is much more developed in certain apocalyptic writings than it is in Christianity, if we except the writings published under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. Most of them are occupied with the coming Messiah. The Christology of these writings is decidedly in advance of that of the Old Testament. That question, however, is discussed under its appropriate heading. Closely connected with this is the doctrine of God, or theology proper. In this, too, there is an approximation to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. With these writers the doctrine of the Last Things is always brought into close relationship to that of the Messiah. His coming is the signal for the end of the world, the last judgment, the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous. What we have just said applies mainly to the strictly Jewish and pre-Christian Apocalypses. In the Christian Jewish Apocalypses the place the incarnation and the miraculous birth hold is worthy of special note. The representation in regard to the latter of these subjects is independent of the gospel narrative. Connected with this independence of the written Scriptures are the variations these writings introduce into history. Many of these are due to apologetic reasons, not a few to the desire to enhance the national glory. The reverence for the letter of Scripture, so markedly characteristic of the rabbinic teachings found in the Talmud, is not found in the apocalyptic writings. Apocalyptic thus presents a stage in the doctrine of Scripture.
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APOCRYPHA

&lt;a-pok’ri-fa&gt;:

1. DEFINITION.

The word Apocrypha, as usually understood, denotes the collection of religious writings which the Septuaqint and Vulgate (with trivial differences) contain in addition to the writings constituting the Jewish and Protestant canon. This is not the original or the correct sense of the word, as will be shown, but it is that which it bears almost exclusively in modern speech. In critical works of the present day it is customary to speak of the collection of writings now in view as “the Old Testament Apocrypha,” because many of the books at least were written in Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament, and because all of them are much more closely allied to the Old Testament than to the New Testament. But there is a “New” as well as an “Old” Testament Apocrypha consisting of gospels, epistles, etc. Moreover the adjective “Apocryphal” is also often applied in modern times to what are now generally called “Pseudepigraphical writings,” so designated because ascribed in the titles to authors who did not and could
not have written them (e.g. Enoch, Abraham, Moses, etc.). The persons thus connected with these books are among the most distinguished in the traditions and history of Israel, and there can be no doubt that the object for which such names have been thus used is to add weight and authority to these writings.

The late Professor E. Kautzsch of Halle edited a German translation of the Old and New Testament Apocrypha, and of the Pseudepigraphical writings, with excellent introductions and valuable notes by the best German scholars. Dr. Edgar Hennecke has edited a similar work on the New Testament Apocrypha. Nothing in the English language can be compared with the works edited by Kautzsch and Hennecke in either scholarship or usefulness. (A similar English work to that edited by Kautzsch is now passing through the (Oxford) press, Dr. R. H. Charles being the editor, the writer of this article being one of the contributors.)

### 2. THE NAME APOCRYPHA.

The investigation which follows will show that when the word “Apocryphal” was first used in ecclesiastical writings it bore a sense virtually identical with “esoteric”: so that “apocryphal writings” were such as appealed to an inner circle and could not be understood by outsiders. The present connotation of the term did not get fixed until the Protestant Reformation had set in, limiting the Biblical canon to its present dimensions among Protestant churches.

#### 1. Original Meanings:

**1. Classical.**

The Greek adjective [ἀπόκρυφος, apokruptos], denotes strictly “hidden,” “concealed,” of a material object (Eurip. Here. Fur. 1070). Then it came to signify what is obscure, recondite, hard to understand (Xen. Mem. 3.5, 14). But it never has in classical Greek any other sense.

**2. Hellenistic.**

In Hellenistic Greek as represented by the Septuagint and the New Testament there is no essential departure from classical usage. In the Septuagint (or rather Theodotion’s version) of Daniel 11:43 it stands for...
“hidden” as applied to gold and silver stores. But the word has also in the same text the meaning “what is hidden away from human knowledge and understanding.” So Daniel 2:20 (Theod.) where the _apokrupha_ or hidden things are the meanings of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream revealed to Daniel though “hidden” from the wise men of Babylon. The word has the same sense in Sirach 14:21; 39:3,7; 42:19; 48:25; 43:32.

(3) **In the New Testament.**

In the New Testament the word occurs but thrice, namely, Mark 4:22 and the parallel Luke 8:17; Colossians 2:3. In the last passage Bishop Lightfoot thought we have in the word _apokruphoi_ (treasures of Christ hidden) an allusion to the vaunted esoteric knowledge of the false teachers, as if Paul meant to say that it is in Christ alone we have true wisdom and knowledge and not in the secret books of these teachers. Assuming this, we have in this verse the first example of _apokruphos_ in the sense “esoteric.” But the evidence is against so early a use of the term in this — soon to be its prevailing — sense. Nor does exegesis demand such a meaning here, for no writings of any kind seem intended.

(4) **Patristic.**

In patristic writings of an early period the adjective _apokruphos_ came to be applied to Jewish and Christian writings containing secret knowledge about the future, etc., intelligible only to the small number of disciples who read them and for whom they were believed to be specially provided. To this class of writings belong in particular those designated Apocalyptic (see _APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE_), and it will be seen as thus employed that _apokruphos_ has virtually the meaning of the Greek _esoterikos_.

2. **“Esoteric” in Greek Philosophy, etc.:**

A brief statement as to the doctrine in early Greek philosophy will be found helpful at this point. From quite early times the philosophers of ancient Greece distinguished between the doctrines and rites which could be taught to all their pupils, and those which could profitably be communicated only to a select circle called the initiated. The two classes of doctrines and rites — they were mainly the latter — were designated respectively “exoteric” and “esoteric.” Lucian (died 312; see Vit. Auct. 26)
followed by many others referred the distinction to Aristotle, but as modern scholars agree, wrongly, for the [ἐξωτερικοὶ λόγοι, exoterikoi logoi], of that philosopher denote popular treatises. The Pythagoreans recognized and observed these two kinds of doctrines and duties and there is good reason for believing that they created a corresponding double literature though unfortunately no explicit examples of such literature have come down to us. In the Greek mysteries (Orphic, Dionysiac, Eleusinian, etc.) two classes of hearers and readers are implied all through, though it is a pity that more of the literature bearing on the question has not been preserved. Among the Buddhists the Samga forms a close society open originally to monks or bhikhus admitted only after a most rigid examination; but in later years nuns (bhikshunis) also have been allowed admission, though in their case too after careful testing. The Vinaya Pitaka or “Basket of Discipline” contains the rules for entrance and the regulations to be observed after entrance. But this and kindred literature was and is still held to be caviare to outsiders. See translation in the Sacred Books of the East, XI (Rhys Davids and Oldenberg).

3. USAGE AS TO APOCRYPHA.

It must be borne in mind that the word apocrypha is really a Greek adjective in the neuter plural, denoting strictly “things hidden.” But almost certainly the noun biblia is understood, so that the real implication of the word is “apocryphal books” or “writings.” In this article apocrypha will be employed in the sense of this last, and apocryphal as the equivalent of the Greek apokruphos.

1. Early Christian Usage:

“Apocalyptic” literature.

The word apocrypha was first used technically by early Christian writers for the Jewish and Christian writings usually classed under “Apocalyptic” (see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE). In this sense it takes the place of the classical Greek word esoterika and bears the same general meaning, namely, writings intended for an inner circle and capable of being understood by no others. These writings give intimations regarding the future, the ultimate triumph of the kingdom of God, etc., beyond, it was thought, human discovery and also beyond the intelligence of the
uninitiated. In this sense Gregory of Nyssa (died 395; Deuteronomy Ordin., II, 44) and Epiphanius (died 403; Haeres, 51 3) speak of the Apocalypse of John as “apocryphal.”

2. The Eastern Church:

Christianity itself has nothing corresponding to the idea of a doctrine for the initiated or a literature for a select few. The gospel was preached in its first days to the poor and ignorant, and the reading and studying of the sacred Scriptures have been urged by the churches (with some exceptions) upon the public at large.

(1) “Esoteric” Literature (Clement of Alexandria, etc.).

The rise of this conception in the eastern church is easily understood. When devotees of Greek philosophy accepted the Christian faith it was natural for them to look at the new religion through the medium of the old philosophy. Many of them read into the canonical writings mystic meanings, and embodied those meanings in special books, these last becoming esoteric literature in themselves: and as in the case of apocalyptic writings, this esoteric literature was more revered than the Bible itself. In a similar way there grew up among the Jews side by side with the written law an oral law containing the teaching of the rabbis and regarded as more sacred and authoritative than the writings they profess to expound. One may find some analogy in the fact that among many Christians the official literature of the denomination to which they belong has more commanding force than the Bible itself. This movement among Greek Christians was greatly aided by Gnostic sects and the esoteric literature to which they gave rise. These Gnostics had been themselves influenced deeply by Babylonian and Persian mysticism and the corresponding literature. Clement of Alexandria (died 220) distinctly mentions esoteric books belonging to the Zoroastrian (Mazdean) religion.

Oriental and especially Greek Christianity tended to give to philosophy the place which the New Testament and western Christianity assign the Old Testament. The preparation for the religion of Jesus was said to be in philosophy much more than in the religion of the Old Testament. It will be remembered that Marcian (died end of 2nd century AD), Thomas Morgan,
the Welsh 18th-century deist (died 1743) and Friedrich Schleiermacher (died 1834) taught this very same thing.

Clement of Alexandria (see above) recognized 4 (2) Esdras (to be hereafter called the Apocalypse of Ezra), the Assumption of Moses, etc., as fully canonical. In addition to this he upheld the authority and value of esoterical books, Jewish, Christian, and even heathen. But he is of most importance for our present purpose because he is probably the earliest Greek writer to use the word *apocrypha* as the equivalent of *esoterika*, for he describes the esoteric books of Zoroastrianism as *apocryphal*.

But the idea of esoteric religious literature existed at an earlier time among the Jews, and was borrowed from them by Christians. It is clearly taught in the Apocalyptic Esdras (2 or 4 Esd) chapter 14, where it is said that Ezra aided by five amanuenses produced under Divine inspiration 94 sacred books, the writings of Moses and the prophets having been lost when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed. Of this large number of sacred books 24 were to be published openly, for the unworthy as well as the worthy, these 24 books representing undoubtedly the books of the Hebrew Old Testament. The remaining 70 were to be kept for the exclusive use of the “wise among the people”: i.e. they were of an esoteric character. Perhaps if the Greek original of this book had been preserved the word “apocrypha” would have been found as an epithetic attached to the 70 books. Our English versions are made from a Latin original (see 2(4) *Ezra* or the *APOCALYPTIC ESDRAS*). Modern scholars agree that in its present form this book arose in the reign of Domitian 81-96 AD. So that the conception of esoteric literature existed among the Jews in the 1st century of our era, and probably still earlier.

It is significant of the original character of the religion of Israel that no one has been able to point to a Hebrew word corresponding to esoteric (see below). When among the Jews there arose a literature of oral tradition it was natural to apply to this last the Greek notion of esoteric, especially as this class of literature was more highly esteemed in many Jewish circles than the Old Testament Scriptures themselves.
(2) Change to “Religious” Books (Origen, etc.).

The next step in the history of the word “apocrypha” is that by which it came to denote religious books inferior in authority and worth to the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament. This change of attitude toward noncanonical writings took place under the influence of two principles:

(1) that no writer could be inspired who lived subsequent to the apostolic age;

(2) that no writing could be recognized as canonical unless it was accepted as such by the churches in general (in Latin the principle was — quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus). Now it was felt that many if not most of the religious writings which came in the end of the 2nd century to be called “apocryphal” in a disparaging sense had their origin among heretical sects like the Gnostics, and that they had never commanded the approval of the great bulk of the churches. Origen (died 253) held that we ought to discriminate between books called “apocryphal,” some such having to be firmly rejected as teaching what is contrary to the Scriptures. More and more from the end of the 2nd century, the word “apocrypha” came to stand for what is spurious and untrustworthy, and especially for writings ascribed to authors who did not write them: i.e. the so-called “Pseudepigraphical books.”

Irenaeus (died 202) in opposition to Clement of Alexandria denies that esoteric writings have any claims to credence or even respect, and he uses the Greek word for “apocryphal” to describe all Jewish and Christian canons. To him, as later to Jerome (died 420), “canonical” and “apocryphal” were antithetic terms.

Tertullian (died 230) took the same view: “apocryphal” to him denoted non-canonical. But both Irenaeus and Tertullian meant by apocrypha in particular the apocalyptic writings. During the Nicene period, and even earlier, sacred books were divided by Christian teachers into three classes:

(1) books that could be read in church;

(2) books that could be read privately, but not in public;
(3) books that were not to be read at all. This classification is implied in the writings of Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius (died 373), and in the Muratorian Fragments (about 200 AD).

(3) “Spurious” Books (Athenasius, Nicephorus, etc.).

Athanasius, however, restricted the word *apocrypha* to the third class, thus making the corresponding adjective synonymous with “spurious.” Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople (806-15 AD) in his chronography (belonging essentially to 500 AD according to Zahn) divides sacred books thus:

(1) the canonical books of the Old Testament and New Testament;
(2) the Antilegomena of both Testaments;
(3) the Apocrypha of both Testaments.

The details of the Apocrypha of the New Testament are thus enumerated:

(1) Enoch;
(2) The 12 Patriarchs;
(3) The Prayer of Joseph;
(4) The Testament of Moses;
(5) The Assumption of Moses;
(6) Abram;
(7) Eldad and Modad;
(8) Elijah the Prophet;
(9) Zephaniah the Prophet;
(10) Zechariah, father of John;
(11) The Pseudepigrapha of Baruch, Habakkuk, Ezekiel and Daniel.

The books of the New Testament Apocrypha are thus given:

(1) The Itinerary of Paul;
The Itinerary of Peter;

The Itinerary of John;

The Itinerary of Thomas;

The Gospel according to Thomas;

The Teaching of the Apostles (the Didache);

and

The Two Epistles of Clement;

Epistles of Ignatius, Polycarp and Hermas.

The above lists are repeated in the so-called Synopsis of Athanasius. The authors of these so-called apocryphal books being unknown, it was sought to gain respect for these writers by tacking onto them well-known names, so that, particularly in the western church, “apocryphal” came to be almost synonymous with “pseudepigraphical.”

Of the Old Testament lists given above numbers 1, 2, 4, 5 are extant wholly or in part. Numbers 3, 7, 8 and 9 are lost though quoted as genuine by Origen and other eastern Fathers. They are all of them apocalypses designated apocrypha in accordance with early usage.

(4) “List of Sixty.”

In the anonymous, “List of Sixty,” which hails from the 7th century, we have represented probably the attitude of the eastern church. It divides sacred books into three classes:

(1) The sixty canonical books. Since the Protestant canon consists of but 57 books it will be seen that in this list books outside our canon are included.

(2) Books excluded from the 60, yet of superior authority to those mentioned as apocryphal in the next class.

(3) Apocryphal books, the names of which are as follows: (a) Adam; (b) Enoch; (c) Lamech; (d) The 12 Patriarchs; (e) The Prayer of Joseph; (f) Eldad and Modad; (g) The Testament of Moses; (h) The
Assumption of Moses; (i) The Psalms of Solomon; (j) The Apocalypse of Elijah; (k) The Ascension of Isaiah; (l) The Apocalypse of Zephaniah (see number 9 of the Old Testament Apocrypha books mentioned in the Chronography of Nicephorus); (m) The Apocalypse of Zechariah; (n) The Apocalyptic Ezra; (o) The History of James; (p) The Apocalypse of Peter; (q) The Itinerary and Teaching of the Apostles; (r) The Epistles of Barnabas; (s) The Acts of Paul; (t) Apocalypse of Paul; (u) Didascalia of Clement; (v) Didascalia of Ignatius; (w) Didascalia of Polycarp; (x) Gospel according to Barnabas; (y) Gospel according to Matthew.

The greater number of these books come under the designation “apocryphal” in the early sense of “apocalyptic,” but by this time the word had taken on a lower meaning, namely, books not good for even private reading. Yet the fact that these books are mentioned at all show that they were more highly esteemed than heathen and than even heretical Christian writings. The eastern churches down to the present day reject the meaning of “apocrypha” current among Protestants (see definition above), and their Bible includes the Old Testament Apocrypha, making no distinction between it and the rest of the Bible.

3. The Western Church:

(1) The Decretum Gelasii.

In the western church the word apocrypha and the corresponding adjective had a somewhat different history. In general it may be said that the western church did not adopt the triple division of sacred books prevalent in the eastern church. Yet the Decretum Gelasii (6th century in its present form) has a triple list which is almost certainly that of the Roman synod of 382 under Damasus, bishop of Rome, 366 to 384. It is as follows:

(1) the canonical books of both Testaments;

(2) writings of the Fathers approved by the church;

(3) apocryphal books rejected by the church. Then there is added a list of miscellaneous books condemned as heretical, including even the works of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Eusebius, these works being all branded as “apocryphal.” On the other hand Gregory of
Nyssa and Epiphanius, both writing in the 4th century, use the word “apocrypha” in the old sense of apocalyptic, i.e. esoteric.

(2) “Non-Canonical” Books.

Jerome (died 420) in the Prologus Galeatus (so called because it was a defense and so resembled a helmeted warrior) or preface to his Latin version of the Bible uses the word “Apocrypha” in the sense of non-canonical books. His words are: Quidquid extra hos (i.e. the 22 canonical books) inter Apocrypha ponendum: “Anything outside of these must be placed within the Apocrypha” (when among the Fathers and rabbis the Old Testament is made to contain 22 (not 24) books, Ruth and Lamentations are joined respectively to Judges and Jeremiah). He was followed in this by Rufinus (died circa 410), in turns Jerome’s friend and adversary, as he had been anticipated by Irenaeus. The western church as a whole departed from Jerome’s theory by including the antilegomena of both Testaments among the canonical writings: but the general custom of western Christians about this time was to make apocryphal mean non-canonical. Yet Augustine (died 430; Deuteronomy Civitale Dei, XV, 23) explained the “apocrypha” as denoting obscurity of origin or authorship, and this sense of the word became the prevailing one in the West.

4. The Reformers:

Separation from Canonical Books.

But it is to the Reformers that we are indebted for the habit of using Apocrypha for a collection of books appended to the Old Testament and generally up to 1827 appended to every printed English Bible. Bodenstein of Carlstadt, usually called Carlstadt (died 1541), an early Reformer, though Luther’s bitter personal opponent, was the first modern scholar to define “Apocrypha” quite clearly as writings excluded from the canon, whether or not the true authors of the books are known, in this, going back to Jerome’s position. The adjective “apocryphal” came to have among Protestants more and more a disparaging sense. Protestantism was in its very essence the religion of a book, and Protestants would be sure to see to it that the sacred volume on which they based their religion, including the reforms they introduced, contained no book but those which in their opinion had the strongest claims to be regarded as authoritative. In the
eastern and western churches under the influence of the Greek (Septuagint) and Latin (Vulgate) versions the books of the Apocrypha formed an integral part of the canon and were scattered throughout the Old Testament, they being placed generally near books with which they have affinity. Even Protestant Bibles up to 1827 included the Apocrypha, but as one collection of distinct writings at the end of the Old Testament. It will be seen from what has been said that notwithstanding the favorable attitude toward it of the eastern and western churches, from the earliest times, our Apocrypha was regarded with more or less suspicion, and the suspicion would be strengthened by the general antagonism toward it. In the Middle Ages, under the influence of Reuchlin (died 1532) — great scholar and Reformer — Hebrew came to be studied and the Old Testament read in its original language. The fact that the Apocrypha is absent from the Hebrew canon must have had some influence on the minds of the Reformers. Moreover in the Apocrypha there are parts inconsistent with Protestant principles, as for example the doctrines of prayers for the dead, the intercession of the saints, etc. The Jews in the early Christian centuries had really two Bibles:

(1) There was the Hebrew Bible which does not include the Apocrypha, and which circulated in Palestine and Babylon;

(2) there was the Greek version (Septuagint) used by Greek-speaking Jews everywhere. Until in quite early times, instigated by the use made of it by Christians against themselves, the Jews condemned this version and made the Hebrew canon their Bible, thus rejecting the books of the Apocrypha from their list of canonical writings, and departing from the custom of Christian churches which continued with isolated remonstrances to make the Greek Old Testament canon, with which the Vulgate agrees almost completely, their standard. It is known that the Reformers were careful students of the Bible, and that in Old Testament matters they were the pupils of Jewish scholars — there were no other competent teachers of Hebrew. It might therefore have been expected that the Old Testament canon of the Reformers would agree in extent with that of the Jews and not with that of the Greek and Latin Christians. Notwithstanding the doubt which Ryle (Canon of the Old Testament, 156) casts on the matter, all the evidence
goes to show that the Septuagint and therefore the other great Greek versions included the Apocrypha from the first onward.

But how comes it to be that the Greek Old Testament is more extensive than the Hebrew Old Testament? Up to the final destruction of Jerusalem in 71 AD the temple with its priesthood and ritual was the center of the religious thought and life of the nation. But with the destruction of the sanctuary and the disbanding of its officials it was needful to find some fresh binding and directing agency and this was found in the collection of sacred writings known by us as the Old Testament. By a national synod held at Jamnia, near Jaffa, in 90 AD, the Old Testament canon was practically though not finally closed, and from that date one may say that the limits of the Old Testament were once and for all fixed, no writings being included except those written in Hebrew, the latest of these being as old as 100 BC. Now the Jews of the Dispersion spoke and wrote Greek, and they continued to think and write long after their fellow-countrymen of the homeland had ceased to produce any fresh original literature. What they did produce was explanatory of what had been written and practical.

The Greek Bible — the Septuagint — is that of the Jews in Egypt and of those found in other Greek-speaking countries. John Wycliffe (died 1384) puts the Apocrypha together at the end of the Old Testament and the same course was taken by Luther (1546) in his great German and by Miles Coverdale (died 1568) in his English translation.

5. Hebrew Words for “Apocrypha”:

Is it quite certain that there is no Hebrew word or expression corresponding exactly to the word “apocrypha” as first used by Christian writers, i.e. in the sense “esoteric”? One may answer this by a decisive negative as regards the Old Testament and the Talmud. But in the Middle Ages [qabbalah] (literally, “tradition”) came to have ‘a closely allied meaning (compare our “kabbalistic”).

(1) Do such exist?

Is there in Hebrew a word or expression denoting “non-canonical,” i.e. having the secondary sense acquired by “apocrypha”? This question does
not allow of so decided an answer, and as matter of fact it has been answered in different ways.

(2) Views of Zahn, Schurer, Porter, etc. (ganaz, genuzim).

Zahn (Gesch. des neutest. Kanons, I, i, 123 ff); Schurer (RE3, I, 623); Porter (HDB, I) and others maintain that the Greek word “Apocrypha (Biblia)” is a translation of the Hebrew [Cepharim genuzim], literally, “books stored away.” If this view is the correct one it follows that the distinction of canonical and non-canonical books originated among the Jews, and that the Fathers in using the word apocrypha in this sense were simply copying the Jews substituting Greek words for the Hebrew equivalent. But there are decisive reasons for rejecting this view.

(3) Reasons for Rejection.

(a) The verb [ganaz] of which the passive part. occurs in the above phrase means “to store away,” “to remove from view” — of things in themselves sacred or precious. It never means to exclude as from the canon.

(b) When employed in reference to sacred books it is only of those recognized as canonical. Thus after copies of the Pentateuch or of other parts of the Hebrew Bible had, by age and use, become unfit to be read in the home or in the synagogue they were “buried” in the ground as being too sacred to be burnt or cut up; and the verb denoting this burying is ganaz. But those buried books are without exception canonical.

(c) The Hebrew phrase in question does not once occur in either the Babylonian or the Jerusalem Talmud, but only in rabbinical writings of a much later date. The Greek apocrypha cannot therefore be a rendering of the Hebrew expression. The Hebrew for books definitely excluded from the canon is [Cepharim chitsonim] = “outside” or “extraneous books.” The Mishna (the text of the Gemara, both making up what we call the Talmud) or oral law with its additions came to be divided analogously into

(1) The Mishna proper;
(2) the external ([chitsonah]) Mishna: in Aramaic called Baraiytha’.

6. Summary:

What has been said may be summarized:

(1) Among the Protestant churches the word “Apocrypha” is used for the books included in the Septuagint and Vulgate, but absent from the Hebrew Bible. This restricted sense of the word cannot be traced farther back than the beginning of the Reformation.

(2) In classical and Hellenistic Greek the adjective apokruphos denotes “hidden” of visible objects, or obscure, hard to understand (of certain kinds of knowledge).

(3) In early patristic Greek this adjective came into use as a synonym of the classical Greek esoterikos.

(4) In later patristic Greek (Irenaeus, etc.) and in Latin works beginning with Jerome, Greek apokruphos meant non-canonical, implying inferiority in subject-matter to the books in the canon.

(5) By the Protestant Reformers the term “apocrypha” (“apocryphal” “books” being understood) came to stand for what is now called the “Old Testament Apocrypha.” But this usage is confined to Protestants, since in the eastern church and in the Roman branch of the western church the Old Testament Apocrypha is as much an integral part of the canon as Genesis or Kings or Psalms or Isaiah.

(6) There are no equivalents in Hebrew for apokruphos in the sense of either “esoteric” or in that of “non-canonical.”

6. CONTENTS OF THE APOCRYPHA.

1. List of Books:

The following is a list of the books in the Apocrypha in the order in which they occur in the English versions (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)):

(1) 1 Esdras;
(2) 2 Esdras (to be hereafter called “The Apocalyptic Esdras”);
(3) Tobit;
(4) Judith;
(5) The Rest of Esther;
(6) The Wisdom of Solomon;
(7) Ecclesiasticus (to be hereafter called “Sirach”);
(8) Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremiah;
(9) The Song of the Three Holy Children;
(10) The History of Susanna;
(11) Bel and the Dragon;
(12) The Prayer of Manasses;
(13) 1 Maccabees;
(14) 2 Maccabees.

No. 5 in the above, “Addition to Esther;” as it may be called, consists of the majority (107 out of 270 verses) of the Book of Esther since it occurs in the best manuscripts of the Septuagint and in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) over the text in the Hebrew Bible. These additions are in the Septuagint scattered throughout the book and are intelligible in the context thus given them, but not when brought together as they are in the collected Apocrypha of our English versions and as they are to some extent in Jerome’s Latin version and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (see The Century Bible, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, 294f). Numbers 9-11 in the above enumeration are additions made in the Greek Septuagint and Vulgate versions of Daniel to the book as found in the Massoretic Text. It will be well to name them “Additions to Daniel.” The bringing together of the writings of the Apocrypha into an apart collection was due in a large measure to Jerome, who separated many of the apocryphal additions from their original context because he suspected their genuineness. His version influenced the Vulgate, which follows Jerome’s version closely.
Though it is generally true that the Apocrypha is the excess of the Greek (Septuagint) and Latin (Jerome, Vulgate) over the Hebrew Bibles (the Masoretic Text), the statement needs qualification. 2 (4) Ezra, i.e. the Apocalyptic Ezra (Esdras), is absent from the Septuagint, from Jerome’s version, and also from Luther’s Bible, but it occurs in the Vulgate and in the English and other modern versions of the Apocrypha. On the other hand 3 and 4 Macc occur in the best manuscripts of the Septuagint, but the Vulgate, following Jerome’s version, rejects both as do modern versions (English, etc.) of the Apocrypha. Moreover, it has to be pointed out that in the Vulgate proper the Prayer of Manasses and 1 (3) Esdras and the Apocalyptic Esdras are appended to the New Testament as apocryphal.

2. Classification of Books:

(1) Historical.

The books of the Apocrypha proper may be thus classified:

(a) 1 and 2 (i.e. 3) Esdras;
(b) 1 and 2 Maccabees;
(c) Additions to Daniel (nos. 9-11 in the above list);
(d) Additions to Esther;
(e) The Epistle of Jeremy (usually appended to Baruch);
(f) Prayer of Manasses.

(2) Legendary.

(a) Book of Baruch (sometimes classed with prophetic books, sometimes with Apocalypses);
(b) Tobit;
(c) Judith.

(3) Apocalyptic.

The Apocalyptic Esdras or 2 Esdras.
(4) **Didactic.**

(a) The Wisdom of Solomon;

(b) Sirach (Ecclesiasticus).

R. H. Charles, our greatest living authority on the Apocalyptic and Apocryphal writings, embraces the following under the heading “Hellenistic Jewish Literature,” the rest coming under the heading “Palestinian Jewish Literature” (Enc Brit, 11th edition, II, 177):

(1) The Additions to Daniel and Esther

(2) The Epistle of Jeremy;

(3) 2 Macc;

(4) The Wisdom of Solomon.

**5. ORIGINAL LANGUAGES OF THE APOCRYPHA.**

The bulk of the Apocrypha was written originally in the Greek language and existed at the first in that language alone. The following books were however written in Hebrew: Tobit, Judith, Sirach, Baruch (part probably in Greek), and 1 Maccabees. In these cases some prefer regarding Aramaic as the original language in at least parts of the above books. For detailed information see under the several books.

**6. DATE OF THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS.**

The question of date as it applies to the separate books of the Apocrypha will be discussed in connection with the articles dealing with the several books. But a general statement regarding the extreme limits between which all the books were completed may safely be made. The oldest apocryphal book is Sirach, which in its original Hebrew form belongs to between 190-170 BC. In its Greek form the best modern scholars agree in fixing it at between 130-120 BC. None of the books can well belong to a date later than 100 AD, though some (2 Esdras, etc.) may be as late as that. The whole of the Apocrypha may with more than average certainty be said to have been written some time between 200 BC and 100 AD. It will be seen that it is an inaccurate assumption that the Apocrypha was in all its parts
of later date than the latest parts of the Old Testament. The canonical Book of Daniel and many of the Psalms are of later date than Sirach and 1 Esdras, and there are cogent reasons for giving the canonical Esther a later date than any of the books named and perhaps than Judith as well (see, however, *Daniel; Esther*). But it is quite certain that by far the greater part of the Apocrypha is of later date than the Old Testament; it is therefore of the utmost importance as reflecting the state of the Jews and the character of their intellectual and religious life at the various periods represented. And in later years much use has been made of it.

**LITERATURE.**

The Greek text of the Apocrypha is given in the various editions of the Septuagint (except the Apocalyptic Esdras, not extant in Gr). The best editions of the Septuagint are those by Tischendorf revised by E. Nestle (1887); and Swete (1895-99 and later editions). Critical editions of the Apocrypha have been issued by A. Fabricius (Hamburg, 1722-23); Apel (ib 1804) and a very valuable edition by O. T. Fritzsche (Leipzig, 1871) which includes the Latin version of the Apocalyptic Esdras — without the missing fragment. There are several modern translations, far the best being that in German edited by E. Kautzsch, containing Introductions, general and special, and valuable notes by the best German scholars. In English besides the Revised Version (British and American) there is the useful Variorum edition, edited by C. J. Ball. An English critical edition of the Apocrypha edited by R. H. Charles, with introductory notes, is now being printed at Oxford and will be very valuable.

The best commentary is that by O. F. Fritsche and C. L. W. Grimm, Kurzgef. Exeg. Handbuch, 1851-60; but the commentary by Bissell in Lange’s Series of Commentaries and that edited by Wace, in the Speaker’s Bible Series, are meritorious.

Introductory matter will be found in the various Bible Dictionaries under the word: see especially H. E. Ryle in DB (1893), Schurer (RE3), but especially in the valuable Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, by H.B. Swete (1900), Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) (C.F. Porter), and R.H. Charles (Enc Brit11). See also the Einleitungen by König, Budde (A. Bertholet has written the part dealing with the Apocrypha),
and Schurer, Geschichte, III, 1898 (Eng. translation, II, iii), where much literature is specified. For monographs on the several books of the Apocrypha or discussing special points, see the special articles.

*Thomas Witton Davies*

**APOCRYPHAL ACTS**

<*a-pok’-ri-fal akts*>:

**A. GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

*1. The Meaning of “Apocryphal.”*

As applied to early-Christian writings the term “apocryphal” has the secondary and conventional sense of “extra-canonical.”

**1. Secret:**

Originally, as the etymology of the word shows (Greek *apokrupto* = “hide”), it denoted what was “hidden” or “secret.” In this sense “apocryphal” was, to begin with, a title of honor, being applied to writings used by the initiated in esoteric circles and highly valued by them as containing truths miraculously revealed and kept secret from the outside world. Just as there were writings of this kind among the Jews, so there were in Christian circles, among Gnostic sects, *apocrypha*, which claimed to embody the deeper truths of Christianity, committed as a secret tradition by the risen Christ to His apostles.

**2. False and Heretical:**

When the conception of a catholic church began to take shape, it was inevitable that these secret writings should have been regarded with suspicion and have been ultimately forbidden, not only because they fostered the spirit of division in the church, but because they were favorable to the spread of heretical teaching. By a gradual and intelligible transference of ideas “apocryphal,” as applied to secret writings thus discredited by the church, came to have the bad sense of spurious and heretical. In this sense the word is used both by Irenaeus and Tertullian.
3. Extra-Canonical:

Short of being stigmatized as false and heretical many books were regarded as unsuitable for reading in public worship, although they might be used for purposes of private edification. Chiefly under the influence of Jerome the term “apocryphal” received an extension of meaning so as to include writings of this kind, stress now being laid on their non-acceptance as authoritative Scriptures by the church, without any suggestion that the ground of non-acceptance lay in heretical teaching. It is in this wide sense that the word is used when we speak of “Apocryphal Acts.” Although the Acts which bear this name had their origin for the most part in circles of heretical tendency, the description of them as “apocryphal” involves no judgment as to the character of their contents, but simply denotes that they are Acts which were excluded from the New Testament canon because their title or claims to recognition as authoritative and normative writings were not admitted by the church. This definition limits the scope of our investigation to those Acts which belong to the 2nd century, the Biblical Acts having secured their place as an authoritative scripture by the end of that century.

See further, APOCRYPHA.

II. General Characteristics.

The Apocryphal Acts purport to give the history of the activity of the apostles in fuller detail than the canonical Acts.

1. Romance:

The additions to the New Testament narrative found in them are highly flavored with romance and reveal an extravagant and unhealthy taste for the miraculous. Wonderful tales, the product of an exuberant fancy, often devoid of delicacy of feeling and always out of touch with reality, are freely heaped one upon the other. The apostles are no longer conceived as living on the ordinary levels of humanity; their human frailties, to which the canonical writers are not blind, have almost entirely disappeared; they walk through the world as men conversant with the mysteries of heaven and earth and possessed of powers to which no limit can be set. They have the power to heal, to exorcise demons, to raise the dead; and while
marvelous deeds of that nature constantly recur, there are other miracles wrought by the apostles which remind one of the bizarre and non-moral prodigies of the Childhood Gospel of Thomas. A smoked fish is made to swim; a broken statue is made whole by the use of consecrated a wafer; a child of seven months is enabled to talk with a man’s voice; animals receive the power of human speech.

2. The Supernatural:

The romantic character of the Apocryphal Acts is intensified by the frequent introduction of the supernatural. Angelic messengers appear in vision and in dream; heavenly voices are heard; clouds descend to hide the faithful in the hour of danger and lightnings smite their foes; the terrifying forces of Nature, earthquake, wind and fire, strike dismay into the hearts of the ungodly; and martyrs die transfigured in a blaze of unearthly glory. Especially characteristic of these Acts are the appearances of Christ in many forms; now as an old man, now as a comely youth, now as a child; but most frequently in the likeness of this or that apostle. (It is interesting to observe that Origen is familiar with a tradition that Jesus during His earthly life could change His appearance when and how He pleased, and gives that as a reason for the necessity of the traitor’s kiss. Compare also Mark 16:9,12.)

3. Sexual Asceticism:

One must not suppose from the foregoing that the Apocryphal Acts with their profusion of romantic and supernatural details were designed merely to exalt the personality of the apostles and to satisfy the prevalent desire for the marvelous. They had a definite practical end in view. They were intended to confirm and popularize a type of Christianity in strong reaction against the world, in which emphasis was laid on the rigid abstinence from sexual relations as the chief moral requirement. This sexual asceticism is the dominant motif in all the Acts. The “contendings” of the apostles, their trials and their eventual martyrdom are in almost every case due to their preaching the sinfulness of conjugal life and to their success in persuading women to reject the society of their husbands. The Acts are penetrated throughout by the conviction that abstinence from marriage is the supreme condition of entering upon the highest life and of winning heaven. The gospel on its practical side is (to use the succinct expression
of the Acts of Paul) “the word of God regarding abstinence and the resurrection.”

4. Heretical Teaching:

Besides inculcating an ascetic morality the Apocryphal Acts show traces more or less pronounced of dogmatic heresy. All of them with the exception of the Acts of Paul represent a docetic view of Christ; that is to say, the earthly life of Jesus is regarded merely as an appearance, phantasmal and unreal. This docetic Christology is most prominent in the Acts of John, where we read that when Jesus walked no footprints were discernible; that sometimes when the apostle attempted to lay hold of the body of Jesus his hand passed through it without resistance; that when the crowd gathered round the cross on which to all appearance Jesus hung, the Master Himself had an interview with His disciple John on the Mount of Olives. The crucifixion was simply a symbolical spectacle; it was only in appearance that Christ suffered and died. Allied with the docetic Christology is a naive Modalism, according to which there is no clear distinction between the Father and the Son.

5. Religious Feeling:

In spite of the unfavorable impression created by the flood of miraculous and supernatural details, the pervading atmosphere of sexual asceticism and the presence of dogmatic misconception, it is impossible not to feel in many sections of the Apocryphal Acts the rapture of a great spiritual enthusiasm. Particularly in the Acts of John, Andrew and Thomas there are passages (songs, prayers, homilies), sometimes of genuine poetic beauty, which are characterized by religious warmth, mystic fervor and moral earnestness. The mystical love to Christ, expressed though it frequently is in the strange language of Gnostic thought, served to bring the Saviour near to men as the satisfaction of the deepest yearnings of the soul for deliverance from the dark power of death. The rank superstition and the traces of unconquered heathenism should not blind us to the fact that in the Apocryphal Acts we have an authentic if greatly distorted expression of the Christian faith, and that through them great masses of people were confirmed in their conviction of the spiritual presence and power of Christ the Saviour.
III. Origin.

The Apocryphal Acts had their origin at a time when the canonical Acts of the Apostles were not yet recognized as alone authoritative. Various motives contributed to the appearance of books dealing with the life and activity of the different apostles.

1. Reverence for Apostles:

Behind every variety of motive lay the profound reverence for the apostles as the authoritative depositories of Christian truth. In apostolic times the sole authority in Christian communities, outside Old Testament Scripture, was “the Lord.” But as the creative period of Christianity faded into the past, “the apostles” (in the sense of the college of the Twelve, including Paul) were raised to a preeminent position alongside of Christ with the object of securing continuity in the credentials of the faith. The commandments of the Lord had been received through them (2 Peter 3:2). In the Ignatian epistles they have a place of acknowledged supremacy by the side of Christ. Only that which had apostolic authority was normative for the church. The authority of the apostles was universal. They had gone into all the world to preach the gospel. They had, according to the legend referred to at the beginning of the Acts of Thomas, divided among themselves the different regions of the earth as the spheres of their activity. It was an inevitable consequence of the peculiar reverence in which the apostles were held as the securities for Christian truth that a lively interest should everywhere be shown in traditional stories about their work and that writings should be multiplied which purported to give their teaching with fullness of detail.

2. Pious Curiosity:

The canonical Acts were not calculated to satisfy the prevailing desire for a knowledge of the life and teaching of the apostles. For one thing many of the apostles are there ignored, and for another the information given about the chief apostles Peter and Paul is little more than a meager outline of the events of their life. In these circumstances traditions not preserved in the canonical Acts were eagerly accepted, and as the actual history of the individual apostles was largely shrouded in obscurity, legends were freely invented to gratify the insatiable curiosity. The marvelous character of
these inventions is a testimony to the supernatural level to which the apostles had been raised in popular esteem.

3. Apostolic Authority Desired:

As in the case of the apocryphal Gospels, the chief motive in the multiplication of apostolic romances was the desire to set forth with the full weight of apostolic authority conceptions of Christian life and doctrine which prevailed in certain circles.

(1) Alongside the saner and catholic type of Christianity there existed, especially in Asia Minor, a popular Christianity with perverted ideals of life. On its practical side the Christian religion was viewed as an ascetic discipline, involving not only abstinence from animal food and wine but also (and chiefly) abstinence from marriage. Virginity was the Christian ideal. Poverty and fastings were obligatory on all. The Apocryphal Acts are permeated by this spirit, and their evident design is to confirm and spread confidence in this ascetic ideal by representing the apostles as the zealous advocates of it.

(2) The Apocryphal Acts were also intended to serve a dogmatic interest. Heretical sects used them as a means of propagating their peculiar doctrinal views and sought to supplement or supplant the tradition of the growing catholic church by another tradition which claimed to be equally apostolic.

4. Interests of Local Churches:

A subsidiary cause in the fabrication of apostolic legends was the desire of churches to find support for the claims which they put forward for an apostolic foundation or for some connection with apostles. In some cases the tradition of the sphere of an apostle’s activity may have been well based, but in others there is a probability that stories of an apostolic connection were freely invented for the purpose of enhancing the prestige of some local church.
In general it may be said that the Apocryphal Acts are full of legendary details. In the invention of these everything was done to inspire confidence in them as historically true.

1. Canonical Acts:

The narratives accordingly abound in clear reminiscences of the canonical Acts. The apostles are cast into prison and are marvelously set at liberty. Converts receive the apostles into their houses. The description of the Lord’s Supper as “the breaking of bread” (Acts 2:42,46) is repeated in the Apocryphal Acts and is strictly apposite to the ritual there set forth in which there is frequently no mention of wine in the celebration of the sacrament. In the Acts of Paul the author evidently used the canonical Acts as the framework of his narrative. This dependence on the canonical Acts and the variety of allusions to details in them served to give an appearance of historical truthfulness to the later inventions and to secure for them a readier acceptance. The fact that the canonical Acts were so used clearly shows that they had a position of exceptional authority at the time when the Apocryphal Acts were written.

2. Traditions:

The legendary character of the Apocryphal Acts does not preclude the possibility of authentic details in the additions made to the canonical history. There must have been many traditions regarding the apostles preserved in Christian communities which had a foundation in actual fact. Some of these would naturally find a place in writings which were designed in part at least to satisfy the popular curiosity for a fuller knowledge of the apostles. It is certain that there is some substratum of historical fact in the episode of Paul’s association with Thecla (Acts of Paul). The description of Paul’s appearance given in the same connection is in all likelihood due to trustworthy historical reminiscence. But it must be confessed that the signs of the presence of reliable traditions are very scanty. The few grains of historical fact are hidden in an overwhelming mass of material whose legendary character is unmistakable.
3. Romances of Travel:

Although a formal connection with the canonical Acts is recognizable and reliable traditions are to a slight extent incorporated in the Apocryphal Acts, it is unquestionable that as a whole they are the creation of the Hellenic spirit which reveled in the miraculous. A noteworthy type of popular literature whose influence is apparent on almost every page of the Apocryphal Acts was that of the travel-romance. The most famous example of this romantic literature is the Life of the neo-Pythagorean preacher, the great wonder-worker Apollonios of Tyana, who died about the end of the 1st century AD. The marvelous deeds reported to have been wrought by him on his travels were freely transferred in a somewhat less striking form to other teachers. It is in the atmosphere of these romances that the Apocryphal Acts had their birth. In particular the Acts of Thomas recall the history of Apollonios. For just as Thomas was a missionary in India, so “Apollonios as a disciple of Pythagoras had traveled, a peaceful Alexander, to the Indian wonderland and there preached his master’s wisdom” (Geffcken, Christliche Apokryphen, 36).

V. Ecclesiastical Testimony.

From the nature of his reference to the canonical Acts it is probable that the writer of the Muratorian Canon (circa 190 AD) had the existence of other Acts in mind. “The Acts of all the apostles,” he says, “are written in a single book. Luke relates them admirably to Theophilus, confining himself to such as fell under his own notice, as he plainly shows by the omission of all reference either to the martyrdom of Peter or to the journey of Paul from Rome to Spain.” During the 3rd century there are slight allusions to certain of the Apocryphal Acts, but it is only in the 4th century that distinct references are frequent in writers both of the East and of the West. A few of the more important references may be given here. (For a full account of the ecclesiastical testimony see Harnack, Gesch. der altchr. Lit., I, 116 ff.)

1. Eastern:

Among eastern writers Eusebius (died 340) is the first to make any clear reference to Apocryphal Acts. He speaks of “Acts of Andrew, of John and of the other apostles,” which were of such a character that no
ecclesiastical writer thought it proper to invoke their testimony. Their style and their teaching showed them to be so plainly of heretical origin that he would not put them even among spurious Scriptures, but absolutely rejected them as absurd and impious (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25.6.7). Ephraem (died 373) declares that Acts were written by the Bardesanites to propagate in the name of the apostles the unbelief which the apostles had destroyed. Epiphanius (circa 375) repeatedly refers to individual Acts which were in use among heretical sects. Amphilochius of Iconium, a contemporary of Epiphanius, declares that certain writings emanating from heretical circles were “not Acts of the apostles but accounts of demons.” The Second Synod of Nicea (787 AD), in the records of which those words of Amphilochius are preserved, dealt with apocryphal literature and had under special consideration the Acts of John to which the Iconoclasts appealed. In the synod’s finding these Acts were characterized as “this abominable book,” and on it the judgment was passed: “Let no one read it; and not only so, but we judge it worthy of being committed to the flames.”

2. Western:

In the West from the 4th century onward references are frequent. Philastrius of Brescia (circa 387) testifies to the use of Apocryphal Acts among the Manicheans, and declares that although they are not suitable for general reading they may be read with profit by mature Christians (Deuteronomy Haeres, 88). The reason for this favorable judgment is to be found in the pronounced ascetic tendency of the Acts, which was in line with the moral ideal prevalent at that time in the West. Augustine refers repeatedly to apocryphal Acts in use among the Manicheans and characterizes them as the work of “cobblers of fables” (sutoribus fabularum). The Manicheans accepted them as true and genuine; and in respect of this claim Augustine says: “They would in the time of their authors have been counted worthy of being welcomed to the authority of the Holy Church, if saintly and learned men who were then alive and could examine such things had acknowledged them as speaking the truth” (Contra Faustum, XXII, 79). The Acts of John and the Acts of Thomas are mentioned by Augustine by name. He also refers to Leucius as the author of Apocryphal Acts. Turribius of Astorga (circa 450) speaks of Acts of Andrew, of John, of Thomas, and attributes them to the Manicheans. Of
the heretical teaching in the Acts of Thomas, Turribius singles out for special condemnation baptism by oil instead of by water. Leucius is mentioned as the author of the Acts of John. The Acts of Andrew, Thomas, Peter, and Philip are condemned as apocryphal in the Gelasian Decree (496 AD) and in the same condemnation are included “all books written by Leucius, a disciple of the devil.”

3. Photius:

The fullest and most important reference to the Apocryphal Acts is found in Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople in the second half of the 9th century. In his Bibliotheca, which contains an account of 280 different books which he had read during his absence on a mission to Bagdad, we learn that among these was a volume, “the so-called Wanderings of the Apostles, in which were included Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, Paul. The author of these Acts, as the book itself makes plain, was Leucius Charinus.” The language had none of the grace which characterized the evangelic and apostolic writings. The book teemed with follies and contradictions. Its teaching was heretical. In particular it was taught that Christ had never really become man. Not Christ but another in His place had been crucified. After referring to the ascetic doctrine and the absurd miracles of the Acts and to the part which the Acts of John had played in the Iconoclastic Controversy, Photius concludes: “In short this book contains ten thousand things which are childish, incredible, ill-conceived, false, foolish, inconsistent, impious and godless. If anyone were to call it the fountain and mother of all heresy, he would not be far from the truth.”

4. Ecclesiastical Condemnation:

There is thus a consensus of ecclesiastical testimony as to the general character of the Apocryphal Acts. They were writings used by a number of heretical sects but regarded by the church as unreliable and harmful. It is probable that the corpus of the Acts in five parts referred to by Photius was formed by the Manicheans of North Africa, who attempted to have them accepted by the church in place of the canonical Acts which they had rejected. These Acts in consequence were stamped by the church with a heretical character. The sharpest condemnation is that pronounced by Leo I (circa 450) who declares that “they should not only be forbidden but should be utterly swept away and burned. For although there are certain
things in them which seem to have the appearance of piety, yet they are never free of poison and secretly work through the allurements of fables so that they involve in the snares of every possible error those who are seduced by the narration of marvelous things.” The Acts of Paul, which show no trace of dogmatic heresy, were included in the ecclesiastical censure owing to the fact that they had received a place at the end of the corpus. Many teachers in the church, however, made a distinction between the miraculous details and the heretical doctrines of the Acts, and while they rejected the latter they retained the former. Witness the words of an orthodox reviser in regard to his heretical predecessor: “Quaedam de virtutibus quidem et miraculis quae per eos Dominus fecit, vera dixit; de doctrina vero multa mentitus est.”

**VI. Authorship.**

In the notice of Photius (Bibliotheca codex 114) all the five Acts are ascribed to one author, Leucius Charinus. Earlier writers had associated the name of Leucius with certain Acts. In particular he is, on the witness of several writers, declared to be the author of the Acts of John. As these Acts show, the author professes to be a follower and companion of the apostle, and Epiphanius (Haeres., 51 6) mentions one named Leucius as being in the entourage of John. This notice of Epiphanius, however, is of doubtful value, as it probably rested on the association in his mind of the name of Leucius with the Acts of John. Whether or not there is any truth in the ascription of these Acts to a disciple of John must be left undecided, but the probabilities are against there being any. Be that as it may, when the different Acts were collected, the name of the reputed author of the Acts of John was transferred to the whole collection. This probably happened not later than the 4th century. Although all the Acts are certainly not from one hand (the difference of style is sufficient proof of this), there are so many striking similarities between some of them as to suggest a possible common authorship in those cases or at least a relation of literary dependence.

**VII. Relationship of Different Acts.**

That some connection existed between the different Acts was clearly recognized in early times, and it was doubtless due to this recognition that they were gathered together in a corpus under the name of one author. It is
acknowledged that there is a close relationship between the Acts of Peter and the Acts of John, some holding that they are the work of the same author (James, Zahn), others that the former are dependent on the latter (Schmidt, Hennecke), while others again believe that their origin in the same theological school and in the same ecclesiastical atmosphere sufficiently explains all similarities (Ficker). The Acts of Andrew, too, reveal a near kinship to the Acts of Peter. But however the matter may stand in regard to literary dependence, the affinity between the different Acts in a material sense is manifest. All are pervaded by the ascetic spirit; in all Christ appears in the form of the apostle; in all women visit the apostle in prison. In respect of theological doctrine the Acts of Paul stand by themselves as anti-Gnostic in tendency, but the others agree in their docetic view of Christ’s person; while in the Acts of John, Peter and Thomas, there is a similar mystical doctrine of the cross.

VIII. Value.

1. As History:

As a source for information about the life and work of the apostles the Apocryphal Acts are almost entirely worthless. A possible exception in this respect is the section of the Acts of Paul dealing with Paul and Thecla, although even there any historical elements are almost lost in the legendary overgrowth. The spheres of the apostles’ work, so far as they are mentioned only in these Acts, cannot be accepted without question, although they may be derived from reliable tradition. Taken as a whole the picture given in the Apocryphal Acts of the missionary labors of the apostles is a grotesque caricature.

2. As Records of Early Christianity:

The Apocryphal Acts, however, though worthless as history, are of extreme value as throwing light on the period in which they were written. They belong to the 2nd century and are a rich quarry for information about the popular Christianity of that time. They give us a vivid picture of the form which Christianity assumed in contact with the enthusiastic mystery-cults and Gnostic sects which then flourished on the soil of Asia Minor. We see in them the Christian faith deeply tinged with the spirit of contemporary paganism; the faith in Christ the Saviour-God, which
satisfied the widespread yearning for redemption from the powers of evil, in association with the as yet unconquered elements of its heathen environment.

(1) The Acts show us popular Christianity under the influence of Gnostic ideas as contrasted with the Gnosticism of the schools which moves in a region of mythological conceptions, cold abstractions and speculative subtleties. At the basis of Gnosticism lay a contempt for material existence; and in the Christianity of the Apocryphal Acts we see the practical working up of the two chief ideas which followed from this fundamental position, a docetic conception of Christ’s person and an ascetic view of life. In this popular religion Christ had few of the features of the historic Jesus; He was the Saviour-God, exalted above principalities and powers, through union with whom the soul was delivered from the dread powers of evil and entered into the true life. The manhood of Christ was sublimated into mere appearance; and in particular the sufferings of Christ were conceived mystically and symbolically, “sometimes in the form that in the story of His sufferings we see only the symbol of human sufferings in general; sometimes in the form that Christ who is present in His church shares in the martyr-sufferings of Christians; sometimes, again, in the form that the sin, weakness and unfaithfulness of His people inflict upon Him ever-renewed sufferings” (Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 181). The ethical influence of Gnosticism is apparent in the spirit of strict asceticism which is the most characteristic feature of these Acts. It is true that the ascetic ideal obtained not only in Gnostic but also in orthodox church circles, as we gather from the Acts of Paul as well as from other sources. The prominence of the strict ascetic ideal in early Christianity is intelligible. The chief battle which the Christian faith had to fight with Hellenic heathenism was for sexual purity, and in view of the coarseness and laxity which prevailed in sexual relations it is not surprising that the Christian protest was exaggerated in many cases into a demand for complete continence. This ascetic note in primitive Christianity was emphasized by the spirit of Gnosticism and finds clear expression in the Acts which arose either in Gnostic circles or in an environment tinged with Gnostic ideas. It goes without saying that the influence of these romances which are so largely concerned
with sexual morality and occasionally are unspeakably coarse, was to preoccupy the mind with unhealthy thoughts and to sully that purity of spirit which it was their intention to secure. There are, however, other ethical elements in these Acts which are in complete harmony with a true Christian morality.

(2) The Apocryphal Acts are an invaluable source for information about early-Christian forms of worship. The ritual of the sacraments is fully described in the Acts of Thomas. Some of the prayers found in the Acts are pervaded by a warm religious spirit and are rich in liturgical expression.

(3) The beginnings of Christian hymnology may be traced in the Acts of Thomas, in which occur Gnostic hymns breathing the fantastic oriental spirit.

(4) Apparent in the Acts throughout is the excessive love for the supernatural and the religious enthusiasm which flourished in Asia Minor in the 2nd century (compare especially the dance of the disciples round Jesus in the Acts of John: chapter 94 ff).

IX. Influence.

The Apocryphal Acts had a remarkable influence in the later history of the church. After the establishment of Christianity under Constantine men turned their eyes to the earlier years of struggle and persecution. A deep interest was awakened in the events of the heroic age of the faith — the age of martyrs and apostles. Acts of martyrs were eagerly read, and in particular the Apocryphal Acts were drawn upon to satisfy the desire for a fuller knowledge of the apostles than was afforded by the canonical books. The heretical teaching with which the apostolic legends were associated in these Acts led to their condemnation by ecclesiastical authority, but the ban of the church was unavailing to eradicate the taste for the vivid colors of apostolic romance. In these circumstances church writers set themselves the task of rewriting the earlier Acts, omitting what was clearly heretical and retaining the miraculous and supernatural elements. And not only so, but the material of the Acts was freely used in the fabrication of lives of other apostles, as we find in the collection of the so-called Abdias in the 6th century. The result was that from the 4th to
the 11th century literature of this kind, dealing with the apostles, grew apace and “formed the favorite reading of Christians, from Ireland to the Abyssinian mountains and from Persia to Spain” (Harnack). Apostolic legends were reproduced in religious poems; they appeared in martyrologies and calendars; they formed the subject of homilies on the feast-days of the apostles, and incidents from them were depicted in Christian article New cycles of legends arose in the Syrian and Coptic churches; and the Coptic legends were translated into Arabic and from Arabic into Ethiopic (Gadla Hawaryat — The Contendings of the Apostles). Literature of this kind was the fruitful mother of every kind of superstition. “Whole generations of Christians (as Harnack says), yes, whole Christian nations were intellectually blinded by the dazzling appearance of these tales. They lost the eye not only for the true light of history but also for the light of truth itself” (Gesch. der altchr. Lit., I, xxvi). It is noteworthy that the apocryphal correspondence with the Corinthians in the Acts of Paul was received as canonical in the Syrian and Armenian churches.

**LITERATURE.**

The Apocryphal Acts form the subject of a voluminous literature. The earlier editions of the available texts by Fabricius (1703) and Tischendorf (1851) have been completely superseded by Lipsius-Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum apocrypha (1891-1903), which contains texts not only of the earlier but also of many of the later Acts. Translations of earlier Acts with valuable introductions are to be found in Hennecke, New Testament Apokryphen (1904), while critical discussions and elucidation of the text are given in Hennecke, Handbuch zu den New Testament Apokryphen (1904). These two works are indispensable to the student. English translations of earlier Acts with short introductions in Pick, Apocryphal Acts (1909). The critical work of Lipsius on these Acts was epoch-making: Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden (1883-90). Full lists of literature may be found in Hennecke and Pick. The following may be mentioned here: Zahn, Geschichte des New Testament Kanons, II, 832 ff (1892); Forschungen zur Gesch. des New Testament Kanons, VI, 14 if, 194 ff (1900); Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, I, 116 ff (1893); II, 493 ff, 541 ff (1897); James, Apocrypha Anecdotata (Texts and Studies, V, 1, 1897); Ehrhard, Die altchristliche
B. THE SEPARATE ACTS

The Apocryphal Acts dealt with in this article are the Leucian Acts mentioned by Photius in his Bibliotheca. As we now have them they have undergone revision in the interest of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, but in their original form they belonged to the 2nd century. It is impossible to say how much the Acts in their present form differ from that in which they originally appeared, but it is evident at many points that the orthodox revision which was meant to eliminate heretical elements was not by any means thorough. Passages which are distinctly Gnostic were preserved probably because the reviser did not understand their true meaning.


1. Ecclesiastical Testimony:

Origen in two passages of his extant writings quotes the Acts of Paul with approval, and it was possibly due to his influence that these Acts were held in high regard in the East. In the Codex Claromontanus (3rd century), which is of eastern origin, the Acts of Paul are treated as a catholic writing and take rank with the Shepherd of Hermas and the Apocalypse of Peter. Eusebius, who utterly rejects “The Acts of Andrew, John and the rest of the apostles,” puts the Acts of Paul in the lower class of debated writings alongside Hermas, Epistle of Barnabas, Didache, the Apocalypse of John, etc. (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25.4). In the West, where Origen was viewed with suspicion, the Acts of Paul were apparently discredited, the only use of them as a reliable source being found in Hippolytus, the friend of Origen, who however does not mention them by name. (The reference by Hippolytus is found in his commentary on Daniel. He argues from Paul’s conflict with the wild beasts to the credibility of the story of Daniel in the lions’ den.)
2. Contents:

Of the Acts of Paul only fragments remain. Little was known of them until in 1904 a translation from a badly preserved Coptic version was published by C. Schmidt, and the discovery was made that the well-known Acts of Paul and Thecla were in reality a part of the Acts of Paul. From the notes regarding the extent of the Acts given in the Cod. Claromontanus and in the Stichometry of Nicephorus we gather that the fragments amount to about one-fourth of the whole.

Of these fragments the longest and the most important is the section which came to have a separate existence under the name The Acts of Paul and Thecla. When these were separated from the Acts of Paul we cannot tell, but this had happened before the time of the Gelasian Decree (496 AD), which without making mention of the Acts of Paul condemns as apocryphal the Acts of Paul and Thecla.

(a) An outline of the narrative is as follows: At Iconium, Thecla, a betrothed maiden, listened to the preaching of Paul on virginity and was so fascinated that she refused to have anything further to do with her lover. On account of his influence over her, Paul was brought before the proconsul and was cast into prison. There Thecla visited him with the result that both were brought to judgment. Paul was banished from the city and Thecla was condemned to be burned. Having been miraculously delivered at the pile, Thecla went in search of Paul and when she had found him she accompanied him to Antioch. (There is confusion in the narrative of Antioch of Pisidia and Syrian Antioch.) In Antioch an influential citizen, Alexander by name, became enamored of her and openly embraced her on the street. Thecla, resenting the familiarity, pulled off the crown which Alexander wore and in consequence was condemned to fight with the wild beasts at the games. Until the day of the games Thecla was placed under the care of Queen Tryphaena, then living in Antioch. When Thecla was exposed in the amphitheater a lioness died in defending her against attack. In her peril Thecla cast herself into a tank containing seals and declared: “In the name of Jesus Christ I baptize myself on my last day.” (It was with reference partly to this act of self-baptism that Tertullian gave the information about the authorship of these Acts: below 3.) When it was
proposed to have Thecla torn asunder by maddened bulls Queen Tryphaena fainted, and through fear of what might happen the authorities released Thecla and handed her over to Tryphaena. Thecla once again sought Paul and having found him was commissioned by him to preach the Word of God. This she did first at Iconium and then in Seleucia where she died. Various later additions described Thecla’s end, and in one of them it is narrated that she went underground from Seleucia to Rome that she might be near Paul. Finding that Paul was dead she remained in Rome until her death.

(b) Although the Thecla story is a romance designed to secure apostolic authority for the ideal of virginity, it is probable that it had at least a slight foundation in actual fact. The existence of an influential Thecla-cult at Seleucia favors the view that Thecla was a historical person. Traditions regarding her association with Paul which clustered round the temple in Seleucia built in her honor may have provided the materials for the romance. In the story there are clear historical reminiscences. Tryphaena is a historical character whose existence is established by coins. She was the mother of King Polemon II of Pontus and a relative of the emperor Claudius. There are no grounds for doubting the information given us in the Acts that she was living at Antioch at the time of Paul’s first visit. The Acts further reveal striking geographical accuracy in the mention of “the royal road” by which Paul is stated to have traveled from Lystra on his way to Iconium — a statement which is all the more remarkable because, while the road was in use in Paul’s time for military reasons, it was given up as a regular route in the last quarter of the 1st century. In the Acts Paul is described as “a man small in stature, bald-headed, bow-legged, of noble demeanor, with meeting eyebrows and a somewhat prominent nose, full of grace. He appeared sometimes like a man, and at other times he had the face of an angel.” This description may quite well rest on reliable tradition. On the ground of the historical features in the story, Ramsay (The Church in the Roman Empire, 375 ff) argued for the existence of a shorter version going back to the 1st century, but this view has not been generally accepted.

(c) The Acts of Paul and Thecla were very widely read and had a remarkable influence owing to the widespread reverence for Thecla,
who had a high place among the saints as “the first female martyr.” References to the Acts in the Church Fathers are comparatively few, but the romance had an extraordinary vogue among Christians both of the East and of the West. In particular, veneration for Thecla reached its highest point in Gaul, and in a poem entitled “The Banquet” (Caena) written by Cyprian, a poet of South-Gaul in the 5th century, Thecla stands on the same level as the great characters of Biblical history. The later Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena are entirely derived from the Acts of Paul and Thecla.

(2) Another important fragment of the Acts of Paul is that containing the so-called Third Epistle to the Corinthians. Paul is represented as being in prison at Philippi (not at the time of Acts 16:23 ff, but at some later time). His incarceration was due to his influence over Stratonice, the wife of Apollonianus. The Corinthians who had been disturbed by two teachers of heresy sent a letter to Paul describing their pernicious doctrines, which were to the effect that the prophets had no authority, that God was not almighty, that there was no resurrection of the body, that man had not been made by God, that Christ had not come in the flesh or been born of Mary, and that the world was not the work of God but of angels. Paul was sorely distressed on receipt of this epistle and, “under much affliction,” wrote an answer in which the popular Gnostic views of the false teachers are vehemently opposed. This letter which abounds in allusions to several of the Pauline epistles is chiefly remarkable from the fact that it found a place, along with the letter which called it forth, among canonical writings in the Syrian and Armenian churches after the second century. The correspondence was strangely enough believed to be genuine by Rinck who edited it in 1823. The original Greek version has not been preserved, but it exists in Coptic (not quite complete), in Armenian and in two Latin translations (both mutilated), besides being incorporated in Ephraem’s commentary (in Armenian translation). The Syriac version has been lost.

(3) Besides the two portions of the Acts of Paul mentioned above there are others of less value, the Healing of a Dropsical Man at Myra by the apostle (a continuation of the Thecla-narrative), Paul’s conflict with wild beasts at Ephesus (based on the misunderstanding of 1 Corinthians
15:32), two short citations by Origen, and a concluding section describing the apostle’s martyrdom under Nero, to whom Paul appeared after his death. Clement of Alexandria quotes a passage (Strom., VI, 5, 42 f) — a fragment from the mission-preaching of Paul — which may have belonged to the Acts of Paul; and the same origin is possible for the account of Paul’s speech in Athens given by John of Salisbury (circa 1156) in the Polycraticus, IV, 3.

3. Authorship and Date:

From a passage in Tertullian (Deuteronomy Baptismo, chapter 17) we learn that the author of the Acts of Paul was “a presbyter of Asia, who wrote the book with the intention of increasing the dignity of Paul by additions of his own,” and that “he was removed from office when, having been convicted, he confessed that he had done it out of love to Paul.” This testimony of Tertullian is supported by the evidence of the writing itself which, as we have seen, shows in several details exact knowledge of the topography and local history of Asia Minor. A large number of the names occurring in these Acts are found in inscriptions of Smyrna, although it would be precarious on that ground to infer that the author belonged to that city. It is possible that he was a native of a town where Thecla enjoyed peculiar reverence and that the tradition of her association with Paul, the preacher of virginity, was the chief motive for his writing the book. Along with this was linked the motive to oppose the views of some Gnostics (the Bardesanites). The date of the Acts of Paul is the latter half of the second century, probably between 160 and 180 AD.

4. Character and Tendency:

The Acts of Paul, though written to enhance the dignity of the apostle, clearly show that both in respect of intellectual equipment and in breadth of moral vision the author, with all his love for Paul, was no kindred spirit. The intellectual level of the Acts is low. There is throughout great poverty in conception; the same motif occurs without variation; and the defects of the author’s imagination have their counterpart in a bare and inartistic diction. New Testament passages are frequently and freely quoted. The view which the author presents of Christianity is narrow and one-sided. Within its limits it is orthodox in sentiment; there is nothing to support the opinion of Lipsius that the work is a revision of a Gnostic writing. The
frequent occurrence of supernatural events and the strict asceticism which characterize the Acts are no proof of Gnostic influence. The dogmatic is indeed anti-Gnostic, as we see in the correspondence with the Corinthians. “The Lord Jesus Christ was born of Mary, of the Seed of David, the Father having sent the Spirit from heaven into her.” The resurrection of the body is assured by Christ’s resurrection from the dead. Resurrection, however, is only for those who believe in it — in this we have the one thought which betrays any originality on the part of the author: “they who say that there is no resurrection shall have no resurrection.” With faith in the resurrection is associated the demand for strict sexual abstinence. Only they who are pure (i.e. who live in chastity) shall see God. “Ye have no part in the resurrection unless ye remain chaste and defile not the flesh.” The gospel which the apostle preached was “the word regarding self-control and the resurrection.” In the author’s desire to secure authority for a prevalent form of Christianity, which demanded sexual abstinence as a condition of eternal life, we recognize the chief aim of the book. Paul is represented as the apostle of this popular conception, and his teaching is rendered attractive by the miraculous and supernatural elements which satisfied the crude taste of the time.

**LITERATURE.**


**II. Acts of Peter.**

**1. Contents:**

A large portion (almost two-thirds) of the Acts of Peter is preserved in a Latin translation — the Actus Vercellenses, so named from the town of Vercelli in Piedmont, where the manuscript containing them lies in the chapter-library. A Coptic fragment discovered and published (1903) by C.
Schmidt contains a narrative with the subscription Praxis Petrou (Act of Peter). Schmidt is of opinion that this fragment formed part of the work to which the Actus Vercellenses also belonged, but this is somewhat doubtful. The fragment deals with an incident in Peter’s ministry at Jerusalem, while the Act. Vercell., which probably were meant to be a continuation of the canonical Acts, give an account of Peter’s conflict with Simon Magus and of his martyrdom at Rome. References in ecclesiastical writers (Philastrius of Brescia, Isidore of Pelusium and Photius) make it practically certain that the Actus Vercellensus belong to the writing known as the Acts of Peter, which was condemned in the rescript of Innocent I (405 AD) and in the Gelasian Decree (496 AD).

(1) The Coptic Fragment contains the story of Peter’s paralytic daughter. One Sunday while Peter was engaged in healing the sick a bystander asked him why he did not make his own daughter whole. To show that God was able to effect the cure through him, Peter made his daughter sound for a short time and then bade her return to her place and become as before. He explained that the affliction had been laid upon her to save her from defilement, as a rich man Ptolemy had been enamored of her and had desired to make her his wife. Ptolemy’s grief at not receiving her had been such that he became blind. As the result of a vision he had come to Peter, had received his sight and had been converted, and when he died he had left a piece of land to Peter’s daughter. This land Peter had sold and had given the proceeds to the poor. Augustine (Contra Adimantum, 17.5) makes a reference to this story but does not mention Acts of Peter. There are also two references to the incident in the Acts of Philip. In the later Acts of Nereus and Achilleus the story is given with considerable changes, the name of Peter’s daughter, which is not mentioned in the fragment, being given as Petronilla.

(2) The contents of the Actus Vercellenses fall into three parts:

(a) The first three chapters which clearly are a continuation of some other narrative and would fitly join on to the canonical Acts tell of Paul’s departure to Spain.

(b) The longest section of the Acts (4 through 32) gives an account of the conflict between Peter and Simon Magus at Rome.
Paul had not been gone many days when Simon, who “claimed to be the
great power of God,” came to Rome and perverted many of the Christians.
Christ appeared in a vision to Peter at Jerusalem and bade him sail at once
for Italy. Arrived at Rome Peter confirmed the congregation, declaring that
he came to establish faith in Christ not by words merely but by miraculous
deeds and powers (allusion to <460420> 1 Corinthians 4:20; <520105> 1 Thessalonians
1:5). On the entreaty of the brethren Peter went to seek out Simon in the
house of one named Marcellus, whom the magician had seduced, and when
Simon refused to see him, Peter unloosed a dog and bade it go and deliver
his challenge. The result of this marvel was the repentance of Marcellus. A
section follows describing the mending of a broken statue by sprinkling the
pieces with water in the name of Jesus. Meantime the dog had given Simon
a lecture and had pronounced on him the doom of unquenchable fire. After
reporting on its errand and speaking words of encouragement to Peter, the
dog expired at the apostle’s feet. A smoked fish is next made to swim. The
faith of Marcellus waxed strong at the sight of the wonders which Peter
wrought, and Simon was driven out of him house with every mark of
contempt. Simon, enraged at this treatment, came to challenge Peter. An
infant of seven months speaking in a manly voice denounced Simon and
made him speechless until the next Sabbath day. Christ appeared in a
vision of the night encouraging Peter, who when morning was come
narrated to the congregation his triumph over Simon, “the angel of Satan,”
in Judea. Shortly afterward, in the house of Marcellus which had been
“cleansed from every vestige of Simon,” Peter unfolded the true
understanding of the gospel. The adequacy of Christ to meet every kind of
need is shown in a characteristic passage which reveals docetic traits: “He
will comfort you that you may love Him, this Great and Small One, this
Beautiful and Ugly One, this Youth and Old Man, appearing in time yet
utterly invisible in eternity, whom a human hand has not grasped, who yet
is now grasped by His servants, whom flesh had not seen and now sees,”
etc. Next in a wonderful blaze of heavenly light blind widows received
their sight and declared the different forms in which Christ had appeared to
them. A vision of Marcellus is described in which the Lord appearing in
the likeness of Peter struck down with a sword “the whole power of
Simon,” which had come in the form of an ugly Ethiopian woman, very
black and clad in filthy rags. Then follows the conflict with Simon in the
forum in presence of the senators and prefects. Words were first exchanged
between the combatants; then from words it came to deeds, in which the power of Peter was signally exhibited as greater than Simon’s in the raising of the dead. Simon was now discredited in Rome, and in a last attempt to recover his influence he declared that he would ascend to God. Before the assembled crowd he flew up over the city, but in answer to Peter’s prayer to Christ he fell down and broke his leg in three places. He was removed from Rome and after having his limb amputated died.

(c) The Actus Vercellenses close with an account of Peter’s martyrdom (33 through 41) Peter had recurred the enmity of several influential citizens by persuading their wives to separate from them. Then follows the well-known “Quo vadis?” story. Peter being warned of the danger he was in fled from Rome; but meeting Christ and leaning that He was going to the city to be crucified again, Peter returned and was condemned to death. At the place of execution Peter expounded the mystery of the cross. He asked to be crucified head downward, and when this was done he explained in words betraying Gnostic influence why he had so desired it. After a prayer of a mystical nature Peter gave up the ghost. Nero was enraged that Peter should have been put to death without his knowledge, because he had meant to heap punishments upon him. Owing to a vision he was deterred from a rigorous persecution of the Christians. (The account of Peter’s martyrdom is also found in the Greek original.)

It is plain from the account given of these Acts that they are entirely legendary in character. They have not the slightest value as records of the activity of Peter.

2. Historical Value:

They are in reality the creation of the ancient spirit which delighted in the marvelous and which conceived that the authority of Christianity rested on the ability of its representatives to surpass all others in their possession of supernatural power. The tradition that Simon Magus exercised a great influence in Rome and that a statue was erected to him (10) may have had some basis in fact. Justin Martyr (Apol, I, 26, 56) states that Simon on account of the wonderful deeds which he wrought in Rome was regarded as a god and had a statue set up in his honor. But grave doubts are thrown on the whole story by the inscription SEMONI SANCO DEO FIDIO SACRUM
which was found on a stone pedestal at Rome in 1574. This refers to a Sabine deity Semo Sancus, and the misunderstanding of it may have led to Justin’s statement and possibly was the origin of the whole legend of Simon’s activity at Rome. The tradition that Peter died a martyr’s death at Rome is early, but no reliance can be placed on the account of it given in the Acts of Peter.

3. Authorship and Date:

Nothing can be said with any certainty as to the authorship of the Acts of Peter. James (Apocrypha Anecdotata, II) believes them to be from the same hand as the Acts of John, and in this he is supported by Zahn (Gesch. des New Testament Kanons, II, 861). But all that can definitely be said is that both these Acts had their origin in the same religious atmosphere. Both are at home on the soil of Asia Minor. Opinion is not unanimous on the question where the Acts of Peter were written, but a number of small details as well as the general character of the book point to an origin in Asia Minor rather than at Rome. There is no knowledge of Roman conditions, while on the other hand there are probable reminiscences of historical persons who lived in Asia Minor. The date is about the close of the 2nd century.

4. General Character:

The Acts of Peter were used by heretical sects and were subjected to ecclesiastical censure. That however does not necessarily imply a heretical origin. There are traces in them of a spirit which in later times was regarded as heretical, but they probably originated within the church in an environment strongly tinged by Gnostic ideas. We find the principle of Gnosticism in the stress that is laid on understanding the Lord (22). The Gnostic view that the Scripture required to be supplemented by a secret tradition committed to the apostles is reflected in several passages (20 in particular). At the time of their earthly fellowship with Christ the apostles were not able to understand the full revelation of God. Each saw only so far as he was able to see. Peter professes to communicate what he had received from the Lord “in a mystery.” There are slight traces of the docetic heresy. The mystical words of Peter as he hung on the cross are suggestive of Gnostic influence (33 f). In these Acts we find the same negative attitude to creation and the same pronounced ascetic sprat as in
the others. “The virgins of the Lord” are held in special honor (22). Water is used instead of wine at the Eucharist. Very characteristic of the Acts of Peter is the emphasis laid on the boundless mercy of God in Christ toward the backsliding (especially 7). This note frequently recurring is a welcome revelation of the presence of the true gospel-message in communities whose faith was allied with the grossest superstition.

**LITERATURE.**

Books mentioned under “Literature” (p. 188). In addition, Ficker, Die Petrusakten, Beiträge zu ihrem Verstandnis (1903); Harnack, “Patristische Miscellen” (TU, V, 3, 1900).

**III. Acts of John.**

1. **Contents:**

According to the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Acts of John in their complete state formed a book about the same length as the Gospel of Matthew. A number of sections which show links of connection with one another are extant — about two-thirds of the whole. The beginning of the Acts is wanting, the existing narrative commencing at 18. What the contents of the earlier chapters were we cannot surmise. In Bonnet’s reconstruction the first fourteen chapters deal with John’s journey from Ephesus to Rome and his banishment to Patmos, while 15 through 17 describe John’s return to Ephesus from Patmos. The sections given by Bonnet may contain material which belonged to the original Acts, but it is improbable that they stood at the beginning of the work, as it seems clear that the narrative commencing at 18 describes John’s first visit to Ephesus. The first extant portion of the Acts (18 through 25) narrates that Lycomedes “the commander-in-chief of the Ephesians” met John as he drew near the city and besought him on behalf of his beautiful wife Cleopatra, who had become paralyzed. When they came to the house the grief of Lycomedes was so great that he fell down lifeless. After prayer to Christ John made Cleopatra whole and afterward raised Lycomedes to life again. Prevailed upon by their entreaties John took up his abode with them. In 26 through 29 we have the incident of the picture of John which played so prominent a part in the discussion at the Second Council of Nicea. Lycomedes commissioned a friend to paint a picture of John and
when it was completed he put it in bedroom with an altar before it and candlesticks beside it. John discovering why Lycomedes repaired so frequently to his room, taxed him with worshipping a heathen god and learned that the picture was one of himself. This he believed only when a mirror was brought that he might see himself. John charged Lycomedes to paint a picture of his soul and to use as colors faith in God, meekness, love, chastity, etc. As for the picture of his body it was the dead picture of a dead man. Chapters 30 through 36 narrate the healing of infirm old women, and in theater where the miracles were wrought John gave an address on the vanity of all earthly things and on the destroying nature of fleshly passion. In 37 through 45 we read that in answer to the prayer of John the temple of Artemis fell to the ground, with the result that many people were won to the worship of Christ. The priest of Artemis who had been killed through the fall of the temple was raised to life again and became a Christian (46 f). After the narration of further wonders (one of them the driving of bugs out of a house) follows the longest incident of the Acts, the inexpressibly repulsive story of Drusiana (62 through 86), which was used as theme of a poem by the nun Hroswitha of Gandersheim (10th century). The following section gives a discourse of John on the life, death and ascension of Jesus (87 through 105) which is characterized by distinct docetic traits, a long passage dealing with Christ’s appearance in many forms and with the peculiar nature of His body. In this section occurs the strange hymn used by the Priscillianists, which purports to be that which Jesus sang after supper in the upper room (Matthew 26:30), the disciples dancing round Him in a ring and responding with “Amen.” Here too we find the mystic doctrine of the Cross revealed to John by Christ. Chapters 106 through 15 narrate the end of John. After addressing the brethren and dispensing the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper with bread alone, John ordered a grave to be dug; and when this was done, he prayed, giving thanks that he had been delivered from “the filthy madness of the flesh” and asking a safe passage through the darkness and dangers of death. Whereupon he lay down quietly in the grave and gave up the ghost.

2. Historical Value:

The Acts of John, it need hardly be said, have not the slightest historical value. They are a tissue of legendary incidents which by their miraculous character served to insinuate into the popular mind the dogmatic
conceptions and the ideal of life which the author entertained. The Acts however are in harmony with the well-founded tradition that Ephesus was the scene of John’s later activity. Very remarkable is the account of the destruction of the Artemis-temple by John — a clear proof that the Acts were not written in Ephesus. The Ephesian temple of Artemis was destroyed by the Goths in 262 AD.

### 3. General Character:

The Acts of John are the most clearly heretical of all the Acts. The docetic traits have already been referred to. The unreality of Christ’s bodily existence is shown by the changing forms in which He appeared (88 through 90), by His ability to do without food (93) and without sleep (‘I never at any time saw His eyes closing but only open,’ 89), by His leaving no footprint when He walked (93), by the varying character of His body when touched, now hard, now soft, now completely immaterial (89, 93) The crucifixion of Jesus, too, was entirely phantasmal (97, 99). The ascension followed immediately on the apparent crucifixion; there was no place for the resurrection of One who had never actually died. Gnostic features are further discernible in the disparagement of the Jewish Law (94), in the view which lays emphasis on a secret tradition committed by Christ to the apostles (96) and in the contempt for those who were not enlightened (‘Care not for the many, and them that are outside the mystery despise,’ 100). The historical incidents of Christ’s sufferings are sublimated into something altogether mystical (101); they are simply a symbol of human suffering, and the object of Christ’s coming is represented as being to enable men to understand the true meaning of suffering and thus to be delivered from it (96). The real sufferings of Christ are those caused by His grief at the sins of His followers (106 f). He is also a partaker in the sufferings of His faithful people, and indeed is present with them to be their support in every trial (103). The Acts of John also reveal a strong encratite tendency, although that is not so pronounced as in the Acts of Andrew and of Thomas. Nowhere however do we get a more horrifying glimpse into the depths of corrupt sexualism than in these Acts. The writing and circulation of the story of Drusiana cast a lurid light on the gross sensual elements which survived in early Hellenic Christianity. Apart from this there are passages which reveal a warm and true religious feeling and some of the prayers are marked by glow and unction (112 ff).
The Acts show that the author was a man of considerable literary ability; in this respect they form a striking contrast to the Acts of Paul.

4. Authorship and Date:

The author of the Acts of John represents himself as a companion of the apostle. He has participated in the events which he describes, and in consequence the narrative possesses a certain lively quality which gives it the appearance of actual history. The author according to testimony which goes back to the 4th century was Leucius, but nothing can with any certainty be said of him (see above A, VI). It is possible that in some part of the Acts which is lost the author mentioned his name. The early date of the Acts is proved by a reference in Clement of Alexandria (circa 200) to the immaterial nature of Christ’s body, the passage plainly indicating that Clement was acquainted with the Acts or had heard another speak of them (Hypotyposeis on 1 John 1:1). The probable date is between 150 and 180 and Asia Minor is the place of origin.

5. Influence:

The Acts of John exerted a wide influence. They are in all probability the earliest of the Apocryphal Acts and those written later owe much to them. The Acts of Peter and of Andrew show so close affinities with the Acts of John that some have regarded them as being from the same hand; but if that be not so, there is much to be said for the literary dependence of the former on the latter. We are probably right in stating that the author of the Acts of John was the pioneer in this sphere of apostolic romance and that others eagerly followed in the way which he had opened up. That the Acts of John were read in orthodox circles is clear from the reference in Clement of Alexandria. In later days however they were regarded with suspicion. Augustine quotes part of the hymn (95) which he read in a Priscillianist work sent him by a bishop Ceretius and makes severe animadversions on it and on the claim advanced regarding it that it had been revealed in secret to the apostles. The second Synod of Nicea (787 AD) passed judgment on the Acts of John in words of great severity (see above A, V, 1). The stories found in the Acts had, however, before this time passed into orthodox tradition and had been used by Prochorus (5th century), a supposed disciple of John, in the composition of his travel-romance
dealing with the apostle, as well as by Abdias (6th century) whose work contains material from the older Acts which is not otherwise preserved.

**LITERATURE.**

See under “Literature” (p. 188); also Zahn, Acta Joannis (1880).

---

**IV. Acts of Andrew.**

The first mention of these Acts which are referred to frequently by ecclesiastical writers is in Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25, 6). They are there, along with other Acts, rejected as absurd and impious. Epiphanius refers to them in several passages (Haeres., 47, 61, 68) as being in use among various heretical sects which practiced a strict ascetic morality. Early writers attribute them to Leucius, the author of the Acts of John.

---

**1. Contents:**

Of the Acts of Andrew only small portions remain. A fragment is preserved by Euodius of Uzala (died 424), a contemporary of Augustine, and a longer piece, found in a manuscript of the 10th or 11th century, containing lives of saints for November, was identified by Bonnet as belonging to the Acts of Andrew. The account of the death of Andrew is preserved in many forms; that which has the most appearance of retaining the form of the original Acts being found in a letter of the presbyters and deacons of the churches of Achaia.

(1) The fragment of Euodius gives two short passages describing the relations of Maximilla with her husband Egetes, whose claims she resisted.

(2) The longest section of the Acts deals with Andrew’s imprisonment because he had induced Maximilla to separate from her husband “Aegeates,” and to live a life of chastity. (“Aegeates,” which occurs as the name of Maximilla’s husband, denotes in reality “a native of Aegae,” Aegae being a town in the vicinity of Patrae, where Andrew was described as carrying on his work.) The section opens in the middle of an address spoken to the brethren by Andrew in prison, in which they were enjoined to glory in their fellowship with Christ and...
in their deliverance from the baser things of earth. Maximilla with her companions frequently visited the apostle in prison. Aegeates expostulated with her and declared that if she did not resume relations with him he would subject Andrew to torture. Andrew counseled her to resist the importunity of Aegeates, and delivered an address on the true nature of man and stated that torture had no terrors for him. If Maximilla should yield, the apostle would suffer on her account. Through her fellowship with his sufferings she would know her true nature and thus escape from affliction. Andrew next comforted Stratocles, the brother of Aegeates, who declared his need of Andrew, the sower in him of the “seed of the word of salvation.” Andrew thereafter announced his crucifixion on the following day. Maximilla again visited the apostle in prison, “the Lord going before her in the form of Andrew.” To a company of the brethren the apostle delivered an address, in which he discoursed on the deceitfulness of the devil, who first had dealt with men as a friend but now was manifest as an enemy.

(3) When brought to the place of crucifixion Andrew addressed the cross which he joyfully welcomed. After being bound to the cross he hung smiling at the miscarriage of the vengeance of Aegeates, for (as he explained) “a man who belongs to Jesus because he is known of Him is armed against every vengeance.” For three days and nights Andrew addressed the people from the cross, and they, moved by his nobility and eloquence, went to Aegeates, demanding that he should be delivered from death. Aegeates, fearing the wrath of the people, went to take Andrew down from the cross, but the apostle refused deliverance and prayed to Christ to prevent his release. After this he gave up the ghost. He was buried by Maximilla, and Aegeates soon afterward cast himself down from a great height and died.

2. General Character:

The encratite ideal in its most pronounced form is exhibited in the Acts of Andrew. (In view of this, and of Andrew’s association elsewhere in ecclesiastical tradition with a strict asceticism, there is a curious irony in the fact that in some parts of Germany Andrew is the patron saint of maidens seeking husbands. In the Harz and in Thuringen St Andrew’s
Night (November 30) is considered by maidens the most favorable time for the vision of their future husbands.) The Gnostic spirit is revealed in the feeling for the preeminent worth of the spiritual man (6). The true nature of man is pure; the weakness and sin are the work of the “evil enemy who is averse to peace.” In seducing men he did not come out openly as an enemy but pretended friendship. When the light of the world appeared the adversary of man was seen in his true colors. Deliverance from sin comes through enlightenment. The mystical view of sufferings reminds us of the similar view in the Acts of John. The addresses of the apostle are characterized by religious earnestness and warmth (words flow from his lips “like a stream of fire” 12), and by a profound sense of the Divine pity for sinful and tempted men.

3. Historical Value:

The only detail in the Acts of Andrew which has a claim to be considered historical is his activity at Patrae on the Corinthian Gulf. (Patrae is not actually mentioned in the fragmentary Acts, but that the scene of the imprisonment and martyrdom of Andrew is laid in that city may be inferred from the name “Aegeates” — see above 1 (2).) Ecclesiastical tradition speaks with great uncertainty of the sphere of Andrew’s missionary labors, Scythia, Bithynia and Greece being all mentioned. It may be regarded as probable that Andrew came to Greece and suffered martyrdom at Patrae, although one must reckon with the possibility that the account of his work and crucifixion there was invented for the purpose of representing the church at Patrae as an apostolic foundation. The crucifixion of the apostle on the so-called Andrew’s cross is a later tradition.

V. Acts of Thomas.

These Acts exist in a complete state and their great popularity in church circles is shown by the large number of manuscripts which contain them. It is probable that they were written originally in Syriac and that they were later freely translated into Greek and worked over from the Catholic point of view.
1. Contents:

In the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Acts of Thomas are mentioned as containing 1,600 stichoi (lines of about sixteen syllables), one-fifth fewer than the Gospel of Mark. If this notice is correct, the form in which we have the Acts is very much more extended. In the Greek versions the Acts are divided into thirteen “deeds” followed by the martyrdom of Thomas. Some idea of the contents may be given as follows:

(1) At a meeting of the apostles in Jerusalem, Thomas had India allotted to him as his sphere of service. He was unwilling to go, but at last consented when the Lord sold him to a messenger from King Gundaforus in India. On the journey to India, Thomas came to the city of Andrapolis where the nuptials of the king’s daughter were being celebrated. In these the apostle took part and sang a hymn in praise of the heavenly wedding. The king asked Thomas to pray for his daughter and after he had done so the Lord appeared in the form of Thomas and won the newly-married pair to a life of sexual abstinence. The king incensed at this sought Thomas, but the apostle had departed.

(2) Arrived in India Thomas undertook to build a palace for king Gundaforus. He received money for this purpose but gave it away in alms. The king discovering this cast Thomas into prison, but afterward released him when he learned from his brother who came back from the dead that Thomas had built a heavenly palace for him. Gundaforus and his brother became Christians.

(3) Traveling farther east Thomas found a youth who had been slain by a dragon because of a woman whom both desired. The dragon at the command of Thomas sucked the poison from the youth’s body and itself died. The young man, restored to life, embraced the ideal of sexual abstinence and was counseled to set his affections on Christ.

(4) The story of a speaking colt.

(5) Thomas delivered a woman from the power of a filthy demon. An account given of the celebration of the Eucharist (with bread alone) which includes a Gnostic prayer.
(6) A youth partaking of the Eucharist was convicted of sin and confessed that he had killed a maiden who refused to live with him in unchaste intercourse. The maiden was raised to life and gave an account of her experience in hell.

(7) Thomas was besought by a commander named Sifor to deliver his wife and daughter from a demon of uncleanness.

(8) While they were on their way to the commander’s house the beast which drew the carriage became exhausted and four wild asses allowed themselves to be quietly yoked. One of the wild asses was instructed by Thomas to exorcise the demons which dwelt in the women.

(9) A woman, Mygdonia, married to Charis, a near relative of King Misdai, listened to a discourse of the apostle and was led to reject the society of her husband. Charis complained to the king about the magician who had put a spell upon his wife and Thomas was cast into prison. At the request of his fellow-prisoners Thomas prayed for them and recited a hymn (known as “the hymn of the soul”) which is entirely Gnostic in character.

(10) Mygdonia received the seal of Jesus Christ, being first anointed with oil, then being baptized, then receiving the Eucharist in bread and water. Thomas was released from prison, and Sifor, his wife and his daughter all received the seal.

(11) Tertia the queen was sent by Misdai to reason with Mygdonia and as a result she herself was won to the new life. Thomas was then brought to the place of judgment.

(12) There Vazan, the king’s son, talked with the apostle and was converted. The king gave orders that Thomas should be tortured with hot plates of iron, but when these were brought water gushed forth from the earth and submerged them. Then follow an address and prayer of Thomas in prison.

(13) The apostle was visited in prison by the women and by Vazan and thereafter Vazan along with others was baptized and received the Eucharist, Thomas coming from prison to Vazan’s house for this purpose.
(14) Thomas was put to death by the command of the king, being pierced with lances, but afterward he showed himself to his followers. Later a son of Misdai was cured of an unclean spirit by dust taken from the apostle’s grave and Misdai himself became a Christian.

2. Character and Tendency:

The Acts of Thomas are in reality a treatise in the form of a travel-romance whose main design was to set forth abstinence from sexual intercourse as the indispensable condition of salvation. In the addresses of Thomas, however, positive Christian virtues are emphasized; and in particular the duty and the recompense of compassion are strikingly exhibited in the story of the building of the heavenly palace. The Acts clearly had their origin in Gnostic circles and were held in high estimation by various encratite sects. The original Acts underwent revision in the interest of orthodoxy. The hymns and dedication-prayers which showed marked Gnostic features were probably retained because their meaning was not understood. As Lipsius says, speaking of “the hymn of the soul”: “The preservation of this precious relic of Gnostic poetry we owe to the happy ignorance of the Catholic reviser, who had no idea what heretical serpent lurked beneath the beautiful flowers of this poem.” The hymn, probably written by Bardesanes, the founder of a Gnostic sect, narrates in the form of an allegory the descent of the soul into the world of sense, its forgetfulness of its heavenly origin, its deliverance by the Divine revelation which awoke it to a consciousness of its true dignity, and its return to the heavenly home from which it came. In the opinion of some, however, the hymn is falsely called “the hymn of the soul.” As Preuschen says: “It describes rather the descent of the Saviour to the earth, His deliverance of the soul which languishes there in the bondage of evil, and His return to the heavenly kingdom of light. One may characterize the whole as a Gnostic embellishment and extension of Philippians 2:5-11” (Hennecke, Handbuch, etc., 587). In whichever way the hymn is to be interpreted, it is a poem of great beauty and rich in oriental imagery. The ascriptions of praise to Christ in the addresses of the apostle are sometimes couched in noble language and always suffused by great warmth of feeling. Throughout the Acts we have miraculous and supernatural elements in abundance. Christ frequently appears in the likeness of Thomas who is represented as his twin-brother. The full name of the apostle is Judas
Thomas — Judas the Twin. In 55 ff there is a graphic account of the tortures of the damned, which remind one of the Apocalypse of Peter.

3. Historical Value:

It goes without saying that the Acts of Thomas, which are a romance with a purpose, are in no sense a historical source for information about the apostle. The author however has made use of the names of historical persons. King Gundaforus (Vindafra) is known from other sources as an Indo-Parthian ruler in the 1st century AD. It is very doubtful whether the tradition preserved in the Acts as to the activity of Thomas in India is trustworthy. The earliest tradition with which we are acquainted places the sphere of his missionary labors in Parthia. Syrian tradition states that he died at Edessa, where in the 4th century there was a church dedicated to him. Thomas is also indirectly associated with Edessa in the Abgar Legend, in which we read that Thaddaeus who founded the church at Edessa was sent by Thomas. In the existing form of the Acts of Thomas we have a combination of the traditions regarding India and Edessa; we read (170) that some time after the apostle’s death his bones were carried “into the regions of the West.” Early tradition knows nothing of Thomas as a martyr; according to a statement of the Valentinian Heracleon (circa 170) quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Strom, IV, 9) the apostle died quietly in his bed. The name of the apostle is given in the Acts as Judas Thomas, and this we also find in the Doctrine of Addai and elsewhere. The statement in the Acts that the apostle was a twin-brother of Jesus was no doubt suggested by the meaning of the name Thomas (= “twin”) and by the desire to enhance the dignity of the apostle. In 110 (in the Hymn of the Soul) there is a reference to the still existing Parthian kingdom, and as that kingdom came to an end in 227 AD, the poem must have been written before that date. The hymn, however, does not seem to have belonged to the original Acts, which probably were in existence before the end of the 2nd century.

LITERATURE.

Besides books mentioned under “Literature” (p. 188) Thilo, Acta Sancti Thomae apostoli (1823); Hoffman, ZNTW (1903, 273-309); Preuschen, Zweignostische Hymnen (1904); Hilgenfeld, ZWT (1904, 229-41). The Syrian Acts of Thomas were edition and translated by W. Wright,
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A. F. Findlay

APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES

<ap-ok'-ri-fal e-pis'-ls>: A few epistles have been attributed to the Virgin Mary, but these are very late and without value. The following epistles fall to be noted as apocryphal:

1. LETTER ATTRIBUTED TO OUR LORD:

The letter attributed to our Lord is given in Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, I, 13) who records that in his day a copy of the letter was to be found among the archives of Edessa. Abgarus, king of Osroene, which was a small country in Mesopotamia, writes from Edessa, the capital, to our Lord, asking for healing and offering Him protection. Our Lord sends back a short letter saying that He cannot leave Palestine, but that, after His ascension, a messenger will come and heal Abgarus. The letters are obviously spurious. Osroene was actually Christianized about the beginning of the 3rd century, and the legend took shape and received official sanction in order to show that the country had received the Gospel at a much earlier date.

See ABGAR.

2. LETTER ATTRIBUTED TO PETER:

The Clementine Homilies is a work of fiction attributed to Clement of Rome; it was actually written about the end of the 2nd century or the beginning of the 3rd. At the beginning of it there is set a letter of Peter to James. In it Peter counsels James not to show the book containing Peter’s preaching except to a limited circle, and makes a violent attack upon the apostle Paul. It is thus evidently Ebionitic in tendency, and is, like the homilies to which it is prefixed, spurious.
3. LETTERS ATTRIBUTED TO PAUL:

(1) The Epistle from Laodicea.

The mention of such an epistle in Colossians 4:16 evidently tempted someone to forge a letter. It is written in Latin, and consists of 20 vs; it is a mere cento of Pauline phrases strung together. It is mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment (170 AD); and by the end of the 4th century, it had a wide circulation. It is now almost universally rejected as spurious.

See COLOSSIANS; EPHESIANS; EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS.

(2) Lost Epistle to the Corinthians.

In 1 Corinthians 5:9 a letter to the Corinthians is mentioned which appears to have been lost. In a 5th century Armenian version of the Scriptures there is inserted after 2 Corinthians a short letter from the Corinthians to Paul, and one from Paul to the Corinthians. These are also found in Syriac, and were evidently accepted in many quarters as genuine at the end of the 4th century. They formed a part of the Apocryphal Acts of Paul, and date from about 200 AD.

See CORINTHIANS.

(3) An Epistle to the Alexandrines.

This is mentioned only in the Muratorian Fragment, and has not come down to us.

(4) Letters of Paul to Seneca.

This is a correspondence in Latin, six of the letters being attributed to Paul and eight to Seneca. Regarding this correspondence Lightfoot says: “This correspondence was probably forged in the 4th century, either to recommend Seneca to Christian readers, or to recommend Christianity to students of Seneca.” It had a wide circulation in the Middle Ages.

LITERATURE.

See article “Apocrypha” in Encyclopedia Biblica and RE. For text of Peter’s letter to James, see Roberts’ and Donaldson’s Ante-Nicene Christian Library, XVII. For the Pauline letters consult Zahn, Geschichte
des New Testament Kanons, II. For Paul’s Laodicean letter, see Lightfoot’s Commentary on Colossians (where the text of the letter is graven); and for the letters to Seneca, Lightfoot’s Commentary on Philippians, Dissertation II, with Appendix.

John Macartney Wilson

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS

*a-pok’-ri-fal gos’-pels*:

The apocryphal gospels form a branch of the apocryphal literature that attended the formation of the New Testament canon of Scripture. Apocryphal here means non-canonical. Besides gospels, this literature included acts, epistles and apocalypses.

1. INTRODUCTORY.

1. Early Gospels:

The introduction to the third canonical Gospel shows that in the days of the writer, when the apostles of the Lord were still living, it was a common practice to write and publish accounts of the acts and words of Jesus. It has even been maintained (S. Baring-Gould, Lost and Hostile Gospels, xxiii, London, 1874) that at the close of the 1st century, almost every church had its own gospel with which alone it was acquainted. These were probably derived, or professed to be derived, from the oral reports of those who had seen, heard, and, it may be, conversed with our Lord. It was dissatisfaction with these compositions that moved Luke to write his Gospel. Whether any of these ante-Lukan documents are among those still known to us is hardly longer doubtful. Scholars of repute — Grotius, Grabe, Mill — were in earlier times disposed to place the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Ebionites, and the Gospel of the Egyptians among those alluded to by Luke, some holding the Gospel of the Hebrews to be as early as just after the middle of the 1st century. More recent criticism does not allow so early an appearance for those gospels, though a fairly early date is still postulated for the Gospel of the Hebrews. The Protevangelium of James (noticed below) is still held by some as possibly falling within the 1st century (EB, I, 259).
2. Canonical Gospels:

However this may be, there can be no doubt that by the close of the 1st century and the early part of the 2nd century, opinion was practically unanimous in recognition of the authority of the four Gospels of the canonical Scriptures. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons (180 AD), recognizes four, and only four Gospels, as “pillars” of the church. The Harmonies of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (168-80 AD), and of Tatian, and the Apology of Justin Martyr carry back the tradition to a much earlier period of the century, and, as Liddon proves at considerable length (Bampton Lectures, 2nd ed., 210-19), “it is scarcely too much to assert that every decade of the 2nd century furnishes its share of proof that the four Gospels as a whole, and John’s in particular, were to the church of that age what they are to the church of the present.” The recent attempt of Professor Bacon of Yale to get rid of the important authority of Irenaeus (The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, New York, 1910) will not succeed; it has been shown to be merely assertive where there is no evidence and agnostic where evidence is apparently demonstrative. During the last century the Gospels, as regards their composition, credibility and historicity, were subjected to the most searching and unsparing criticism which, though intimations of it were previously not wanting, may be said to have begun when Strauss, to use Liddon’s words, “shocked the conscience of all that was Christian in Europe” by the publication of his first Life of Jesus. The methods pursued in this work consisted largely in the application to the sacred books, and especially to the Gospels, of the principles of criticism that had for forty years previously been used in estimating the structure and composition of some of the literary products of antiquity; and the controversy excited by this criticism can hardly yet be said to have subsided. This is not the place for entering upon an account of the controversy; it may be sufficient here to say that the traditional positions of the church have been ably defended, and in particular, that the claims of the canonical Gospels have been abundantly maintained.

3. Apocryphal Gospels:

Whatever was the fate of the ante-Lukan and other possible 1st-century gospels, it is with the 2nd century and the formation of an authoritative canon that the apocryphal gospels, such as we now have, for the most part
begin to appear. In the days of the reproduction of documents by manuscript, of restricted communications between different localities, and when the church was only as yet forming and completing its organization, the formation and spread of such gospels would be much easier than now. The number of such gospels is very considerable, amounting to about fifty. These exist mainly in fragments and scattered notices; though some, as pointed out below, are either entire or nearly so. The apparent number has probably been increased by the use of different names for the same document. Thirty are named by Hofmann with more or less explanation in RE, I, 511; a complete hat is given in Fabricius (Cod. Apocrypha New Testament, I, 355 ff). Ebionistic and Gnostic circles were specially prolific of such gospels. “It would be easy,” says Salmon (Intro, 1st ed., 239) “to make a long list of names of gospels said to have been in use in different Gnostic sects; but very little is known as to their contents, and that little is not such as to lead us to attribute to them the very slightest historical value.” Of many indeed no more is known than the names of the authors, such as the gospels of Basilides, of Cerinthus, of Apelles, of Matthias, of Barnabas, of Bartholomew, of Eve, of Philemon and many others. The scholars and authorities of the early church were quite well aware of the existence and aims of these productions. It is noteworthy also that they had no hesitation in characterizing them as they deserved. The Marcosians, according to Irenaeus, adduced “an unspeakable number of apocryphal and spurious writings, which they themselves had forged, to bewilder the minds of the foolish”; and Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25) gives the following list of spurious and disputed books: “That we have it in our power to know both these books (the canonical) and those that are adduced by the heretics under the name of the apostles such, namely, as compose the gospels of Peter, of Thomas, and of Matthew, and certain others beside these or such as contain the Acts of Andrew and John, and of the other apostles, of which no one of those writers in the ecclesiastical succession has condescended to make any mention in his works: and, indeed, the character of the style itself is very different from that of the apostles, and the sentiments, and the purport of these things that are advanced in them, deviating as far as possible from sound orthodoxy, evidently prove they are the fictions of heretical men: whence they are not only to be ranked among the spurious writings but are to be rejected as altogether absurd and impious.” In the appendix to Westcott’s
Introduction to the Study of the Gospels will be found, with the exception of those recently discovered in Egypt, a complete list of the non-canonical sayings and deeds ascribed to our Lord as recorded in the patristic writings; and also a list of the quotations from the non-canonical gospels where these are only known by quotations.

The aim of the apocryphal gospels may be regarded as

(1) heretical or

(2) supplemental or legendary: that is to say, such as either were framed in support of some heresy or such as assume the canonical gospels and try to make additions — largely legendary — to them. Before considering these it may be well to take separate account of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

4. Gospel According to the Hebrews:

The undoubted early date of this gospel, the character of most of its not very numerous quotations, the respect with which it is uniformly mentioned by early writers, and the esteem in which it is at present held by scholars in general, entitle the Gospel according to the Hebrews to special notice. Apart from the tradition, to which it is not necessary to attach too great importance, that represented our Lord as commanding His disciples to remain for twelve years in Jerusalem, it is reasonable to suppose that for the Christian communities resident in Jerusalem and Palestine a written gospel in their own language (Western Aramaic) would soon be a necessity, and such a gospel would naturally be used by Jewish Christians of the Diaspora. Jewish Christians, for example, settled in Alexandria, might use this gospel, while native Christians, as suggested by Harnack, might use the Gospel of the Egyptians, till of course both were superseded by the four Gospels sanctioned by the church. There is no proof however that the gospel was earlier than the Synoptics, much less that it was among the ante-Lukan gospels. Harnack, indeed, by a filiation of documents for which there seems hardly sufficient warrant, placed it as early as between 65 and 100 AD. Salmon, on the other hand (Intro, Leer X) concludes that “the Nazarene gospel, so far from being the mother, or even the sister of one of our canonical four, can only claim to be a grand-daughter or grand-niece.” Jerome (400 AD) knew of the existence of this
gospel and says that he translated it into Greek and Lat; quotations from it are found in his works and in those of Clement of Alexandria. Its relation to the Gospel of Matthew, which by almost universal consent is declared to have been originally written in Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic), has given rise to much controversy. The prevalent view among scholars is that it was not the original of which Matthew’s Gospel was a Greek translation, but still that it was a fairly early composition. Some, like Salmon and Harnack, are disposed to regard Jerome’s Hebrew Gospel as to all intents a fifth gospel originally composed for Palestinian Christians, but which became of comparatively insignificant value with the development of Christianity into a world-religion. Besides two references to the baptism of Jesus and a few of his sayings, such as — ”Never be joyful except when ye shall look upon your brother in love”; “Just now my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs and bore me away to the great mountain Thabor” — it records the appearance of our Lord to James after the resurrection, adduced by Paul (1 Corinthians 15:7) as one of the proofs of that event; but of course Paul might have learned this from the lips of James himself as well as from ordinary tradition, and not necessarily from this gospel. This indeed is the principal detail of importance which the quotations from this gospel add to what we know from the Synoptics. In other divergences from the Synoptics where the same facts are recorded, it is possible that the Gospel according to the Hebrews may relate an earlier and more reliable tradition. On the other hand, the longest quotation, which gives a version of Christ’s interview with the Rich Young Ruler, would seem to show, as Westcott suggests, that the Synoptics give the simpler and therefore the earlier form of the common narrative. Many scholars, however, allow that the few surviving quotations of this gospel should be taken into account in constructing the life of Christ. The Ebionites gave the name of Gospel of the Hebrews to a mutilated gospel of Matthew. This brings us to the heretical gospels.

2. HERETICAL GOSPELS.

1. Gospel of the Ebionites:

The Ebionites may be described generally as Jewish Christians who aimed at maintaining as far as possible the doctrines and practices of the Old Testament and may be taken as representing originally the extreme
The conservative section of the Council of Jerusalem mentioned in Acts 15:1-29. They are frequently mentioned in patristic literature from the 2nd to the 4th centuries, and the prolonged Gnostic controversies of those times may well have founded among them different sects or at least parties. Accordingly Jerome, a writer of the 4th century, states (Ep ad August. 122 13) that he found in Palestine Jewish Christians known as Nazarenes and Ebionites. Whether these were separate sects or simply supporters of more liberal or narrower views of the same sect cannot well be determined. Some, such as Harnack and Uhlhorn, have held that the two names are general designations for Jewish Christians; others regard the Ebionites as the most retrograde and the narrowest of Jewish Christians, while the Nazarenes were more tolerant of difference of belief and practice. The Gospel of the Ebionites or the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, as it was also called, represented along with the Gospel of the Hebrews (noticed above) this Judeo-Christian spirit. Some fragments of the Gospel of the Ebionites are preserved in Epiphanius (d 376). He speaks of the Nazarenes as “having the Gospel according to Matthew in a most complete form, in Hebrew” (i.e. Aramaic), though he immediately adds that he does not know whether “they removed the genealogies from Abraham to Christ,” that is to say, whether they accepted or rejected the virgin birth of Christ. In contrast with this statement he says that the Ebionites had a gospel “called the Gospel according to Matthew, not entire and perfectly complete, but falsified and mutilated, which they call the Hebrew gospel.” The extant fragments from the gospel are given in Westcott (Intro, 437 f). They “show that its value is quite secondary and that the author has simply compiled it from the canonical, and especially from the Synoptic Gospels, adapting it at the same time to the views and practices of Gnostic Ebionism” (DCG, I, 505).

2. Gospel of the Egyptians:

Three short and somewhat mystic verses are all that are left of what is known as the Gospel of the Egyptians. They occur in Book III of the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria, who devoted that book to a refutation of Encratism, that is, the rejection, as absolutely unlawful, of the use of marriage, of flesh meat and of wine. Already in the Pauline Epistles are met parties with the cry (Colossians 2:21) “Handle not, nor taste, nor touch,” and (1 Timothy 4:3) “forbidding to marry, and commanding
to abstain from meats.” The verses in Clement read as follows: “When Salome asked how long will death prevail? The Lord said, As long as ye women bear children: for I have come to destroy the function of women. And Salome said to him. Did I not well then in not bearing children? And the Lord answered and said, Eat of every herb, but do not eat of that which is bitter. And when Salome asked when the things would be known about which she had inquired, the Lord said, When ye trample on the garment of shame, and when the two shall be one, and the male with the female neither male nor female.” The words assuredly vary much from the usual character of those of our Lord. Modern writers vary as to their encratite tendency and as to how far the Gospel of the Egyptians was practical. With so little to go upon, it is not easy to form a conclusion. It may have contained other passages on account of which Origen deemed it heretical. It was used by the Naassenes and Sabellians. The date of the Gospel is between 130 and 150.

3. Gospel of Marcion:

The Gospel of Marcion would seem to have been intended as a direct counteractive to the Aramaic gospels. A native of Pontus and the son of a bishop, Marcion settled at Rome in the first half of the 2nd century and became the founder of the anti-Jewish sect that acknowledged no authoritative writings but those of Paul. This work forms a striking example of what liberties, in days before the final formation of the canon, could be taken with the most authoritative and the most revered documents of the faith, and also as showing the free and practically unlimited nature of the controversy, of which the canon as finally adopted was the result. He rejected the Old Testament entirely, and of the New Testament retained only the Gospel of Luke, as being of Pauline origin, with the omission of sections depending on the Old Testament and ten epistles of Paul, the pastoral epistles being omitted. The principal Church Fathers agree upon this corruption of Luke’s Gospel by Marcion; and the main importance of his gospel is that in modern controversy it was for some time assumed to be the original gospel of which Luke’s Gospel was regarded as merely an expansion. The theory was shown first in Germany and afterward independently in England to be quite untenable. It was lately revived by the author of Supernatural Religion; but Dr. Sanday’s work on
The Gospels in the Second Century (chapter viii) may be said to have closed the controversy. (Compare also Salmon’s Intro, Lect XI.)

4. Gospel of Peter:

Until about a quarter of a century ago no more was known of the Gospel of Peter than of the crowd of heretical gospels referred to above. From Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, VI, 12, 2) it was known that a Gospel of Peter was in use in the church of Rhossus, a town in the diocese of Antioch at the end of the 2nd century, that controversy had arisen as to its character, and that after a careful examination of it Serapion, bishop of Antioch (190-203), had condemned it as docetic. Origen (died 253 AD), in his commentary on Matthew 10:17, refers to the gospel as saying that “there are certain brothers of Jesus, the sons of Joseph by a former wife, who lived with him before Mary.” Eusebius further in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 3, 2 knows nothing of the Gospel according to Peter being handed down as a catholic writing, and in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25, 6 he includes the Gospel of Peter among the forged heretical gospels. Theodoret, one of the Greek ecclesiastical historians (390-459), says that the Nazarenes used a gospel called “according to Peter.” The gospel is also referred to in Jerome (Deuteronomy Viris Illustr., chapter 1) and it is condemned by the Decretum Gelasianum (496?). Salmon (Intro, 231) remarks: “Of the book no extracts have been preserved, and apparently it never had a wide range of circulation.” These words were written in 1885. In the following year the French Archaeological Mission, working in upper Egypt, found in a tomb, supposed to be a monk’s, at Akhmim (Panopolis), a parchment containing portions of no less than three lost Christian works, the Book of Enoch, the Gospel of Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter. These were published in 1892 and have given rise to much discussion. The gospel has been carefully reproduced in facsimile and edited by competent scholars The fragment is estimated to contain about half of the original gospel. It begins in the middle of the history of the Passion, Just after Pilate has washed his hands from all responsibility and ends in the middle of a sentence when the disciples at the end of the Feast of Unleavened Bread were betaking themselves to their homes “But I (Simon Peter, the ostensible writer) and Andrew my brother took our nets and went to the sea; and there was with us Levi the son of Alpheus whom the Lord. ....” Harnack (Texte und
Untersuchungen, IX, 2, 2nd edition, 76) exhibits about thirty new traits contained in the Petrine account of the Passion and burial. These are given in detail in an additional volume of the Ante-Nicene Library: Recently Discovered manuscripts, etc., Edinburgh, 1897. But Dr. Swete (Gospel of Peter, xv, London, 1893) shows that “even details which seem to be entirely new or which directly contradict the canonical narrative, may have been suggested by it”; and he concludes that notwithstanding the large amount of new matter which it contains, “there is nothing in this portion of the Petrine Gospel which compels us to assume the use of sources other than the canonical gospels.” To Professor Orr (NT Apocryphal Writings, xix f) the Gnostic origin of the gospel seems clear in the story given of the Resurrection; and its docetic character — that is, that it proceeded from those who held that Christ had only the semblance of a body — from the statement that on the cross Jesus was silent as one who felt no pain, and from the dying cry from the cross, “My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me,” the really Divine Christ having departed before the crucifixion. The date of the gospel has been placed by some in the first quarter, and by others in the third quarter, of the 2nd century. For the other newly discovered “Sayings of Jesus,” see LOGIA.

5. Gospel of the Twelve Apostles:

A Gospel of the Twelve is mentioned by Origen (Hom. I, in Luc), and a few fragments of it are preserved by Epiphanius (Haerea, 39 13-16,22). It commenced with the baptism, and was used by the Ebionites. It was written, Zahn thinks, about 170 AD.

6. Gospel of Barnabas and Bartholomew:

A Gospel of Barnabas and Gospel of Bartholomew are condemned in the decree of Pope Gelasius. The latter is mentioned by Jerome (Prooem ad Matt).

3. SUPPLEMENTARY OR LEGENDARY GOSPELS.

In all of the gospels of this class it is noteworthy that considering the desire of the writers of non-canonical gospels to multiply miracles, no notice is taken of the period in the life of Christ that intervened between his twelfth year and his thirtieth. The main reason for the omission
probably is that no special dogmatic end was to be served by the narrative of this period of the Saviour’s life. Where access cannot be had to these documents in their original languages, it may be useful to point out that a good and full translation of them may be found in Vol XVI of Clark’s Ante-Nicene Library, Edinburgh, 1870.

1. Gospels of the Nativity:

(a) The Protevangelium of James.

The earliest of these documents is the Protevangelium of James. James is supposed to be the Lord’s brother. The title “Protevangelium” or First Gospel — a catching title which assumes much and suggests more — was given to this document by Postellus, a Frenchman, who first published it in Latin in the year 1552. In the Greek and Syriac manuscripts, it is known by various other titles, such as, The History of James concerning the Birth of the All-Holy and Ever-Virgin Mother of God and of Her Son Jesus Christ. Tischendorf in the notes to chapter i of his Evang. Apocrypha gives a long list of the names descriptive of it in the various manuscripts. In the Gelasian Decree depriving it of canonical authority it is simply styled Evangelium nomine Jacobi minoris apocryphum. In this document the birth of Mary is foretold by angelic announcement to her parents, Joachim and Anna, as was that of Jesus to Mary. It contains in twenty-five chapters the period from this announcement to the Massacre of the Innocents, including accounts of the early training of Mary in the temple, the Lukan narrative of the birth of Christ with some legendary additions, and the death of Zacharias by order of Herod for refusing to give information regarding the place of concealment of Elisabeth and the child John who, in their flight during the massacre, are miraculously saved by the opening of a mountain. At chapter 18 a change takes place in the narrative from the third to the first person, which has been taken (NT Apocrypha Writings by Professor Orr, D.D., London, 1903) to suggest an Essenian-Ebionitic origin for the document, and at least to argue for it a composite character, which again may account for the great variety of view taken of its date. It has been assigned (EB, I, 259) to the 1st century. Zahn and Kruger place it in the first decade, many scholars in the second half of the 2nd century; while others (e.g. Harnack) place it in its present form as late as the middle of the 4th century. Good scholars (Sanday, The Gospels
in the Second Century) admit references to it in Justin Martyr which would imply that possibly in some older form it was known in the first half of the 2nd century. In its latest forms the document indicates the obvious aim of the writer to promote the sanctity and veneration of the Virgin. It has been shown to contain a number of unhistorical statements. It was condemned in the western church by Popes Damasus (382), Innocent I (405) and by the Decretum Gelasianum (496?). It would seem as if the age thus deprived of the Protevangelium demanded some document of the same character to take its place.

(b) **Pseudo-Matthew.**

A forged correspondence between Jerome and two Italian bishops supplied a substitute in the Gospel of the Pseudo-Matthew, which Jerome was falsely represented to have rendered in Latin from the original Hebrew of Mt. The gospel is known only in Latin and, as already indicated, is not earlier than the 5th century. The Protevangelium is freely used and supplemented from some unknown (probably Gnostic) source, and further miracles especially connected with the sojourn in Egypt have been wrought into it with others added from the Childhood Gospel of Thomas. Some of the miracles recorded of Egypt are represented as fulfillments of Old Testament prophecy, as when (chapter 18) the adoration of the infant Jesus by dragons recalls the fulfillment of what was said by David the prophet: “Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons: ye dragons and all ye deeps”; or as when (chapter 19) lions and panthers adored them, showing the company the way in the desert, “bowing their heads and wagging their tails and adoring Him with great reverence,” which was regarded as a fulfillment of the prophecy: “Wolves shall feed with lambs and the lions and the ox shall eat straw together.” In this gospel, too, appears for the first time the notice of the ox and the ass adoring the child Jesus in the manger, of which much was made in Christian article The gospel is further eked out by the relation of several of the miracles connected with the Gospel of the Childhood.

(c) **The Nativity of Mary.**

The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary was written in Latin. It goes over much the same ground as the earlier portion of the Pseudo-Matthew, but so differs from it as to indicate a later date and a different author. It
includes more of the miraculous element and daily angelic visits to Mary during her residence in the temple. This gospel makes Mary leave the temple in her 14th year; according to the gospel next described, where the narrator is represented as the Son of Mary Himself, she left the temple in her 12th year, having lived in it nine years. It was for long held to be the work of Jerome, and from this gospel was almost entirely formed the “Golden Legend” which largely took the place of the Scriptures in the 13th century, throughout Europe before the invention of printing. It was among the books early printed in some countries where (as in England) it might not be safe to print the Scriptures. Its services to medieval literature and art should not blind us to the fact that it was a forgery deliberately introduced into the service of the church about the 6th century, when the worship of Mary was specially promoted in the church.

(d) Gospel of Joseph the Carpenter.

To the same class of compositions belongs the Gospel of Joseph the Carpenter. Originally written in Coptic, it was translated into Arabic, in which language with a Latin version it was published in 1722. The composition is devoted to the glorification of Joseph, a cult which was specially favored by the monophysite Coptics. It dates from the 4th century. It contains in 22 chapters the whole history of Joseph and relates in the last part the circumstances of his death at the age of 111 years. These are of some importance for the history of dogma.

(e) The Passing of Mary.

Transitus Mariae: although not strictly a gospel of the Nativity notice may here be taken of the account of John the Theologian of the Falling Asleep (koimesis) of the Holy Mother of God or as it is more commonly called “the Passing of Mary” (transitus Mariae). It was originally written in Greek, but appears also in Latin and several other languages. Two years, it seems, after the ascension of Jesus, Mary, who paid frequent visits to the, “Holy tomb of our Lord to burn incense and pray” was persecuted by the Jews and prayed her Son that He would take her from the earth. The archangel Gabriel brings an answer to her prayers and announces that after three days she shall go to the heavenly places to her Son, into true and everlasting life. Apostles from their graves or from their dioceses are summoned to her bedside at Bethlehem and relate how they were occupied
when the summons reached them. Miracles of healing are wrought round the dying bed; and after the instantaneous transportation of Mary and the attendant apostles to Jerusalem, on the Lord’s Day, amidst visions of angels Christ Himself appears and receives her soul to Himself. Her body is buried in Gethsemane and thereafter translated to Paradise. Judged by its contents which reveal an advanced stage of the worship of the Virgin and also of church ritual, the document cannot have been produced earlier than the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century, and it has a place among the apocryphal documents condemned by the Gelasian Decree. By this time indeed it appears as if the writers of such documents assumed the most unrestricted license in imagining and embellishing the facts and situations regarding the gospel narrative.

2. The Gospels of the Infancy or Childhood:

(a) Gospel of Thomas.

Next to the Protevangelium the oldest and the most widely spread of the apocryphal gospels is the Gospel of Thomas. It is mentioned by Origen and Irenaeus and seems to have been used by a Gnostic sect of the Nachashenes in the middle of the 2nd century. It was docetic as regards the miracles recorded in it and on this account was also acceptable to the Manichees. The author was one of the Marcosians referred to by Irenaeus. Great variations exist in the text, of which there are only late catholic recasts, two in Greek, one in Latin and one in Syriac. One of the Greek versions is considerably longer than the other, while the Latin is somewhat larger than either. They are very largely concerned with a record of miracles wrought by Jesus before He was 12 years of age. They depict Jesus as an extraordinary but by no means a lovable child. Unlike the miracles of the canonical Gospels those recorded in this gospel are mainly of a destructive nature and are whimsical and puerile in character. It rather shocks one to read them as recorded of the Lord Jesus Christ. The wonder-worker is described by Renan as “un gamin omnipotent et omniscient,” wielding the power of the Godhead with a child’s waywardness and petulance. Instead of being subject to His parents He is a serious trouble to them; and instead of growing in wisdom He is represented as forward and eager to teach. His instructors, and to be omniscient from the beginning. The parents of one of the children whose death He had caused entreat
Joseph, “Take away that Jesus of thine from this place for he cannot dwell with us in this town; or at least teach him to bless and not to curse.” Three or four miracles of a beneficent nature are mentioned; and in the Latin gospel when Jesus was in Egypt and in his third year, it is written (chapter 1), “And seeing boys playing he began to play with them, and he took a dried fish and put it into a basin and ordered it to move about. And it began to move about. And he said again to the fish: ‘Throw out the salt which thou hast, and walk into the water.’ And it so came to pass, and the neighbors seeing what had been done, told it to the widowed woman in whose house Mary his mother lived. And as soon as she heard it she thrust them out of her house with great haste.” As Westcott points out in his Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 444, “In the apocryphal miracles we find no worthy conception of the laws of providential interference; they are wrought to supply present wants or to gratify present feelings, and often are positively immoral; they are arbitrary displays of power, and without any spontaneity on our Lord’s part or on that of the recipient.” Possibly the compilers of the 1st-century narratives above mentioned had in many cases deemed it expedient to make the miraculous an essential — even a too prominent — part of their story; and this may be the reason why John in the opening of the Fourth Gospel declared all the reported miracles of the Childhood to be unauthorized by the statement that the first miracle was that performed, after the beginning of the public ministry, at the marriage at Cana of Galilee. “This beginning of his signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory; and his disciples believed on him” (John 2:11).

(b) Arabic Gospel of the Childhood.

The Arabic Gospel of the Childhood is a composite production. Though first published in Arabic with a Latin translation in 1697, its Syriac origin may be inferred from the use of the era of Alexander the Great in chapter 2, from the acquaintance of the writer with oriental learning, and from that of the child Jesus, when in Egypt, with astronomy and physics. The popularity of the book among the Arabs and Coptics in Egypt may also be explained by the fact that the most important of its miracles take place during the Sojourn in Egypt. It is noteworthy also that according to this gospel (chapter 7) it was on the ground of a prophecy of Zoroaster regarding the birth of the Messiah that the Magi undertook their journey to
Bethlehem. Some of its stories also appear in the Koran and in other Mohammedan writings. Chapters 1 through 9 are based on the canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke and on the Protevangelium of James, while chapters 26 to the end are derived from the Gospel of Thomas. The intermediate portion of the work is thoroughly oriental in character and reads like extracts from the Arabian Nights. It is not easy to treat seriously the proposal to set productions like these on anything approaching equality with the canonical Gospels. The gospel also has much to do with the growth of the veneration of the Virgin.

3. Gospels of the Passion and Resurrection:

(a) Gospel of Peter (as above).

(b) Gospel of Nicodemus.

The principal documents in this connection are the Gospel of Nicodemus and to some extent, as above shown, the Gospel of Peter. The Gospel of Nicodemus is a name given not earlier than the 13th century to a duplicate composition the two parts of which were

(1) the Acta Pilati or Acts of Pilate and

(2) the Descent of Christ to the Lower World. The document professes to be a translation into Greek from the Hebrew, and to have been made in the 17th year of the emperor Theodosius and the 6th of Valentinian. It exists in six forms, two Greek and one Latin of the Acts of Pilate, and two Latin and one Greek of the Descent to the Lower World. The general consensus of scholars places the composition in the 5th century, though Tischendorf, relying upon references in Justin and Tertullian, places it in the 2nd century, a date by which it is quite possible for the legend to have arisen. Possibly there has been some confusion between the report on the proceedings connected with the trial and crucifixion of Jesus that had to be furnished to the emperor, as required by the rules of the Roman civil service, and the extended record of the proceedings contained in the Gospel of Nicodemus. The writer was obviously a Jewish Christian. He wrote for this class and was anxious to establish his record by evidence from the mouths of the
enemies of Jesus and especially of the officials connected with the events before and after the death of Jesus.

(1) Acts of Pilate

Pilate in particular is shown to be favorable to Jesus and — a gap that must have struck many readers of the canonical narratives — several of those on whom miracles of healing had been wrought come forward to give evidence in favor of Jesus — a most natural step for a late narrator to suppose as having taken place in a regular and formal trial, but one which, as may be gathered from the silence of the canonical writers, was omitted in the turbulent proceedings of the priestly conspiracy that ended with the crucifixion. With all the writer’s acquaintance with Jewish institutions “he shows himself in many points ignorant of the topography of Palestine; thinks, e.g. that Jesus was crucified in the garden in which he was seized (chapter 9) and places Mr. Mamilch or Malek (S. of Jerusalem) in Galilee, and confounds it with the Mount of Ascension” (Orr, op. cit., xix).

(2) Descent of Jesus into the Lower World

The second part of the gospel — The Descent of Christ to the Lower World — is an account of an early and widely accepted tradition not mentioned in any canonical Gospel but based upon 1 Peter 3:19: “He went and preached unto the spirits in prison.” Two saints who were raised at His resurrection relate how they had been confined in Hades when the Conqueror appeared at its entrance, how the gates of brass were broken and the prisoners released, Jesus taking with Him to Paradise the souls of Adam, Isaiah, John the Baptist and other holy men who had died before Him. The document is purely imaginary: its only importance is in showing how this article of the creed was regarded in the 4th century.

(c) Other Fabrications.

Of even less importance are some late fabrications referring to Pilate sometimes in the manuscripts attached to the Gospel of Nicodemus, such as Pilate’s Letter to the emperor Tiberius; Pilate’s Official Report, above referred to; the Paradoxes of Pilate and the Death of Pilate, who, after condemnation to the most disgraceful death, is represented as dying by his
own hand. In the Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea the writer gives a loose rein to his imagination.

The study of the documents above described fully justifies the observation of the editors of the Ante-Nicene Library that while they afford us “curious glimpses of the state of the Christian conscience, and of modes of thought in the first centuries of our era, the predominant impression which they leave on our minds is a profound sense of the immeasurable superiority, the unapproachable simplicity and majesty, of the Canonical Writings.”

**LITERATURE.**

In addition to the books quoted above may be mentioned the following: Fabricius, Codex Apocryphus, 1719; the collections and prolegomena of Thilo (1832); Tischendorf, Gospels, 1853, Ellicott, “On the Apocryphal Gospels” in Cambridge Essays, 1856; Lipsius, article “Gospels (Apocrypha)” in Dict. of Christ. Biog.; Dr. W. Wright in Journal of Sacred Lit. (January and April, 1865) on the Syriac versions of the Protevangelium, The Gospel of Thomas, and the Transitus Mariae: Studia Sinaitica (No. XI, 1902) giving new Syriac texts of the Protevangelium and Transitus Mariae. A. F. Findlay, article “Acts (Apocrypha),” where will be found a very copious body of references to works, British and foreign, dealing with all branches of the subject.

*J. Hutchison*

**APOLLONIA**

<ap-o-lo’-ni-a> ([ Ἀπόλλωνία, Apollonia]): A town in Mygdonia, a district in Macedonia. It was situated a little to the south of Lake Bolbe, on the Via Egnatia, the great Roman road leading from the coast of the Adriatic to the river Hebrus (Maritza), one of the main military and commercial highways of the empire: it lay between Amphipolis and Thessalonica, a day’s journey (Livy xlv.28) or about 30 Roman miles from the former and 38 from the latter. The foundation of the town may perhaps be attributed to about 432 BC; in any case, coins are extant which attest its existence in the 4th century BC (Head, Historia Numorum, 181). Paul and Silas passed through the town on their journey from Philippi to
Thessalonica, but do not appear to have stayed there (Acts 17:1). The name seems to have survived in the modern Pollina (Leake, Northern Greece, III, 458; Cousinery, Voyage dans la Macedoine, I, 115).

Marcus N. Tod

APOLLONIUS

<απολλώνιος> (Ἀπολλώνιος, Apollonios): A common name among the Syro-Macedonians. Prideaux (Connexion) interrupts his narrative of the year 148 BC to give an account of the different persons who bore this name

(1) Son of Thrasaeus (2 Macc 3:5) who was governor of Coele-Syria (Palestine and Phoenicia) under Seleucus Philopator, when Heliodorus came to Jerusalem to rob the temple, and afterward, by his authority in that province, supported Simon the governor of the temple at Jerusalem against Onias the high priest. He was also chief minister of state to King Seleucus. But on the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, Apollonius, in some way becoming obnoxious to the new king, left Syria and retired to Miletus.

(2) A son of (1) who, while his father resided at Miletus, was brought up at Rome along with Demetrius, son of Seleucus Philopator, and at that time held as a hostage by the Romans. This Apollonius lived in great intimacy with Demetrius, who, on recovering the crown of Syria, made him governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, the same government which his father held under Seleucus Philopator. He seems to have been continued in the same government by Alexander (1 Macc 10:69) but he revolted from him to embrace the interest of Demetrius.

(3) Son of Menestheus, and favorite and chief minister of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 4:21). He went as ambassador from Antiochus, first to Rome (Livy xlii.6) and afterward to Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt (2 Macc 4:21). This is generally held to be the same who is said to have been over the tribute (1 Macc 1:29; 2 Macc 5:24) and who, on the return of Antiochus from his last expedition into Egypt, was sent with a detachment of 22,000 men to destroy Jerusalem. He
attacked the Jews while keeping the Sabbath day holy and slew great multitudes of them (2 Macc 5:24-27).

(4) Governor of Samaria in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. He was slain in battle by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 3:10,11; Ant, XII, vii, 10).

(5) Son of Gennaeus (2 Macc 12:2); as governor of a toparchy in Palestine under Antiochus Eupator he proved a bitter enemy of the Jews.

J. Hutchison

APOLLOPHANES

<ap-o-ləf'-ə-nəz>, <a-pol-o-fə'-nez> ([Ἄπολλοφάνης, Apolophonːes]): A Syrian killed by Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 10:37).

APOLLOS

<a-pol'-əs> ([Ἀπόλλος, Apollos], the short form of Apollonːiːus): Apollos was a Jew of Alexandrian race (Acts 18:24) who reached Ephesus in the summer of 54 AD, while Paul was on his third missionary journey, and there he “spake and taught accurately the things concerning Jesus” (Acts 18:25). That he was eminently fitted for the task is indicated by the fact of his being a “learned man,” “mighty in the scriptures,” “fervent in spirit,” “instructed in the way of the Lord” (Acts 18:24,25). His teaching was however incomplete in that he knew “only the baptism of John” (Acts 18:25), and this has given rise to some controversy. According to Blass, his information was derived from a written gospel which reached Alexandria, but it was more probably the fruits of what Apollos had heard, either directly or from others, of the preaching of John the Baptist at Bethany beyond Jordan (compare John 1:28). Upon receiving further instruction from Priscilla and Aquila (Acts 18:26), Apollos extended his mission to Achaia, being encouraged thereto by the brethren of Ephesus (Acts 18:27). In Achaia “he helped them much that had believed through grace; for he powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the scriptures that Jesus was the Christ” (Acts 18:27,28). During Apollos’ absences in Achaia, Paul had reached Ephesus and learned of what had been taught by Apollos there.
Acts 19:1). Since Paul was informed that the Ephesians still knew nothing of the baptism of the Spirit (Acts 19:2-4), it is probable that Apollos had not imparted to his hearers the further instruction he had received from Priscilla and Aquila, but had departed for Achaia shortly after receiving it. Paul remained upward of two years among the Ephesians (Acts 19:8,10), and in the spring of 57 AD he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians. By this time Apollos was once more in Ephesus (compare 1 Corinthians 16:12). It is incredible that this epistle of Paul could have been prompted by any feelings of jealousy or animosity on his part against Apollos. It was rather the outcome of discussion between the two regarding the critical situation then existing in Corinth. The mission of Apollos had met with a certain success, but the breeding of faction, which that very success, through the slight discrepancies in his teaching (compare 1 Corinthians 1:12; 3:4) with that of Paul or of Cephas, had engendered, was utterly alien to his intentions. The party spirit was as distasteful to Apollos as it was to Paul, and made him reluctant to return to the scene of his former labors even at the desire of Paul himself (1 Corinthians 16:12). The epistle voiced the indignation of both. Paul welcomed the cooperation of Apollos (1 Corinthians 3:6: “I planted, Apollos watered”). It was not against his fellow-evangelist that he fulminated, but against the petty spirit of those who loved faction more than truth, who saw not that both he and Apollos came among them as “God’s fellow-workers” (1 Corinthians 3:9), the common servants of the one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. This view is also borne out by the tenor of Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthians (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 84-112, especially 105): nor does it conflict with the passages 1 Corinthians 12:1-7; 2 Corinthians 3:1; 11:16, where Paul seems to allude to Apollos’ eloquence, wisdom, and letter of commendation. Paul wrote thus not in order to disparage Apollos but to affirm that, even without these incidental advantages, he would yield to none in the preaching of Christ crucified.

The last mention of Apollos is in the Epistle to Titus, where he is recommended along with Zenas to Titus (Titus 3:13). He was then on a journey through Crete (Titus 3:15), and was probably the bearer of the epistle. The time of this is uncertain, as the writing of the Epistle to Titus,
though generally admitted to have been after the release of Paul from imprisonment at Rome, has been variously placed at 64-67 AD.

See TITUS, EPISTLE TO. — C. M. Kerr

APOLLYON

<α-πολ’-i-on> ([Ἀπολλύων, Apolluon]; אבַּדְדַּן ['abhaddon], “destroyer”): Present participle of the verb [ἀπολλύω, apolluo], “to destroy.”

I. DEFINITION.

A proper name, original with the author of the Apocalypse and used by him once (Revelation 9:11) as a translation of the Hebrew word “Abaddon” (see ABADDON) to designate an angel or prince of the lower world.

2. OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND.

1. Fundamental Meaning:

The term Abaddon (“destruction”) appears solely in the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament and in the following narrow range of instances:

- Job 26:6; 28:22; 31:12; Psalm 88:11; Proverbs 15:11. In all these passages save one (Job 31:12) the word is combined either with Sheol, “death,” or “the grave,” in such a way as to indicate a purely eschatological term based upon the advanced idea of moral distinctions in the realm of the dead. In the one exceptional passage (Est 8:6 is incorrectly referred to — the word here is different, namely, אבַּדְדַּן ['abhedhan]) where the combination does not occur, the emphasis upon the moral element in the “destruction” mentioned is so definite as practically to preclude the possibility of interpreting the term in any general sense (as Charles, HDB, article “Abaddon”; per con., Briggs, ICC, “Psalms” in the place cited.; BDB, sub loc.). The meaning of the word, therefore, is: the place or condition of utter ruin reserved for the wicked in the realm of the dead.
2. Personification:

One other feature of Old Testament usage is worthy of consideration as throwing light upon Revelation 9:11. Abaddon and the accompanying terms “Death” and Sheol are personified (as in Job 28:22) and represented as living beings who speak and act (compare Revelation 6:8).

3. NEW TESTAMENT USAGE.

1. The Starting-Point:

The starting-point of the Apocalyptist’s use of “Apollyon” is to be found in the fundamental meaning of “Abaddon” as moral destruction in the underworld, together with the occasional personification of kindred terms in the Old Testament. The imagery was in general terms familiar while the New Testament writer felt perfectly free to vary the usage to suit his own particular purposes.

2. Apollyon not Satan but Part of an Ideal Description:

(1) Since Apollyon is a personification he is not to be identified with Satan (compare Revelation 9:1 where Satan seems to be clearly indicated) or with any other being to whom historical existence and definite characteristics are ascribed. He is the central figure in an ideal picture of evil forces represented as originating in the world of lost spirits and allowed to operate destructively in human life. They are pictured as locusts, but on an enlarged scale and with the addition of many features inconsistent with the strict application of the figure (see Revelation 9:7-10). The intention is, by the multiplication of images which the author does not attempt to harmonize, to convey the impression of great power and far-reaching destructiveness.

(2) This interpretation finds additional support in the writer’s significant departure from the familiar usage. In the Old Testament the place of destruction is personified — in Revelation 9:11, personal forces issue from the Abyss, of which the presiding genius is Destruction in person. The seer’s picture is equally independent of the tradition represented by the Talmud (Shab f. 55) where Abaddon is personified as jointly with Death president over six destroying angels.
These modifications are evidently due to the exigencies of the pictorial form. It is clearly impossible to portray forces proceeding from the place of ruin in the charge of the place itself.

3. Apollyon Necessary to the Picture:

The importance of the conception of Apollyon to the completeness of the picture should not be overlooked. It is intended to represent these forces as having a certain principle of internal unity and as possessors of the power of effective leadership.

4. General Significance of the Description:

As to the specific significance of the vision of the locusts as a whole it is not easy to reach a conclusion. Professor Swete suggests (Commentary on Apocalypse in the place cited.) that “the locusts of the abyss may be the memories of the past brought home at times of divine visitation; they hurt by recalling forgotten sins.” It seems to us more probable that it represents an actual historical movement, past or to come, demoniacal in origin and character, human in the mode of its operation and the sphere of its influence, used by God for a scourge upon mankind and kept in restraint by His grace and power.

See ABADDON.

Louis Matthew Sweet

APOSTASY; APOSTATE

<α-ποสτασία> (ἡ ἀποστασία, he apostasia), “a standing away from”): I.e. a falling away, a withdrawal, a defection. Not found in the English Versions of the Bible, but used twice in the New Testament, in the Greek original, to express abandonment of the faith. Paul was falsely accused of teaching the Jews apostasy from Moses (Acts 21:21); he predicted the great apostasy from Christianity, foretold by Jesus (Matthew 24:10-12) which would precede “the day of the Lord” (2 Thessalonians 2:2). Apostasy, not in name but in fact, meets scathing rebuke in the Epistle of Jude, e.g. the apostasy of angels (Jude 1:6). Foretold, with warnings, as sure to abound in the latter days (1 Timothy 4:1-3; 2 Thessalonians 2:3; 2 Peter 3:17). Causes of:
persecution (Matthew 24:9, 10); false teachers (Matthew 24:11); temptation (Luke 8:13); worldliness (2 Timothy 4:4); defective knowledge of Christ (1 John 2:19); moral lapse (Hebrews 6:4-6); forsaking worship and spiritual living (Hebrews 10:25-31); unbelief (Hebrews 3:12). Biblical examples: Saul (1 Samuel 15:11); Amaziah (2 Chronicles 25:14,27); many disciples (John 6:66); Hymeneus and Alexander (1 Timothy 1:19,20); Demas (2 Timothy 4:10). For further illustration see Deuteronomy 13:13; Zephaniah 1:4-6; Galatians 5:4; 2 Peter 2:20,21.

“Forsaking Yahweh” was the characteristic and oft-recurring sin of the chosen people, especially in their contact with idolatrous nations. It constituted their supreme national peril. The tendency appeared in their earliest history, as abundantly seen in the warnings and prohibitions of the laws of Moses (Exodus 20:3,4,23; Deuteronomy 6:14; 11:16). The fearful consequences of religious and moral apostasy appear in the curses pronounced against this sin, on Mount Ebal, by the representatives of six of the tribes of Israel, elected by Moses (Deuteronomy 27:13-26; 28:15-68). So wayward was the heart of Israel, even in the years immediately following the national emancipation, in the wilderness, that Joshua found it necessary to re-pledge the entire nation to a new fidelity to Yahweh and to their original covenant before they were permitted to enter the Promised Land (Joshua 24:1-28). Infidelity to this covenant blighted the nation’s prospects and growth during the time of the Judges (Judges 2:11-15; 10:6,10,13; 1 Samuel 12:10). It was the cause of prolific and ever-increasing evil, civic and moral, from Solomon’s day to the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities. Many of the kings of the divided kingdom apostatized, leading the people, as in the case of Rehoboam, into the grossest forms of idolatry and immorality (1 Kings 14:22-24; 2 Chronicles 12:1). Conspicuous examples of such royal apostasy are Jeroboam (1 Kings 12:28-32); Ahab (1 Kings 16:30-33); Ahaziah (1 Kings 22:51-53); Jehoram (2 Chronicles 21:6,10,12-15); Ahaz (2 Chronicles 28:1-4); Manasseh (2 Chronicles 33:1-9); Amen (2 Chronicles 33:22). See IDOLATRY. Prophecy originated as a Divine and imperative protest against this historic tendency to defection from the religion of Yahweh.
In classical Greek, apostasysignifiedrevolt from a military commander. In
the roman catholic church it denotesabandonment of religious orders;
renunciation of ecclesiastical authority; defection from the faith. The
persecutions of the early Christian centuries forced many to deny
Christian discipleship and to signify their apostasy by offering incense to
a heathen deity or blaspheming the name of Christ. The emperor Julian,
who probably never vitally embraced the Christian faith, is known in
history as “the Apostate,” having renounced Christianity for paganism
soon after his accession to the throne.

An apostate’s defection from the faith may be intellectual, as in the case of
Ernst Haeckel, who, because of his materialistic philosophy, publicly and
formally renounced Christianity and the church; or it may be moral and
spiritual, as with Judas, who for filthy lucre’s sake basely betrayed his
Lord. See exhaustive articles on “Apostasy” in the Jewish Encyclopedia.

Dwight M. Pratt

APOSTLE

< a-pos'-l> ([ ἀπόστολος, apostolos], literally, “one sent forth,” an
envoy, missionary): For the meaning of this name as it meets us in the
New Testament, reference is sometimes made to classical and Jewish
parallels. In earlier classical Greek there was a distinction between an
aggelos or messenger and an apostolos, who was not a mere messenger,
but a delegate or representative of the person who sent him. In the later
Judaism, again, apostoloi were envoys sent out by the patriarchate in
Jerusalem to collect the sacred tribute from the Jews of the Dispersion. It
seems unlikely, however, that either of these uses bears upon the Christian
origin of a term which, in any case, came to have its own distinctive
Christian meaning. To understand the word as we find it in the New
Testament it is not necessary to go beyond the New Testament itself. To
discover the source of its Christian use it is sufficient to refer to its
immediate and natural signification. The term used by Jesus, it must be
remembered, would be Aramaic, not Greek, and apostolos would be its
literal equivalent.
1. THE TWELVE:

In the New Testament history we first hear of the term as applied by Jesus to the Twelve in connection with that evangelical mission among the villages on which He dispatched them at an early stage of His public ministry (Matthew 10:1 ff; Mark 3:14; 6:30; Luke 6:13; 9:1 ff). From a comparison of the Synoptics it would seem that the name as thus used was not a general designation for the Twelve, but had reference only to this particular mission, which was typical and prophetic, however, of the wider mission that was to come (compare Hort, Christian Ecclesia, 23-29). Luke, it is true, uses the word as a title for the Twelve apart from reference to the mission among the villages. But the explanation probably is, as Dr. Hort suggests, that since the Third Gospel and the Book of Acts formed two sections of what was really one work, the author in the Gospel employs the term in that wider sense which it came to have after the Ascension.

When we pass to Acts, “apostles” has become an ordinary name for the Eleven (Acts 1:2,26), and after the election of Matthias in place of Judas, for the Twelve (2:37,42,43, etc.). But even so it does not denote a particular and restricted office, but rather that function of a world-wide missionary service to which the Twelve were especially called. In His last charge, just before He ascended, Jesus had commissioned them to go forth into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature (Matthew 28:19,20; Mark 16:15). He had said that they were to be His witnesses not only in Jerusalem and Judea, but in Samaria (contrast Matthew 10:5), and unto the uttermost part of the earth (Acts 1:8). They were apostles, therefore, qua missionaries — not merely because they were the Twelve, but because they were now sent forth by their Lord on a universal mission for the propagation of the gospel.

2. PAUL:

The very fact that the name “apostle” means what it does would point to the impossibility of confining it within the limits of the Twelve. (The “twelve apostles” of Revelation 21:14 is evidently symbolic; compare in 7:3 ff the restriction of God’s sealed servants to the twelve tribes.) Yet there might be a tendency at first to do so, and to restrict it as a badge of
honor and privilege peculiar to that inner circle (compareActs 1:25). If any such tendency existed, Paul effectually broke it down by vindicating for himself the right to the name. His claim appears in his assumption of the apostolic title in the opening words of most of his epistles. And when his right to it was challenged, he defended that right with passion, and especially on these grounds: that he had seen Jesus, and so was qualified to bear witness to His resurrection (1 Corinthians 9:1; compareActs 22:6 ff); that he had received a call to the work of an apostle (Romans 1:1; 1 Corinthians 1:1, etc.; Galatians 2:7; compareActs 13:2 ff; 22:21); but, above all, that he could point to the signs and seals of his apostleship furnished by his missionary labors and their fruits (1 Corinthians 9:2; 2 Corinthians 12:12; Galatians 2:8). It was by this last ground of appeal that Paul convinced the original apostles of the justice of his claim. He had not been a disciple of Jesus in the days of His flesh; his claim to have seen the risen Lord and from Him to have received a personal commission was not one that could be proved to others; but there could be no possibility of doubt as to the seals of his apostleship. It was abundantly clear that “he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for (Paul) also unto the Gentiles” (Galatians 2:8). And so perceiving the grace that was given unto him, Peter and John, together with James of Jerusalem, recognized Paul as apostle to the Gentiles and gave him the right hand of fellowship (Galatians 2:9).

3. THE WIDER CIRCLE:

It is sometimes said by those who recognize that there were other apostles besides the Twelve and Paul that the latter (to whom some, on the ground of 1 Corinthians 15:7; Galatians 1:19, would add James the Lord’s brother) were the apostles par excellence, while the other apostles mentioned in the New Testament were apostles in some inferior sense. It is hardly possible, however, to make out such a distinction on the ground of New Testament usage. There were great differences, no doubt, among the apostles of the primitive church, as there were among the Twelve themselves — differences due to natural talents, to personal acquirements and experience, to spiritual gifts. Paul was greater than Barnabas or Silvanus, just as Peter and John were greater than Thaddaeus or Simon the Cananean. But Thaddaeus and Simon were disciples of Jesus in the very
same sense as Peter and John; and the Twelve and Paul were not more truly apostles than others who are mentioned in the New Testament. If apostleship denotes missionary service, and if its reality, as Paul suggests, is to be measured by its seals, it would be difficult to maintain that Matthias was an apostle par excellence, while Barnabas was not. Paul sets Barnabas as an apostle side by side with himself (1 Corinthians 9:5 f; Galatians 2:9; compare Acts 13:2 f; 14:4,14); he speaks of Andronicus and Junias as “of note among the apostles” (Romans 16:7); he appears to include Apollos along with himself among the apostles who are made a spectacle unto the world and to angels and to men (1 Corinthians 4:6,9); the natural inference from a comparison of Thessalonians 1:1 with 2:6 is that he describes Silvanus and Timothy as “apostles of Christ”; to the Philippians he mentions Epaphroditus as “your apostle” (Philippians 2:25 the Revised Version, margin), and to the Corinthians commends certain unknown brethren as “the apostles of the churches” and “the glory of Christ” (2 Corinthians 8:23 the Revised Version, margin). And the very fact that he found it necessary to denounce certain persons as “false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ” (2 Corinthians 11:13) shows that there was no thought in the primitive church of restricting the apostleship to a body of 12 or 13 men. “Had the number been definitely restricted, the claims of these interlopers would have been self-condemned” (Lightfoot, Galatians, 97).

4. APOSTLES IN DIDACHE:

When we come to the Didache, which probably lies beyond the boundary-line of New Testament history, we find the name “apostles” applied to a whole class of nameless missionaries — men who settled in no church, but moved about from place to place as messengers of the gospel (chapter 11). This makes it difficult to accept the view, urged by Lightfoot (op. cit., 98) and Gwatkin (HDB, I, 126) on the ground of Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8,22; 1 Corinthians 9:1, that to have seen the Lord was always the primary qualification of an apostle — a view on the strength of which they reject the apostleship of Apollos and Timothy, as being late converts to Christianity who lived far from the scenes of our Lord’s ministry. Gwatkin remarks that we have no reason to suppose that this condition
was ever waived unless we throw forward the Didache into the 2nd century. But it seems very unlikely that even toward the end of the 1st century there would be a whole class of men, not only still alive, but still braving in the exercise of their missionary functions all the hardships of a wandering and homeless existence (compare Didache 11:4-6), who were yet able to bear the personal testimony of eye-witnesses to the ministry and resurrection of Jesus. In Luke 24:48 and Acts 18:22 it is the chosen company of the Twelve who are in view. In 1 Corinthians 9:1 Paul is meeting his Judaizing opponents on their own ground, and answering their insistence upon personal intercourse with Jesus by a claim to have seen the Lord. But apart from these passages there is no evidence that the apostles of the early church were necessarily men who had known Jesus in the flesh or had been witnesses of His resurrection — much less that this was the primary qualification on which their apostleship was made to rest.

5. THE APOSTLESHIP:

We are led then to the conclusion that the true differentia of the New Testament apostleship lay in the missionary calling implied in the name, and that all whose lives were devoted to this vocation, and who could prove by the issues of their labors that God’s Spirit was working through them for the conversion of Jew or Gentile, were regarded and described as apostles. The apostolate was not a limited circle of officials holding a well-defined position of authority in the church, but a large class of men who discharged one — and that the highest — of the functions of the prophetic ministry (1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11). It was on the foundation of the apostles and prophets that the Christian church was built, with Jesus Christ Himself as the chief corner-stone (Ephesians 2:20). The distinction between the two classes was that while the prophet was God’s spokesman to the believing church (1 Corinthians 14:4,22,25,30,31), the apostle was His envoy to the unbelieving world (Galatians 2:7,9).

The call of the apostle to his task might come in a variety of ways. The Twelve were called personally by Jesus to an apostolic task at the commencement of His earthly ministry (Matthew 10:1 ff parallel), and after His resurrection this call was repeated, made permanent, and given a
universal scope (Matthew 28:19,20; Acts 1:8). Matthias was called first by the voice of the general body of the brethren and thereafter by the decision of the lot (Acts 1:15,23,26). Paul’s call came to him in a heavenly vision (Acts 26:17-19); and though this call was subsequently ratified by the church at Antioch, which sent him forth at the bidding of the Holy Ghost (Acts 13:1 ff), he firmly maintained that he was an apostle not from men neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him from the dead (Galatians 1:1). Barnabas was sent forth (exapostello is the verb used) by the church at Jerusalem (Acts 11:22) and later, along with Paul, by the church at Antioch (Acts 13:1); and soon after this we find the two men described as apostles (Acts 14:4). It was the mission on which they were sent that explains the title. And when this particular mission was completed and they returned to Antioch to rehearse before the assembled church “all things that God had done with them, and that he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles” (Acts 14:27), they thereby justified their claim to be the apostles not only of the church, but of the Holy Spirit.

The authority of the apostolate was of a spiritual, ethical and personal kind. It was not official, and in the nature of the case could not be transmitted to others. Paul claimed for himself complete independence of the opinion of the whole body of the earlier apostles (Galatians 2:6,11), and in seeking to influence his own converts endeavored by manifestation of the truth to commend himself to every man’s conscience in the sight of God (2 Corinthians 4:2). There is no sign that the apostles collectively exercised a separate and autocratic authority. When the question of the observance of the Mosaic ritual by Gentile Christians arose at Antioch and was referred to Jerusalem, it was “the apostles and elders” who met to discuss it (Acts 15:2,6,22), and the letter returned to Antioch was written in the name of “the apostles and the elders, brethren” (Acts 15:23). In founding a church Paul naturally appointed the first local officials (Acts 14:23), but he does not seem to have interfered with the ordinary administration of affairs in the churches he had planted. In those cases in which he was appealed to or was compelled by some grave scandal to interpose, he rested an authoritative command on some express word of the Lord (1 Corinthians 7:10), and when he had no such word to rest on, was careful to distinguish his own judgment and counsel from a
Divine commandment (1 Corinthians 12:25,40). His appeals in the latter case are grounded upon fundamental principles of morality common to heathen and Christian alike (1 Corinthians 5:1), or are addressed to the spiritual judgment (1 Corinthians 10:15), or are reinforced by the weight of a personal influence gained by unselfish service and by the fact that he was the spiritual father of his converts as having begotten them in Christ Jesus through the gospel (1 Corinthians 4:15 f).

It may be added here that the expressly missionary character of the apostleship seems to debar James, the Lord’s brother, from any claim to the title. James was a prophet and teacher, but not an apostle. As the head of the church at Jerusalem, he exercised a ministry of a purely local nature. The passages on which it has been sought to establish his right to be included in the apostolate do not furnish any satisfactory evidence. In 1 Corinthians 15:7 James is contrasted with “all the apostles” rather than included in their number (compare 1 Corinthians 9:5). And in Galatians 1:19 the meaning may quite well be that with the exception of Peter, none of the apostles was seen by Paul in Jerusalem, but only James the Lord’s brother (compare the Revised Version, margin).

LITERATURE.


J. C. Lambert

APOSTLES’ CREED; THE <kred>.

THE OLDEST CREED:

The Apostles’ Creed is the oldest creed, and lies at the basis of most others. Though not, as the long-current legend of its origin affirmed, the direct work of the Apostles, it has its roots in apostolic times, and embodies, with much fidelity, apostolic teaching. It will be seen immediately that it had an important place in the early church, when as yet no creed but itself existed. The oldest usage of the term “Rule of Faith”
(regula fidei), now commonly given to the Scriptures, has reference to this creed. It was the creed that could be appealed to as held by the church in all its great branches, and so as forming the test of catholicity. It was as resting on this creed that the church could be called “catholic and apostolic.” Of late the creed has been the subject of great controversy, and violent attempts have been made to thrust out some of its chief articles from the Christian faith. This is a special reason for considering the foundations on which these articles of faith rest.

**I. FORM OF THE CREED.**

In the first place, what is the creed? Here, first of all, it is to be pointed out that the received form of the creed is not its oldest or original form. The creed exists in two forms — a shorter and a longer; the former, known as the Old Roman Form, going back certainly as early as the middle of the 2nd century (about 140 AD), the latter, the enlarged form, in its present shape, of much later date. Its final form was probably given to it in South Gaul not before the middle of the 5th century (in one or two clauses, as late as the 7th). It is desirable, at the outset, to put these two forms of the creed (in translation) clearly before the reader.

1. *Old Roman Form:*

First, the Old Roman Form is given from the Greek of Marcellus, of Ancyra, 341 AD. It runs thus:

“I believe in God the Father Almighty. And in Jesus Christ His only (begotten) Son our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost; the holy Church; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; (the life everlasting).”

The last clause is omitted in the Latin form preserved by Rufinus, 390 AD.
2. The Received Form:

The Received Form of the creed reads thus: “I believe in God the Father Almighty; Maker of Heaven and Earth; and in Jesus Christ His only (begotten) Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven; and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. Amen.”

Such is the form of the creed. Something must now be said of its origin and history.

2. ORIGIN OF THE CREED.

The legend was that the creed took shape at the dictation of the Twelve Apostles, each of whom contributed a special article. Thus, Peter, it was alleged, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, commenced, “I believe in God the Father Almighty”; Andrew (or according to others, John) continued, “And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord”; James the elder went on, “Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,” etc. This legend is not older than the 5th or 6th centuries, and is absurd on the face of it.

1. Baptismal Confession:

The real origin of the creed has now been traced with great exactness. The original germ of it is to be sought for in the baptismal confession made by converts in the reception of that rite. The primitive confession may have contained no more than “I believe that Jesus is the Son of God,” but we have evidence within the New Testament itself that it soon became enlarged. Paul speaks of the “form of teaching” delivered to converts (<5Hai 16:17>, Romans 6:17), and reminds Timothy of “the good (beautiful) confession” he had made in sight of many witnesses (<5Hai 1 Timothy 6:12>). Similar language is used of Christ’s confession before Pilate (<5Hai 1 Timothy 6:13>). We may perhaps conjecture from the epistles that Timothy’s confession contained references to God as the author of life, to Jesus
Christ and His descent from David, to His witness before Pontius Pilate, to His being raised from the dead, to His coming again to judge the quick and the dead (1 Timothy 6:13; 2 Timothy 2:8; 4:1). Early Christian writers, as Ignatius (110 AD), and Aristides the apologist (circa 125 AD), show traces of other clauses.

2. “Rule of Faith”:

In any case, the fact is certain that before the middle of the 2nd century the confession at baptism had crystallized into tolerably settled shape in all the greater churches. We have accounts given us of its contents (besides the Old Roman Form) in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Novatian, Origen, etc.; and they show substantial unity with a certain freedom of form in expression. But the form in the Roman church came gradually to be the recognized type. After the middle of the century, the confession rose to new importance as the result of the Gnostic controversies, and assumed more of the character of a formal creed. It came to be known as the “Rule of Truth,” or “Rule of Faith,” and was employed to check the license of interpretation of Scripture of these fantastic heretical speculators. The creed had originated independently of Scripture — in the early oral teaching and preaching of the apostles; hence its value as a witness to the common faith. But it was not used to supersede Scripture; it was held to corroborate Scripture, where men by their allegorical and other perversions sought to wrest Scripture from its real sense. It was employed as a check on those who sought to allegorize away the Christian faith.

3. HISTORY OF THE CREED.

1. The Roman Creed:

The Old Roman Form of the creed was, as said above, certainly in use by the middle of the 2nd century, in Rome; probably a considerable time before. We have it in both its Greek and Latin forms (the Greek being probably the original). The Latin form is given by Rufinus about 390 AD who compares it with the creed of his own church of Aquileia — a very old church. The Greek form is preserved by Marcellus, of Ancyra, in the 4th century. The old shorter form of the creed long maintained itself. We find it in England, e.g. up to nearly the time of the Norman Conquest (in 8th or 9th century manuscripts in British Museum).
2. The Received Creed:

The Received Form of the creed has a much more obscure history. The additional clauses came in at different times, though in themselves some of them are very old. The addition to the first article, e.g. “Maker of heaven and earth,” first appears in this form in Gaul about 650 AD, though similar forms are found in much older creeds. Another addition, “He descended into hell,” meets us first in Rufinus as part of the creed of Aquileia, but is probably also old in that church. It is known that the creed had assumed nearly its present shape (perhaps without the above clauses, and that on the communion of saints) by the time of Faustus of Reiz, about 460 AD. Thence it spread, and had reached Ireland apparently before the end of the 7th century. In England it appears a century later, about 850 AD (from the court of Charlemagne?), and from the beginning of the 10th century it largely superseded the older from. The same applies to other countries, so that the Gallican form is now the one in common use. Two significant changes may be noted in the form given to it. In England, whose form we follow, the Reformers substituted for “the resurrection of the flesh” the words, “the resurrection of the body,” and in Germany the Lutherans change the word “catholic” to “Christian,” in “the holy catholic Church.”

4. STRUCTURE OF THE CREED.

1. Its Trinitarian Form:

The Apostles’ Creed, it will be perceived, has no theological or metaphysical character. It is not only the oldest, but the simplest and least developed of all creeds. It is a simple enumeration, in order, of the great verities which the church was known to have held, and to have handed down from the beginning — which Scripture also taught. Originating from the baptismal confession, it naturally follows the Trinitarian order suggested by the customary formula for baptism. The first article declares belief in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. The second to the seventh articles declare belief in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, and in the great facts embraced in the gospel testimony regarding Him. The eighth article affirms belief in the Holy Ghost, to which are appended the additional clauses, declaring belief in the holy catholic
church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh (body), and the life everlasting.

2. Creed of Apelles:

It will help to show the kind of heresies the church of that age had to contend with, and what the earnest struggles of the Fathers of the time (using the Apostles’ Creed as a bulwark), if we append here the Creed of Apelles, a 2nd-century Gnostic, as reconstructed by Principal Lindsay (The Church and the Ministry, 222) from Hippolytus:

“We believe, that Christ descended from the Power above, from the Good, and that He is the Son of the Good; that He was not born of a virgin, and that when He did appear He was not devoid of flesh. That He formed His Body by taking portions of it from the substance of the universe, i.e. hot and cold, moist and dry; That He received cosmical powers in the Body, and lived for the time He did in the world; That He was crucified by the Jews and died; That being raised again after three days He appeared to His disciples; That He showed them the prints of the nails and (the wound) in His side, being desirous of persuading them that He was no phantom, but was present in the flesh; That after He had shown them His flesh He restored it to the earth; That after He had once more loosed the chains of His Body He gave back heat to what is hot, cold to what is cold, moisture to what is moist, and dryness to what is dry; That in this condition He departed to the Good Father, leaving the Seed of Life in the world for those who through His disciples should believe in Him.”

5. MODERN CONTROVERSIES.

It was mentioned that of late the Apostles’ Creed has been the subject of many attacks and of keen controversies. In Germany, particularly, quite a fierce controversy broke out in 1892 over the refusal of a Lutheran pastor, named Schrempf, to use the creed in the administration of baptism. He did not believe in its articles about the virgin-birth of Christ, the resurrection of the flesh, etc. The offender was deposed, but a great battle ensued, giving rise to an enormous literature. The conflict has been overruled for good in leading to a more thorough examination than ever before of the history and meaning of the creed, but it has given precision also to the attacks made upon it. A leading part in this controversy was taken by
Professor Harnack, of Berlin, whose objections may be regarded as representative. Professor Harnack, and those who think with him, criticize the creed from a twofold point of view:

1. They deny that in all respects it represents true apostolical doctrine — this not only in its later arts., but even in such an article as that affirming the virgin-birth of Christ:

2. They deny that the meaning we now put on many of the clauses of the creed is its true original meaning, i.e. we use the words, but with a different sense from the original framers.

Harnack’s Criticism:

In considering these objections, it is always to be remembered that those who urge them do so from the standpoint of rejection of most that is usually considered essential to Christianity. There is in their view no incarnation, no real Godhead of Christ, no real miracle in His life (only faith-cures), no resurrection from Joseph’s tomb. This no doubt takes the bottom from the Apostles’ Creed, but it takes the bottom also out of apostolic Christianity. Where Harnack, for instance, objects that “Father” and “Son” in the first and second articles of the creed have no Trinitarian reference, but relate only, the former to God’s relation to creation, the latter, to Christ’s historical appearance, the reply can only be the whole evidence in the New Testament for a Trinitarian distinction and for the essential Divinity of Christ. When it is declared that the virgin-birth is no part of the early Christian tradition, one can only appeal to the evidence of the fact in the Gospels, and recall that no section of the Christian church, except a heretical branch of the Ebionites, and some of the Gnostic sects, is known to have rejected it. (See VIRGIN-BIRTH.) For detailed replies to Harnack’s criticisms, Dr. Swete’s book on the Apostles’ Creed may be consulted.

LITERATURE.

A list of the voluminous pamphlet literature produced by the German controversy on the Apostles’ Creed may be seen in Nippold’s Die theologische Einzelschule, II, 232-33. The most important contributions are those of Harnack (Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss, also English
Translation); Kattenbusch, and Cremer. Compare also Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, I, 14-23; II, 45-55. Special works are: Pearson, Exposition of the Creed (1659); Kattenbusch, Das apostolische Symbolum, 2 volumes (1894-1900); Zahn, Das apostolische Symmbolum (1893); English translation (1899); H. B. Swete, The Apostles’ Creed and Primitive Christianity (1894); A. C. McGiffert, The Apostles’ Creed, Its Origin, Its Purpose, and Its Historical Interpretation (1902).

*James Orr*

**APOSTLES, GOSPEL OF THE TWELVE**

*See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.*

**APOSTOLIC AGE**

<ap-os-to-l'-ik aj>.

1. **THE MISSION:**

(1) When the disciples realized that they had seen the risen Christ for the last time and that it had now become their duty to spread His message, they gathered themselves together and restored the number of “witnesses” to the appointed Twelve. Immediately afterward the outpouring of the Holy Spirit gave them the signal to begin work. At first this work was rigidly centered in Jerusalem, and the first journeyings were the result of forcible dispersion and not of planned effort (<441119>Acts 11:19). But pilgrims to the feasts had carried away the gospel with them, and in this way Christianity had been spread at least as far as Damascus (<440902>Acts 9:2,19). The dispersion itself widened the circle to Cyprus and to Antioch and marked the beginning of the Gentile work (<441119>Acts 11:19-20). Here the extreme prominence of Paul’s ministry in the New Testament should not obscure the success of the other missionaries. When the apostles began their journeys we do not know but at the time of <480119>Galatians 1:19 only Peter represented the Twelve in Jerusalem. Paul mentions their extended work in <460905>1 Corinthians 9:5,6 and it seems certain that Peter was in Rome shortly before his death. The troubles caused Paul by the Judaizers at least give evidence of the missionary zeal of the latter.
Barnabas and Mark worked after their separation from Paul (Acts 15:39) and Gentile Christianity existed in Rome long before the latter’s arrival there (Romans 1:13). By the year 100 it appears that Christianity extended around the Mediterranean from Alexandria to Rome (and doubtless farther, although data are scanty), while Asia Minor was especially pervaded by it.

(2) Many factors cooperated to help the work: Peace was universal and communication was easy. Greek was spoken everywhere. The protection given Judaism sheltered from civil interference. The presence of Judaism insured hospitality and hearers for at least the first efforts to convert. The Jews’ own proselytizing zeal (Matthew 23:15) had prepared Gentiles to receive Christianity. And not the least element was the break-up of the old religions and the general looking to the East for religious satisfaction.

(3) For the methods, Paul’s procedure is probably typical. Avoiding the smaller places, he devoted himself to the cities as the strategic points and traveled in a direct route, without side-journeys. In this way a “line of fire” (Harnack) was traced, and the flame could be trusted to spread of its own accord to each side of the road. So as fruits of Paul’s work at Ephesus there appear churches at Colosse and Laodicea some hundred and twenty miles away (Colossians 2:1; 4:16). The churches founded needed revisiting and confirming, but when the apostle felt that they could shift for themselves, he felt also that his work in the East was over (Romans 15:23).

2. JERUSALEM CHURCH:

The members of the earliest Jerusalem church thought of themselves simply as Jews who had a true understanding of the Messiah and so constituting a new “way” or “party” (hardly “sect”) in Judaism (Acts 22:4, especially). At first they were suffered to grow unmolested and their right to exist was apparently unquestioned, for the Sadducean actions of Acts 4:1; 5:17 were in the nature of police precautions. And it is significant that the first attack was made on a foreigner, Stephen. He seems to have angered the crowds by preaching the impending destruction of the Temple, although he was martyred for ascribing (practically) Divine
honors to Jesus (Acts 7:56). Yet the apostles were not driven from the city (Acts 8:1) and the church was able to continue its development. In 41 AD, the Roman representatives gave way to the Pharisaically inclined Agrippa I and (for reasons that are not clear) persecution broke out in which James was martyred and Peter delivered only by a miracle (Acts 12). With the resumption of Roman rule in 44 AD the persecution ceased. Some peaceable mode of living was devised, as appears from the absence of further allusions to troubles (compare Acts 21:17-26) and from the accounts of Josephus and Hegesippus of the esteem in which James the Lord’s brother was held. His martyrdom (in 62 AD?) was due to the tension that preceded the final revolt against Rome, in which the Christians of Jerusalem took no part. Instead, they retired across the Jordan to Pella (Revelation 12:13-17), where they formed a close, intensely Jewish body under the rule of the descendants of Christ’s brethren according to the flesh. Some mission work was done farther to the east but in the 2nd century they either were absorbed in normal Christianity or became one of the factors that produced Ebionism.

3. JUDAISTS:

Many members of this body (and, doubtless, other Jewish Christians outside it) showed various degrees of inability to understand the Gentile work. The acceptance of an uncircumcised Christian as “saved” offered fairly slight difficulty (Galatians 2:3; Acts 15). But to eat with him was another thing and one that was an offense to many who accepted his salvation (Galatians 2:12,13). The rigorous conclusion that the Law bound no Christian was still another thing and one that even James could not accept (Acts 21:21). At the time of Galatians 2:9, the “pillars” were as yet not thinking of doing Gentile work. Paul’s controversies are familiar and probably the last friction did not end until the fall of Jerusalem. But the difficulties grew gradually less and 1 Peter is evidence that Peter himself finally accepted the full status of Gentiles.

4. RELATIONS WITH ROME:

From the Roman power Christianity was safe at first, as the distinctions from Judaism were thought too slight to notice (Acts 18:14-16; 25:19). (Troubles such as those of Acts 17:9 were due to disturbance of the
peace.) So the government was thought of as a protector (Thessalonians 2:7) and spoken of in the highest terms (Romans 13:1; 1 Peter 2:13,14). But, while absolute isolation was not observed (1 Corinthians 10:27), yet the Christians tended more and more to draw themselves into bodies with little contact with the world around them (1 Peter 4:3-5), so provoking suspicion and hostility from their neighbors. Hence they were a convenient scapegoat for Nero after the burning of Rome. It is uncertain how far his persecution spread or how far persecutions occurred from his time until the end of the reign of Domitian (see Peter, First Epistle of), but in Revelation, Rome has become the symbol for all that is hostile to Christ.

5. "HELLENISM":

Influence of the “pagan” religions on Christianity is not very perceptible in the 1st century. But syncretism was the fashion of the day and many converts must have attempted to combine the new religion with views that they held already (or that they learned still later). Apparently little attention was paid to this attempt, if restricted to entirely minor details (1 Corinthians 15:29?), but in Colossians 2:8-23 a vital matter is touched. The danger is more acute in the Pastorals (1 Timothy 1:4; 4:3; Titus 3:9) and in Revelation 2 great harm is being done. And Jude, 2 Peter, and 1 John contain direct polemics against the systems so arising, the beginnings of what in the 2nd century appeared as Gnosticism.

For further details see the separate articles, especially MINISTRY; NEW TESTAMENT CANON; and (for life in the Apostolic Age) SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

LITERATURE.

See the separate articles. Works with the title Apostolic Age are by Gilbert (brief), Bartlet (useful), Purves (very conservative), Ropes, McGiffert, and Weizsacker. The last three are for critical study.

Burton Scott Easton

APOSTOLICAL CHURCH ORDINANCES

See DIDACHE.
APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS

See DIDACHE.

APOSTOLICAL COUNCIL

<ap-os-tol’-i-kal koun’-sil>: The assembly of the apostles and elders held in Jerusalem (49 AD), an account of which is given in Acts 15.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS

An appellation usually given to the writers of the 1st century who employed their pens in the cause of Christianity.

See SUB-APOSTOLIC LITERATURE.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS, EPISTLES OF

See SUB-APOSTOLIC LITERATURE.

APOTHECARY

<a-poth’-e-ka-ri>: Found in English Versions of the Bible eight times in the Old Testament and Apocrypha for Hebrew word rendered more accurately “perfumer” by the Revised Version (British and American) in Exodus 30:25,35; 37:29; Ecclesiastes 10:1; though inconsistently retained elsewhere (2 Chronicles 16:14 the English Revised Version; Nehemiah 3:8 the English Revised Version (compare the margin)); Sirach 38:8; 49:1).

See PERFUMER.

APPAIM

<ap’-aa-im>, <ap’-a-im> ([appayim], “nostrils”): A son of Nadab of the house of Jerahmeel, of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:30 f).

APPAREL

<a-par’-el>: The English equivalent of six Hebrew and three Greek words, variously signifying all kinds of raiment, chiefly garments costly and
beautiful: ornamental (2 Samuel 1:24); royal, as of Ahasuerus (Est 6:8), of Herod (Acts 12:21; 2 Samuel 13:18); priestly (Ezra 3:10); also mourning (2 Samuel 14:2). In Samuel 17:38,39 “apparel” replaces “armor” of King James Version: “Saul clad David with his apparel,” probably some close-fitting garment worn under the armor, or sometimes without it. Severe judgment was pronounced on Jewish princes who clothed themselves with “strange” (the King James Version), i.e. “with foreign apparel” (Zephaniah 1:8; compare Isaiah 2:6-8). “Modest apparel” as against “costly raiment” is commended as suited to Christians (1 Timothy 2:9; 1 Peter 3:4). Angels are robed in white apparel (Acts 1:10; compare Luke 24:4, “dazzling”). Fig. of the glorious and red (suggestive of the wine-press) apparel of the Messiah (Isaiah 63:1,2), and of “a meek and quiet spirit” (1 Peter 3:4).

Dwight M. Pratt

APPARENTLY

<ap-par'-ent-li> (Mróm, [mar’eh], the Revised Version (British and American) “manifestly,” signifying in the only place so translated (Numbers 12:8) “in the form of seeing” (Keil and Delitzsch), i.e. “an appearance,” “a similitude,” a manifestation of the invisible God in human form): This is the Old Testament manner of Divine revelation “in the person and form of the angel of Yahweh”: “In the bush I did manifestly reveal myself, and talked with Moses” (2 Esdras 14:3). God talked with Moses openly, without figure, in a direct manner revealing to him His will in the clear distinctness of a spiritual communication: “With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches; and the form of Yahweh shall he behold.”

M. O. Evans

APPARITION

<ap-a-rish’-un> ([ índalma, indalma], [éphaneia, epiphaneia]; [phantasma, phantasma]): This word is not found in the Old Testament or New Testament canon, the King James Version or the American Standard Revised Version, but occurs twice in the Revised Version (British and

**APEAL**

<ap-el'>: If an appeal be, as it properly is, a petition for the removal of a case that has been decided for rehearing and review and final decision by a higher court, we find no such instance either in the Old Testament or the New Testament.

In the institution of judges by Moses (<021826>Exodus 18:26), the reference: “The hard cases they brought unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves,” indicates simply a distribution of cases between two courts, but gives no trace of any provision for the rehearing of any case, by a higher court, that has already been decided by a lower. In <051708>Deuteronomy 17:8-13, directions are given that a lower court, under certain conditions, shall ask a higher for instructions as to procedure, and shall strictly follow the order prescribed: nevertheless, the decision itself belongs to the lower court. When its sentence was once given, there was no appeal.

In the New Testament, the provision of the Roman law, for an appeal from a lower to a higher court, is clearly recognized, although the case of Paul in Acts 25 does not strictly fall within its scope. The Roman law originally gave a citizen the right of appeal to the tribune of the people, but, with the establishment of the Empire, the emperor himself assumed this function of the tribune, and became the court of last resort. The case of Paul, however, had not been tried before Festus, nor any verdict rendered, when (<442510>Acts 25:10,11) he utters the proper legal formula: “I appeal unto Caesar” ([Καίσαρος ἐπικαλοῦμαι, Kaisara epikaloumai]). That Roman citizens could insist upon such procedure, as right, is not
perfectly certain (HJP, II, 2 279). Paul evidently acted upon the suggestion of the governor himself (Acts 25:9), who seems to have been desirous of avoiding the responsibility of a case involving questions most remote from his ordinary attention. At first sight, Paul’s decision to appeal seems premature. He throws away his chance of acquittal by Festus, and acts upon the assumption that he has been already condemned. Acts 26:32 shows that the possibility of his acquittal had amounted almost to a certainty. His course is explicable only by regarding his appeal the master stroke of a great leader, who was ready to take risks. In the proposition of Festus, he grasps at what had been an object of hope long deferred. For many years, he had been desiring and praying to get to Rome (Acts 19:21; Romans 1:11,15; 15:23,24). The Lord had just assured him (Acts 23:11), that as he had testified at Jerusalem, “so must thou bear witness also at Rome.” With this promise and direction in view, he hastens toward the world’s capital and the center of the world’s influence, in the seemingly precipitate words, “I appeal,” which a lower order of prudence would have deferred until he had first been condemned.

H. E. Jacobs

APEAR

\(<a-per’>\>: Of eight Hebrew originals the chief is \(\text{רָאָה} [ra’ah], “to be seen.” Used mainly of God’s self-revelations in person and in dreams and visions: “Yahweh appeared unto Abram” (Genesis 12:7); to Moses (Exodus 3:2); to Solomon (1 Kings 3:5). All originals used of Nature’s processes, of the appearing, i.e. coming of the morning (Exodus 14:27); stars (Nehemiah 4:21); flowers, flocks of goats, tender grapes (Song 2:12; 4:1 m; 7:12 margin). So New Testament \(\text{οὐράνιος, ophthen}], passive of horao, “I see,” “to be seen” used especially of angelic revelations and visions: as on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matthew 17:3); an angel (Luke 1:11); the risen Lord (Luke 24:34); cloven tongues at Pentecost (Acts 2:3); vision to Paul (Acts 16:9); a great wonder in heaven (Revelation 12:1, the King James Version).

\(\text{οἰπτάνω, opiano}], in Acts 1:3, of Christ appearing after his suffering; \(\text{φαίνομαι, phainomai}], “to shine,” like the above with the added thought of a resplendent, luminous revelation, as of the Bethlehem star
(Matthew 2:7); the bringing to light of sin (Romans 7:13, the King James Version). Also [φανερώ, phanero], “to make manifest,” used exclusively of the post-resurrection appearances and second coming of Christ and of the disclosures of the great judgment day. See Colossians 3:4; 2 Corinthians 5:10; Revelation 3:18 and seven other passages the King James Version.

Dwight M. Pratt

APPEARANCE

<α-пер’-ans> (םרא [mar’eh]; chiefly used of the mystic and supernatural visions of Ezekiel and Daniel): A semblance, as of lightning, wheels, sapphire stone (Ezekiel 1:14,16,26); Gabriel’s overpowering revelation (Daniel 8:15; see also 10:6,18). In the New Testament refers exclusively, through three Greek words, [πρόσωπον, prosopon], “sight,” “countenance,” to “outward appearance” (2 Corinthians 10:7 the King James Version); and its possibly deceptive nature: [opsis, opsis], “Judge not according to appearance.” (John 7:24); “them that glory in appearance.” (2 Corinthians 5:12; compare 1 Samuel 16:7). See also Thessalonians 2:22, the English Revised Version, margin (eidos = “sight”).

APPEARING

<α-пер’-ing> ([ἀποκάλυψις, apokalupsis], “an unveiling”; [ἐπιφάνεια, epiphaneia], “a manifestation”): Exclusively technical, referring in the six passages where found to the return, the millennial advent of Christ (e.g. 1 Peter 1:7, the King James Version; 2 Timothy 1:10; Titus 2:13).

APPEASE

<α-pez’>: “To make one at peace.” Esau is appeased, i.e. placated, won over by means of presents (Genesis 32:20). One “slow to anger appeaseth strife,” i.e. puts an end to it (Proverbs 15:18). the Revised Version (British and American) changes “appeased” of the King James Version in Acts 19:35 into “quieted” (Greek katastello, “put down,” “suppress,” “restrain,” referring to a popular commotion).
APPERTAIN

<ap-er-tan’>: Only once in English Versions of the Bible, namely, in Jeremiah 10:7, for [ya’ah] “it becometh,” “it is seemly,” Vulgate “Tuum est enim decus,” “it is Thy honor.” Generally in the sense of “to belong to” (Leviticus 6:5, “to whom it appertaineth”); Nehemiah 2:8, “the castle which appertained to the house” (Tobit 6:12; 1 Esdras 8:95; 1 Macc 10:42).

APPETITE

<ap’e-tit> (chai, nephesh): This word occurs four times in Old Testament text and once in the King James Version margin. Once (Job 38:39) it is a translation of [chai], “life”; “Canst thou .... satisfy the appetite (life) of the young lions?” Twice (Proverbs 23:2; Ecclesiastes 6:7; also Isaiah 56:11, the King James Version margin) it is a translation of [nephesh]: Proverbs 23:2, [ba’al nephesh] “a man given to appetite”; Ecclesiastes 6:7, “the [nephesh] is not filled.” In Isaiah 56:11, “strong of [nephesh]” is translated “greedy.” [Nephesh] means originally “breath,” hence “the soul,” psuche, “the vital principle,” “life”; therefore in certain expressions referring to the sustaining of life the [nephesh] hungers (Proverbs 10:3), thirsts (Proverbs 25:25), fasts (Psalm 69:10). [Nephesh] then comes to mean the seat of the senses, affections, emotions, and to it is ascribed love, joy, desire (compare Deuteronomy 12:20; Proverbs 6:30 the Revised Version, margin; Micah 7:1, where the [nephesh] “desires”). The idea of desire or appetite of the [nephesh] may include all forms of longing; e.g. lust (Jeremiah 2:24; “her desire” is literally “the desire of her [nephesh]”), the appetite for revenge (Psalm 41:2, “the will of his enemies” is literally “the [nephesh],” etc.). The next step is to identify the [nephesh] with its desire, hence in the cases above [nephesh] is translated “appetite.” In the 4th case (Isaiah 29:8) “His soul hath appetite” is a free translation of [naphsho shoqeqah], literally “His soul runneth to and fro.”

S. F. Hunter
APPHIA

<af’-i-a>, <ap’-fi-a> (["Ἀπφία, Apphia], dative case of Apphia; in Philem 1:2, though Apphia, Amphia, and Appia, also occur): A Christian of Colosse, probably the wife of Philemon; certainly a member of his household, greeted as “the sister” the Revised Version, margin. In the Greek church, November 22 is sacred to her memory. It has been supposed, since this epistle concerns one household exclusively, that Apphia was Philemon’s wife and the mother or sister of Archippus (which see). She was stoned to death with Philemon, Onesimus, and Archippus in the reign of Nero. (See Lightfoot, Col., 372.)

APPHUS

<af’-us>, <ap’-fus>: A name borne by Jonathan, the fifth son of Mattathias (["Ἀπφους, Apphous], 1 Macc 2:5). All the brothers, according to this passage, had double names; John is said to have been called Gaddis; Simon, Thassi; Judas, Maccabeus; Eleazar, Avaran; Jonathan, Apphus (1 Macc 2:2-5). The latter were probably the names which Mattathias gave his sons, while the former were received later when they became “leaders of the people.” The common explanation of the word “Apphus” relates it to the Syriac (𒋈𒆠 [choppus]), “the dissembler”; but Torrey (article “Maccabees,” Encyclopedia Biblica) points out that we have no means of ascertaining with what guttural consonant the word began, or what Semitic consonant the Greek “s” represents. Both the form and meaning of the name are, therefore, still to be explained.

H. J. Wolf

APPII FORUM

<ap’-i-i fo’-rum>, transliteration of Lat; APPIUS <ap’-i-us>, MARKET OF (Revised Version) (["Ἀππίου φόρον, Appiou phoron]): Appi Forum (Cicero ad Att. 2.10; Suetonius Tib. 2: Appii Forum; Vulgate Revised Version: Forum Appi; Horace Satires i.5; Pliny, Nat. Hist., iii.64; xiv.61; CIL, X, 6824), or Market of Appius, was a town situated at the forty-third milestone on the Appian Road (39 1/2 English miles from Rome, a single day’s journey for energetic travelers) according to the imperial
itineraries (Ant., 108; Hierosol. 611; Geog. Rav. 4.34). Its existence probably dates from the time of Appius Claudius Caecus (Suet. Tib. 2; compare Mommsen, Rom. Forsch., I, 308), who laid out the famous highway from Rome to Capua in 312 BC. In the 1st century it had the rank of a municipality (Pliny, iii.64). Its importance as a highway station is due chiefly to the canal which ran by the side of the road from there to within a short distance of Tarracina (at the sixty-second milestone), affording an alternative means of conveyance (Strabo v.3.6). It was customary to cover this section of the journey, passing through the Pontine Marshes, by night in canal boats drawn by mules. Horace (Sat. i.5) offers a lively picture of the discomforts of the trip, mentioning the importunate inn-keepers and intolerable drinking water at Appii Forum, the gnats and frogs which were enemies to repose, and the exasperating procrastination of the muleteer.

The Christian brethren in Rome went out along the Appian Road to welcome the apostle Paul upon hearing of his arrival at Puteoli. One party awaited him at Three Taverns while another proceeded as far as Appii Forum (Acts 28:15).

George H. Allen

APPLE; APPLE-TREE

<ap’l> <ap’l tre>, (אַפְּלָהּ<br>애플, [tappuach]): A fruit tree and fruit mentioned chiefly in Cant, concerning the true nature of which there has been much dispute.

Song 2:3 says: “As the apple-tree among the trees of the wood, so is my beloved among the sons. I sat down under his shadow with great delight”; Song 8:5: “Under the apple-tree I awakened thee: there thy mother was in travail with thee, there was she in travail that brought thee forth.” Of the fruit it is said, Song 2:3: “His fruit was sweet to my taste”; Song 2:5: “Stay ye me with raisins, refresh me with apples”; Song 7:8: “the smell of thy breath (Hebrew “nose”) like apples.”

In all the above references the true apple, Pyrus malus, suits the conditions satisfactorily. The apple tree affords good shade, the fruit is sweet, the perfume is a very special favorite with the people of the East. Sick
persons in Palestine delight to hold an apple in their hands, simply for the
smell. (Compare Arabian Nights, “Prince Hassan and the Paribanou.”)
Further the Arabic for apple tuffah is without doubt identical with the
Hebrew [tappuach]. The apple was well known, too, in ancient times; it
was, for example, extensively cultivated by the Romans.

The one serious objection is that apples do not easily reach perfection in
Palestine; the climate is too dry and hot; farther north in the Lebanon they
flourish. At the same time it is possible to exaggerate this objection, for
with careful grafting and cultivation exceedingly good apples may be
produced in the mountain regions. Apple trees there need special care and
renewal of the grafts, but there is no impossibility that at the time of the
writing of Canticles skilled gardeners should have been able to produce
sweet and perfumed apples in Palestine. Small but very sweet and fragrant
apples are now grown at Gaza. Good apples are now plentiful in the
market at Jerusalem, but they are chiefly importations from the North.

On account of the above difficulty three other fruits have been suggested
by various writers. Two doubtless have been brought forward with a view to
Proverbs 25:11: “A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in
network of silver,” but the reference would certainly seem to be to some
silver filigree work ornamented with gold modeled to look like fruit rather
than to any actual fruit. The citron and the apricot (Tristram) have both
been suggested as the true [tappuach]. The former, which is a native of
Persia, does not appear to have been introduced into Palestine until well
into the Christian era and the apricot, though an attractive substitute for
the apple and today one of the most beautiful and productive of fruit trees,
can hardly have been established in Palestine at the time of the scriptural
references. It is a native of China and is said to have first begun to find its
way westward at the time of Alexander the Great.

The third of the fruits is the quince, Cydonia vulgaris (Natural Order
Rosaceae), and this had more serious claims. It flourishes in Palestine and
has been long indigenous there. Indeed it is probable that even if
[tappuach] was a name for apple, it originally included also the closely
allied quince. The greatest difficulty is its harsh and bitter taste. Further
the Mishna distinguishes the [tappuach] from the quince, which is called
[parish], and from the crab apple or [chazor] (Kohler in Jewish
Encyclopedia, II, 23). The quince along with the apple was sacred to Aphrodite, the goddess of love.

On the whole there does not appear to be any sufficient reason for rejecting the translation of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American); the Biblical references suit it; the identity of the Hebrew and Arabic words favor it and there is no insuperable objection on scientific grounds.

The word [tappuach] appears in two place names, BETH-TAPPUAH and TAPPUAH (which see).

E. W. G. Masterman

APPLE, OF THE EYE

<ap’-’-l>: The eyeball, or globe of the eye, with pupil in center, called “apple” from its round shape. Its great value and careful protection by the eyelids automatically closing when there is the least possibility of danger made it the emblem of that which was most precious and jealously protected. The Hebrew terms for it were, [‘ishon], diminutive of [‘ish], “man,” little man or mannikin, referring perhaps specially to the pupil, probably from “the little image one sees of himself when looking into another’s pupil” (Davies’ Lexicon). “He kept him (Israel) as the apple of his eye” (Deuteronomy 32:10); “Keep me as the apple of the eye,” literally, “as the apple, the daughter of the eye” (Psalm 17:8). “Keep my law (the Revised Version, margin “teaching”) as the apple of thine eye” (Proverbs 7:2). Compare Proverbs 7:9 where it is used to denote what is the center (American Revised Version, “in the middle of the night”; the English Revised Version “in, the blackness of night”; margin “Hebrew pupil (of the eye)’); [babhah] perhaps an “opening,” “gate”; others regard it as a mimetic word akin to Latin pupa, papilla (“He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye,” i.e. Yahweh’s; Zechariah 2:8); [bath-`ayin], “daughter of the eye”; “Give thyself no respite, let not the apple of thine eye cease” (Lamentations 2:18), which means, either “sleep not,” or “cease not to weep.” [κόρη, kore], “young girl,” “pupil of the eye”: “He (the Lord) will keep the good deeds (the Revised Version (British and American) “bounty”) of a man as the apple of the eye” (Ecclesiasticus
17:22); the Septuagint also has *kore* in all instances except *Lamentations* 2:18, where it has *θυγάτηρ*, thugater, “daughter.”

W. L. Walker

**APPLIES OF SODOM**

<sod’-um>: Josephus (BJ, IV, viii, 4) says that “the traces (or shadows) of the five cities (of the plain) are still to be seen, as well as the ashes growing in their fruits, which fruits have a color as if they were fit to be eaten; but if you pluck them with your hands they dissolve into smoke and ashes.” What this “Dead Sea fruit” is, is uncertain. The name “Dead Sea apples” is often given to the fruit of the Solanum Sodomaean “a prickly shrub with fruit not unlike a small yellow tomato.” Cheyne thinks that the fruits referred to by Josephus (compare Tacitus Hist. v.37) may be either

(1) those of the [*’osher*] tree ([*’usar*, Calotropis procera], described by Hasselquist (Travels, 1766)), found in abundance about Jericho and near the Dead Sea, which are filled with dust when they have been attacked by an insect, leaving the skin only entire, and of a beautiful color. Tristram describes the fruit as being “as large as an apple of average size, of a bright yellow color, hanging three or four together close to the stem”; or as suggested by Tristram

(2) those of the wild colocynth; the fruit is fair of aspect with a pulp which dries up into a bitter powder (EB, article “Sodom,” col. 4669, note 2). This colocynth is supposed to be the “wild vine” mentioned *2 Kings* 4:39. The “vine of Sodom” of *Deuteronomy* 32:32 has been supposed to bear the “Dead Sea fruit”; but most modern writers regard the passage as figurative.

W. L. Walker

**APPLY**

<a-pli’>: Purely an Old Testament term representing five Hebrew originals which signify respectively, “to enter,” “to incline,” “to give,” “to go about,” “to put or place,” in each instance spoken of the heart in its attitude to wisdom (*Psalm* 90:12 the King James Version); instruction
Proverbs 23:12); understanding (Proverbs 2:2); knowledge (Proverbs 22:17).

**APPOINT**

<\textit{a-point}'>: This word is used for the expression of a large variety of ideas and the translation of almost as many words.

\[
\text{[naqabh]} = \text{“stipulate” (Genesis 30:28).} \quad \text{[paqadh]} = \text{“put into office” (Genesis 41:34; Numbers 1:50; Est 2:3); “select” (Jeremiah 51:27); “put in charge” (Jeremiah 49:19; 50:44); “assign” (Numbers 4:27; Jeremiah 15:3); “send” (Leviticus 26:16); “designate,” “select” (Exodus 21:13; Numbers 4:19; 2 Samuel 7:10; Isaiah 61:3); “single out” (1 Samuel 8:11,12; Hosea 1:11).} \quad \text{[nathan]} = \text{“designate,” “select” (Numbers 35:6 the King James Version; Joshua 20:2 the King James Version; Ezekiel 45:6); “set aside” (Exodus 30:16).} \quad \text{[shith]} = \text{“designate,” “select” (Job 14:13; Isaiah 26:1). So also } \text{[`amadh] (1 Chronicles 15:16; Nehemiah 7:3); so } \text{[shalach] (1 Kings 5:9); [qarah] (Numbers 35:11).} \quad \text{[tsawah]} = \text{“choose” (2 Samuel 6:21).} \quad \text{[bachar]} = \text{“select” (2 Samuel 15:15 the King James Version).} \quad \text{[`amar]} = \text{“command” (1 Kings 5:6 the King James Version).} \quad \text{[\textit{tithemi}]} = \text{“designate,” “select” (Matthew 24:51; Luke 12:46).} \quad \text{A careful reading of the above passages will bring to mind the doctrine that with reference to the world’s work, God Himself calls men into office, selecting them from among the multitude and setting them aside for His special purposes; and that He calls to His assistance not only men but also events and forces of Nature (Leviticus 26:16).}
\]

_Frank E. Hirsch_

**APPREHEND**

<\textit{ap-re-hend}'>: Occurs in the New Testament in two meanings: “to arrest” ([\textit{pia>zw}, piaz]; Acts 12:4; 2 Corinthians 11:32 the Revised Version (British and American), “take”); and “to seize,” “grasp,” “take into one’s possession,” “attain,” “inquire eagerly” ([\textit{kata\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\nuω},
katalambano], the American Standard Revised Version “laid hold on,” “laid fast hold of,” (Philippians 3:12,13; Ephesians 3:18). In John 1:5, “The darkness apprehended it not,” the Revised Version, margin gives “overcame not.”

See COMPREHEND.

APPROVE

\(<a\-proov'>\): This word, as ordinarily used, means “to entertain a favorable opinion concerning” (Psalm 49:13; Lamentations 3:36). Its Biblical and archaic use conveys a much stronger meaning and is equivalent to its use in legal formalities of today, “to approve a bill,” i.e. by some act, generally a signature, to express approval. In New Testament, a number of times, for Greek dokimazo, “to test, try, make proof of,” and its derivative, dokimos, “tested,” “tried.” The word will, in almost every ease, imply that the proof is victoriously demonstrated, the proved is also approved, just as in English we speak of “tried men” (Trench, Greek Synonyms of New Testament). It is the word most frequently used for the testing of ores. That which does not stand the test is adokimos, “reprobate.” Compare Jeremiah 6:30 King James Version: “reprobate silver.” That which stands the test is dokimos, “approved.” “Salute Apelles the approved in Christ” (Romans 16:10); “they that are approved” (I Corinthians 11:19); “Present thyself approved unto God” (2 Timothy 2:15); when he hath been “approved” (James 1:12). See also Romans 14:18,22; 1 Thessalonians 2:4.

H. E. Jacobs

APRON

\(<a\'-prun>: Appears only in Genesis 3:7 and Acts 19:12 English Versions. (English na-prun, North of England nap-peon, from Low Latin, through French nape, nappe, “napkin.” The “n” was dropped owing to false division of the article a from the noun; thus “a napron” became “an apron.”) In Genesis 3:7 it is used to translate a Hebrew word rendered “girdles” in Revised Version margin: “And they sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons.” In Acts 19:12 [σιμικίνθια, simikinthia], stands for semicinctia, which is really a Latin word meaning “half-girdle,”
i.e. girdles going only half round the body and covering the front of the person: “Unto the sick were carried away from his (Paul’s) body handkerchiefs (soudaria, rendered “napkins” Luke 19:20; John 11:44; 20:7) or aprons.” The word denotes here, probably, a workman’s apron, perhaps those of Paul himself; though it seems more natural to suppose that the people brought their own “handkerchiefs” or “aprons” to Paul to secure the miraculous effect desired. The garments, at any rate, were such as could be easily removed and carried back and forth. (See Rich, Dict. of Roman and Greek Ant, under the word, for illust.; also Pope’s Lexicon, under the word).

George B. Eager

APT

(Literally, “fitted”): Applied to one distinguished for readiness in meeting demands of some special situation, or emergency. For this, there is no specific Biblical word in either Old Testament or New Testament. It occurs always in the English translations in paraphrases, as “apt for war” (2 Kings 24:16), “apt to teach,” Greek “didaktikos” (1 Timothy 3:2; 2 Timothy 2:24).

AQUEDUCT

<ak’-we-dukt>. See CISTERN.

AQUILA

<ak’-wi-la> ([Ἀκύλας, Akulas]), “an eagle”): Aquila and his wife Priscilla, the diminutive form of Prisca, are introduced into the narrative of the Acts by their relation to Paul. He meets them first in Corinth (Acts 18:2). Aquila was a native of Pontus, doubtless one of the colony of Jews mentioned in Acts 2:9; 1 Peter 1:1. They were refugees from the cruel and unjust edict of Claudius which expelled all Jews from Rome in 52 AD. The decree, it is said by Suetonius, was issued on account of tumults raised by the Jews, and he especially mentions one Chrestus (Suetonius Claud. 25). Since the word Christus could easily be confounded by him to
refer to some individual whose name was Chrestus and who was an agitator, resulting in these disorders, it has been concluded that the fanatical Jews were then persecuting their Christian brethren and disturbances resulted. The cause of the trouble did not concern Claudius, and so without making inquiry, all Jews were expelled. The conjecture that Aquila was a freedman and that his master had been Aquila Pontius, the Roman senator, and that from him he received his name is without foundation. He doubtless had a Hebrew name, but it is not known. It was a common custom for Jews outside of Palestine to take Roman names, and it is just that this man does, and it is by that name we know him. Driven from Rome, Aquila sought refuge in Corinth, where Paul, on his second missionary journey, meets him because they have the same trade: that of making tents of Cilician cloth (Acts 18:3). The account given of him does not justify the conclusion that he and his wife were already Christians when Paul met them. Had that been the case Luke would almost certainly have said so, especially if it was true that Paul sought them out on that account. Judging from their well-known activity in Christian work they would have gathered a little band of inquirers or possibly converts, even though they had been there for but a short time. It is more in harmony with the account to conclude that Paul met them as fellow-tradespeople, and that he took the opportunity of preaching Christ to them as they toiled. There can be no doubt that Paul would use these days to lead them into the kingdom and instruct them therein, so that afterward they would be capable of being teachers themselves (Acts 18:26). Not only did they become Christians, but they also became fast and devoted friends of Paul, and he fully reciprocated their affection for him (Romans 16:3,4). They accompanied him when he left Corinth to go to Ephesus and remained there while he went on his journey into Syria. When he wrote the first letter to the church at Corinth they were still at Ephesus, and their house there was used as a Christian assembly-place (1 Corinthians 16:19). The decree of Claudius excluded the Jews from Rome only temporarily, and so afterward Paul is found there, and his need of friends and their affection for him doubtless led them also to go to that city (Romans 16:3). At the time of the writing of Paul’s second letter to Tim they have again removed to Ephesus, possibly sent there by Paul to give aid to, and further the work in that city (2 Timothy 4:19). While
nothing more is known of them there can be no doubt that they remained the devoted friends of Paul to the end.

The fact that Priscilla’s name is mentioned several times before that of her husband has called forth a number of conjectures. The best explanation seems to be that she was the stronger character.

Jacob W. Kapp

**AR, AR OF MOAB**

<ar>, <mo’-ab> ([‘ar], [‘ar-mo’ab]; [“Ḥr, Er]; [ʼAroḥn, Aroer] or [Σηείρ, Seeir]): The city of Ar is named in a snatch of ancient song ([Numbers 21:15]), literally “the site of Ar.” It is identical with “Ar of Moab” ([Numbers 21:28; Isaiah 15:1]). This is probably the place called the City of Moab in [Numbers 22:36], where the Hebrew is [‘ir mo’abh]. It is probably also intended by “the city that is in the middle of the valley” ([Deuteronomy 2:36; Joshua 13:9,16; 2 Samuel 24:5]). It lay “on the border of the Arnon, which is in the utmost part of the border” ([Numbers 22:36]). A possible identification might be the ruin noted by Burckhardt, in the floor of the valley, on a piece of pasture-land below the confluence of the Lejjun and the Mojib. Buhl however thinks that not a city but a Moabite district somewhere in the region south of the Arnon may be intended (GAP, 269).

W. Ewing

**ARA**

<ʼa-ra> ([‘ara’], meaning unknown): A son of Jether of the tribe of Asher ([1 Chronicles 7:38]).

**ARAB**

<ʼa-rab> ([‘arabh], “ambush”): A city in the hill country of Judah, probably the site of the ruins Er-Rabiyeh South of Hebron ([Joshua 15:52]).
ARAB; ARABIANS

<ar’-ab>, <a-ra’-bi-ans>.

See ARABIA.

ARABAH

<ar’-a-ba>, <a-ra’-ba> הָעָרֹבָה [ha-arobah], “the Arabah”): This word indicates in general a barren district, but is specifically applied in whole or in part to the depression of the Jordan valley, extending from Mount Hermon to the Gulf of Akabah. In the King James Version it is transliterated only once (Joshua 18:18) describing the border of Benjamin. Elsewhere it is rendered “plain.” But in the Revised Version (British and American) it is everywhere transliterated. South of the Dead Sea the name is still retained in Wady el-Arabah. In Deuteronomy 1:1; 2:8 (the King James Version “plain”) the southern portion is referred to; in Deuteronomy 3:17; 4:49; Joshua 3:16; 11:2; 12:3 and 2 Kings 14:25 the name is closely connected with the Dead Sea and the Sea of Chinnereth (Gennesaret). The allusions to the Arabah in Deuteronomy 11:30; Joshua 8:14; 12:1; 18:18; 2 Samuel 2:29; 4:7; 2 Kings 25:4; Jeremiah 39:4; 52:7 indicate that the word was generally used in its most extended sense, while in Joshua 11:16, and 12:8 it is represented as one of the great natural divisions of the country.

The southern portion, which still retains the name of Arabah, is included in the wilderness of Zin (Numbers 34:3). According to the survey of Lord Kitchener and George Armstrong made in 1883, under the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund, its length from the head of the Gulf of Akabah to the Dead Sea is 112 miles. The lowest point of the watershed is 45 miles from Akabah, and 660 feet above tide (1,952 above the Dead Sea). The average width of the valley up to this point is about 6 miles, but here a series of low limestone ridges (called Er Risheh) rising 150 feet above the plain runs obliquely across it for a distance of 10 miles, narrowing it up to a breadth of about one-half mile. North of this point, opposite Mount Hor, the valley widens out to 13 miles and then gradually narrows to 6 miles at the south end of the Dead Sea. At Ain Abu Werideh, 29 miles north of the watershed, the valley is at the sea-level — 1,292 feet above
that of the Dead Sea. North of the watershed, the main line of drainage is the Wady el-Jeib, which everywhere keeps pretty close to the west side of the valley. At Ain Abu Werideh it is joined by numerous wadies descending from the Edomite mountains on the east, which altogether water an oasis of considerable extent, covered with a thicket of young palms, tamarisks, willows and reeds. Twenty-four miles farther north the Arabah breaks down suddenly into the valley of the Dead Sea, or the Ghor, as it is technically called. Lord Kitchener’s report is here so vivid as to be worthy of literal reproduction. “The descent to the Ghor was down a sandy slope of 300 feet, and the change of climate was most marked, from the sandy desert to masses of tangled vegetation with streams of water running in all directions, birds fluttering from every tree, the whole country alive with life; nowhere have I seen so great and sudden a contrast” (Mount Seir, 214). The descent here described was on the eastern side of the semicircular line of cliffs formed of sand, gravel, and marl which enclose the Ghor at the south end, and which are probably what are referred to in Joshua 15:3 as the “ascent of Akrabbim.” The ordinary route, however, leading to the plain of the Arabah from the Dead Sea is up the trough worn by the Wady el-Jeib along the west side of the valley. But this route would be impracticable during the rainy season after the cloudbursts which occasionally visit this region, when torrents of water pour down it, sufficient to roll boulders of considerable size and to transport an immense amount of coarse sediment.

South of the Dead Sea a muddy plain, known as the Sebkah, extends 6 miles, filling about one-half of the width of the Ghor. During most of the year the mud over this area is so thin and deep that it is impossible to cross it near its northern end. This whole area between the “ascent of Akrabbim” and the Dead Sea has evidently been greatly transformed by the sedimentary deposits which have been brought in by the numerous tributary wadies during the last 4,000 years, the coarser material having encroached upon it from either side, and the fine material having been deposited over the middle portion, furnishing the clay which is so embarrassing to travelers. (For further considerations upon this point see DEAD SEA; CITIES OF THE PLAIN.)
1. GEOLOGY OF THE REGION:

The Arabah in its whole extent occupies a portion of the great geological fault or crevasse in the earth’s crust which extends from Antioch near the mouth of the Orontes southward between the Lebanon and the Anti-Lebanon Mountains to the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, and onward to the Gulf of Akabah, whence it can be traced with considerable probability through the Red Sea and the interior lakes of Africa. The most remarkable portion of this phenomenal crevasse is that which extends from the Waters of Merom to the springs of Ain Abu Werideh; for through this entire distance the Arabah is below sea-level, the depression at the Dead Sea being approximately 1,292 feet. See DEAD SEA. Throughout the entire distance from the Waters of Merom to the watershed, 45 miles from Akabah, the western side of the Arabah is bordered by strata of Cretaceous (chalk) limestone rising pretty continuously to a height of from 2,000 to 3,000 feet above sea-level, no older rocks appearing upon that side. But upon the eastern side older sandstones (Nubian and lower Carboniferous) and granitic rocks border the plain, supporting, however, at a height of 2,000 or 3,000 feet Cretaceous limestones corresponding to those which descend to the level of the gorge on the western side. Throughout this entire distance, therefore, the strata have either slipped down upon the western side or risen upon the eastern side, or there has been a movement in both directions. The origin of this crevasse dates from the latter part of the Cretaceous or the early part of the Tertiary period.

But in post-Tertiary times an expanded lake filled the region, extending from the Waters of Merom to Ain Abu Werideh, a distance of about 200 miles, rising to an elevation of about 1,400 feet above the present level of the Dead Sea, but not sufficiently high to secure connection with the ocean either through the Arabah proper or across the valley of Esdraelon. This body of water was, on the average, 30 miles wide and over the northern part of the Dead Sea had an extreme depth of 2,700 feet. The most distinct evidence of the existence of this enlargement of the lake is to be found at Ain Abu Werideh, where Hull reports “banks of horizontally stratified materials .... sometimes of coarse material, such as gravel; at other times consisting of fine sand, loam, or white marl, with very even stratification, and containing blanched semi-fossil shells of at least two kinds of univalves, which Professor Haddon has determined to be Melania
tuberculata Mull, and Melanopsis Saulcyi, Bourg” (Mount Seir, 99, 100).
These are shells which are now found, according to Tristram, in great
numbers in semi-fossil condition in the marl deposits of the Dead Sea, and
both of these genera are found in the fluvio-marine beds formed in the
brackish or salt water of the Isle of Wight. The existence of the shells
indicates the extent to which the saline waters of the Dead Sea were diluted
at that time. It should be added, however, that species somewhat similar
still exist around the borders of the Dead Sea in lagoons where fresh water
is mingled in large quantities with that of the Dead Sea. This is especially
true in eddies near the mouth of the Jordan. (See Merrill, East of the
Jordan.) Huntington in 1909 confirms the fact that these high-level shore
lines are found on both sides of the Dead Sea, though for some reason the
have not been traced farther north.

At lower levels, especially at that which is 650 feet above the Dead Sea,
there is, however, a very persistent terrace of gravel, sand and clay marking
a shore line all the way from the south end of the Dead Sea to Lake Galilee.
This can be seen running up into all the wadies on either side, being very
prominent opposite their mouths, but much eroded since its deposition.
On the shores of the lake between the wadies the line is marked by a slight
accumulation of coarse material. Below the 650-foot line there are several
other minor strands marking periods when the subsiding waters were for a
short time stationary.

This period of enlargement of the waters in the Arabah is now, with
abundant reason, correlated with the Glacial epoch whose influence was so
generally distributed over the northern hemisphere in early post-Tertiary
times. There were, however, no living glaciers within the limits of the
Arabah Valley — Mount Hermon not being sufficiently large to support
any extensive ice-sheet. The nearest glacier of any extent was on the west
side of the Lebanon Mountains, 40 to 50 miles north of Beirut, where
according to my own observations one descended from the summit of the
mountains (10,000 feet high) 12 miles down the valley of the Kadesha
River to a level 5,500 feet above the sea, where it built up an immense
terminal moraine several miles across the valley, and 5 miles up it from its
front, upon which is now growing the celebrated grove of the Cedars of
Lebanon. (See Records of the Past, Am. series, V, 195-204.) The existence
of the moraine, however, had been noted by Sir Joseph Hooker forty years before. (See Nat. Hist. Rev., January, 1862.)

But while there were no glaciers in the Arabah Valley itself, there, as elsewhere, semi-glacial conditions extended beyond the glacial limits a considerable distance into the lower latitudes, securing the increased precipitation and the diminished evaporation which would account for the enlargement of the bodies of water occupying enclosed basins within reach of these influences. The basin of Great Salt Lake in Utah presents conditions almost precisely like those of the Arabah, as do the Caspian and Aral seas, and lakes Urumiah, Van, and various others in central Asia. During the Glacial epoch the water level of Great Salt Lake rose more than 1,000 feet higher than now and covered ten times its present area. At the same time the Aral Sea discharged into the Caspian Sea through an outlet as large as Niagara. When the conditions of the Glacial epoch passed away the evaporation again prevailed, until the water areas of these enclosed basins were reduced to the existing dimensions and the present equilibrium was established between the precipitation and the evaporation.

While it is susceptible of proof that the close of this epoch was geologically recent, probably not more than 10,000 years ago (see Wright, Ice Age in North America, 5th edition, chapter xx), the present conditions had become established approximately long before the time of Abraham and the development of civilization in Babylonia and Egypt.

East of the Arabah between the Dead Sea and Akabah numerous mountain peaks rise to the height of more than 4,000 feet above tide level, the highest being Mount Hor, though back of it there is a limestone range reaching 5,000 feet. This mountainous region contains numerous fertile areas and furnishes through its numerous wadies a considerable amount of water to favor vegetation. The limestone floor of the Arabah south of the Dead Sea is deeply covered with sand and gravel, washed in from the granitic areas from the east. This greatly favors the accumulation of sediment at the mouths of the wadies emptying into the south end of the Ghor.
2. HISTORY:

At present the Egyptian government maintains a fort and harbor at Akabah, but its authority does not extend into the interior. The Arabah has, however, from time immemorial furnished a caravan route between northern Arabia and the Sinaitic Peninsula. It was this which supported the great emporium of Petra. The Israelites traversed its southern portion both on their way from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea and on their return, when the king of Edom refused passage through his land (Numbers 20:21; Deuteronomy 2:3). This opposition compelled them to turn up the forbidding Wady el-Ithem, which opens into the Arabah a few miles north of Akabah and leads to the Pilgrim route between Damascus and Mecca. The terrors of this passage are referred to in Numbers 21:4, where it is said “the soul of the people was much discouraged because of the way.” Around Akabah itself there are still groves of palms, the existence of which, at the time of the Exodus, is indicated by the name Elath (Deuteronomy 2:8), “a grove of trees.”

LITERATURE.


George Frederick Wright

ARABATTINE

<ar-a-ba-ti’-ne>.

See AKRABATTINE (Apocrypha).

ARABIA

<a-ra’-bi-a> (אָרָב, [arabh], [᾿Αραβία, Arabia]):
1. NAME AND SITUATION.

1. Name:
The Hebrew word "\[\text{\`arabh}\]" always denotes, strictly speaking, not the country, but the people of Arabia taken collectively, and especially the nomadic Arabs. The name of the country does not occur in the Old Testament, but in the New Testament it is used to denote the Syrian desert or the peninsula of Sinai.

2. Situation and Configuration:
Surrounded as it is on three sides by the sea — by the Indian Ocean on the south, and its two branches, the Red Sea on the west and the Persian Gulf on the east — and on the fourth side by the desert of Syria, the country of Arabia is to all intents and purposes an island; and it is named by its inhabitants and by those who speak their language “the Island of the Arabs.” In configuration the country is roughly of the form of a parallelogram, about 1,000 miles in length by 500 or 600 miles broad. This parallelogram is not of uniform altitude, but the generally even surface is tilted to one corner in such a way that the most southerly point contains mountains rising to 10,000 feet in height, whilst the Northeast corner is almost on a level with the sea. The altitudes of the intervening portions are in proportion to their situation with respect to these extremes. Thus the mountains of the Southeast corner have an altitude of from 5,000 to 6,000 feet, those of the Northwest of 4,000 or 5,000, whereas those which are situated near the middle of the West coast rise to 8,000 feet, and the plateau which forms the northern half of the interior of the peninsula is between 3,000 and 4,000 feet above sea-level. In consequence of this configuration the main watershed of the country runs parallel to the West coast at a distance of between 50 and 100 miles from the sea, with a subsidiary watershed running along the south; and the principal outlets for the drainage run in a Northeast direction. The whole of Arabia stretches from about 13 degrees to about 36 degrees north of the equator, and it lies between 33 degrees and 60 degrees east of Greenwich. Its area is about eight times that of the British Isles, or nearly 1,000,000 square miles.
2. PHYSICAL FEATURES.

1. The Desert:

Although Arabia is considered by geographers as part of the continent of Asia, it belongs in almost every respect to Africa. The great bulk of the country is desert, of fine sand in the southern part, but consisting of coarse sand (the nefud), gravel and flints in the northern. It is in fact an offshoot from the great African Sahara. Of the southern half little is known, and it has never been crossed by the foot of European. The northern has been traversed in many directions; it has numerous caravan routes, and some important towns are situated in the heart of it. Arabian fancy has peopled the desert with strange creatures not of human kind (compare Isaiah 13:21; 34:14), and fancy has been justified by the common phenomena of the mirage and the Fata Morgana (Isaiah 35:7; 49:10). To the keen sight of the nomad the glowing desert heat is visible as a fine gossamer (Isaiah 18:4). Perhaps this is the meaning of [sharabh] in Isaiah 35:7; 49:10 also. It is quite certain, however, that the whole of Arabia and especially the northern borders in the neighborhood of the Sinai peninsula and eastward to the south of Palestine and the country of Edom, were at one time very much better watered than they are at the present day. For centuries a constant process of desiccation has been going on. Indeed, persons now living can remember the existence of wells one or two generations ago, where now there are none. It follows that this district must formerly have supported a very much larger population that it does at present.

2. Climate:

It will be obvious that the climate of Arabia must vary greatly in its different parts, the temperature and rainfall depending not so much upon latitude as upon latitude, so that within a few miles the greatest extremes co-exist. In the southern angle where the mountains are highest there are two rainy seasons, one in spring the other in autumn, so that this province well deserves its Grecian name of Arabia Felix. In the higher reaches of this province, for example, at its capital San`a, snow falls in December; while on the coast of the Red Sea at Loheia, scarcely 100 miles distant, thermometer rarely falls below 80 degrees. In the Red Sea 93 degrees is a common reading in the shade in summer, while the heat of the Persian Gulf, owing to its steep shores and great evaporation, is hardly endurable.
by a European. In the Northwest province, in which are situated the two
sacred cities of Mecca and Medina, the rainfall is unreliable and takes the
form of heavy thunder showers which occasion frequent floods in the
former town, and are, owing to the arborial denudation of the country, of
little use for the purpose of agriculture or irrigation. These winter rains
may commence as early as September, and by December at latest the new
pasture will have covered the ground. Hence the true spring in northern
Arabia, or in Syria, falls in our autumn, but there is not the distinction of
former and latter rain (compare Hosea 6:3) which obtains in Palestine.
The climate of the northern central plateau is described by Palgrave as one
of the most salubrious in the world.

3. Mountains:

As has been indicated above, the backbone of the peninsula is the
mountain range which runs down its western side. In its northern parts
this is said to be an extension of the limestone ranges of the Lebanon and
Anti-Libanus. In its midmost reaches it attains an elevation of between
8,000 and 9,000 feet, and at its southern extremity it spreads out into the
plateau of Arabia Felix, where its highest peaks have an altitude of as much
as 11,000 feet. In the Southeast corner of the peninsula the range of Jebel
Akhdar runs parallel to that on the West, and is connected with it along the
South coast by a range of less elevation. In the interior the northern plateau
is intersected by numerous irregular mountain ranges of moderate length, of
which the most frequently mentioned are Jebel Aja and Jebel Selma, which
face one another in the Shammar country.

4. Rivers:

The course of the rivers is determined by the direction of the mountain
ranges. As has been said the drainage is mainly from West to East, but the
fact is that Arabia is a land almost without rivers. The only quarter in
which perennial streams are found is Arabia Felix, and to some extent they
occur along the South coast. The rest of the peninsula is destitute of rivers
and lakes. The scour (seyl) from the winter thunder showers cuts out for
itself a torrent bed (wadi), which, however, may be filled only once or
twice in a generation, and even so dries up as soon as the rain ceases. The
most important of these wadis is the West Sirhan, which runs from the
Hauran in a Southeast direction to the Jauf (see DUMAH), the West el-
Kora to the North of Medina, the West el-Hamth between Medina and Mecca, and the West Duweisir to the South of Mecca. Larger than any of these however is the West er-Rumma, which extends from the neighborhood of Medina to the head of the Persian Gulf. It has never been explored, and is filled with water only at long intervals.

5. Oases and Wells:

In these circumstances the Arabs have to seek their water supply elsewhere than in their rivers. In many places the surface of the country sinks into a depression down to the level of permanent water, thus forming an oasis, which word is probably none other than the Arabic wadi. The best known of these occur at Kheibar and Teima (see TEMA) to the North of Medina, and also at Tabuk to the Northwest. The West Duweisir is itself practically an oasis of a length of three days’ journey. In addition to these natural depressions there are also dotted over all the inhabited parts of Arabia and along the caravan routes numerous wells, these routes following naturally the course of the wadis. These wells are plentiful in the West Sirhan, and a number were sunk by command of Zubeida the wife of Harun al-Rashid, along the Pilgrim way from Persia to Mecca; but the most famous of all is the well of Zemzem in the Holy City itself. It is said that the water in it flows, so that it is probably one of those subterranean rivers which are not uncommon in Arabia. Its water, however, is heavy and brackish and causes indigestion, and the sweetest water obtainable in Mecca for drinking purposes was originally brought by Zubeida from a source some 15 miles distant. The purest water of all is that which collects after rain in the hollows of the numerous outcrops of lava which occur at frequent intervals and in great masses along the western mountain ranges. A spot where lava predominates is called a harrah (from the Arabic verb “to be hot”), and several of these volcanic regions still show signs of activity.

3. POLITICAL DIVISIONS.

1. Ancient Divisions:

The peninsula of Arabia was divided by the ancient geographers into three parts: Arabia Petrea, Arabia Deserta and Arabia Felix. The first of these names, which is found in Ptolemy, means, not Arabia the Rocky, but that
part of Arabia in which is situated the city of Petra (see SELA), and it also includes the peninsula of Sinai. It is identical with the desert of the Wanderings. Arabia Deserta is a translation from the Greek *Arabia eremos* of Strabo (circa 24 AD). It denotes the extreme north of the continent of Arabia which is thrust in like a wedge between the fertile lands which drain into the Euphrates on the East and into the Jordan valley on the West. It is thus equivalent to the Syrian Desert. The third term, Arabia Felix, is also a translation from the Greek — *Arabia eudaimon* — which is again a translation, or rather a mistranslation of the Arabic El-Yemen. This last name denotes the country to the right hand, i.e. the S, just as the Arabic Es-Shem (Syria) means the country to the left hand, or to the North El-Yemen, however, was interpreted as equivalent to El-Eyman, the Fortunate or Happy, a name which the district truly deserves.

2. Modern Divisions:

Since before the time of Mohammed (6th century) Arabia has been divided into seven or eight tribal or political states, the boundaries of which are for the most part clearly defined by intervening deserts or uninhabited tracts. The most important of these from a religious point of view is the Hijaz, which may be described as the northern half of the western coast, stretching from the Red Sea to a distance of between 100 and 200 miles inland. The whole of the coast line, indeed, where the land is low lying is called the Tihama. This may, however, be considered as belonging to the adjacent high land beneath which it lies. Hijaz means “Barrier,” and the district is so called because it consists mainly of the mountain ranges which separate the great northern central plateau from the Tihama. This last name is connected with a root meaning “to be unwholesome.” Whether the district gave its origin to the verb, or the verb gave its denomination to the district, the name is equally appropriate. The chief importance of the Hijaz arises from the fact that in it are situated the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina — the cradle and the grave of the Prophet. It is thus the religious center of the Islamic world. The Yemen forms the southern corner of the peninsula. It is identical with Arabia Felix, and its physical characteristics have been described above. The Hijaz often fell to the sovereign of Egypt, but for the last four centuries it has, like Egypt, been subject to the Turk. It is only within the last fifty years, on the other hand, that the sultan has attempted to enforce his sovereign rights in the
Yemen. The southern coast of Arabia is generally designated as Hadramaut, although in strictness that appellation is properly applicable to a section of it only. The eastern corner of Arabia is taken up by Oman, a state which has generally claimed and secured a position of independence. Both it and the southern states are now under the protection of the Indian government. The country adjacent to Oman toward the North formed the province of El-Bahrein (“the Two Seas”), but this name is now restricted to a large island at the western end of it and some smaller islands famous for their pearl fishery. The remaining province of El-Hasa is occupied by practically independent tribes. From many points of view the most interesting province of Arabia is the great northern central plateau called Nejd, that is, “high land.” From its situation it is least susceptible to foreign influence. It contains some fairly large towns, but the bulk of its population live, as their fathers have done from time immemorial, the life of the Bedawi. Two small provinces remain to be noticed. Between the Yemen and the Hijaz lies the district of `Asir, which largely resembles the first-named province in its physical features. To the East of Nejd lies the district of Yemama, which used to be the territory of an important tribe.

3. Political Situation:

On the whole the political situation in Arabia today bears a considerable resemblance to that which obtained immediately before the mission of Mohammad. At that time (about 600 AD) the Northwest parts of the peninsula were more or less subject to the Byzantine emperor, while the whole East and South coasts were under the sway of Persia. Today the West coast of Arabia is again subject to Constantinople, and the East and South coasts are under the protection of an eastern power — in this case the government of India.

4. Chief Towns:

The principal towns of Arabia and the other centers of population owe their existence to the natural features of the country and have probably remained the same in all ages, just as those of Palestine have, and even their population does not seem to have altered much. Thus Mecca owes its existence to the presence of the famous well Zemzem; Teima, Kheibar and Tabuk to their oases; Mascat, the capital of Oman, to its natural harbor;
and so on. An exception is the ancient town of Saba (see SHEBA) or Marib, which probably sprang up as the result of the building in prehistoric times of a gigantic dam for the purposes of irrigation. When the dam burst in the 2nd or 3rd Christian century, the population dispersed. Owing to the absence of a census it is not possible to make accurate statements regarding the population of an eastern town, and estimates by European travelers always vary greatly. Speaking generally, the cities of Arabia of the first magnitude appear to have some 35,000 inhabitants, though Mascat is said to have as many as 60,000.

4. FLORA AND FAUNA.

1. Flora:

The peninsula of Arabia belongs, as has been said, in its physical features to Africa, and its flora and fauna are those of that continent. Of all the products of the soil by far the most important is the date palm. It flourishes in every oasis. In the Wadi Duweisir alone it is said one may ride straight on for three days without leaving the shelter of the palm groves. The dates, which are the staff of life of the Arab, differ in quality in each locality, each district producing a variety of its own. In the Yemen, with its varied altitudes, almost every kind of fruit and vegetable known in temperate latitudes is cultivated on the terraced mountain sides. Vines are grown, as Ibn Khaldun remarks, for the sake of the berry, not for the purposes of wine making. The vine is common to Arabia and Palestine, whereas the date palm has almost gone out of cultivation in the latter country. On the other land the olive, which is so important in the northern country is almost unknown in the southern. The olive is constantly referred to in the Bible ( Judges 9:8 and often), the date never. From the South coast especially are exported frankincense, balsam, myrrh and other aromatic plants; and cotton is cultivated in the province of Oman. Cereals flourish in the Yemen and tobacco is grown wherever possible in Arabia. The coffee of the Yemen is famous; it is exported to Constantinople and named from the port of export Mokha coffee; but the bulk of it is consumed within Arabia itself. Coffee and tobacco are the only two articles of consumption which are used in Arabia today, and which have not been used from time immemorial. Coffee was probably introduced into Arabia from Gallaland on the African mainland two or three centuries ago.
The Arabs are most inveterate coffee drinkers. Tobacco was probably first brought from English ships at Constantinople in the reign of James I. It is cultivated in every oasis, unless in the interior in Nejd, where its use is discouraged on religious grounds. There is only one other point in regard to which the Arabs of today differ from the Arabs of Mohammed’s time — the use of gunpowder. Except in respect of the three commodities just mentioned, everyday life in the desert today goes on exactly as it did 1,600 years ago. Forest trees are extremely rare in Arabia, but a species of tamarisk called ghada which grows in the northern nefud is proverbial for the quality of charcoal it affords and is a favorite food of the camel. An acacia called katad is likewise a by-word on account of its long spines. The wood is used for making camels’ saddles; it grows in the Tihama. As in Palestine and in most countries which have been inhabited for many thousands of years, the larger trees have long been cut down for fuel or for building purposes.

2. Fauna:

Among beasts of prey panthers, wolves, hyenas, jackals and (it is said) even lions are found in Arabia Many of the tribes are named after these and other animals. The wild ox or oryx (see UNICORN) is rarely seen, but gazelles are plentiful. Apes abound in the Yemen, as they do all along the North of Africa, and are kept as pets (compare 1 Kings 10:22). By far the most important domestic animal is the camel. Without it many parts of the country would be uninhabited. It is commonly supposed that the best breed of horses comes from Nejd, but this appears to be an error. In Nejd the camel is the indispensable beast of burden and mount; horses are comparatively useless there. The best Arabian horses are reared in Mesopotamia. Studs are, indeed, kept by the emirs of Nejd, but the horses are small and of little use. The pedigrees of the best horses go back, according to tradition, to the time of Solomon (1 Kings 10:28). Dogs are trained to hunt the wild ox, to tend sheep and to watch the camp. All domestic animals — dogs, horses, mules, asses — receive names as with us. The ostrich is rarely met with, but is found as far north as the Jauf; it no doubt found its way into Arabia from Africa. A common bird is the kata or sand grouse. It is noted for going straight to its watering place. “Better guided than a kata” is a common proverb. Hawks and falcons are found, and falconry among the Arabs was a favorite sport. In Arabia the
locust, so far from being a scourge wherever it appears, is a valuable article of food. It is eaten not only by human beings (Matthew 3:4), but also by dogs, horses and even beasts of prey. As might be expected in a rocky and sun-scorched land like Arabia, scorpions and various sorts of serpents abound. The chameleon (Leviticus 11:30) is common here. It is used as a simile for fickle people and those who do not fulfill their promises. It may be regarded as a substitute for thermometer, as on very hot days it ascends trees or any high places. Another sign of extreme heat is that the vipers writhe on the ground.

The Persian Gulf, especially the Bahrein archipelago, is famous for its pearls, while the Red Sea is noted for its coral reefs, which have caused many a shipwreck. It is believed that in the interior of Hadramaut there are many mineral deposits including gold.

5. INHABITANTS.

1. Classification:

The inhabitants of Arabia are divided into three classes. There are in the first place a number of tribes which became extinct, and which are not connected genealogically with those which survived. The latter are divided into two great stems, the south Arabian and indigenous branch descended from Kahtan, and the north Arabian or immigrant tribes descended from Ishmael, the son of Abraham. There is naturally a good deal of inconsistency in the various traditions of the origins of these tribes and their subsequent history.

2. Extinct Tribes:

Of the extinct tribes the most familiar name is that of Amlak or Amlik (Amalek). By the Arabian genealogists he is variously described as a grandson of Shem and as a son of Ham. In Genesis 36:12 he is a son of Esau’s son, Eliphaz, by Timna. They are said to be first met with in Chaldea, from which they were expelled on the rise of the Assyrian power under Nimrod. They migrated into Ar, occupying in turn the Bahrein, Oman, the Yemen, and finally the Hijaz, where they are said to have been the first settlers at Yathrib (Medina) and also to have occupied land round Mecca and Kheibar. In the time of Abraham they were expelled from
Mecca on the arrival of two new tribes from the South, those of Jurhum and Katura (Genesis 25:1). Later, it is said, David, during the rebellion of Absalom, took up his quarters in Kheibar and ruled over the surrounding districts. According to another tradition Moses sent an expedition against the Amalekites in the Hijaz, on which occasion the Israelites, disobeying his orders, spared their king Arkam (compare Rekem, Numbers 31:8; Joshua 13:21) — a reminiscence of the incident in the life of Saul (1 Samuel 15). In any case the Amalekites were supplanted in the northern Hijaz by Jewish tribes, who continued there until the time of Mohammad. The Amalekites migrated into Egypt and southern Palestine. The Pharaohs of the time of Abraham, Joseph and Moses are represented to have been Amalekites. Finally, broken up by Josh, they fled into northern Africa, where they are said to have grown into the Berber races. The rest of the tribes which became extinct like the Amalekites are of less interest for the present purpose, being unconnected with the Bible narrative. They are mentioned in the Koran, in which book their destruction is attributed to their idolatrous proclivities and to their rejection of the monotheistic prophets. The best known and most important are `Ad and Thamud. `Ad is variously named the son of Amalek and the son of Uz (Genesis 10:23). The tribe dwelt in the deserts behind the Yemen. They became polytheists; the prophet Hud was sent to them; they rejected him, and were destroyed by a hurricane. The remnant grew into a new tribe, whose chief, Lokman, built the great dam at Marib. In the end they were conquered by a tribe of Kahtan. Thamud was closely related to `Ad, being a son of Aram the father of Uz. They were driven out of the Yemen and settled in the northern Hijaz; they rejected their prophet Salih and were destroyed by an earthquake accompanied by a loud noise. The rock-cut sepulchral monuments of Medain Salih in the Wadi el-Kora are still pointed out as their dwellings. They were, therefore, considered to have been troglodites like the Horites of the Bible. A second pair were the brother tribes of Tasm and Jadis, grandsons of Aramaic Tasm oppressing Jadis, the latter rose and almost exterminated the former, only to be in turn destroyed by a king of the Yemen. Their home was Yemama.

3. South Arabian Tribes:

The southern Arabs claim to be descended from an ancestor called Kahtan son of `Abir, son of Shalikh, son of Arfakhshad, son of Shem, son of
Noah. Kahtan is undoubtedly the Biblical Joktan (Genesis 10:26), and the names of his descendants reappear as Arabic place names. Indeed the tenth chapter of Genesis throws much light on the earliest history of Arabia and the movements of the tribes. Thus the fact that Sheba and Dedan appear as grandsons of Cush, that is, as Abyssinian tribes descended from Ham, in Genesis 10:7 and again as descendants of Keturah and Abraham in Genesis 25:3 points to the fact that parts of these tribes migrated from the one country to the other. Havilah in Genesis 10:7 may similarly be connected with Havilah in Genesis 10:29, the intercourse between Southwest Arabia and the opposite coast of Africa being always very close. Among the sons of Joktan are mentioned Almodad, Hazarmaveth, Uzal (Izal), Sheba, Ophir, Havilah. In Almodad we have probably the Arabic El-Mudad, a name which occurs among the descendants of Jurhum, son of Yaktan (Joktan). Hazarmaveth is obviously Hadramaut. Uzal is the ancient name of San`a, the capital of the Yemen. Sheba is the Arabic Saba or Marib. Ophir and Havilah were probably in South or East Arabia. In Genesis 10:30 it is said that the camping grounds of these tribes stretched from Mesha as you go toward Sephar, the mountain of the East, that is, probably from the North of the Persian Gulf to the center of South Arabia, Sephar being Zafar, the capital of the South Arab kingdom near to the present Mirbat.

4. Migration of Tribes:

Many of the most illustrious tribes are descended from Kahtan, and some of them still survive. A constant stream of migration went on toward the North. Thus the tribe of Jurhum left the Yemen on account of drought and settled in the Hijaz and the Tihama, from which they drove out the Amalekites, and were in turn driven out by Koda`a, another Kahtanite tribe. After that they disappear from history and are reckoned among the extinct tribes. Koda`a was a descendant of Himyar. The Himyarites founded, about the 1st century BC, a kingdom which lasted for five centuries. The king bore the title of Tubba`, and the capital was successively Marib (Saba), Zafar and San`a. One of their monarchs was the queen Bilkis whom the Arabian historians identify with the queen of Sheba who visited Solomon, though she must have lived much later. The story of the meeting is given in the Koran, chapter 38. A chief occasion on which many of the tribes left the district Northeast of the Yemen was the
bursting of the great dam, built by Lokman at Marib, about the 2nd century AD. A section of these grew into the Arabian kingdom of Ghassan, whose capital was Damascus and many of whose kings bore the name Al-Harith (Aretas, 1 Corinthians 11:32). This kingdom lasted till the time of Mohammad (7th century) and was in alliance with the Roman and Greek empires. On the opposite side of the Syrian desert the Lakhmid kingdom of Al-Hira on the Euphrates (also of Kahtanite origin) was allied to Persia. The two Arabian “buffer-states” were almost constantly at war with one another.

5. North Arabian Tribes:

Among the Arabs Ishmael holds the place occupied by Isaac in the Hebrew tradition. It was to the valley, afterward the site of the town of Mecca, that Abraham conducted Hagar and her son, and that Ishmael grew up and became the father of a great nation. The locality is full of spots connected by tradition with his life history, the ground where Hagar searched for water, the well Zemzem of which Gabriel showed her the place, the mount Thabir where Abraham would have sacrificed his son (Ishmael), and the graves of Hagar and Ishmael. The Jurhum, among whom Ishmael grew up, gave him seven goats: these were the capital with which he began life. He married a woman of Jurhum. He had twelve sons (Genesis 25:16) of whom Kaidar and Nabat are the best known, perhaps the Cedrei and Nabataei of Pliny; other sons were Dumah and Tema (which see). The subsequent history of the Ishmaelites is lost for several generations until we come to `Adnan, who is said to have been defeated by Nebuchadnezzar, when the latter invaded Arabia. All the Ishmaelite tribes are descended from `Adnan. They are the north Arabian tribes, as opposed to the Kahtanite or south Arabian. One of them, Koreish, under their chief, Kosay, became master of Mecca, driving out Koda`a. Later, as the tribe of the Prophet, they became the rulers of Arabia and the aristocracy of the Muslim empire; and the descendants of Mohammad remain to this day the only hierarchy known to Islam.

6. Other Tribes:

There are one or two other branches which are not included in the above classification: such are the Nabateans (see NEBAIOTH), and the descendants of Esau and Keturah. The Nabateans are not generally
reckoned among the Arabian tribes. They were an Aramean stock, the indigenous inhabitants of Mesopotamia, and spoke not Arabic but Aramaic. They founded a kingdom in Arabia of which the capital was Petra (see SELA). This was the most famous of their colonies, and it endured, at first in alliance with the Romans and later in subjection to them, for 500 years — from the 2nd century BC to the 3rd century AD. Petra was an important trading emporium, but, when the trade left the overland routes and was carried by way of the Red Sea, it quickly fell into poverty and oblivion. The descendants of Esau are named in Genesis 36:1 ff; they were allied to the Hittites and Ishmaelites. Among the tribes descended from Keturah are Jokshan and Midian, Sheba and Dedan (Genesis 25:2 ff).

7. Foreign Elements:

In Arabia there was and still, in spite of religious disabilities, is a large Jewish population. Before the age of Mohammad they lived chiefly in the Northwest, the two best known tribes — An-Nadir and Koreiza — occupying Yathrib (Medina). After the rise of Islam they were expelled from Arabia; but at the present time there are probably some 60,000 Jews in the Yemen alone. There has always been a close connection between the South and West of Arabia and the opposite African coast. Especially in the 6th century there was a large influx of Abyssinians into the Yemen, as there still is into the western districts. A like intermixture of population went on between Zanzibar and Oman.

VI. RELIGION.

1. Monotheism:

The religion of the greater part of the Arabs before the time of Mohammad consisted of a vague deism combined with a primitive form of stone-worship. This is chiefly true of the Ishmaelite tribes descended from Modan, a great-grandson of `Adnan, and among them it is especially true of Koreish. The origin of this stone worship may have been that as each family was forced to hive off from the main stock and quit the sacred territory around Mecca, it carried with it a stone as a monument of the homeland. This stone soon became a fetish. It was worshipped by stroking it with the hand. Before setting out on a journey a man would perform this
religious duty, and also immediately on his return, before even visiting his
wife and family. The best known idols of the pagan Arabs, from the
mention of them in the Koran, are Al-Lat, Al-Ozza and Al-Manat (Kor 53
19.20), worshipped by the Thakif at Taif, by the two tribes of Medina,
the Aus and the Khazraj, and by Koreish, in a shrine near Mecca,
respectively. Koreish had also a great idol named Hubal in the “house of
God” at Mecca, which contained other idols besides. The deity in each
case was probably at first a large boulder of stone, then a portable image
was made, apparently in human form. They were regarded as feminine and
called the daughters of God. Indeed, Al-Lat is apparently merely the
feminine of Allah (God). The deities mentioned in the Koran (71 23),
Yaghuth, Ya`uk and Nesr, were worshipped in the Yemen. It is certain,
however, that the idolatry of the Arabs of “the Ignorance” (Jahiliyah,
“roughness,” “ignorance”; compare Acts 17:30) — so native writers
name the ages before Mohammad (Koran 3 148, etc.) — has been greatly
exaggerated by Mohammadan historians. It is remarkable that the words
denoting an idol, sanam and wethen, are not Arabic roots, and the practice
of idolatry seems also to have been an importation from without. Even the
idolatrous Arabs believed in a supreme deity, whose daughters the idol
deities were, and with whom they had powers of intercession. They
therefore were rather images of saints than of gods. As Renan has said, the
desert is monotheistic; it is too empty to give birth to a pantheon, as the
fruitful plains of India could do. At the present day the desert Arabs are
more strictly monotheistic than the Muslims themselves. Their religion
consists in nothing save a vague belief in God.

2. The Ka`ba, Pilgrimages and Fairs:

Though there were many houses of God in the country, the chief religious
resort even before the time of Mohammad was Mecca. The House of God
(see BETHEL) here was called the Ka`ba, which is the English word
“cube,” the building being so called from its shape. It was believed to have
been built by Abraham and Ishmael. The honor of acting as guardians of
the House was a subject of rivalry among the tribes. The office was held
consecutively by the tribes of Jurhum, Koda`a and Koreish, and last by
the grandfather and uncles of Mohammad. These, therefore, correspond to
the tribe of Levi in Israel. It is said to have contained a large number of
images, but it is remarkable that the nearer our authorities get to the time of
Mohammad the smaller is the number of images mentioned. The chief of these, Hubal, is not named in the Koran. The worship took the form of circumambulation (tawaf), running or marching round the sanctuary (compare Psalm 26:6). An annual visitation was and still is made by those living at a distance, and sacrifices are offered. This is the hajj or pilgrimage; the same name is used for the corresponding rite among the Hebrews (Exodus 10:9 and often). These religious assemblies were combined with fairs, at which markets were held and a considerable trade carried on. Before the time of Mohammad the great annual fair was held at Okaz, a place still pointed out about three days’ journey East of Mecca and one day West of Taif. Here were not only all kinds of commercial transactions carried on — auctions, sales, settling of accounts and payment of blood-wit, but an academy was held at which poets recited their odes, and received judgment upon their merits. These fairs were generally held in the sacred months, that is, the first, seventh, eleventh and twelfth months, in which fighting was forbidden. They had therefore a great civilizing and pacifying influence.

3. Judaism:

Before the time of Mohammad Judaism prevailed extensively in Arabia, especially in the Hijaz. It began no doubt with the migration of families due to disturbed political conditions at home. The conquest of Palestine by Nebuchadnezzar, by the Seleucids, by the Romans under Pompey, Vespasian and finally Hadrian, drove many Jews to seek peace and safety in the deserts out of which their forefathers had come. Thither Paul also withdrew after his conversion (Galatians 1:17). Two of these emigrant tribes, the Nadir and Koreiza, settled at Medina, first in independence, then as clients of the Aus and Khazraj. In the end they were harried and destroyed by Mohammad. The Jewish colony at Kheibar met the same fate. Several free Arab tribes also professed the Jewish faith, especially certain branches of Himyar and Kinda, both descendants of Kahtan, the former in southern, the latter in central Arabia. Judaism was introduced into the Yemen by one of the Tubbas, probably in the 3rd century AD, but it was not until the beginning of the 6th century that it made much headway. At that epoch the Tubba Dhu Nuwas became a fierce protagonist of this creed. He seems to have attacked the Aus and Khazraj to whom the Jews of Yathrib (Medina) were subject. He instituted against
the Christians of Nejran, a territory lying to the Northeast of the Yemen, a persecution which brought upon him the vengeance of the Byzantine emperor and of the Negus of Abyssinia and involved his kingdom and dynasty in ruin.

4. Christianity:

Judaism did not hold such a large place in Arabia as did Christianity. The apostle Bartholomew is said to have carried the gospel thither. One of the Jurhum kings who may have lived about the beginning of the 2nd century AD is named Abd el-Masih (“Christ’s slave”). There is said to have been a representation of the Virgin Mary and her Son in the Ka`ba. The Christian emperor Constans (337-50) sent the Bishop Theophilus into South Arabia in order to obtain toleration for the Christians. The mission was successful. Churches were built at Zafar, at Aden, and on the shore of the Persian Gulf. The emperor’s real object was doubtless political — to counteract the influence of Persia in these regions. Most of the Yemenite tribes were at this time pagan: they worshipped the idols mentioned above (Koran 71 23). Some time after we find the Abyssinian sovereign describing himself in the inscriptions at Axum as king of the Himyarites. This supremacy would be favorable to the spread of Christianity. One of the chief seats, however, of the Christian religion, was at the above-mentioned Nejran, the territory of the tribe Harith ibn Ka`b, whom ecclesiastical writers seem to denote by Arethas son of Caleb. It was this tribe that Dhu Nuwas, Tubba of the Yemen, on his conversion to Judaism, attacked. He threw all the Christians who held by their faith into a trench of fire in which they were burned (Koran 85 4). News of this atrocity was either carried by those who escaped or sent by the Lakhmid, king of Al-Hira, to the emperor Justin I, who, in turn, either directly or through the patriarch of Alexandria, invoked the cooperation of the Axumite king. The result was that the Abyssinians invaded the Yemen and overthrew the Himyarite dynasty. Christianity then became the prevailing religion of South Arabia. The Abyssinians were in their turn, however, expelled by the Persians, under whom all religions — Christianity, Judaism and paganism — were tolerated, until they all disappeared before Islam. Several of the Lakhmid kings of Al-Hira, although they were from circumstances under the influence of the Persian Zoroastrianism, professed Christianity. Nu`man I who reigned at the end of the 4th and beginning of
the 5th century, perhaps under the influence of Simon Stylites, retired from the world and became an ascetic. Mundhir II, in the middle of the 6th century, seems to have come temporarily under the influence of the Eutychian heresy. Nu`man V, one of his successors, was also converted to Christianity. But the kingdom in which Christianity flourished most was naturally that in closest contact with the Byzantine empire — the kingdom of the Ghassanids, although it seems not to have been until after the conversion of Constantine that this was the case. From his reign date the monasteries of which the ruins are still visible in the Ghassanid country. The powerful Ishmaelite tribe of Taghlib, whose settlements were in Mesopotamia was also converted to Christianity through similar influences, but not until the end of the 6th century. Some members of the Kahtanite Koda`a professed the same religion, as did the Kelb in the Jauf.

5. Sabianism:

In the Koran a third creed is bracketed with those of the Jews and Christians as entitled to toleration — that of the Sabians. These are monotheists who also worshipped the stars or the angels. The name Sabian has no connection with Sabean which is derived from the name of the town of Saba. An account of their religion, taken from Abu’l Faraj (Bar Hebraeus), the Jacobite bishop, who wrote about the middle of the 13th century, will be found in Sale’s Koran, Preliminary Discourse, section I. Sale, however, identified Sabianism with the primitive religion of the Arabs, which Mohammad sought to supplant. This is impossible, however, in view of the fact that Mohammad tolerated the one and proscribed the other. Since the publication of Chwolson’s Ssabier und Ssabismus it has been recognized that under the term Sabians are included two very different groups of people. In the first place the devotees of the old Semitic idolatry which flourished at Harran assumed the name Sabian to enable them to claim the protection afforded by the Koran. It is the tenets of these Harranians of which Chwolson’s work contains an exposition. The true Sabians, however, were a survival of primitive Christian Gnosticism; whence they were also called Mandeans. From their frequent ablutions they received their name derived from the Aramaic [tsebha`], to “baptize,” the `ayin being softened to `aleph, and connected with John the Baptist.
The Jews, Christians and Sabians are called in the Koran “the people of the book,” that is, those to whom a revelation had been vouchsafed, and who were in consequence of this tolerated. In one passage of the Koran (22:17) a fourth religion is added to these — the Magian, or Zoroastrian, introduced from Persia.

6. Seekers after Truth: Islam:

Shortly before the appearance of Mohammad a number of thinking persons had become dissatisfied with the old Arabian religion of their ancestors, and yet had not joined the Christian or Jewish faith. They gave up the worship of idols, studied the various sacred books, and sought to find out the true way. They are considered in the Koran as having been of the true faith even before Mohammad had appeared. About a dozen are mentioned by the historians, of whom the most important are four — Waraka the cousin of Mohammad’s wife Khadija; Othman who became a Christian; Obeidallah who became a Christian and then a Muslim; Zeid who traveled in pursuit of Truth, but did not attach himself to any one faith. The Hebrew prophets and those who accepted their doctrines are regarded as belonging to the same class. A person who is a monotheist, and who yet does not attach himself to any particular creed is called in the Koran a Hanif. This pure religion is called the religion of Abraham. Mohammad claimed to restore this primeval religion in Islam. By John of Damascus Mohammad was regarded as the founder of a Christian sect. It is probable that but for his appearance Christianity would have spread over the whole of Arabia.
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ARABIAN

See ARABIA.

ARABIC GOSPEL OF THE INFANCY

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

ARABIC HISTORY OF JOSEPH THE CARPENTER

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

ARABIC LANGUAGE

<ar’-a-bik lan’-gwaj>: For the student of the Bible the Arabic language is of interest, first, as one of the members of the Semitic group of languages, to which belong the Hebrew and Aramaic tongues of the Bible; secondly, as one of the languages into which the Bible and other church literature were early translated and in which a Christian literature was produced; and thirdly, as the vernacular of Mohammed and his followers, the classical tongue of that religious system which is the offspring of a degenerate Judaism and Christianity.

1. PHILOLOGICAL CHARACTERIZATION:

Scholars are generally agreed in grouping the Arabic and Ethiopic together as a South-Sem branch of the Semitic stock. For the geographical and ethnological background of the Arabic language, see ARABIA. A general characteristic of this tongue of the desert is its remarkable retention into a late historical period, of grammatical features obliterated or in process of obliteration in the other Semitic tongues at their earliest emergence in literature; so that in the period since the golden age of its literature, the Arabic has been undergoing changes in some respects analogous to those which its sister-dialects underwent in their pre-literary or earliest literary stage. Thus, for example, the case-endings of nouns, lost in Aramaic and Canaanitish (including Hebrew), all but lost in the Abyssinian dialects, beginning to be disregarded in even the early (popular) Babylonian, lost
also in the dialects of modern Arabic are in full vitality throughout the classical period of Arabic literature.

The Arabic language itself, ancient and modern, divides into a vast number of dialects, many of which have attained the distinction of producing a literature greater or less. But the dialect of the tribe of Koreish, to which Mohammed belonged, is the one that, naturally, by the circumstance of the Koran’s composition and diffusion, has become the norm of pure Arabic. Old Arabic poems, some of them produced in “the Ignorance,” that is, before the days of Mohammed, are in substantially the same dialect as that of the Koran, for it appears that Bedouin tribes ranging within the limits of the Arabian desert spoke an Arabic little differentiated by tribal or geographical peculiarities. On the other hand the inhabitants of the coast of the Indian Ocean from Yemen to Oman, and of the island of Socotra off that coast, spoke an Arabic differing widely from that of the northern tribes. The various dialects of this “South-Arabic,” known partly through their daughter-dialects of today (Mehri, Socotri, etc.), partly from the numerous and important inscriptions (“Minaean” and “Sabaean”) found in Yemen by recent travelers, notably Halevy and Glaser, show a closer affinity than do the “North-Arabic” with the Abyssinian dialects (Ge’ez, i.e. “Ethiopic,” Tigre, Tigrina, Amharic, etc.), as might indeed be expected from the admitted South Arabian origin of the Habesh-tribes or Abyssinians.

For the interpretation of the Old Testament the Arabic language has been of service in a variety of ways. In the department of lexicography it has thrown light not only on many a word used but once in the Bible or too seldom for usage alone to determine its meaning, but also on words which had seemed clear enough in their Biblical setting, but which have received illustration or correction from their usage in the immense bulk and range of Arabic literature with its enormous vocabulary. For the modern scientific study of Hebrew grammar, with its genetic method, Arabic has been of the greatest value, through the comparison of its cognate forms, where, in the main, the Arabic has the simpler, fuller and more regular morphology, and through the comparison of similar constructions, for which the highly developed Arabic syntax furnishes useful rubrics. In addition to this the Arabic language plays a prominent part, perhaps the foremost part, in the determination of those laws of the mutation of sounds, which once
governed the development and now reveal the mutual relationships of the various Semitic languages.

The script which we know as Arabic script, with its numerous varieties, developed out of the vulgar Aramaic alphabet in North Arabia; diacritical points were added to many of those letters, either to distinguish Arabic sounds for which no letter existed, or to differentiate letters the forms of which had become so similar as to create confusion. In Yemen another script arose early, that of the inscriptions above mentioned, admirably clear and adapted to express probably all the chief varieties of consonantal sounds in actual use, though quite without vowels.

2. CHRISTIAN ARABIC LITERATURE:

For Arabic versions of the Bible, see ARABIC VERSIONS. Outside of the Scriptures themselves there was most felt by Christian communities living in the Arabic-speaking world (primarily, though not exclusively, in Egypt and Syria) the need of a Christian literature suited to the tastes of the time and region. Apocryphal and legendary material makes up a large part, therefore, of the list of Christian Arabic literature. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS. But this material was not original. With the small degree of intellectual activity in those circles it is not surprising that most of such material, and indeed of the entire literary output, consists of translations from Syriac, Greek or Coptic, and that original productions are few in number.

Of these last the most noteworthy are the following: theological and apologetic tracts by Theodore, bishop of Haran, the same who held the famous disputation with Mohammedan scholars at the court of Caliph Al-Mamun early in the 9th century; apologetic and polemic writings of Yahya ibn Adi of Tekrit, and of his pupil Abu All Isaiah ibn Ishaq, both in the 10th century; the Arabic works of Bar Hebraeus, better known for his numerous Syriac compositions, but productive also of both historical and theological works in Arabic (13th century); in Egypt, but belonging to the same Jacobite or Monophysite communion as the above, the polemic and homiletic productions of Bishop Severus of Eshmunain (10th century), and, a generation earlier than Severus and belonging to the opposing or Melkite Egyptian church, the chronicle of Eutychius, patriarch of
Alexandria, continued a century later by Yahya ibn Said of Antioch; large compilations of church history, church law and theological miscellany by the Coptic Christians Al-Makin, Abu Ishaq ibn Al-Assal, Abu’il-Barakat and others, the leaders in a general revival of Egyptian Christianity in the 13th century; on the soil of Nestorianism, finally, the ecclesiastical, dogmatic and exegetical writings of Abulfaraj Abdallah ibn At-Tayyib, (11 century), the apologetic compositions of his contemporary, Elias ben Shinaya, the historian, and the Nestorian church chronicle begun in the 12th century by Mari ibn Suleiman and continued two centuries later by Amr ibn Mattai and Saliba bar Johannan. After this date there is no original literature produced by Arabic-speaking Christians until the modern intellectual revival brought about by contact with European Christianity.

3. THE LITERARY VEHICLE OF ISLAM:

What Aramaic, Greek and Latin have been successively in the history of Christianity, all this, and more, Arabic has been in the history of Islam. The language of its founder and his “helpers,” the language of the Koran “sent down” from God to Mohammed by the angel Gabriel, the language therefore in which it has always been preserved by the faithful, untranslated, whithersoever it has spread in the wide world of Islam, Arabic is identified with Islam in its origin, its history, its literature and its propaganda. All the points of contact between the religion of the Bible and the religion of the Koran, literary, historical, apologetic and missionary, are alike in this, that they demand of the intelligent student of Christianity a sympathetic acquaintance with the genius and the masterpieces of the great Arabic tongue.

J. Oscar Boyd

ARABIC VERSIONS

<ar’-a-bik vur’-shuns>: Arabic translations of the Bible must have been made at a very early date, for Christianity and Judaism had penetrated far into Arabia by the 6th century of our era, but the oldest of which a copy has come down to our time is that of Sasdish the Gaon (942 AD). This version was made directly from the Massoretic Text and is said to have covered the whole of the Old Testament, but much of it is no longer extant.
It is characterized by an avoidance of anthropomorphisms (e.g. "sons of nobles" and “daughters of common people”) and by giving modern equivalents, e.g. Turks, Franks, Chinese, for the Hebrew names. Saadiah’s Pentateuch was first printed at Constantinople in 1546 and was incorporated into the Paris (1629-45) and London (1657) Polyglots. When, after the rise of Islam, Arabic became the common language of Syria, Egypt and North Africa, translations were made from the Septuagint, from the Peshitta and from Coptic. In the Polyglots the translation of Joshua is, like the Pentateuch, made from the Massoretic Text, as also portions of Kings and Nehemiah, with interpolations from the Peshitta. Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings (in parts), 1 and 2 Chronicles (?), Nehemiah (in parts) and Job have been translated into Arabic from Syriac. The remaining books (Prophets, Psalms, Proverbs, etc.) are from the Septuagint, and that according to Codex Alexandrinus. In the New Testament the Gospels have been translated from the Vulgate, and the remaining books, although from the Greek, are late. A revised edition of the versions in Walton’s Polyglot was published by J. D. Carlyle, professor of Arabic in Cambridge, and printed at Newcastle by Sarah Hodgson in 1811. A very fine translation of the entire Bible in classical Arabic has been issued by the Jesuit Fathers in Beirut, and a simpler version in Arabic which can be understood by the common people, educated and uneducated alike, was made by the late Dr. Cornelius Van Dyck of the Syrian Protestant College and published by the American Press in Beirut. Dr. Van Dyck had the benefit of the help and advice of the Sheikh Nacif al-Yaziji.

A large number of manuscripts of the Bible in Arabic, in whole or in part, are to be found in the British Museum, the Bibliotheque Nationale and the great libraries of the Continent, but none of them are of sufficient age to make them of value for the criticism of the text.

_Thomas Hunter Weir_

**ARABOTH**

_<ar’-a-both>._

*See ARUBBOTH.*
ARAD

\(<a\text{-}rad>\) (ܪܹܕ [aradh]; [ \(\text{Αράδ} \), Arad]):

(1) A city mentioned four times in the Old Testament. In the King James Version it is twice mistakenly rendered as the name of a king (Numbers 21:1; 33:40). Three times it is spoken of as in the South Country, one mention using the phrase `the wilderness of Judah which is in the South Country of Arad’ (Judges 1:16), that is, the part of the wilderness of Judah which is in the South Country near Arad. It was situated near the frontier of Judah and Simeon, being grouped with Debir, Hormah, Makkedah, etc. (Joshua 12:14). Arad and other cities joined in attacking Israel in the fortieth year of the sojourn in the wilderness (Numbers 21:1-3), and Israel vowed to “make their cities a devoted thing.” In the case of Zephath, one of the cities, this vow was fulfilled after the death of Joshua (Judges 1:17). The Kenite relatives of Moses had their inheritance near Arad (Judges 1:16). In the form a-ru-da the city is mentioned by Shishak of Egypt as among the places which he conquered in Palestine. The identification of the site with Tel Arad, about 17 miles South of Hebron, seems to be generally accepted.

(2) One of the descendants of Elpaal the son of Shaharaim, mentioned among the descendants of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:15).

*Willis J. Beecher*

ARADUS

\(<ar\text{-}a\text{-}dus>\) ([ Αράδος, Arados], 1 Macc 15:23): Greek name of the Old Testament &ARVAD (which see), a city on the coast of Phoenicia.

ARAH

\(<a\text{-}ra>\) (ܪܹܪ [arach], “traveler”?):

(1) The son of Ulla, an Asherite (1 Chronicles 7:39).

(2) The head of a family that returned from the exile with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:5; Nehemiah 7:10). He is sometimes identified with Arah.
of Nehemiah 6:18 whose grand-daughter became the wife of Tobiah, the Ammonite who tried to thwart Nehemiah in rebuilding Jerusalem.

**ARAM**

\(<a’-ram>\) (אֲרָם [’aram]):

1. A son of Shem (Genesis 10:22; 1 Chronicles 1:17). See **ARAMEANS; SYRIA**.
3. A descendant of Asher (1 Chronicles 7:34).

**ARAMEANS; ARAMEANS**

\(<ar-a-me’-ans>\): Often in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Syrians.

*See SYRIA.*

**ARAMAIC LANGUAGE**

\(<ar-a-ma’-ik lan’-gwaj>\) (ארامي [’aramith]; the King James Version Syrian, Syriac; SYRIAN in the Revised Version (British and American)):

The name is given to a form of Semitic speech, most nearly related to Hebrew and Phoenician, but exhibiting marked peculiarities, and subsisting in different dialects. Its original home may have been in Mesopotamia (Aram), but it spread North and West, and, as below shown, became the principal tongue throughout extensive regions. After the return from the Captivity, it displaced Hebrew as the spoken language of the Jews in Palestine. In its eastern form it is known as Syriac. In its occurrence in the Old Testament, it formerly, though incorrectly, generally bore the name Chaldee. The present article deals with it chiefly in its Old Testament relations.
1. EARLY NOTICES OF ARAMAIC IN SCRIPTURE:

If we neglect two words which occur in Genesis 31:47, the earliest notice of the use of this language in Scripture is in the request which the representatives of Hezekiah make to Rabshakeh: “Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syriac language” ([’aramith], 2 Kings 18:26; Isaiah 36:11). The narrative from which we have made this excerpt, even if it stood alone, would prove that Aramaic, “the Syriac language,” was so different from Hebrew, “the Jews’ language,” that it was not understood by the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Further, it shows that Aramaic was the ordinary language of Assyrian diplomacy. We next meet with Aramaic in Jeremiah 10:11 which appears to be an answer put into the mouths of the Jews as a reply to any attempt to seduce them to the worship of idols. If we assume the traditional date of Daniel to be correct, the six chapters in that book (Daniel 2:4 through 7:28), forming the greater part of the whole, are the next and most important occurrence of Aramaic in Scripture. There are, further, passages in Ezra 4:8 through 6:18; 7:12-26, amounting approximately to three chapters, in which Aramaic is used. In the New Testament several Aramaic words and phrases occur, modified by having passed through Greek.

2. EXTRA-BIBLICAL EVIDENCES OF ARAMAIC:

Formerly our knowledge of Aramaic earlier than the Targums and the Peshitta was restricted to the above-noticed passages of Scripture. Now, however, discoveries, still comparatively recent, have put us in a different position. In the closing decade of last century extensive inscriptions were discovered in Sibbaldia, in the neighborhood of Aleppo, dated in the reigns of Tiglathpilesar and the Sargonid monarchs, and one that seems earlier. More recent has been the discovery of the Assouan papyri; these bear dates which synchronize with Ezra and Nehemiah. Earlier than these in discovery, but between them in date of origin, are weights of the reign of Sargon, with two inscriptions, one, official, in cuneiform, which not only gives the designation of the weight, but relates the name and titles of the king; the other, popular, in Aramaic, which only tells the weight. More striking is the fact that frequently, in regard to contract tablets, while the binding document is in cuneiform character and the Assyrian language, the inscription on the clay envelope which served as a docquet is in Aramaic,
language and letter. This affords proof that at all events before the reign of Tiglath-pileser Aramaic was the general speech for commerce and diplomacy all over Southwest Asia.

3. THE SCRIPT OF ARAMAIC INSCRIPTIONS:

When we come in contact with it, Aramaic is a fully formed alphabetical language, and has attained a further stage of development than the Assyrian with its cumbrous cuneiform. To the end, Assyrian was largely ideographic and hieroglyphic. The same group of symbols represented very different sounds according to circumstances, and widely differing meanings were connected with the same sound, with the consequent necessity for determinatives. The alphabet employed in Aramaic is practically that found on the Moabite Stone. It evidently stands at the end of a long process of evolution. It is probable that a hieroglyphic stood behind it; whether it is derived from the Hittite (Conder), or from Egyptian (Rouge), or Assyrian (Delitzsch), or is of independent origin (Gesenius), cannot be determined. Aramaic is, like Hebrew and Assyrian, a North Semitic tongue, standing in a manner between them. It is more regular in its formation than either of the others, a character that may to some extent be due to its use as a lingua franca over so wide a territory. Aramaic was the official language of the extensive Persian empire, as it had been to some extent that of its predecessor, the empire of Assyria. It may be regarded as having been generally understood from Asia Minor on the North, to the Cataracts of the Nile on the South, and from the mountains of Media on the East, to the Mediterranean on the West. Its history has been long; spoken, as we learn by inscriptions, from before the days of Tiglath-pileser, it is still spoken on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates.

4. DIALECTS OF ARAMAIC:

These extensive limits, geographical and chronological, imply dialectic differences. Means of communication were so ineffective that the distance between the eastern and western limits would require greater time to traverse, than does that which separates America from Europe, or New York from Brazil. The primary dialectic distinction was between eastern Aramaic (Syriac) and western (formerly called Chaldee). The peculiarity which most prominently distinguishes these is the preformative of the
imperfect; in the western, as in Hebrew and Arabic, it is yodh (y), while in
the eastern it is nun (n) or lamedh (l). Each of these has sub-dialects. In
Palestine, besides the Chaldee of the Jewish Targums, there was the
Samaritan Pentateuch; in it, besides many foreign elements in the
vocabulary, the use of `ayin instead of waw in the preterite of `ayin-waw
verbs is the most striking feature. The sub-dialect of eastern Aramaic is
Mandean; it is characterized by the use of the matres lectionis instead of
vowel signs. From the inscriptions and the papyri it would seem to follow
that the eastern peculiarities are the more recent — changes introduced
through passage of time. In eastern Aramaic the script became more
cursive than in western, which retained the square character we associate
with Hebrew: except the Samaritan, which used a still earlier script, less
removed from the angular style of the inscriptions. The script of the
Assouan papyri indicated a tendency toward the later square character.

5. GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES:

Although an article like the present is not the place to give a full grammar
of Aramaic, yet we may advert to some of the more prominent
peculiarities, common to all branches of the language, which distinguish it
from Hebrew, the best-known of north Semitic tongues. The peculiarity
that most strikes the beginner in Aramaic is the want of the article, and the
presence instead of the status emphaticus, which follows the syntactic
rules of the Hebrew article. The next thing likely to attract attention is the
use of the relative pronoun [zi] or [di] as if it were a preposition meaning
“of.” While in Hebrew the passive voice is generally indicated in the
derived conjugations by internal vocalic changes, as the pu`al from the
pi`el; in Aramaic the syllable ‘eth (E) or ‘ith (W) is prefixed (earlier hith).
Instead of the Hebrew causative hiph`il there is the `aph`el (earlier haph`el
with its passive ‘ethtaph`al or ‘ittaph`al (earlier hoph`al). The causative
had also shaph`el and taph`el forms, which occasionally are found. While
in the Targums and the Old Testament Peshitta the syllable yath is the
sign of the accusative (earlier vath, as in the Sinjirli inscriptions), the letter
lamedh serves that purpose in Aramaic which is not a translation from
Hebrew. A characteristic of later Aramaic prominent in the Peshitta of the
New Testament is the facility with which it adopted words and phrases
from Greek which had already largely displaced it as the common language. New Syriac shows a similar facility in regard to Arabic and Persian.

6. COMPARISON OF THE ARAMAIC OF SINJIRLI WITH THAT OF THE BIBLE:

A question of very considerable importance to the Biblical student is the relation in which the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra stands to that of the Sinjirli inscriptions and that of the more nearly contemporary Assouan papyri. In making the comparison we must bear in mind that the Hebrew Massoretic Text is the result of transcriptions extending the Bible over 1,500 or 1,200 years, according as we take the traditional or the critical dates for the books in question. This implies probably a score or more of transcriptions each with its quota of variations from the original. While the variations introduced by any one transcription might be few and unimportant, they would all be in the direction of lateness, and cumulatively might easily become very great. The late Hebrew of Ecclesiastes, notwithstanding its ascription to Solomon, shows how little the idea of the chronology of style entered into the thoughts of the scribes of those days, to check this tendency to modernization. It follows that while the presence of late peculiarities proves nothing but the inaccuracy of the copyist, early grammatical forms and modes of spelling are nearly indisputable evidences of antiquity.

The Sinjirli inscriptions, if we neglect the less important, are three, the Panammu inscription, the Hadad inscription and the Barrekab inscription (Bauenschrift, Sachau). The first and last of these are dated in the reign of Tiglath-pileser, the middle one is placed by Sachau in the preceding century. It ought to be noted that, when first discovered, it was a matter of doubt whether the inscriptions should not be reckoned as Hebrew, rather than Aramaic. The close affinity between them and Hebrew is shown in various ways. By a relation among the north Semitic tongues similar to that among the Aryan languages expressed by Grimm’s law, where letters with the s-sound appear in Hebrew, in later Aramaic we find corresponding letters with the t-sound. But in the Sinjirli inscriptions we do not find this mark of the later language; thus we have [sheqel], not [theqel], [shelathin] instead of [telathin], [zehabh] for [dhehabh], etc. That this is not due to the proximity of Hebrew is proved by the fact that on
the weights in Sargon’s palace we find [sheqel]. Thus, the Sinjirli inscriptions date from a period when Hebrew and Aramaic had not been completely differentiated. There are other points of likeness. Instead of the [‘aph`el] and [‘ethtapht`al] or [‘ittaph`al] of later Aramaic, there is haph`el and hoph`al; instead of the ‘eth or ‘ith as the sign of the passive, there is hith. The vocabularies also are nearly identical. In both, the syllable yath or wath, sign of the accusative, is present, as if a survival, only as the support of the oblique case of a pronoun ([Daniel 3:12; Sinjirli, Had 28]. The pronouns exhibit a similar resemblance to Hebrew and also to Biblical Aramaic. The 1st person pronoun is [‘anokh] (once [‘anokhi] in Pan. 1.19), as in the Phoenician and Moabite dialects of Hebrew; [‘anah] occurs occasionally as in Daniel. The most marked differences from later Aramaic is “z” instead of “dh” in the demonstrative pronoun; here there is relation to the Hebrew [zeh]. Another case in frequent evidence is [‘arqa`] instead of [‘ar`a].

7. COMPARISON OF ARAMAIC OF ASSOUAN WITH THAT OF DANIEL:

More nearly contemporary with the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is that of the Assouan papyri. These are carefully dated, and extend from 471 BC to 411 BC; these two dates include the whole reign of Artaxerxes I, the king whose cupbearer Nehemiah was, and who sent him as governor to Jerusalem, and a few years of his predecessor’s and successor’s reigns. These documents, as written with a reed pen on papyrus, and not cut with a chisel on stone, manifest a very different style of letter; as already said, there is some approximation to the later square character. The resemblance between the grammar and vocabulary of these papyri and those of Biblical Aramaic is closer than that of the latter to the Sinjirli grammar and diction. Where, in the more ancient Aramaic, we have “z,” in these papyri we occasionally find the later “dh.” It is not improbable that, as in Spain, a lisping pronunciation became prevalent; the “dh” pronounced as “th” in “then” would in that case represent more accurately the sound actually uttered than would “z.” The word already noticed, [‘arqa`] which generally appears in Biblical Aramaic as [‘ar`a], is a similar case. In northern Palestine the Arabic qaf is pronounced much as if it were [‘ain], if not even the related sound hemzeh; instances of this spelling also are found in the
Assouan papyri. Both of these differences are due to frequent transcription assimilating the spelling to the pronunciation. Another peculiarity is probably due to a different cause. In Biblical Aramaic the preformative of the 3rd person singular and plural of the imperfect of the substantive verb is lamedh. Of this peculiarity Dr. Bevan gives an ingenious explanation. If the yodh preformative were used, the resulting word would have a resemblance to the sacred name: to avoid this, he thinks, the yodh was changed into a lamedh. Unfortunately this explains too much, therefore explains nothing. Had this been the explanation, the name “Jehu,” which consonantally is nearly the same as the 3rd person singular and plural of the substantive verb, would never have been written as it is. Further, if Jewish reverence for the Divine name expressed itself in this way, we should expect to find this preformative in the Targums, which, however, we do not. Hundreds of cases in proof may be found in Onkelos alone. The truth is, it is a Mandean form, which proves that the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is eastern. A further peculiarity is the nun compensative; as [tinda`] (Daniel 4:23), which regularly would be [tidda`]. This also is found in the Mandean; it is, however, also found in papyri of Assouan, an evidence that the Mandean characteristic was a survival from an earlier time.

8. ELEPHANTINE PAPYRI:

Another interesting point of contact between the Aramaic of this period and that of Daniel is exhibited in the Elephantine papyri published by Sachau. These papyri, discovered in the island of Elephantine (opposite Assouan) in 1907, are three in number, and are dated in the 14th year of Darius II (407 BC). In the first, ll. 2, 27, 28, the second, l. 26, and the third ll. 3, 4, we have God called “the God of heaven,” the title given to God throughout Daniel 2. This is also the appellation used in the Aramaic of Ezra (5:11,12; 6:9 etc.) From the passages where it occurs it would seem that during the Babylonian and Persian rule this was the recognized governmental title of the God of the Hebrews.

9. COMPARISON WITH ARAMAIC OF THE TARGUMS:

As it is frequently asserted that the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is that of the Targums, it is necessary to examine the truth of this statement. In
considering this question son with we must have regard to the history of these paraphrases, as only in this way can we estimate truly the chronological value of this “great” resemblance, should it be found to exist. According to Talmudic tradition the Targums were delivered orally, and were not committed to writing till late in the 2nd century of our era. A traditional rendering was handed on from meturgeman (interpreter) to meturgeman. In such circumstances archaic forms, words and idioms, are perpetuated. The sacred always tends to preserve the antique; in illustration we need only refer to the song of the Fratres Arvales, a college of priests dating from primitive Latin times and continuing to the days of the Gordians. This sacred song of theirs preserves to us the most ancient form of the Latin tongue, though the inscriptions, from which we learn of it, date from the classic period. Hence the Aramaic of the Targums may represent the form of the language a couple of centuries before the Christian era.

10. CHIEF DIFFERENCES IN LATTER: 

We cannot attempt to give an exhaustive summary of the differences between Biblical and Targumic Aramaic, but indicate only some of the more obvious. Account need not be taken of yath, the sign of the accusative, as it appears only as representing the Hebrew [’eth]. In verbs, reference has already been made to the “L” preformative in the substantive verb, a peculiarity which Biblical Aramaic shares with Mandeans in distinction from other forms of the language: also to the fact that the hith of the earlier verbal forms is replaced by ‘ith in the more recent ‘ithpe`el and ‘ithpa`al. This also is the case with ‘aph`el (in earlier and Biblical Aramaic haph`el), the passive of which is hoph`al, not ‘ittaph`al, as in Targumic. The importance of verbal forms in determining age is readily recognized; thus in English, if the 3rd person singular of the verbs in an English writing is in eth we decide that writing to belong, in fact or feigning, to a period not later than the 17th century. In regard to pronouns, while in Biblical Aramaic, as in Sinjirli and Assouan, the 1st person singular is [’an’a], in Targumic it is [’anah]: the plural in Biblical Aramaic is [’anachna’) akin to ‘anachnah in Assouan, whereas in the Targums it is usually [’anan], though sometimes the Biblical form appears. The 2nd person singular in Biblical Aramaic is ‘ant as in Assouan, with the plural
[‘antum] (Assouan, [‘antem]): in Targumic it is [‘att] and [‘attun]. To compare our own language, when we find “thou” and “ye” in a writing, we date it as not later than the 17th century. The ordinary vocabulary, though not without value in this respect, is not very important chronologically. Connective particles, however, are. Everyone acquainted with Hebrew knows how frequently [yesh], “is” occurs; as frequent is ‘ith in Targumic. In the Bible, the papyri, the form found is [‘ithi]. In the Targums [‘i] stands for “if”; in the Bible and papyri it is hen. Cognate with this, the Bible and the papyri have lahen, “therefore”: this is not found in the Targums, which have instead [‘al-ken]. In our own language the presence of “eke” in serious prose or poetry as a conjunction would prove the antiquity of the composition. The fact that the distinction between “c” and “s” has disappeared in the Targums, but is still preserved in the Bible, is a note of age that cannot be passed over. Other examples might be given, but these will suffice. Professor Bevan lightly dismisses many of these differences as mere matters of orthography; yet in French the presence of “l” for “u” or as strengthening the “u” in such words as alx, eulx, aultres is regarded as a note of old as distinct from modern French; yet probably the pronunciation was not different.

In pursuing this part of the subject the latter portion of Pusey’s first Lecture (Daniel the Prophet) is worthy of study. Pusey had not the advantage of contemporary documents with which to compare Biblical Aramaic; he could only emphasize the nature and amount of the differences which separated the language of Daniel from that of the Targums. The argument can now be supplemented by a yet stronger argument from the resemblance between the former and the contemporary papyri of Assouan, and yet the earlier Sinjirli inscriptions.

See further, SYRIAC; LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; and compare the article “Aramaic” in Encyclopedia Biblica.

LITERATURE.

Numerous grammars and dictionaries of the two principal dialects of Aramaic, eastern (Syr) and western (Chaldee) may be seen in any catalogues. There is an excellent compendium of the grammar of Biblical Aramaic in Delitzsch’s introduction to Baer’s Text of Daniel and Ezra. For
the Samaritan there is a small grammar by Nicholls, also one in the series “Porta Linguarum Orientalium.” Noldeke has published grammars for Mandeans and New Syriac

J. E. H. Thomson

ARAMAIC VERSIONS

See TARGUMS.

ARAM-DAMMESEK

<aro'-am-dam'-es-ek>: Syria of Damascus, conquered by David (2 Samuel 8:5,6).

See SYRIA.

ARAMITESS

<aro'-am-it'-es>, <aro'-am-it-es>, <aro'-am-it-es> (אֶרֶמָיָה): The term applied to the concubine-mother of Machir, the father of Gilead (1 Chronicles 7:14); the inhabitants of Gilead were thus in part Arameans (Syrians) by descent.

ARAM-MAACAHAH

<aro'-am-ma'el-ka>.

See SYRIA.

ARAM-NAHARAIM

<aro'-am-na-ha-ra'-im>.

See SYRIA.

ARAM-REHOB

<aro'-am-re'-hob>.

See SYRIA.
ARAM-ZOBAH

See SYRIA.

ARAN

See SYRIA.

ARAN

<"a'-ran"> (אָרָן, "wild goat"): A son of Dishan, the Horite (Genesis 36:28, 1 Chronicles 1:42). It may possibly be connected with the Yerahmelite Oren (אֹרֶן, "wild goat") (1 Chronicles 2:25; compare Curtis, Chron. at the place; Dillmann, Genesis at the place; ZDMG, L, 168); Robertson Smith claims that this name is equivalent to the Samaritan (אֹרֶנ), "wild goat" (Jour. Phil., IX, 90). J. Jacobs translates it by "ass" (Stud. Biblical Arch., 71). This is one of the many totem names in the Bible. More than one-third of the Horites, the descendants of Seir, bear animal names, and those clans of the Edomites connected with the Horites also have animal names. The very name "Self" means a "he-goat," and Dishan, "a gazelle" (Stud. Biblical Arch., 70-72). Gray, however, remarks that "the instance (Aran) is most uncertain" (HPN, 108).

Samuel Cohon

ARARAH

Same as ARARAT (Tobit 1:21).

ARARAT

<"ar'-a-rat"> (אֱרָרָת, [’araraT]): A mountainous plateau in western Asia from which flow in different directions the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Aras and the Choruk rivers. Its general elevation is 6,000 feet above the sea. Lake Van, which like the Dead Sea has no outlet, is nearly in its center. The Babylonian name was Urartu, the consonants being the same in both words. In 2 Kings 19:37 and Isaiah 37:38 the word is translated in the King James Version Armenia, which correctly represents the region designated. It was to Armenia that the sons of Sennacherib fled. In Jeremiah 51:27 Ararat is associated with Minni and Ashkenaz, which according to the Assyrian monuments lay just to the east of Armenia. In
Genesis 8:4 the ark is said to have rested “upon the mountains of Ararat,” i.e. in the mountainous region of Armenia, the plural showing that the mountain peak known as Ararat was not referred to. This peak is of volcanic origin and lies outside the general region, rising from the lowlands of the Araxes (Aras) River to a height of 17,000 feet, supported by another peak seven miles distant, 13,000 feet high. It is only in comparatively modern times that the present name has been given to it. The Armenians still call it Massis, but believe, however, that Noah was buried at Nachitchevan near its base.

The original name of the kingdom occupying Armenia was Bianias, which Ptolemy transliterated Byana. Later the “B” was modified into “V” and we have the modern Van, the present capital of the province. The “mountains of Ararat” on which the ark rested were probably those of the Kurdish range which separates Armenia from Mesopotamia and Kurdistan. In the Babylonian account the place is called “the mountain of Nizir” which is east of Assyria. Likewise Berosus locates the place “in the mountain of the Kordyaeans” or Kurds (Ant., I, iii, 6), while the Syriac version has Hardu in Gen. 8:4 instead of Ararat. The Kurds still regard Jebel Judi, a mountain on the boundary between Armenia and Kurdistan, as the place where the ark rested.

This elevated plateau of Armenia has still many attractions, and is eminently suited to have been the center from which the human race spread in all directions. Notwithstanding its high elevation the region is fertile, furnishing abundant pasture, and producing good crops of wheat and barley, while the vine is indigenous. Moreover there are unmistakable indications that in early historic times there was a much more abundant rainfall in all that region than there is now, so that the climate was then better adapted to the wants of primitive man. This is shown by the elevated beaches surrounding lakes Van, Urumiah, and, indeed, all the lakes of central Asia. Great quantities of mammoth bones have been found in these bordering lacustrine deposits corresponding to those found in the glacial and postglacial deposits of Europe and America. It should, also, be remembered that the drying up of the waters of the flood is represented to have been very gradual — it being 170 days from the time the waters began to subside before Noah could disembark. It may have been many centuries before the present conditions were established, the climate, meanwhile,
being modified to a corresponding degree by the proximity of vast surrounding bodies of water.

Armenia abounds in inscriptions carved on the rocks, altar stones and columns, but they have been only imperfectly translated. The script is cuneiform and each letter has only a single phonetic character attached to it. But there are introduced a good many borrowed ideographs which have assisted in the decipherment. According to Sayce this cuneiform syllabary was introduced from Assyria after the conquest of Shalmaneser II in the 9th century BC.

George Frederick Wright

ARARATH

<ar’-a-rath>: Same as ARARAT (which see).

ARATHES

<a-ra’-thez> (the King James Version Araiarthes; [ Ἄραθης, Arathes]; [ Ἄραραθης, Ariarathes]): King of Cappadocia, 163-130 BC. Educated in Rome, he imbibed Roman ideas and became a faithful ally of the Romans, in conformity with whose wishes he declined a proposal of marriage with the sister of Demetrius Soter. The latter declared war, drove Arathes from his kingdom and set up Holophernes in his stead. He fled to Rome about 158, and through the good offices of the Romans succeeded in obtaining for himself a participation in the government of Cappadocia. Later he again became sole king. In 139 BC, as a result of an embassy sent by Simon Maccabeus, the Romans wrote letters to Arathes (1 Macc 15:22) and other eastern kings in behalf of the Jews. (See Diodor. XXXI, 19, 28, 32; Justin, XXXV, 1; Polyb. III, 5; XXXII, 20-30; XXXIII, 12).

J. E. Harry

ARAUNAH

<a-ro’-na> ([’arawnah], 2 Samuel 24:16,20 ff; [’aranyah] 2 Samuel 24:18, and [’ornan], 1 Chronicles 21:15 ff; 2 Chronicles 3:1, all from a Hebrew root meaning “to be strong”): A Jebusite from whom David at the request of the prophet Gad bought a threshing-
floor located upon Mt. Moriah, as a site for an altar of the Lord at the time of the great plague (2 Samuel 24:15 ff; 1 Chronicles 21:15 ff), upon which Solomon later erected the temple (2 Chronicles 3:1).

**ARBA, CITY OF**

*See KIRIATH-ARBA.*

**ARBA**

<ar’-ba> (יָּרְבָּא [‘arba`], “four”): Variously described as “the greatest man among the Anakim” (Joshua 14:15), “the father of Anak” (Joshua 15:13), “the father of Anok” (Joshua 21:11 margin). Thus he seems to have been regarded as the ancestor of the Anakim, and as the most famous hero of that race. He was the reputed founder of the city called after him, on the site of which Hebron was built (Joshua 21:11).

**ARBATHITE**

<ar’-bath-it> (יהִּבְרְדָּתִי [ha-`arbhathi]): Perhaps “a native of the Arabah.” Klostermann suggests “a native of Beth-arabah.” The Arbathite is Abi-albon (2 Samuel 23:31), also named Abiel (1 Chronicles 11:32), one of David’s heroes.

**ARBATTA**

<ar-bat’-a>, <ar-bat’-is> the King James Version Arbattis, (Ἄρβάττοις, en Arbattois) (plural)): Apparently a district in the neighborhood of Galilee, from which the Jews who were in danger of attack by the heathen were carried by Simon Maccabeus to Jerusalem (1 Macc 5:21 ff). It cannot be identified with certainty. Ewald (Hist, V, 314, English translation) favors [el-BaTeicha], the plain through which the Jordan flows into the Lake of Galilee. Encyclopedia Biblica (s.v.) suggests “the Arabah, or Araboth of Jordan.” Possibly however we should look for it in the toparchy of Akrabattis, to the Southeast of Shechem (BJ, III, iii, 4 f).

*W. Ewing*
ARBELA

<ar-be’-la> ([ἐν Ἁρβήλαις, en Arbelois]): This place is mentioned in 1 Macc 9:1 ff, and in Ant, XII, xi, 1, describing the march and encampment of Bacchides. The former says that “Demetrius sent Bacchides and Alcimus into the land of Judea .... who went forth by the way that leadeth to Galgala, and pitched their tents before Masaloth, which is in Arbela, and after they had won it they slew much people.” Josephus says that Bacchides “marched out of Antioch and came into Judea and pitched his camp at Arbela, a city of Galilee, and having besieged and taken those that were there in caves (for many people fled into such places) he removed and made all the haste he could to Jerusalem.” It was from the caves near the village of Arbela in Galilee that Herod dislodged the robbers (Ant., XIV, xv, 4 f; BJ, I, xvi, 2 ff). Josephus fortified the caves of Arbela in lower Galilee (Vita, 37), “near the lake of Gennesar” (BJ, II, xx, 6).

The references in Josephus point plainly to the caves in the cliff forming the south wall of the tremendous gorge of Wady el-Chamam which opens on the plain of Gennesaret, west of the village el-Mejdel. A series of these caves, skillfully adapted to purposes of refuge and defense, is still known as Qal`at ibn Ma`an, “fortress of the son of Ma`an.” On the height above stand the ruins of Irbid or Irbil (both forms are heard today), which unquestionably represent the Arbela of Josephus. The army from Antioch may quite well have come this way. No name however in the least resembling Masaloth has been recovered in this district. We may mention Robinson’s suggestion (BR, II, 398, note), that it may stand for the Hebrew [mecilloth], “steps, stories, terraces,” and may apply to the fortress in the rocks.

On the other hand the writer of 1 Macc is an earlier authority than Josephus. If we accept his guidance, Bacchides must have crossed the plain of Esdraelon and followed the main highway southward through Samaria. Galgala may then be identified with Jiljilia, about 8 miles North of Bethel, and Masaloth with Meselieh, about 3 miles Southeast of Dothan. Onomasticon mentions an Arbela in the great plain, 9 miles from Legio (Lejun), but it is now unknown. The phrase [en arbelois] might mean that
Masaloth was in the district of Arbela; but there is no trace of this name as attaching to any tract in this neighborhood.

One or other of these routes must have been taken. While no certain decision can be reached, special weight attaches to the statement of Josephus, on account of his acquaintance with the localities in the region, and his unquestionable familiarity with the history.

See also BETH-ARBEL.

W. Ewing

ARBITE

<ar’-bit> (אַרְבֵּי [ha’-arbi]): The Arbite or perhaps an inhabitant of Arabia in southern Judah (Joshua 15:52). The epithet is used in connection with one of David’s mighty men in 2 Samuel 23:35; where Paarai the Arbite occurs. In the parallel list (1 Chronicles 11:37) we have Naarai the son of Ezbai.

ARBONAI

<ar-bo’-nai>, <ar-bo’na-i> ([ʿAḇrōnā, Abrona]): A torrent mentioned in Judith 2:24. Beyond what is indicated in this passage, it is not possible to determine the location; but from this it appears to have been near Cilicia. Identification with the modern Nahr Ibrahim is rejected on the ground

(1) that the ancient name of this river was Adonis, and

(2) that this does not answer to the term “torrent” applied by Judith. A possible misreading of “the high cities that were [be’ebher ha-nahar]” (“beyond the river”; Encyclopedia Biblica under the word).

ARCH

<arch> (אֲרֵךְ ['ayil]; Septuagint [τὰ αἰλαμ, ta ailam], in sense of “posts” or “colonnade”): Referred to repeatedly in Ezekiel 40:16 ff, but translation is an error for “porch” or “portico.” the Revised Version
(British and American) gives in marg., “or, colonnade. The meaning of the Hebrew word is uncertain.” The principle of arch construction was known to the Jews and examples of early Jewish rude arches have been found in Palestine. An arched form need not necessarily be constructed with radiating joints; it can be corbelled as at Mycenae (Treasury of Atreus). This type of construction has been found also in Palestine.

**ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM**

<ar-ke-o’l-o-ji>, <krit’-i-siz’-m>: Archaeology, the science of antiquities, is in this article limited to the Biblical field, a field which has been variously delimited (Deuteronomy Wette, 1814, Gesenius), but which properly includes not only all ancient facts bearing upon the Bible which had been lost and have been recovered, but all literary remains of antiquity bearing upon the Bible and, also, as of the first importance, the Bible itself (Hogarth, Authority and Archaeology, vi).

**SCOPE OF ARTICLE:**

Criticism, the art of scrutiny, is here limited mainly, though not exclusively, to the literary criticism of the Bible, now, following Eichhorn, commonly called the Higher Criticism. Thus “Archaeology and Criticism,” the title of this article, is meant to designate the bearing of the archaeology of Bible lands upon the criticism, especially the Higher Criticism, of the Bible. The subject as thus defined calls for the discussion of, I. What archaeology can do in the case — the powers, rights and authority, that is to say, the Function of archaeology in criticism; and II. What archaeology has done in the case, the resulting effects of such archaeological evidence, that is to say, the History of the bearing of archaeology upon the criticism of the Bible.

**1. FUNCTION.**

The function of archaeology in criticism has only recently been given much attention and the opinions thereon have varied greatly.

(a) Ignored by Encyclopaedists:

Biblical encyclopaedists generally, until the most recent, have not given this subject a place at all (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, Encyclopedia

(b) Variously Estimated by Critics:

Critics have varied much in their estimate of the value of archaeology in criticism, according to their individual predilections and their critical theories, but until very recently archaeology has not generally been given a commanding, or even a prominent, place in criticism. Wellhausen seems to declare for the dominance of archaeology in criticism in the beginning of his History of Israel, though he very much ignores it in the pages that follow (History of Israel, 12). Driver (Authority and Archaeology, 143-50), thinks “testimony of archaeology sometimes determines the question decisively,” but is “often strangely misunderstood,” and the defeats of criticism at the hands of archaeology are often “purely imaginary” (LOT, 1897, 4). Orr thinks “archaeology bids fair before long to control both criticism and history” (POT, 305-435). Eerdmans, successor to Kuenen at Leyden, definitely and absolutely breaks with the Wellhausen school of criticism, chiefly on the ground that archaeology has discredited their viewpoint and the historical atmosphere with which they have surrounded the Old Testament. Wiener, the most prominent of recent Jewish critics, also believes that a proper apprehension of the nature of ancient institutions, customs, documents and codes, i.e. archaeology, and especially the archaeology of the Bible itself, is clearly decisive in its influence on the issue raised by the Wellhausen school (BS, 1908-10).

(c) Urged by Archaeologists:

Archaeologists generally for a long time have been putting forward the superior claims of their science in the critical controversy (Brugsch, Egypt
under the Pharaohs; Naville, Recueil de Travaux, IV, N.S.; Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities, chapters i-iv; Researches in Sinai, 188-223; Spiegelberg, Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten; Steindorf, Explorations in Bible Lands (Hilprecht), 623-90; Sayce, Higher Criticism and the Monuments; Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition, xi; Jeremias, Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients).

The function of archaeology in criticism, as fully brought to light by recent discussion, is as follows:

1. Historical Setting.

Archaeology furnishes the true historical setting of Scripture. In the criticism of a painting, it is of the utmost importance to hang the picture aright before criticism begins. It is not greatly different in the criticism of literature, and especially Biblical literature. The patriarchs and prophets and psalmists are the “old masters” of spirituality and of religious literature; their productions were brought forth under certain social, political, moral and religious conditions, and within certain surroundings of influences, enemies, opportunities, temptations and spiritual privileges. It is only archaeology that can hang their pictures aright, and it is only when thus hung that true criticism is ready to begin. The critic is only then a critic when he has seen how archaeology has hung the picture (BST, 1906, 366).


Archaeology gives guidance to the methods of criticism. This it does;

(a) Presuppositions:

With regard to presuppositions. Presuppositions are inevitable from our mental constitutions, and necessary to the consideration of any subject, since all subjects cannot be considered at once. But our presuppositions are naturally, to a large extent, those induced by our own experience and environment, until we are otherwise instructed. As it is only archaeology that is able to instruct us concerning the exact circumstances of certain portions of the Bible it is evident that, in those portions, without the instruction which archaeology can give, we cannot be assured of correct presuppositions in the critic.
(b) Canons:

Archaeology gives guidance concerning the canons of criticism. It is of the utmost importance that a literature should be judged only by the canons followed by its own literati. The innumerable literary remains of Egypt and Babylonia reveal methods and standards very different from each other, and still more different from those of modern western literature, but exhibiting to a marked degree the literary peculiarities of the Old Testament. In Babylonian literature, much attention is paid to epochal chronology. In Egyptian literature, comparatively little attention is given to chronology, and what chronology there is, is seldom epochal, but either synchronistic or merely historianic. In the Old Testament there is a mixture of all these kinds of chronology. Again, in Babylonian literature, there is carefulness and some degree of accuracy; in Egyptian literature, carelessness, slovenliness and inaccuracy are provokingly frequent. The Scriptures of the Old Testament are, in this respect, in striking contrast to these other literatures, yet nowhere in ancient oriental literature is there the mathematical rigidity of statement demanded in occidental literature today; on the other hand there is frequently a brevity and abruptness of literary method which, to western minds, appears to be fragmentariness of documents. The attempt to elucidate oriental literature in the Bible and out of it by applying thereto the tests and standards of western literature is not less disastrous than would be the attempt to judge western literature by these oriental peculiarities.

(c) Literary Form:

Archaeology gives guidance concerning literary form. Much of the definiteness and unity of modern literature is due to the arts of printing and book-binding. All archaeological literature of Bible lands, lacking, as it does, the influence of these arts, is, in form, indefinite, or fragmentary, or both. These peculiarities in form and the causes of the same, archaeology makes very plain by abundant illustration. It makes clear, also, that fragmentariness and indefiniteness in oriental literature, in so far as it arises from the literary form and not from partial destruction of documents, in no wise militates against integrity.

(d) Interpretation:
Archaeology gives guidance concerning interpretation. Archaeology admonishes us of the truism, too often overlooked, that a language or literature means only what it is understood to mean by those from whom it comes, so that the etymological, syntactical and speculative methods of interpretation employed in criticism, in order to be reliable, must have the support of the historical method. In the absence of this support, more especially if contemporary history as revealed by archaeology be antagonistic, interpretation, though supported by all the other methods of criticism, is very precarious. The interpretation of a rubric by the etymological and analytical methods may be partly or completely overthrown by a single picture or a brief description of the priest at the altar. For instance, it is very disquieting to compare the remarks of commentators on Bible references to the worship at high places with the facts revealed by the recent discovery of high places and the worship there conducted (Macalister, PEFS, 1903, 23-31; Robinson, BW, January, 1901; January, 1908, 219-25, 317-18; Vincent, Canaan, 144). Archaeology must guide in the interpretation of ancient literature, whether that which has just been dug up, as the recent finds of manuscripts and monuments, or that which has never been lost, as in the Bible itself.

**3. Facts to Test Theories.**

Archaeology supplies facts wherewith to test theories.

Facts and Correct Criticism Agree:

There can be no real antagonism between the facts of archaeology and a correct literary criticism of trustworthy documents. But who or what is to determine when the criticism is correct? If there is conflict between the facts of archaeology and the conclusions of criticism, which must give way? To ask the question is to answer it. Theory must always give way to facts. “Where the testimony of archaeology is direct, it is of the highest possible value, and, as a rule, determines a question decisively; even where it is indirect, if it is sufficiently circumstantial and precise, it may make a settlement highly probable” (Driver, Authority and Archaeology, 143).

This prerogative of archaeological facts in the testing of critical theories must, then, of necessity be given wide and positive recognition.
(a) Theories Need Attestation:

No theory is to be finally accepted and made applicable to faith and life until tested and attested by facts; if it be a theory in the field of Nature, by the facts of Nature; if in the field of experience, by facts of experience; if in the field of history, by facts of history. The Master brings even revelation to this test when He says, “If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself” (<sup>430717</sup> John 7:17). Anything in the Bible may be discredited by theory; as everything in heaven and earth may be — indeed, has been — discredited by theory. One might as safely abandon the beaten track for the most alluring but unconfirmed appearance of an eastern desert, as turn one’s life aside to a theory unattested by fact. However perfect the appearance, it may, after all, be only the mirage, and the disappointed pilgrim may never get back to the safe road. Let theory first be confirmed by fact; then it may be received into the life.

(b) Success not Attestation:

Even a theory which meets all the known conditions of the case in hand is not by that fact proved to be true, and therefore to be received into the life. The most alluring danger to which criticism is subject is the contrary assumption that a theory which meets all the known conditions of the case in hand is thereby proved to be true. This is not the case. Such a theory must, in addition, be corroborated by facts independently brought to light, or by mysteries unlocked; and even if mysteries be unlocked, the theory is not necessarily an entirely correct theory — the key that turns the lock must be something like the key that belongs to it, but may after all, be a false key. There must, in any case, whether of mysteries unlocked or of facts otherwise brought to light, be independent, genuine evidence in addition to the adaptability of theory to all the known conditions of the case in hand. And furthermore, a theory must not only be able to meet the test of some additional facts, but the test of all the conditions imposed by any additional facts brought to light, and be able, also, to incorporate these new facts as naturally as those upon which theory was originally constructed.

(1) Theory in Life:
The problem is not to determine one or several of the ways in which an event might have taken place, but the one way in which it did take place. A theory which meets all the conditions of the case in hand may be one of the several ways in which the event might have taken place, but only by independent, genuine, corroborative evidence is any theory to be attested as the way in which the event actually did take place. That this statement of the case is correct in the experiences of life, we have abundant evidence in the proceedings of courts of law. The most careful procedure does not wholly prevent false convictions. The prosecutor presents a theory of the commission of a crime which meets all the conditions of the case as made out by the evidence, convinces twelve jurymen, and secures a conviction. Yet sometimes afterward it is found out that another person committed the crime in an entirely different way. That the dictum under discussion is inapplicable to literature is equally well established.

Sir Peter LePage Renouf argued with great acuteness and force that it is possible to assign significations to an unknown script, give meanings to the words thus formed, construct a grammar and translate inscriptions as historical statements and make good sense, though not a single sign, or word, or construction, or thought be correct (Life-work, I, 6, 7). He says of such a method: “It is not difficult to make out the Ten Commandments, the Psalms of David, the Homeric Poems, or the Irish Melodies, on any ancient or modern monument whatever, and in any language you please.”

(2) Theory in Literature:

Actual examples in fulfillment of Renouf’s warning thesis are not wanting. The grotesque, yet confident, efforts at the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphs before the discovery of the Rosetta Stone are not forgotten. Dr. Budge says (The Mummy, 124): “In more modern times the first writer at any length on hieroglyphics was Athanasius Kircher, the author of some ponderous works in which he pretended to have found the key to the hieroglyphic inscriptions, and to translate them. Though a man of great learning, it must be plainly said that, judged by scholars of today, he would be considered an impostor.” Joseph de Guignes (1770) maintained that China was settled by Egyptians, and the Chinese characters only degenerate Egyptian hieroglyphs. Similar failures in the attempt to decipher the Hittite hieroglyphs and translate the Hittite inscriptions must
form painful recollections to distinguished scholars yet living, whose efforts, extending in some cases not only to lists of signs but to syllabaries, vocabularies, grammars and translations, are now, in part, and in some cases, in toto, rejected by the whole learned world. However successful present or future efforts of these scholars may prove to be, they have, in part at least, themselves repudiated their former work. The most plausible theory of a literature, though it seem to embrace every detail, may, after all, be found to be, as in one or two of the instances referred to above, wholly false when tested by the principles of philology and the facts of contemporary history.

(3) Theory in History:

The dangers of unconfirmed theory in life and literature are even greater in history, which, in its present-day form, is but life written down, human experiences given over to all the accidents and conventionalities of literature. The warnings here from Egyptian and classical history and literature are not to be disregarded. Menes and other early kings of Egypt were declared by critics to be mere mythological characters; likewise Minos of Crete; and the stories of Troy and her heroes were said to belong to “cloudland.” But the spades of Petrie at Abydos (Royal Tombs), of Evans at Knossos (Quarterly Review, October, 1904, 374-95), and of Schliemann at Troy (Ilios: City and Country of the Trojans), have shown the “cloudland” as solid earth, and the ghostly heroes to be substantial men of flesh and blood. If we are to learn anything from experience, certainly no theory of either sacred or profane history is to be accepted as final until tested and attested by facts.

(c) Source of the Needed Facts:

Only archaeology is bringing forth any new facts on the questions raised by criticism. Criticism produces only theories; it combines facts, but produces none. Exegetes and commentators rarely, if ever, now bring to light new facts any more than present-day philosophers give the world new thoughts. A flood of light is, indeed, pouring across the page of the exegete and the commentator in these latter days which makes their work inestimably more helpful for interpretation, but the source of that light is neither criticism nor exegesis, but archaeology. Archaeology it is which
sets alongside the Bible history the facts of contemporary life and thus illustrates Biblical literature and literary methods by contemporary literature and the methods of contemporary literati, and which makes the purity, sanctity and divinity of the things of revelation stand out in their own glorious light by setting round about them the shadows of contemporary ritual and morality and superstition.

(d) Scope of Function:

Hence, no critical theory of the Bible is to be finally accepted and made a part of our faith until tested and attested by archaeological facts. Even Wellhausen, however far he departs from this principle in the course of his criticism, seems to lay it down as fundamental in the beginning of his History of Israel, when he says: “From the place where the conflagration was first kindled the fire men keep away; I mean the domain of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas — that whole region as Vatke in his Biblical Theology has marked it out. But only here, where the conflict was kindled, can it be brought to a definite conclusion” (History of Israel, 12). G. A. Smith quotes also with approval these words from Napoleon (Campagnes d’Egypte et de Syrie dictees par Napoleon lui-meme, II):

“When camping upon the ruins of the ancient cities, someone read the Bible aloud every evening in the tent of the General-in-Chief. The verisimilitude and the truthfulness of the descriptions were striking. They are still suited to the land after all the ages and the vicissitudes.” But Dr. Smith adds, “This is not more than true, yet it does not carry us very far. All that geography can do is to show whether or not the situations are possible at the time to which they are assigned; even this is a task often beyond our resources” (HGHL, 108). Thus critics, while here and there acknowledging the proper function of archaeology in criticism, have not heretofore allowed it much scope in the exercise of that function.

2. HISTORY.

Limitations of Discussion:

The history of archaeology in criticism to be set forth here has mainly to do with the testing of critical theories by archaeological facts. The contributions of archaeology to the furnishing of the historical setting of the Biblical narratives make up a large part of this and every dictionary of
the Bible. The history of the guidance of critical methods by archaeological information is in the making. There can hardly as yet be said to be any to record.

A Wide Field:

The field opened up for the testing of critical theories by the results of archaeological research is so varied and so extended that only an outline can be given here. Extravagant claims concerning the outcome of this testing have been made both by some critics and by some of their opponents; as when Dr. Driver says, after except the points upon which the evidence of archaeology is neutral, “On all other points the facts of archaeology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the position generally adopted by the critics” (Authority and Archaeology, 145); or as when the astronomer, C. Piazzi Smyth, thought that the great pyramid proved the “wisdom of the Egyptians” to have included some of the abstruse problems of higher mathematics; and Dr. Seiss, in his Miracle in Stone, was confident that the same colossal monument of Egypt definitely portrayed some of the extreme positions of the premillennial theology.

Some of the instances of the testing of critical theories concerning the Scriptures by the facts of archaeology, for which unquestionable historical proofs can be offered, are here presented.

1. Theories Not Affecting Historicity or Integrity.

Many critical theories, notably those not affecting the historicity or the integrity of the Scriptures, i.e. accordant with the face value of Scripture, have been corroborated and others discredited.

(a) Theories corroborated:

(1) Geography and Topography:

The theory of the geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture, i.e. that the peoples, places and events of Scripture are to be found just where the Bible places them. Attempts to belittle the importance of this geographical and topographical corroboration of the trustworthiness of the Scriptures have been made (Driver, Authority and Archaeology, 148; also LOT, xi; Smith, HGHL, 108), but such attempts
are not satisfying. The theory of the correctness of the Biblical statements has been of well-nigh universal acceptance; archaeologists have fitted out expensive expeditions in accordance with it, exegesis has allowed it to enter into its conclusions, discussion has proceeded upon the assumption of its correctness, the whole body of identifications which make up Biblical geography and topography attest it, and the whole list of sacred geographies, uniform in every essential particular, are in evidence in support of this theory, even the works of those writers who have spoken disparagingly of it.

(2) Story of the Nations:

The theory of the ethnographical correctness of Scripture. That the relation between peoples as indicated in Scripture is correct, has been a working theory for all general purposes and only departed from for special ends. Kautzsch says (Die bleibende Bedeutung des Alttestaments, 17): “The so-called Table of Nations remains, according to all the results of monumental exploration, an ethnographic original document of the first rank, which nothing can replace.” The progress of archaeological research has confirmed this general working theory and every year adds new confirmation with regard to particular items which, for some special end, have been represented as against theory. That the general theory of the correctness of the tribal relationships in Scripture has been, and is being, sustained, is indisputable (Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition; Gunkel, Israel und Babylonien, chapter vi; Sayce, Patriarchal Palestine, chapter ii; Winckler, OLZ, December 15, 1906; Budge, History of Egypt, I; Orr, POT, 400-401, 529-30).

See TABLE OF NATIONS.

(3) Accuracy of Scripture:

The theory of the accuracy of Scripture in both the originals and the copies. Every theory of inspiration postulates this in greater or less degree, and the most prevalent analytical theory put forth by criticism, with its lists of words indicating, as it is asserted, authorship, demands, for its very life, a degree of accuracy and invariableness in the use of words in both the writing of originals and the transmission of them by copyists greater than that demanded by any the most exacting theory of inspiration. Wherever it
has been possible to test the statements of Scripture in its multitudinous historical notices and references, archaeology has found it correct to a remarkable degree, and that in its present form and even in minute peculiarities of statement (Brugsch, Broderick edition, Egypt under the Pharaohs, chapters v-vi; Sayce, Patriarchal Palestine; Naville, Recueil de Travaux, IV, N.S.; Petrie, Tahpanhes; Tompkins, The Age of Abraham; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel).

(4) Bible Imagery:

The theory of the correctness of the imagery of the Bible. This is another of the fundamental and universal working theories of criticism which is, however, sometimes forgotten. Whatever theory of the authorship and the origin of the various books of the Bible, there is always, with only a few special exceptions, the underlying assumption on the part of the critics of the correctness of the imagery reflecting the topography, the flora and the fauna, the seasons and the customs. Indeed, upon the trustworthiness of the imagery, as upon the exactness in the use of words, criticism depends. And this underlying assumption of criticism of every hue has been confirmed indisputably in its general features, and is being corroborated year by year in its minutest details, and even in those very special instances where it has been disputed. To this end testify the whole company of oriental residents, intelligent travelers and scientific investigators (Thomson; Van Lennap; Robinson; Stanley; Palmer, Desert of the Exodus; Trumbull, Kadesh Barnea; Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Researches; Van Dyke, Out of Doors in the Holy Land).

Besides these theories of a general character, some concerning particulars may be noticed:

(5) Garden of Eden:

The theory of the location of the Garden of Eden somewhere in the Euphrates Valley. This theory has been all but universally held and, while it is not yet definitely of substantiated, is receiving cumulative corroboration along ethnological lines. Wherever it is possible to trace back the lines of emigration of the early nations mentioned in the Bible, it is always found that the ultimate direction is toward a certain comparatively small area in western Asia.
(6) The Flood:

The geological theory concerning the flood of Noah as the last great change in land levels is being most exactly confirmed, not only by investigations into glacial history, but by examination of the records of the cataclysm left upon the mountains and valleys of central and western Asia (Wright, The Ice Age in North America; and Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, chapters vii-xi).

See DELUGE.

(7) Sodom and Gomorrah:

The geological theory of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain has been exactly confirmed by the examination of the strata; a bituminous region, a great stratum of rock-salt capped by sulphur-bearing marls and conglomerates cemented by bitumen, an explosion of pent-up gases, which collect in such geological formations, blowing the burning brimstone high in the air, and the waters of the Jordan coming down to dissolve the salt of the ruptured rock-salt stratum — all this provides for exactly what the Bible describes and for the conditions found there today; the pillar of smoke rising up to heaven, the rain of fire and brimstone falling back from the blowing-off crater, the catching of Lot’s wife in the edge of the cataclysm and her encrustation with salt (Wright, Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, 144; Blankenkorn, ZDPV, XIX, 1).

(8) Hyksos and Patriarchs:

It has long been thought that there might be some relationship between the mysterious Hyksos kings of Egypt and the Patriarchs to account for the favorable reception, even royal distinction, given the latter. This theory of relationship has been very fully established by the discoveries of Petrie at Tell el-Yehudiyeh (Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities, 1-16). He has not shown to what race the Hyksos belonged, but he has shown their tribal character, that they were, as their name indicates, “Bedouin princes,” leaders of the nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes of Upper and Lower Ruthen, i.e. Syria and Palestine, and northern and western Arabia, as were the Patriarchs, so that the latter were shown by the former the consideration of one “Bedouin prince” for another.
(b) Theories Discredited:

(1) Uncivilized Canaan:

The interesting picture which was wont to be drawn of Abraham leaving all his friends and civilization behind him to become a pioneer in a barbarous land has become dim and dimmer and at last faded out completely in the ever-increasing light of contemporary history revealed by Babylonian and Palestinian discoveries (Vincent, Canaan, chapters i-ii).

(2) Concerning Melchizedek:

Concerning Melchizedek, “without father and without mother” (Hebrews 7:3), Tell el-Amarna Letters, while not wholly affording the needed information, have put to flight a host of imaginings of old commentators, and pointed toward Melchizedek’s place in a line of kings at Jerusalem of unique title disclaiming any hereditary rights in the crown. “It was not my father and it was not my mother who established me in this position, but it was the mighty arm of the king himself who made me master of the lands and possessions of my father.” This title, over the correct translation of which there has been much controversy, occurs not once only, but seems to have been required at every formal mention of the sovereignty of the king (Budge, History of Egypt, IV, 231-35).

(3) Oriental Chronology:

The theory of the chronology of the early portions of the Old Testament, which made it to be so exactly on the principle of the system of chronology in vogue in our western world today, which, indeed, assumed that there could be no other system of chronology, and which was universally held as a working hypothesis by all classes of critics and commentators until very recently, has been greatly modified, if not utterly discredited, by both archaeological and ethnological research. Whatever may have been the system and method of chronology in use in early Biblical history, it certainly was not the same as our epochal chronology based upon exact astronomical time. The early chronologies of the Orient were usually historicianic, oftentimes synchronistic, but very seldom epochal. The first, and usually the only, intent of present-day chronology is to chronicle the flight of time; the ancient systems of the East often
introduced a moral element; events, rather than time, were chronicled, and the time in which nothing took place and the man who accomplished nothing were apt to be passed over in silence. Sometimes chronicles were arranged symmetrically, and again the visional conception of time found in all prophecy seems sometimes to have prevailed in the writing of history. Certain it is that ancient oriental thought regarded man’s relation to life as of far greater importance than his relation to time — a more deeply moral conception of chronology than our own (Green, BS, April, 1890, 285-303).

2. Theories Affecting the Integrity or Historicity of Scripture.

Many critical theories attacking the integrity or historicity of Scripture, i.e. reconstructive theories, have been utterly discredited by archaeological evidence, and, in some cases, abandoned by those who held them (compare Driver, Genesis, addenda, 7th edition, xx).

(a) Ignorance of Patriarchal Age:

The ignorance of the patriarchal age was once a frontier fortress which threatened away all literary pretensions beyond that limit. This ignorance, though never held by all advocates of a reconstructing criticism, was held by some. Von Bohlen scoffed at the idea of the “undisciplined horde” possessing knowledge of laws (Gen, 29-41; compare Reuss, Gesch des Altes Testament, 96; Dillmann, Numbers and Josh, 594). Dr. Driver says, indeed, “It is not denied that the patriarchs possessed the art of writing,” but thinks the possession of a literature by them a mere hypothesis, for the truth of which no positive ground can be alleged (Gen, xlii-xliii; also Orr, POT, 375). That this theory is absolutely abandoned by everyone hardly needs to be stated. The discovery of evidence of a postal system in Canaan in the days of Naram Sin (Sayce, Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, 143; Heuzey, Revue d’Assyriologie, 1897, 1-12), the strict conformity of many of the patriarchal customs and events to written law, as revealed by DeMorgan’s discovery of the Code of Hammurabi, Dr. Murch’s discovery of the Tell el-Amarna Letters, revealing as they do the wide diffusion of the art of writing about one hundred and thirty years before the Exodus, together with the gradual pushing back by epigraphic evidence of the date of the origin of the Hebrew script (Clay, Amurru, 30-32), and the overwhelming evidence, from recent excavations, of the general
culture and refinement of patriarchal Palestine, while not yet making known fully the exact state of the patriarchal civilization, has made any theory of the ignorance of that age impossible.

**(b) Religious Ideas in Canaan:**

The theory of the nomadic, semi-barbarous condition of Palestine and of the impossibility of high religious ideas among the patriarchs before the Exodus (Kuenen, Rel of Ideas Israel, I, 108-109), though most closely connected with the preceding, demands separate notice. This theory is essential to the current evolutionary view of Israel’s history and has been definitely espoused by nearly all holding that view (G. A. Smith, The Expositor, 1908, 254-72; compare POT, 60). This theory, though less important to other schools of critics, has in fact been held by nearly all commentators. But the discovery of the earliest wall- and cistern-work at Taanach (Sellin), and the engineering feats on the defenses and the water-works at Gezer (Macalister and Vincent, PEFS), and the 40-ft. city wall pictured in Egyptian illustration of Canaanite war (Petrie, Deshasha, plural IV), as well as the list of richest booty taken by Thothmes III (Sayce, Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, 156-57; Birch, RP, 1st ser, II, 35-52; Lepsius, Denkmaler, Abth. III, bl. 32, 32A, 30A, 30B; Auswahl, III, L. 42-45), which could scarcely be duplicated by all the museums of the world today, testify equally to the luxurious culture and refinement of the times. All this, in addition to the mass of evidence against the ignorance of the patriarchal age (see (a) above), overwhelmingly sustains the opinion of W. Max Muller that “the civilization of Palestine in the patriarchal age was fully equal to that of Egypt.”

**(c) Evolutionary History:**

The theory of the evolution of Israel’s history chiefly from a Palestinian origin and environment (Budde, Hist of Israel before the Exile, especially 77; Kuenen, Hist of Israel, 225; Wellhausen, Hist of Israel, 462). Palestine discoveries show a contrast between the unique religion of the Hebrews and the religion of the surrounding peoples of Canaan as marked as it may well be. The evidence is not at all of a purer religion growing up out of the vile culture of Palestine, but of a purer religion coming down and overwhelming it (PEFS, 1902-9; G. A. Smith, Mod. Crit. and the
Preaching of the Old Testament, chapter iv, especially 142; PEFS, 1905, 287-88).

Descending now to a few of the great mass of particulars, we may mention:

(d) Mythology and Bible:

The theory of the legendary character of the four kings of Genesis 14, and of the Hittites; and theory of the generally mythological character of the early portions of the Bible. The four kings have been called “petty sheiks of the desert,” and their names “etymological inventions.” The historical character of the account of these kings has been utterly discredited by many. Noldeke in his Untersuchungen arrives at the result that the history (Genesis 14) is throughout a “free creation,” and the person of Melchizedek a “poetical figure.” And Wellhausen thinks Noldeke gave the “death-blow” to the historicity of the story (Wellhausen, Comp. of the Hexateuch, 311-12). Ed. Meyer is of the same opinion as Noldeke, but expresses himself in a still more unfavorable manner (Gesch, 136). Hitzig, however, goes to the extreme of depreciation when he sees in the expedition of Chedorlaomer only an adumbration of the invasion by Sennacherib (2 Kings 19:13). Delitzsch gives a very comprehensive review of those critics who have regarded this narrative of the kings as legend of small or no historical basis (Gen, I, 396-99; compare Dillmann, Gen, II, 32-33). In addition, the mythological character of the early portions of the Bible generally has had ardent advocates (Stade, Gesch, 129-30; Schultz, Old Testament Theology, I, 31; Wellhausen, Gesch Israels, 317-20).

(1) Chedorlaomer and Allies:

But the four kings have appeared in archaeological discoveries. While there is still some dispute about the identification of certain of them, the confederacy has appeared in Babylonia and also the Babylonian suzerainty over Palestine in the age called for by the narrative, and, indeed, the whole historical setting into which the narrative fits with perfect naturalness (Jeremias, Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients; Hommel, Hebrew Tradition, chapter v; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, chapter vi). But myths do not receive archaeological confirmation
such as has not only been given to the narrative of the confederacy of the four kings, but which is rapidly bringing out the features of the whole early Old Testament history (Gunkel, Gen, 263; Ladd, Doct of Sac Scrip, I, 737).

(2) The Hittites:

Then grave doubts in the past have been raised concerning the Hittites. Occasionally it has been boldly said that “no such people ever existed” (compare Newman, Hebrew Monarchy, 184-85; Budge, Hist of Egypt, IV, 136). But in addition to the treaty of Rameses II with the “Kheta,” long generally believed to have been the Hittites (RP, 2nd series, IV, 25-32), and the references to the “Hatti” in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, also thought to be the same people, we now have Winckler’s great discovery of the Hittite capital at Boghaz-Koi, and the Hittite copy of the treaty with Rameses II in the cuneiform script. The Hittites are seen to be a great nation, a third with Egypt and Babylonia (OLZ, December 15, 1906).

See HITTITES.

(e) The Theory of Anachronisms.

Aside from the general application of this theory by many critics to the traditional view of Scripture and the assertion of the systematic representation of earlier events in the light of much later times (Robertson, Early Religion, 30; Frip, Comp. of Gen), many special instances of anachronisms have been alleged. Edom has been said to be mentioned too early in the narrative (Deuteronomy Wette, Int, II, 71, Parker’s note; also Gunkel, Gen, 61). But an officer of Seti Meremptah II, about the time of the Exodus, in an official report, mentions the people of Edom as desiring to pasture their flocks in Goshen. They had thus early found their way clear across the Sinai peninsula (Muller, Asien und Europa, 135; compare Papyrus Anastasia). Then Moab, long unidentified, has had doubt cast on its existence at so early a time as its first mention; but it also occurs in an inscription of Rameses II near the time of the Exodus, and the land of Moab is placed in “Ruthen,” the Egyptian name for Syria and Palestine and northern and western Arabia (Kyle, “Geographical and Ethnic Lists of Rameses II,” Recueil de Travaux, XXX).
3. Theories Now Challenged.

Several critical theories are just now challenged in the name of archaeological discovery; whether or not the challenges will ultimately be sustained remains to be determined. A few only are mentioned here, but they are of such a character as, if ultimately sustained, will have a far-reaching effect upon criticism.

(a) Semitic Origins:

The theory, long established and almost universally held, of the Babylonian origin and westward course of early Semitic culture, especially of religious traditions (Barton, Semitic Origins, chapter i; also “Tiamat,” JAOS, XVI, 1-27; Paton, Early Hist of Palestine and Syria, chapters iii-viii; Driver, Gen, 30-31; Orr, POT, 397). This theory has been mildly questioned for some time and is now boldly challenged. A complete “right-about-face” is proposed by reason of many archaeological considerations, which, it is claimed, make Amurru, Syria and Palestine, the home of the northern Semite, to be, if not the original source of Semitic culture, at least an earlier source than Babylonia, and the course of religious culture among Semites in that early age to be not westward but eastward, as apparently in Genesis 11:2 the Revised Version (British and American) (Clay, Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites).

(b) Invasion of Canaan:

The theory of the gradual invasion of Palestine instead of the conquest is now for the first time challenged by evidence other than the record in Joshua. Such Palestinian researches and the collection of such evidence have but begun within a few years, and from the very breadth of the question the process is necessarily slow. So far, however, as the excavations have gone, the evidence is of a decided change in the culture even at such towns as Gezer, without, however, the Canaanite culture coming fully under Israelite influence and succumbing to it; exactly, in fact, as is represented in the Biblical narrative (PEFS, 1903, 49, Macalister; ib, 1908, Macalister, 17; Vincent, 228).
(c) AD Date of Hermetic Writings:

The post-Christian view of the Hermetic Writings. These Egyptian documents in the Greek tongue have been thought to reflect early Christian thought in Egypt, chiefly because of a certain “unholy resemblance” to gospel language found in them. A recent critical examination of these writings has established, it is claimed, by archaeological evidence gathered from the writings themselves, that the “unholy resemblance” to gospel expressions arose not from the reflection of Christian teaching, but from the appropriation by the evangelists of current expressions of Alexandrian Greek in use in pre-Christian theological language. This view of the Hermetic Writings, if finally established, cannot but have a far-reaching effect upon New Testament study (Petrie, Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity).

4. Reconstructive Criticism Not Confirmed.

(a) The Claims of Some Critics:

Not a single critical theory still maintained, either generally or by prominent individual critics, which proposes to take Scripture at other than its face value, has been sustained by archaeology. The assertion that is otherwise, that “on all other (controverted) points, the facts of archaeology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the positions generally advocated by the critics” (Driver, Authority and Archaeology, 145; LOT (1897), Pref, xviii; Gen, addenda to 7th edition, XXXIV-XXXVI), means either that such unsustained theories are not advocated by the person making the assertion and not by him regarded as generally advocated by critics, or, more commonly, that theories in question have not been positively and definitely contradicted by archaeological evidence. But it is not enough that theories are not definitely contradicted by archaeological evidence; we have seen (compare above) that they must be definitely corroborated before being accepted and allowed to affect one’s faith. An instance of the claims of criticism concerning the harmony between its theories and the facts of archaeology, a claim whose importance merits presentation at length, is found in the Addenda to the 7th edition of Driver’s Introduction to Gen, the latest and most positive utterance of criticism on this subject. Driver says (xxxiv):
It is stated by Professor Sayce expressly, and by Dr. Orr and Professor A. T. Clay, by implication, that Noldeke’s arguments against the historical character of the narrative of Genesis 14 have been refuted by archaeology. The statement supplies such an object-lesson of the methods on which the opponents of criticism not infrequently rely, that it may be worth while to explain here the grounds upon which it rests. Here are Professor Sayce’s words (Monumental Facts, 1904, 54; cf, though without Noldeke’s name, Monuments, 161 f): “In 1869 the great Semitic scholar, Professor Noldeke, published a treatise on the Unhistorical Character of Genesis 14. He declared that ‘criticism’ had forever disproved its claim to be historical. The political situation presupposed by it was incredible and impossible; at so distant a date Babylonian armies could not have marched to Canaan, much less could Canaan have been a subject province of Babylonia. The whole story, in fact, was a fiction based upon the Assyrian conquest of Palestine in later days. The names of the princes commemorated in it were etymological inventions: eminent Semitic scholars had already explained those of Chedorlaomer and his allies from Sanskrit, and those of the Canaanite princes were derived from the events in which they were supposed to have borne a part.” And then he goes on to declare triumphantly (55) how the progress of archaeology has refuted all these statements. ....

It will probably surprise the reader to be told that, of the series of arguments thus attributed to Professor Noldeke, while the one about the names is attributed to him with partial correctness (though in so far as it is stated correctly, it has not been refuted by archaeology), the other arguments were never used by him at all .... (xxxv). The one grain of truth in Professor Sayce’s long indictment is that of the names of the five Canaanite kings, which are given, Bera and Birsha (suggesting the idea of “evil” and “wickedness”), and perhaps Shinab and Shemeber as well, are formed artificially; but this (NB) is not asserted of the name of any of the four kings from the East .... The fact is, Noldeke’s arguments on Genesis 14 have not been refuted, or even touched, by archaeology. .... Professor Sayce has simply not mentioned Noldeke’s real arguments at all. Nor are they mentioned by Dr. Orr or Professor Clay. .... Archaeology has met the arguments which Noldeke did not use; it has not met the arguments which he did use. Noldeke never questioned, as Professor Sayce declares that he
did, the general possibility at this time of an expedition being sent from the
far East into Palestine: his argument consisted in pointing out various
historical improbabilities attaching to the details of a particular expedition;
and archaeology can overthrow this argument only by producing evidence
that this expedition, with the details as stated in Genesis 14, actually took
place. And this up to the present time (June, 1909) archaeology has not
done.

(b) Noldeke’s Assertions:

Compare with these declarations of Driver, one by one, though in
somewhat different order, Noldeke’s own words. He says
(Untersuchungen, 157-60):

“The chapter begins with an imposing enumeration of kings, in whose time
the narrated event is alleged to have occurred. .... Of what use is the dating
according to kings, the time of whose reign is perfectly unknown to us? ....
so that the dating is wholly superfluous and tells us nothing.”

Bern and Birsha are said to be “quite decidedly unhistorical. .... The
alliterative pairing also of these names speaks more for their fictitious than
for their historical origin. It is striking that for the single historical city of
Zoar, no name of the king is given. .... Besides, we are bound to no time,
for the event recounted could quite as well have taken place in the year
4000 as 2000; the artificial chronology of Genesis is for us no rule. ....
Whence the narrator got the names of the hostile kings we cannot say.
They may really have been handed down to him, perhaps quite in another
connection. However that may be, the utmost we can admit is that he has
employed a few correct names intermingled with false or invented ones,
and the appearance of historicity thus produced can as little permanently
deceive us as the proper names and dates in the book of Esther. ....
Concede provisionally the correctness of the names of the kings and test
the narrative further.”

Here in a long paragraph, Noldeke follows the reductio ad absurdum
arguing that, from a historical standpoint, the provisional supposition is
incredible and impossible, and concludes (163), “Now this whole
expedition is historically improbable to the same extent that it is adapted
to the production of a striking effect; the usual sign that it is fictitious. ....
Does not the manifest improbability of the narrative lie precisely in the
details which give it the appearance of historicity?"

Concerning the story of Abram’s pursuit of the kings and the rescue of
Lot, he says (165): “If that is possible, then is nothing impossible. It may
be replied that the number of Abram’s servants was in reality much
greater; but everything depends upon it, and the number belongs again to
the very things which spread over the narrative the deceptive shimmer of
historicity.”

Of Melchizedek and the Amorite allies of Abram, he says (168): “So do
the proofs pile up, that our narrative has no historical worth. .... Even if
the rest of the chapter were historical we would still hold Melchizedek a
poetical figure.” He sums up the argument in the following words (170-
71): “In accordance with what has been said, it is very improbable that the
composer in the chief matters rested upon a real tradition of the people,
but we must accept as a fact that it is a free creation throughout.”

On the same subject, in reply to some of his critics (Zeitschrift fur W.
Theol, 1870, 218-19), he says:

“I sum up once more the general points:

(1) Of the names mentioned in Genesis 14, several are unhistorical (the
name of Sodom and Gomorrah, the three Amorites, Melchizedek; in
my view, also, Abram and Lot, and probably the four overwhelmed
cities).

(2) The expedition of the kings cannot have taken place as narrated ....
even through the very clearness of the narrative are we made to know
that we have here to do with a romantic expedition, the course of
which is determined by aim at sharper effect, and which has for itself
no historical probability.

(3) The small number of the host, in whose complete victory over the
army of the four kings the story at last comes to a climax, is contrary
to sense, while yet it designates about the utmost number which, as his
own fighting men, a private citizen could put in the field.
“Whoever now throughout all of this will hold to an historical kernel may do so; he must then admit that at some perfectly uncertain time in great antiquity a king of Elam ruled over the Jordan land and made a warlike expedition thither. But that would be the utmost concession I could make. Everything more precise, as numbers, names, etc., and also exactly that which produces the appearance of careful tradition and trustworthiness is partly false, partly quite unreliable .... more especially, beyond the conquest itself nothing whatever could be known. But to me it still seems much more probable, in view of the consistent, and for the aim of the narrator, exceedingly well ordered, but still, in reality, impossible course of the narrative, out from which there cannot be separated any single things as bare exaggeration of the tradition, that we have here a conscious fiction in which only a few historical names have been used.”

(5) The Facts of Archaeology:

Now, recalling to mind the facts of archaeology in this case (compare above) it becomes evident that they are very far from “harmonizing entirely” with the opinion advanced by Noldeke and reiterated by Driver, and the method of advocating such “harmonizing” appears very clearly. Moreover, what is true of this particular theory of Noldeke and Driver is equally true of other radical critical theories at present held. Of the current reconstructive theories of criticism — the patriarchs not individuals but personifications; the rude, nomadic, semi-barbarous condition of Palestine in the patriarchal age; the desert; Egypt; the comparative unimportance of Moses as a lawgiver; the gradual invasion of Palestine; the naturalistic origin of Israel’s religion from astral myths; and the late authorship of the Pentateuch — not one is being sustained. In fact, however much archaeological evidence there may be that is negative in character or that is not definitely against the reconstructive theories of criticism, no one can point to a single definite particular of archaeological evidence whereby any one of these theories is positively sustained and corroborated.

5. The Present State of the Discussion.

The present stage of progress of the testing of critical theories by archaeological evidence may briefly be stated. The Bible at its face value is being corroborated wherever archaeology immediately and definitely touches it. To illustrate this statement fully would be to cite every definite
piece of archaeological evidence in the Biblical field of scientific research during the last one hundred years.

But views of Scripture must finally square with the results of archaeology, i.e. with contemporaneous history, and, just as archaeological research makes that contemporaneous history to appear, critical theories at variance therewith are of necessity giving way; so that, as far as the process has been carried to the present time, archaeology is bringing criticism into harmony with the face value of Scripture, and is not definitely and unequivocally encouraging attempts at literary reconstruction of any portion of the Bible, although sometimes asked to render such service.

**LITERATURE.**

The bibliography of the discussion has appeared in the references fully given throughout this article. The bibliography on the subject of this article, “Archaeology and Criticism,” is, as indicated above, exceedingly meager, since the importance of the subject has but recently come to the front and been generally recognized. The following may be cited: Driver, in Authority and Archaeology (Hogarth), chapter i; Eerdmans, Hibbert Journal, July, 1909; also Alttestamentliche Studien; Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, chapter xi; Bennett, Contemporary Review, 1906, 518.

* M. G. Kyle

**ARCHAEOLOGY OF ASIA MINOR**

*See ASIA MINOR, ARCHAEOLOGY OF.*

**ARCHANGEL**

<ark-an’-jel>.

*See ANGEL.*

**ARCHELAUS**

<ar-ke-la’-us> ([ʼΑρχέλαος, Archelaos], Matthew 2:22): Son of Herod the Great by his wife Malthace. He succeeded on his father’s death to the government of Judea, Samaria and Idumaea, but was deposed by the Romans for misgovernment in 6 AD.
See HEROD.

ARCHERY

<ar’-cher-i>:

(1) The art of using the arcus, or bow and arrow for hunting and in battle is of great antiquity. It is mentioned in Genesis 21:20, as well as in the Iliad and the Odyssey, and depicted on Egyptian monuments and in Assyrian sculptures. The Philistines excelled in the art, which led David to order that special training in it be given to the Hebrews (2 Samuel 1:18). It was an important art throughout the world in Biblical times (see Genesis 27:3; Isaiah 22:6; 49:2; Psalm 127:4). The Benjamites among the Hebrews were noted as archers (Judges 20), and archers constituted much of the fighting strength, and played no mean part in the victories, of the world-famed Greek and Roman armies.

(2) The bow was common to civil (Genesis 21:20) and military life (Zechariah 9:10), and vies with the spear in importance and antiquity. It was usually made of tough, elastic, seasoned wood, and often mounted with bronze (see Psalm 18:34 Revised Version (British and American); compare Job 20:24). But horn, too, was used for bows by the ancients, some with double curves being evidently modeled after the horns of oxen. The bow-string was commonly ox-gut and the arrows were of reed, or light wood tipped with flint, bronze, or iron.

(3) The battle bows, such as are mentioned in Zechariah 9:10; 10:4, must have been of great size, since they required to be strung by pressing the foot on the lower end, while the upper end was bent down to receive the string into a notch; hence the expression “to tread (= string) the bow,” and “bowtreaders,” for archers (Jeremiah 50:14,29 Hebrew). The arrows, “the sons of his quiver” (Lamentations 3:13 margin, the Revised Version (British and American) “shafts”), were ordinarily, of course, carried in the quiver, which was either placed on the back or slung on the left side, secured by a belt over the right shoulder (HDB). The day of gunpowder and firearms, of course, was not yet.

George B. Eager
ARCHEVITE

<ar’-ke-vit> (Kethibh, אֲרַכֹּו [’arkawey]; Qere, אִרְכּוּ [’arkewaye’]): One of the tribes which Osnappar transplanted to swell the mixed multitudes in the cities of Samaria (Ezra 4:9). The Archevites were the inhabitants of Erech, one of the four cities originally founded by Nimrod in Babylonia. (For its modern site compare Loftus, Travels in Chaldea and Susiana, 162 ff). Marquardt (Fund, 64 ff) emends the text to read נָבָא [ן] ת [di kuthaye’], “who are Cuthaeans” (2 Kings 17:24).

ARCHI

<ar’-ki>.

See ARCHITES.

ARCHIPPUS

<ar-kip’-us> ([Αρχίππος, Archippos]): Addressed by Paul in his letter to Philem, as “our fellow-soldier”; probably a member of Philem’s family circle, holding some official position in the church (Colossians 4:17; Philem 1:2). See APPHIA. The tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples, became bishop of Laodicea and later became a martyr, seems to have little historical foundation.

ARCHITECTURE

<ar’-ki-tek-tur>:

1. GENERAL HISTORY.

The words “architect” and “architecture” do not occur in the Old Testament or the New Testament.

As the greatness of a nation and its social elevation are reflected in the course of architectural development, so is a nation’s failure to rise to firm establishment, after victory in war, reflected in the absence of such development. The latter condition was that of the Jews in Palestine; they failed so to establish themselves that their character and aims could find
true expression in architecture. The country by reason of its geographical position and its broken territorial character, which exaggerated the tribal nature of its inhabitants, did not favor political empire (see HGHL, 10). The great difficulty of the Jews was the preservation of their own integrity. There could be no victorious expeditions to foreign lands to inspire monumental evidence of achievement in arms, nor had they the inspiration of various gods or saints, to whose glory great and separate buildings might be raised. Their dwellings were, by force of circumstances, unpretentious, and their tombs were of the same character.

1. Plans, Estimates and Measuring:

Although in the smaller buildings there is very little evidence of the builder having been governed by a previously drawn plan, there seems no doubt that in larger works a plan was prepared. The Tabernacle was made according to a “pattern” (Exodus 25:9) and Solomon’s Temple was also designed and submitted for approval (1 Chronicles 28:11). Estimated cost was also considered (Luke 14:28). The equivalents to a tape line and foot rule can be identified (Ezekiel 40:3,5; 47:3; Revelation 11:1; 21:15).

The Israelites arrived in tents, and the walled cities, “great and walled up to heaven” (Deuteronomy 1:28 the King James Version) which they took and occupied were well fortified, unlovely shelters, covering areas of anything from 12 acres, as at Taanach and Megiddo, to about 23 acres as at Gezer (Canaan d’apres l’exploration recenle). The habitations within the walls were poor structures of mud bricks or rude stone; in many cases they were rock-cut caves. True, the Jews attempted, at the outset of their full possession, to build in beauty, and made efforts toward greater substantiality, using the best available help; the attempt, however, was doomed to failure. Their most important buildings were their fortifications. The engineering skill displayed in the construction of aqueducts and other water systems was forced out of them by sheer necessity, and proved the existence of a latent constructive power, which they never had sustained opportunity to apply to architecture. In striking contrast is the architecture of the Crusaders. In a comparatively short time of less than 200 years, during the half of which practice in the arts of peace was well-nigh impossible, they stamped their occupation by the erection of an
enormous number of great and beautiful buildings, the ruins of which are among the most imposing landmarks in the country.

2. Old Testament References:

The often-repeated references to building greatness in the Old Testament, indicate a pride out of all scale with actuality. They tell the story of a long desert pilgrimage during which the Jews, as dwellers in tents, were impressed with the walled cities which, with extraordinary fortitude, they stormed and occupied, and which, with pardonable enthusiasm, they consequently exaggerated, to the glory of God. Although references to buildings in the Old Testament are frequent, they are seldom sufficiently detailed to convey an idea of their character.

Cain built a city and named it Enoch (Genesis 4:17); his descendant Tubal Cain was “an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron” (Genesis 4:22 the Revised Version, margin). The description of the plan of the ark (Genesis 6:14 ff) is the first detailed architectural description in the Old Testament. Asshur, a descendant of Ham, built Nineveh and other cities (Genesis 10:11). The tower of Babel was built of “brick for stone and slime for mortar” (Genesis 11:3). In Exodus 27:9-21 plan, dimensions and construction of the Tabernacle are given.

2. TEMPLE AND PALACE OF SOLOMON.

The most complete architectural reference is the description of the Temple and Palace of Solomon (1 Kings 6; 7) and (Ezekiel 40; 41). These buildings are fully dealt with under TEMPLE, but a brief note is here necessary, as they are by far the greatest buildings of which there is mention in the Old Testament. It is clear that Solomon had ambition for architectural greatness, and, following the example of David (2 Samuel 5:11) he employed Phoenician designers and craftsmen to carry out the work.

1. Construction and Materials:

It is known that the buildings were of stone, that the chambers surrounding the Temple were three stories high, that the Temple was roofed (presumably flat) with cedar. Fergusson’s restoration shows a sloping roof, following the precedent of the sloping roof of the Tabernacle (Temples of the Jews, 26). The walls and ceilings were lined with cedar, so
that “there was no stone seen” (1 Kings 6:18) within the house. The interior was enriched with carved foliage and cherubim, and in the decorative scheme, gold was freely applied. The description of the exterior is less minutely detailed. Stones were large and, as in the buildings of Egypt, were “sawed with saws” “from foundation to coping” (1 Kings 7:9), “foundation to the top of walls” (3 Ki 7:9, the Douay Version). The inference therefore is that the masonry was smooth-faced: “no sign of any hammer” (Ant., VIII, iii, 2). Windows were “narrow” (1 Kings 6:4 the King James Version), repeatedly referred to (Ezekiel 40:16,26). In the interior of the palace, cedar beams were carried on rows of cedar columns, and there were three rows of windows, one row to each story, directly opposite each other. Doors and posts were “square in prospect” (1 Kings 7:5 the English Revised Version), i.e. square-headed. In Ezekiel 40:21 ff English Versions of the Bible arches are repeatedly mentioned but this is an error of translation.

See ARCH.

2. Style:

In the description, there is very little indication of the style of architecture. The rich nature of the pillars of brass and their “chapiters” (1 Kings 7:15 ff English Versions) point to some hankering after an ornate trabeated style. There is no indication, however, of such a style in constructive stone. No mention is made of a crowning feature of a distinctive kind, not even an eave, simply a “coping.” The use of a coping suggests that the walls were topped by parapets, “battlement” (Deuteronomy 22:8 English Versions), according to the law. Fergusson’s restoration shows both cornice and battlements (Temples of the Jews, Frontispiece).

One can only vaguely conjecture the sources of influence which guided the builders. The description clearly shows that the great columnar architecture of Egypt was not taken as a model, although certain Egyptian characteristics in detail are evident in contemporary work. Probably Phoenician intercourse with the Mediterranean, generally, showed its influence, in which case a comparatively poor result might be inferred.
3. Facts:

There remain these facts, namely, that here is described a group of buildings, of comparatively great scale; internally, at least, richly detailed and disposed in a way which shows considerable appreciation of architectural fitness, inspired by ambition for monumental greatness and dedicated, as was all that is great and spontaneous in architecture, to the glory of God. The one great flaw lay in the complete lack of a national constructive ability to respond to the call.

4. Phoenician Designers:

The Phoenicians who were employed seem to have been indifferent builders. They took 13 years to build Solomon’s house (1 Kings 7:1) and 7 1/2 years to build the Temple (1 Kings 6:38), and they, in all probability, found such a great work beyond their powers of adequate conception, more especially as the housement of a strange God was uninspiring. “Shalt thou build me an house for me to dwell in?” (2 Samuel 7:5 English Versions) was a command which they were only hired to fulfill.

3. CONCLUSIONS FROM ACTUAL REMAINS.

There are only a very few known examples from which a knowledge of Jewish architecture can be obtained. There are none now standing, and what the spade has uncovered proves little more than a mere building craft of an inferior order. Remains of the period of the monarchy have been uncovered on several sites, notably Jerusalem, Lachish, Tel es Safi (Gath?), Gezer, Taanach, Tel es Mutesellim (Megiddo), Jericho, and these give a general idea of the building craft of the period, but give no evidence of an architectural style. It may, with good reason, be argued that there was no style, but it is too much to conclude that the Jews had no architectural instinct. Ideals were not lacking: “Behold, I will set thy stones in fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy pinnacles of rubies, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy border of precious stones” (Isaiah 54:11,12). Had history been different, Solomon’s great example might have laid a foundation from which a national style would have been developed. The arts of peace, however, did
not even bud, and the bane of internal and external conflict forced building energy to concentrate itself on fortifications.

1. Defence Walls:

Indeed in the great defense walls lies the building history of the Jews. They were hurriedly built and frequently destroyed. Destruction and reparation alternated so consistently, that each successive city within was little more than a temporary housement, at all times subservient to the more important work of defense. Under such conditions nothing flourished, least of all architecture. Building art became a thing of bare temporary utility.

2. Streets:

Streets were laid out without method; narrow, tortuous alleys broken into by projections, founded at the will of each individual builder, served as main thoroughfares (Bible Sidelights, 95; Excavation of Gezer, Vol I, p. 167 ff); compare similarity of conditions with streets of Mediterranean city of Philakopi (Journal RIBA, XI, 531). See CITY. Masonry was usually of rough unhewn stones, unskillfully laid without mortar, and buildings were rarely on the square. Under these conditions the enthusiasm displayed in the description of Solomon’s work can be understood.

3. Absence of the “Grand Manner”:

In Jerusalem the Temple area was the center of architectural grandeur, and it is possible that it may have inspired building endeavor of another nature in other cities. Palestine has as yet yielded no such parallel. Free areas, where they are found to have existed, seem to have happened so, and do not always coincide in position in successive superincumbent cities. They lay claim to no particular “lay out” and, in all probability, they served as space for the dump heaps of the town refuse or for the penning-up of cattle and sheep (Isaiah 58:12, “waste places”). Compare the modern city of Esther Salt; it gives a fairly good idea of the general appearance of an ancient Jewish city. The use of wooden shafts for porticos and roofs of large covered areas appears to have been prevalent, and these were frequently set in stone sockets which served as bases. Stone columns seem to have been sparingly used; in fact, there is no evidence whatever that a
stone columnar style of architecture prevailed in the more important buildings.

4. Solomonic Detail:

At Lachish (Lachish, 23 ff) a number of voluted low-relief slabs were discovered which were originally built into the left reveals of the doorways of a building of considerable importance. These slabs were found in conjunction with a molded lintel of Egyptian character. The discovery disclosed the only authentic examples of the architectural detail of the Solomonic period, and is particularly interesting as furnishing, perhaps, the earliest prototype of the Ionic volute. At its best it is a shoddy unconstructive adaptation of exotic features, and if it is to be taken as a key to the work of the period throughout Palestine, there can be nothing great to record.

5. Temple of Onias:

When Onias fled to Egypt from the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, circa 154 BC, he gained permission from Ptolemy and Cleopatra to build a temple at Leontopolis like to that at Jerusalem (Ant., XIII, iii, 3). The temple was built in fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah and modeled after the temple of Zerubbabel, but “smaller and poorer” and “resembled a tower.” Petrie recovered this temple (Hyksos, 19 ff) on an artificial mound resembling the Temple hill at Jerusalem, raised alongside the Hyksos camp, where an influential Jewish community had established itself. It is the most complete plan of a Jewish building of monumental character yet discovered. A sort of rude Corinthian detail was used, and certain fragments point to a battlemented treatment, suggestive of Babylonian origin, and to some extent confirming the inference drawn from the description of Solomon’s Temple.

6. Comparison with Maccabean Work:

Fragments of contemporary architecture of the Maccabean dynasty throughout Palestine show a Greco-Syrian style of considerable dignity and interest, illustrating a readiness to respond to the Hellenizing influence in the arts, which at that time was characterized, in architecture, by a decadent Greek provincialism. The battlemented details, found at Hyksos,
seem to indicate the use of a style antedating the Maccabean work, preserving, to some extent, Babylonian traditions.

7. Painted Tombs at Marissa:

From the 3rd century BC up to the Christian era architecture shows a consistent Greek origin with local character in detail (see Expl. in Palestine, 18, 19) at Tel Sandahannah and Mareshah (Painted Tombs of Marissa). These Marissa tombs show most interesting decorated elevations, with painted architectural detail. The work is Phoenician (93) and the date probably 194 to 119 BC (79). Greek Ionic capitals are used, with wreath enrichments painted on the architrave over the capital, and a deep frieze of painted animals, surmounted by a representation of a “battlement” “coping” (<sup>110709</sup>L Kings 7:9) remarkably like the details found by Petrie at Hyksos. An interesting detail is the pointed head to the intercolumnar opening, a form which seems to have suggested itself universally to the primitive builder, where the handling of large lintel stones presented a difficulty. They call to mind the heads of Anglo-Saxon openings.

A liking for mural decoration existed throughout the whole Jewish period, as is seen from the small fragments of painted plaster discovered in the various excavated cities, but the decoration on the Marissa tombs is the most complete example, and resembles in many ways the mural decoration at Knossos and Phylakopi.

8. Characteristic Feature:

The tomb of Zechariah in the Kedron valley probably belongs to the same date as its neighbor, the tomb of James, which Deuteronomy Vogue, from the inscription upon it, ascribes to the time of Herod (Leviticus Temple de Jerusalem, 46). The detail of the crowning part of the entablature is an often-recurring feature in Palestine architecture, appearing as early as the Solomonic era at Lachish. It is characteristically Egyptian, and is also seen at Persepolis (Gwilt’s Encyclopedia, 22), and although neither might have been borrowed from the other, they are not many removes from the common parent. (A curious eastern tradition mentioned (BD, “Cities,” 610) ascribes the building of Persepolis to Solomon.) It was a feature commonly used by the Phoenicians (Rawlinson, Hist. of Phoenician, 142),
and was probably introduced by them from Egypt. It seems to have been in favor up to the time of Herod and was abandoned after the wholesale introduction of the classic entablature which in Hellenistic times was only partially incorporated into the prevailing style. The successive variations of the crowning feature of their design is an important factor in tracing the development of Jewish architecture.

4. HERODIAN WORK.

The Temple of Siah (described by Deuteronomy Vogue in Recovery of Jerusalem, 419 ff, and Temples of the Jews, 140 ff) is an interesting example of the work of the Herodian period and is more Greek in character than one would expect. Here, local character in carving is strongly marked, foliage and figures being freely used with a certain Assyrian manner which, in spite of loose handling, betrays its origin. In fact this chord of architectural enrichment can be traced through the work of India, Assyria, Persia and Syria on to the Byzantine period, when the great cathedral church of Sophia in Constantinople displayed it in the most perfect harmony of all time.

The great building period of Herod need not be detailed. Herod was an Edomite and his architecture partook of the more robust Roman style which dominated Jewish art at a time when the opportunity of national incorporation had passed.

5. SYNAGOGUES.

This Roman influence, however, remained in Palestine as can be seen by the important remains of synagogues in Galilee of the 3rd century AD (see Fig. 8 from Kerr Berim; Studies in Galilee, chapter vi; Memoirs of the Survey of Western Palestine, special papers, 294 ff). The many remains investigated shed light upon the plan of these post-exilic places of worship, of which there is little or no mention in the Old Testament. See SYNAGOGUE. The plans vary considerably in proportion. The example at Meiron measures 90 ft. x 44 ft. 8 inches, while that at Irbid measures 57 ft. 3 inches x 53 ft. (SWP, special papers, 299). In general arrangement the plans vary very little, consisting usually of five aisles with a triple entrance, most often facing south. The details are richly carved and “a
surprising feature common to all is the use of animal figures, especially lions, or lambs and eagles. .... In some examples human figures, usually intentionally mutilated, are found” (Studies in Galilee, 110).

6. FINAL.

It is probable that future researches may add to our knowledge of early Jewish architecture, but it is doubtful whether there is more to discover than is constituted in the crude and unskilled use of building materials, influenced by limited knowledge of exotic features, which the Jews had neither the time nor the knowledge properly to apply.

See CITY; BUILDING; FORTIFICATIONS; HOUSE; TEMPLE.
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ARCHITES

<ar’-kits> (אַרְכִּתּי, ha’arki; the King James Version Archi): A clan mentioned in connection with the marking of the southern boundary of Joseph (Joshua 16:2). The phrase (בַּבְוַל הָיִן אֲרֻכִּיתְיָים תָּאָרְוָת, gebhul ha’arki `aTaroth]) offers difficulties, and it has been suggested that the order of the last two words be changed to read “the border of Ataroth-of-the-Archites.” See ATAROTH. G. A. Smith identifies Ataroth with the present Atara on the high road from Jerusalem to Bethel, three and one-half miles South of Bethel and six East of the upper Beth-horon. Hushai, the “friend” of David, was an Arcbite (2 Samuel 16:16).
ARCHIVES

<ar’-kivs> (the more correct the Revised Version (British and American) rendition of בֵּית שַּׁפָּרָיָא יְבֵית שַּׁפָּרָיָא [beth ciphrayya’], in Ezra 6:1, “house of the archives” instead of “house of rolls” as in the King James Version): A part of the royal treasure-house (5:17), in which important state documents were kept.

ARCTURUS

<ark-tu’-rus>: The “Plough” or “Charles’s Wain” is intended.

See ASTRONOMY, II, 13.

ARD

<ard> ([’ard], meaning unknown): Either directly or more remotely a son of Benjamin. Numbers 26:38-40 mentions five sons of Benjamin, together with Ard and Naaman, the sons of Bela, Benjamin’s oldest son, counting all seven as ancestors of Benjamite families. In 1 Chronicles 8:1-3 Addar and Naaman are mentioned, with others, as sons of Bela, Addar and Ard being apparently the same name with the consonants transposed. In Genesis 46:21 ten sons of Benjamin are counted, including at least the three grandsons, Ard and Naaman and Gera.

ARDAT

<ard’-at> (the King James Version Ardath; Syriac and Ethiopic have Arphad): A certain field where Ezra communed with God (2 Esdras 9:26).

ARDITES

<ar’-dits>: Patronymic of ARD, which see.

ARDON

<ar’-don> ([’ardon], meaning unknown): One of the three sons of Caleb and Azubah, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:18).
ARELI

<re-li> (['ar’eli], apparently the gentilic form of a compound that would mean “God’s lioness,” or “God’s hearth”): One of the sons of Gad the son of Jacob (Genesis 46:16; Numbers 26:17). “Arelites” (which see) is exactly the same word.

ARELITES

<re-lits>: In Numbers 26:17.

See ARELI.

AREOPAGITE

<ar-ep’a-jit>.

See DIONYSIUS.

AREOPAGUS

<ar-ep’a-gus> (,['aret θάγος, Areios pagos]; Acts 17:19,22. Mars’ Hill, 17:22 the King James Version): A sort of spur jutting out from the western end of the Acropolis and separated from it by a very short saddle. Traces of old steps cut in the rock are still to be seen. Underneath are deep grottoes, once the home of the Eumenides (Furies). On the flat surface of the summit are signs still visible of a smoothing of the stone for seats. Directly below to the North was the old Athenian agora, or market-place. To the East, on the descent from the Acropolis, could be seen in antiquity a small semicircular platform — the orchestra — from which rose the precipitous rock of the citadel. Here the booksellers kept their stalls; here the work of Anaxagoras could be bought for a drachma; from here his physical philosophy was disseminated, then, through Euripides, the poetical associate of Socrates and the sophists, leavened the drama, and finally reached the people of Athens. Then came the Stoics and Epicureans who taught philosophy and religion as a system, not as a faith, and spent their time in searching out some new thing in creed and dogma and opinion. Five centuries earlier Socrates was brought to this very Areopagus to face the charges of his accusers. To this same spot the apostle Paul came almost five hundred years after 399 BC, when the Attic martyr was
executed, with the same earnestness, the same deep-rooted convictions, and with even greater ardor, to meet the philosophers of fashion. The Athenian guides will show you the exact place where the apostle stood, and in what direction he faced when he addressed his audience. No city has ever seen such a forest of statues as studded the market-place, the streets and the sides and summit of the Acropolis of Athens. A large part of this wealth of art was in full view of the speaker, and the apostle naturally made this extraordinary display of votive statues and offerings the starting-point of his address. He finds the Athenians extremely religious. He had found an altar to a god unknown. Then he develops theme of the great and only God, not from the Hebrew, but from the Greek, the Stoic point of view. His audiences consisted, on the one hand, of the advocates of prudence as the means, and pleasure as the end (the Epicureans); on the other, of the advocates of duty, of living in harmony with the intelligence which rules the world for good. He frankly expresses his sympathy with the nobler principles of the Stoic doctrine. But neither Stoic nor Epicurean could believe the declarations of the apostle: the latter believed death to be the end of all things, the former thought that the soul at death was absorbed again into that from which it sprang. Both understood Paul as proclaiming to them in Jesus and Anastasis (“resurrection”) some new deities. When they finally ascertained that Jesus was ordained by God to judge the world, and that Anastasis was merely the resurrection of the dead, they were disappointed. Some scoffed, others departed, doubtless with the feeling that they had already given audience too long to such a fanatic.

The Areopagus, or Hill of Ares, was the ancient seat of the court of the same name, the establishment of which leads us far back into the mythical period long before the dawn of history. This court exercised the right of capital punishment. In 594 BC the jurisdiction in criminal cases was given to the archons who had discharged the duties of their office well and honorably, consequently to the noblest, richest and most distinguished citizens of Athens. The Areopagus saw that the laws in force were observed and executed by the properly constituted authorities; it could bring officials to trial for their acts while in office, even raise objections to all resolutions of the Council and of the General Assembly, if the court perceived a danger to the state, or subversion of the constitution. The
Areopagus also protected the worship of the gods, the sanctuaries and sacred festivals, and the olive trees of Athens; and it supervised the religious sentiments of the people, the moral conduct of the citizens, as well as the education of the youth. Without waiting for a formal accusation the Areopagus could summon any citizen to court, examine, convict and punish him. Under unusual circumstances full powers could be granted by the people to this body for the conduct of various affairs of state; when the safety of the city was menaced, the court acted even without waiting for full power to be conferred upon it. The tenure of office was for life, and the number of members without restriction. The court sat at night at the end of each month and for three nights in succession. The place of meeting was a simple house, built of clay, which was still to be seen in the time of Vitruvius. The Areopagus, hallowed by the sacred traditions of the past, a dignified and august body, was independent of and uninfluenced by the wavering discordant multitude, and was not affected by the ever-changing public opinion. Conservative almost to a fault, it did the state good service by holding in check the too rash and radical younger spirits. When the democratic party came to power, after Cimon’s banishment, one of its first acts was to limit the powers of the Areopagus. By the law of Ephialtes in 460 the court lost practically all jurisdiction. The supervision of the government was transferred to the nomophulakes (law-guardians). At the end of the Peloponnesian war, however, in 403 its old rights were restored. The court remained in existence down to the time of the emperors. From Acts 17:19,22 we learn that it existed in the time of Claudius. One of its members was converted to the Christian faith (17:34). It was probably abolished by Vespasian.

As to whether Paul was “forcibly apprehended and formally tried,” see Conybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles of Paul, chapter x, and The Expositor, 5th series, II, 209 f, 261 f (Ramsay).

**LITERATURE.**

P. W. Forchhammer, Deuteronomy Areopago (Kiel, 1828); Philippi, Der A. und die Epheten (Leipzig, 1874); Lange, Die Epheten und der A. vor Solon (Leipzig, 1874).

*J. E. Harry*
AREOPOLIS

<ar-e-op’-o-lis>. The Greek name of &AR (which see).

ARES

<a’-res>, <ar’-es> ([”Αρες, Ares] = Arah ( Ezra 2:5; Nehemiah 7:10)): 756 of the sons of Ares returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:10).

ARETAS

<ar’e-tas> ([’Αρέτας, Aretas]): The name is a common one among Arabian princes and signifies “virtuous or pleasing.”

1. 2 MACC 5:8:

It is mentioned several times in Biblical literature and in Josephus. Here it refers to an Arabian king, who was a contemporary of Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 170 BC), before whom Jason the high priest was accused.

2. OBODAS:

Another Arabian prince of this name, surnamed Obodas (Ant., XIII, xv, 2; xvi, 2; XVI, ix, 4) defeated Antiochus Dionysius and reigned over Coele-Syria and Damascus. He participated with Hyrcanus in the war for the Jewish throne against his brother Aristobulus, but the allies were completely defeated at Papyron, by Aristobulus and Scaurus, the Roman general. The latter carried the war into Arabia and forced Aretas to make an ignominious peace, at the price of three hundred talents of silver. Of that event a memorial denarius still exists, with a Roman chariot in full charge on the one side and a camel on the other, by the side of which an Arab is kneeling, who holds out a branch of frankincense.

3. AENEAS:

The successor of Obodas was apparently surnamed Aeneas and this is the Arabian king who figures in the New Testament ( 2 Corinthians 11:32; compare Acts 9:24). The Aretas, here mentioned, is the father-in-law of Herod Antipas, who divorced his wife to marry Herodins, the wife of his
brother Philip (Matthew 14:3; Mark 6:17; Luke 3:19). Josephus (Ant., XVIII, v, 1,3) gives us a circumstantial narration of the events leading up to and following the conduct of Antipas. Coupled with a boundary dispute, it occasioned a bitter war between the two princes, in which Antipas was completely overwhelmed, who thereupon invoked the aid of the Romans. Tiberius ordered Vitellius, proconsul of Syria, to make war on Aretas and to deliver him dead or alive into the hands of the emperor. On the way, at Jerusalem, Vitellius received intelligence of the death of Tiberius, March 16, 37 AD, and stopped all warlike proceedings (Ant., XVIII, v, 1,3). According to 2 Corinthians 11:32, Damascus, which had formerly belonged to the Arabian princes, was again in the hands of Aretas, when Paul escaped from it, not immediately after his conversion, but on a subsequent visit, after his Arabian exile (Galatians 1:16,17). It is inconceivable that Aretas should have taken Damascus by force, in the face of the almost omnipotent power of Rome. The picture moreover, which Josephus draws of the Herodian events, points to a passive rather than an active attitude on the part of Aretas. The probability is that Cajus Caligula, the new emperor, wishing to settle the affairs of Syria, freely gave Damascus to Aretas, inasmuch as it had formerly belonged to his territory. As Tiberius died in 37 AD, and as the Arabian affair was completely settled in 39 AD, it is evident that the date of Paul’s conversion must lie somewhere between 34 and 36 AD. This date is further fixed by a Damascus coin, with the image of King Aretas and the date 101. If that date points to the Pompeian era, it equals 37 AD, making the date of Paul’s conversion 34 AD (Mionnet, Descript. des medailles antiques, V, 284-85).

Henry E. Dosker

ARGOBN<ar'-gob> (אָרִנָב, ['argobh], “story”): A locality or a person mentioned in the obscure passage 2 Kings 15:25. The context deals with Pekah’s conspiracy against Pekahiah; but it is not clear, owing to the state of the text, whether Argob and his associate Arieh (if these are the names of men) were officers of Pekahiah who were slain with him, or fellow-conspirators with Pekah. The vulg takes them as names of places; they
may then be considered glosses that have crept into the text. Rashi holds that Argob was the royal palace. Argob is more likely the name of a place than a person.

*See ARIEH.*

**H. J. Wolf**

**ARGOB**

<ar'-gob> (אֶרֶב, אָרֶב, אַרְבּ, אַרְבּ; "Argob"): A region East of the Jordan which in Deuteronomy 3:4,5 is equivalent to the kingdom of Og in Bashan, and in 3:13 is referred to as “all the region of Argob, even all Bashan.” Deuteronomy 3:14 is evidently corrupt. Havvoth-jair lay not in Bashan but in Gilead (Judges 10:4; Numbers 32:40 f; 1 Kings 4:13). It contained threescore cities. “All these were cities fortified with high walls, gates and bars; besides the unwalled towns a great many.” Deuteronomy 3:14 seems to say that it marched with Geshur and Maacah; but we cannot lay stress on this. We may take it that Argob lay in the land of Bashan; beyond this, on available data, we cannot certainly go.

The word [chebhel], translated “region,” means primarily a line or cord, then “a measuring line,” then “the portion measured,” e.g. “the part of the children of Judah” (Joshua 19:9), the “lot” or “portion” of an inheritance (Deuteronomy 32:9; Joshua 17:14, etc.). [Chebhel] precedes Argob in each of the four cases where it is named. This has led many to think that a district with very clearly marked borders is intended. No region so well meets this condition as el-Leja’, a volcanic tract lying about 20 miles South of Damascus, and 30 miles East of the Sea of Galilee. It is roughly triangular in form, with the apex to the North, and is about 25 miles long, with a base of some 20 miles. The lava which has hardened into this confused wilderness of black rock, rent and torn by countless fissures, flowed from the craters whose dark forms are seen on the East. It rises to an average height of about 20 ft. above the plain, on which it lies like an island on a sea of emerald, the edges being sharply defined. At all points it is difficult of entrance, and might be defended by a few resolute men against an army. To this fact doubtless it owes its name el-Leja’, “the
refuge.” There are many traces of considerable cities in the interior. The present writer collected there the names of no fewer than seventy-one ruined sites. See further TRACHONITIS. This identification is supported by taking [’argobh] as the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek trachon, “stony.” This is possible only if, as Gesenius assumes, the root raghabh is cognate with ragham, an extremely precarious assumption. “Clod” is the translation of the word [reghebh] in Job 21:33; 38:38; probably therefore [’argobh] should be tendered “a region of clods,” i.e. “arable land.” This practically rules out el-Leja’. We have seen above that the term [chebhel] need have no reference to the clearly marked rocky boundaries. As regards the great cities, all Bashan is studded with the ruins of such. The splendid remains that everywhere meet the traveler’s eye were thought by Porter (Giant Cities of Bashan) and others, to be the wreck of the great cities that struck the invading Israelites with wonder. It is now clear that the ruins above ground are not older than the beginning of our era. The Greek and Roman architecture is easily recognized. Probably, however, excavation will prove that in very many cases the sites have been occupied from very ancient times. Cave dwellings, chambers cut in the rock and covered with stone vaults, and what may be described as subterranean cities, have been found in different parts, the antiquity of which it is impossible to estimate. There is nothing which enables us to identify the region of Argob. The whole country of Bashan, with the exception of el-Leja’, is “arable land.” The soil is very fertile, composed of lava detritus. In almost every district might have been found the threescore cities. Guthe suggests the western part of [el-Chauran], stretching from Edrei ([Der’ah]) to Nawa. Buhl would locate it in the district of [ec-Cuweit], to the Southeast of the low range of ez-Zumleh. This however seems too far to the South. The Southwest slopes of Jebel ed-Druze seem to meet the conditions as well as any. They form quite a wellmarked district; they are very fertile, and the strong cities in the region must have been numerous.

W. Ewing
ARGUE

<ar’-gu>: Only in the Revised Version (British and American) in Job 40:2. יָחַח [yakhach], which it translates, literally means “to be right,” and in the causative form “reason with,” “answer back,” and is found in the King James Version rendered “reproach.”

ARIARATHES

<ari-a-ra’-thez>.

See ARATHES.

ARIDAI

<ar’-i-di>, <a-rid’-a-i> (אָרִידָי [’aridhay]: a son of Haman (Est 9:9)): The name may be related to the Persian Hari-dayas, “delight of Hari”; the text is very uncertain.

ARIDATHA

<ar-i-da’-tha>, <a-rid’-a-tha> (אָרִידָתָה [’aridhatha’]): A son of Haman (Est 9:8). It may be related to the Persian Hari-data, “given by Hari.” The Septuagint reads Pharadatha.

ARIEH

<a’-ri-e>: “(the) Lion.”

See ARGOB.

ARIEL

<a’-ri-el> (אָרִיֶל [’ariy’el] or אָרִיֶל [’ari’el], “lioness of God”): But the word occurs in Ezekiel 43:15,16, and is there translated in the Revised Version (British and American) “ALTAR HEARTH.”

(1) According to the Revised Version (British and American) a man of Moab whose two sons were slain by David’s warrior Benaiah the son of
Jehoiada (2 Samuel 23:20; 1 Chronicles 11:22). Here the King James Version translates “two lionlike men of Moab.”

(2) A name applied to Jerusalem (Isaiah 29:1,2,7). The many explanations of the name are interesting, but mainly conjectural.

(3) One of the members of the delegation sent by Ezra to the place Casiphia, to secure temple ministers for his expedition to Jerusalem (Ezra 8:16).

Willis J. Beecher

ARIGHT

<ar-rit’>: “In a right way,” “correctly,” “going straight to the point,” without error or deviation. “Set aright” (Job 11:13; Wiener, Pentateuchal Studies 78 8). Its use in Psalm 50:23 is without authority in the Hebrew text; hence in italics.

ARIMATHAEA

<ar-i-ma-the’-a> ([’Arîmûaθâía, Arimathaia]): “A city of the Jews,” the home of Joseph in whose sepulchre the body of Jesus was laid. Its identity is the subject of much conjecture. The Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome identifies it with Ramathaim-Zophim in the hill-country of Ephraim (1 Samuel 11), which is Ramah the birthplace and burial-place of Samuel (1 Samuel 1:19; 25:1), and places it near Timnah on the borders of Judah and Dan. G. A. Smith thinks it may be the modern Beit Rima, a village on an eminence 2 miles North of Timnah. Others incline to Ramallah, 8 miles North of Jerusalem and 3 miles from Bethel (Matthew 27:57; Mark 15:43; Luke 23:51; John 19:38).

S. F. Hunter

ARIOCH

<ar’-i-ok>: (אֶריָו, aroykh]):

(1) The name of the vassal king of Ellasar, under Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and Amraphel, king of Shinar (Babylonia), who took part in the
expedition against Sodom, Gomorrah and other states (Genesis 14:1,9). Assyriologists generally, and probably rightly, identify Arioch with Eri-Aku (which see), king of Larsa, Ellasar being for Al-Larsa (now Sinqara in central Babylonia).

**TEXTS REFERRING TO THE REIGN OF ARIOCH:**

For an account of the expedition see AMRAPHEL, and for the Babylonian texts bearing upon the reign, see ERI-AKU. In Genesis 14:1,9, where the names of the allied kings who marched against the Cities of the Plain are given, that of Arioch follows his more immediate suzerain, Amraphel, and not Chedorlaomer, who, however, appears to have been the real overlord (verse 4), which agrees with the indications of the Bah records. No details of the expedition are available from Babylonian sources. Besides Larsa, Eri-Aku’s inscriptions inform us that Ur (Muqayyar, Mugheir) was in the principality of which Larsa was the capital.

(2) The Arioch of Daniel 2:14,25 was captain of the bodyguard of King Nebuchadnezzar. Nothing else is known about him except that it was he who was commanded to slay the “wise men” who failed to repeat to the king his dream and its interpretation; and who communicated to his royal master that Daniel had undertaken the task.

*T. G. Pinches*

**ARISAI**

<ar’-i-sai>, <a-ris’-a-i> ([’aricai]): Probably a Persian word of unknown meaning. One of Haman’s sons, slain by the Jews (Est 9:9).

**ARISTARCHUS**

<ar-is-tar’-kus> ([’Aρίσταρχος, Aristarchos], “best ruler”): He was one of those faithful companions of the apostle Paul who shared with him his labors and sufferings. He is suddenly mentioned along with Gaius as having been seized by the excited Ephesians during the riot stirred up by the silversmiths (Acts 19:29). They are designated “men of Macedonia, Paul’s companions in travel.” We learn later that he was a native of Thessalonica (Acts 20:4; 27:2). They were probably seized to extract
from them information about their leader Paul, but when they could tell nothing, and since they were Greeks, nothing further was done to them.

When Aristarchus attached himself to Paul we do not know, but he seems ever after the Ephesian uproar to have remained in Paul’s company. He was one of those who accompanied Paul from Greece via Macedonia (Acts 20:4). Having preceded Paul to Troas, where they waited for him, they traveled with him to Palestine. He is next mentioned as accompanying Paul to Rome (Acts 27:2). There he attended Paul and shared his imprisonment. He is mentioned in two of the letters of the Roman captivity, in the Epistle to the church at Colossians (4:10), and in the Epistle to Philem (1:24), in both of which he sends greetings. In the former Paul calls him “my fellow-prisoner.” According to tradition he was martyred during the persecution of Nero.

S. F. Hunter

ARISTOBULUS

<ar-is-to-bu’-lus> ([Αριστόβουλος, Aristoboulos], “best counselor”):

(1) Son of the Maccabean, John Hyrcanus, who assumed the power and also the title of king after his father’s death (105 BC) and associated with him, as co-regent, his brother Antigonus (Ant., XIII, xi), though by the will of his father the government was entrusted to his mother. Three other brothers and his mother he cast into prison, where they died of starvation. He murdered Antigonus, and died conscience-stricken himself in 104 BC. See MACCABEES.

(2) Aristobulus, nephew of the former, dethroned his mother, Alexandra (69 BC), and forced his brother Hyrcanus to renounce the crown and mitre in his favor. In 64 Pompey came to Palestine and supported the cause of Hyrcanus. See HYRCANUS. Aristobulus was defeated and taken prisoner, and Hyrcanus was appointed ethnarch in 63 BC. Aristobulus and his two daughters were taken to Rome, where he graced the triumph of Pompey. The father escaped later (56 BC) and appeared in Palestine again as a claimant to the throne. Many followers flocked to his standard, but he was finally defeated, severely wounded and taken prisoner a second time and
with his son, Antigonus, again taken to Rome. Julius Caesar not only restored him to freedom (49 BC), but also gave him two legions to recover Judea, and to work in his interest against Pompey. But Quintus Metellus Scipio, who had just received Syria as a province, had Aristobulus poisoned as he was on his way to Palestine.

(3) Grandson of the preceding, and the last of the Maccabean family.

*See* ASMONEANS.

(4) The Jewish teacher of Ptol. VII (2 Macc 1:10).

(5) An inhabitant of Rome, certain of whose household are saluted by Paul (*Romans* 16:10). He was probably a grandson of Herod and brother of Herod Agrippa, a man of great wealth, and intimate with the emperor Claudius. Lightfoot (Philippians, 172) suggests that “the household of Aristobulus” were his slaves, and that upon his death they had kept together and had become the property of the emperor either by purchase or as a legacy, in which event, however, they might, still retain the name of their former master. Among these were Christians to whom Paul sends greeting.

*M. O. Evans*

**ARITHMETIC**

<"a-řith'-me-tik">.

*See* NUMBER.

**ARIUS**

<"a-ri’-us>, <"a'-ri-us"> (["Αρης, Ares]): The reading of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) adopted in the Revised Version (British and American) for the former reading Areus and Areios of Josephus. A king of Sparta (309-265 BC) who wrote the letter to Onias, the high priest, given in 1 Macc 12:7,20-23. There were two Spartan kings named Arius, and three high priests named Onias. Chronology requires the letter mentioned to have been written by Arius I to Onias I, most probably in the interval between 309 and 300 BC.
ARK, OF BULRUSHES

<ark>, <bool’-rush-iz> (דַּבָּר) [tebhah]; Egyptian tebt; Septuagint [τῆβις, thabis], “a chest,” “a vessel to float”).

1. DEFINITIONS:

The Hebrew word here translated “ark” is used in the Old Testament only of the ark of Noah (.Genesis 6:14 ff) and of the ark of bulrushes (Exodus 2:3), and always in the secondary meaning, a vessel to float. The Septuagint translates it of Noah’s ark by [κιβωτός, kibotos], “a casket,” and of the ark of bulrushes by thabis, a little basket made of osiers or flags. For the Ark of the Covenant, the Hebrew employed a different word (אָרוֹן [’aron], “a chest”). Bulrushes (גוממ [gome’], “papyrus”): This species of reed was used by the Egyptians for many different vessels, some of which were intended to float or even to be used as a skiff. Slime (chemar), “bitumen”), pitch (זֶפֶת [zepheth], “pitch”) was probably the sticky mud of the Nile with which to this day so many things in Egypt are plastered. In this case it was mixed with bitumen. Flags (כּפ [cuph], “sedge”) were reeds of every kind and tall grass growing in the shallow water at the edge of the river.

2. HISTORY:

Thus the ark of bulrushes was a vessel made of papyrus stalks and rendered fit to float by being covered with a mixture of bitumen and mud. Into this floating vessel the mother of Moses placed the boy when he was three months old, and put the vessel in the water among the sedge along the banks of the Nile at the place where the ladies from the palace were likely to come to bathe. The act was a pathetic imitation of obedience to the king’s command to throw boy babies into the river, a command which she had for three months braved and which now she so obeyed as probably to bring the cruelty of the king to the notice of the royal ladies in such way as to arouse a womanly sympathy,
A similar story is related of Sargon I of Babylonia (Records of the Past, 1st series, V, 1-4; Rogers, Hist. Babylonian and Assyrian, I, 362).

The one story in no wise discredits the other. That method of abandoning children, either willingly or by necessity, is as natural along the Nile and the Euphrates, where the river is the great artery of the land and where the floating basket had been used from time immemorial, as is the custom in our modern cities of placing abandoned infants in the streets or on door-steps where they are likely to be found, and such events probably occurred then as often as now.

M. G. Kyle

ARK OF THE COVENANT

<کونان> (תֵּברֵית יָה [’aron ha-berith]):

I. THE STATEMENTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CONCERNING THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

I. Pentateuch:

In Exodus 25:10 ff, Moses receives the command to build an ark of acacia wood. Within this ark were to be placed the tables of the law which God was about to give to Moses. Upon the top of the ark, probably not as a lid but above the lid, the קפירות [kapporeth], in the New Testament [τὸ ἱλαστήριον, to hilasterion] (Hebrews 9:5), is to be placed, which was a golden plate upon which two cherubim, with raised wings and facing each other, covered the ark. From the place between the two cherubim God promises to speak to Moses, as often as He shall give him commands in reference to the Israelites.

The portion of the Pentateuch in which this is recorded is taken from the so-called Priest Codex (P). The reports of the Elohist (E) and the Jahwist (Jahwist) on this subject are wanting; but both of these sources report concerning the important role which the ark played in the entrance of Israel into Canaan, and these documents too must have contained the information that the people had received this ark. It can further with certainty be stated concerning the Elohist, and with some probability concerning the Jahwist,
in what part of these documents these accounts were to be found. For Elohist reports in Exodus 33:6 that the Israelites, in order to demonstrate their repentance on account of the golden calf, had at God’s command laid aside their ornaments. In 33:7-10 there follows a statement concerning the erection of the sacred tent; but this is explained only by the fact that between 33:6 and 7 a report concerning the erection of the ark of the covenant must have been found, which the R of the Pentateuch (since before this he had already made use of the much more exhaustive account of the Priest Codex) was compelled to omit. But that at this place the Elohist must have reported not only concerning the erection of the sacred tent but also of the construction of the ark of the covenant, is in itself probable, and can too be concluded from this, that according to the Deuteronomist, the composition of which is also conditioned upon that of the Elohist and the Jahwist, the ark was built on this occasion. We further conclude that it was not so much the tabernacle which could serve as a consolation to the people, something that at that time they needed, but rather the ark, which was to symbolize to them that God was on the march with them. In the Jahwist we do not indeed find at this place any statement concerning this sacred structure, but we do find the statement that the Israelites, out of sorrow because of the bad news brought by Moses, discarded their ornaments. For Exodus 33:4 is taken from the Jahwist, since the Elohist contains the command to discard the ornaments later on, and hence could not have written 33:4. Now it is a justifiable surmise that the Jahwist has also reported what use was made of the ornaments that had been discarded; and as this author, just as is the case with the Elohist, must have at some place contained a report concerning the construction of the ark, he certainly must have given this just at this place. The corresponding account in the Deuteronomist is found in Deuteronomy 10:1-5. Accordingly, then, all the four Pentateuch documents reported that Moses had built the ark at Sinai. The Deuteronomist, like the Priestly Code (P), says, that it was built of acacia wood. In the Elohistic narrative the subject is mentioned again in Numbers 10:33 ff, where we read that the ark had preceded the people as they broke camp and marched from Sinai. At this place too the words are found which Moses was accustomed to speak when the ark began to move out and when it arrived at a halting-place.
2. Joshua:

According to the narrative in Joshua 3 the ark cooperated at the crossing of the Jordan in such a way that the waters of the river ceased to continue flowing as soon as the feet of the priests who were carrying the ark entered the water, and that it stood still above until these priests, after the people had crossed over, again left the bed of the river with the ark. In the account of the solemn march around Jericho, which according to Joshua 6 caused the walls of the city to fall, the carrying of the ark around the city is regarded as an essential feature in 6:4,7,11. In chapter 7 it is narrated that Joshua, after the defeat of the army before Ai, lamented and prayed before the ark. In chapter 8 this is mentioned in connection with Mount Ebal.

3. Other Historical Books:

At the time of Eli the ark stood in the sanctuary at Shiloh (1 Samuel 3:3). From this place it was taken after Israel had been defeated by the Philistines at Ebenezer, in order to assure the help of Yahweh to the people; but, instead of this, the ark fell into the hands of the Philistines (1 Samuel 4). But the various misfortunes that now afflicted the Philistines induced these to regard the possession of the ark as a calamity (1 Samuel 5) and they sent it back to Israel (1 Samuel 6). It was brought first to Bethshemesh in the tribe of Judah, near the borders of the Philistines, and soon after to Kiriath-jearim, about 7.5 miles Northwest of Jerusalem. There the ark remained for years in the house of a man by the name of Abinadab, whose son was its guardian (1 Samuel 7:1), until David brought it to Mount Zion, after he had established his camp and court there. He there placed it in a tent prepared for it (2 Samuel 6; 1 Chronicles 13; 15). In David’s time again the ark was taken along into battle (2 Samuel 11:11). When David fled from the presence of Absalom, the priests wanted to accompany him with the ark, but he sent it back (2 Samuel 15:24 f). David had also intended to build a temple, in which the ark was to find its place, since before this it had always found its resting-place in a tent. But God forbade this through Nathan, because He was willing to build a house for David, but was not willing that David should build one for Him (2 Samuel 7). Solomon then built the temple and placed the ark of the covenant in the Holy of Holies of this temple, where it was placed
under the wings of two mighty cherubim images (1 Kings 8; 2 Chronicles 5).

4. Prophetical and Poetical Books:

Jeremiah in the passage 3:16, which certainly was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, states that in the future new Jerusalem nobody will any more concern himself about the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, and no one will again build such a one. In the post-exilic Psalm 132 (verse 8), Yahweh is petitioned to occupy together with the ark, the symbol of His omnipotent presence, also the sanctuary that has been erected for Him, the poet describing himself and those who sing this psalm as participants in the home-bringing of the ark by David. No further mention is made of the ark of the covenant in the Psalter or the prophetical books.

5. The New Testament:

In the New Testament the ark of the covenant is mentioned only in Hebrews 9:4 in the description of the Solomonic temple.

2. THE FORM OF THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

According to the statements in the Priestly Code (P), the ark of the covenant was a chest made out of acacia wood, 2 1/2 cubits (about equal to 4 ft.) long, 1 1/2 cubits wide and 1 1/2 high. That it was made out of acacia wood is also stated by the Deuteronomist in Deuteronomy 10:3. According to P it was covered with gold within and without, and was ornamented with a moulding of gold running all around it. At its four feet rings were added, through which the gold-covered carrying-staves were put. These staves are also mentioned in 1 Kings 8:7,8; 2 Chronicles 5:8,9, and mention is often made of those who carried the ark (2 Samuel 6:13; 15:24). The correctness of these statements cannot be proved, but yet there is no reason to doubt them. Rather we might have reason to hesitate in clinging to the view that on the old ark there was really a golden kapporeth, but only because in olden times the possession of such valuables and their use for such a purpose would be doubtful. But on the basis of such reasons we could at most doubt whether the lid with its cherubim consisted of solid gold. That the cherubim were attached to or above the ark is not at all improbable. That Solomon placed the ark in the
Holy of Holies between two massive cherubim figures (1 Kings 6:19,23 ff; 8:6) does not prove that there were no cherubim figures on the ark itself, or even that those cherubim figures, which according to Exodus 25:19 were found on the ark, were nothing else than those of Solomon’s days in imagination transferred back to an earlier period (Vatke, Biblische Theologie, 1835, 333; Popper, Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshutte, 1862). In recent times the view has been maintained that the ark in reality was no ark at all but an empty throne. It was Reichel, in his work Vorhellenische Gotterkulte, who first expressed this view, and then Meinhold, Die Lade Jahwes, Tubingen, 1910, and Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1901, 593-617, who developed this view in the following manner. It is claimed that in the days of Moses a throne-like rock at Mount Sinai was regarded as the seat of Yahweh, and when the Israelites departed from Sinai they made for themselves a portable throne, and Yahweh was regarded as sitting visibly enthroned upon this and accompanying His people. In the main the same view was maintained by Martin Dibellius (Die Lade Jahwes, Göttingen, 1906; Hermann Gunkel, Die Lade Jahwes ein Thronsitz, reprinted from the Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft, Heidelberg, 1906). The occasion for this view was given by the fact that among the Persians and other people there were empty thrones of the gods, which were carried or hauled around in processions. The reasons for finding in the ark of the covenant such an empty throne are found chiefly in this, that the passages in the Old Testament, in which it seems that the presence of God is made conditional on the presence of the ark (compare Numbers 14:42-44), can be explained if the ark is regarded as a throne of Yahweh. However, empty thrones of the gods are found only among the Aryan people, and all of the passages of the Old Testament which refer to the ark can be easily explained without such a supposition. This view is to be rejected particularly for this reason, that in the Old Testament the ark is always described as an ark, and never as a throne or a seat; and because it is absolutely impossible to see what reason would have existed at a later period to state that it was an ark if it had originally been a throne. Dibelius and Gunkel appeal also particularly to this, that in several passages, of which 1 Samuel 4:4; 2 Samuel 6:2 are the oldest, Yahweh is declared to be enthroned on the cherubim. But this proves nothing, because He is not called “He who is enthroned on the ark,” and the cherubim and the ark
are two different things, even if there were cherubim on the lid of the ark. Compare the refutation of Meinhold and Dibelius by Budde (ZATW, 1901, 193-200, and Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1906, 489-507).

3. THE CONTENTS OF THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

According to the Priestly Code the two tables of the law constituted the contents of the ark. In Exodus 25:16; 40:20, as also Deuteronomy 10:5, and, too, in 1 Kings 8:9, we have the same testimony. The majority of the modern critics regard this as an unhistorical statement first concocted by the so-called “Deuteronomistic school.” Their reasons for this are the following:

(1) The critics deny that the existence of the Mosaic tables of the law is a historical fact;

(2) The critics declare that if these tables had really been in possession of the Israelites, they would not have been so foolish as to put them into a box which it was forbidden to open;

(3) The critics declare that the views entertained in olden times on the importance of the ark cannot be reconciled with the presence of the tables in the ark.

But we reply:

(1) that the actual existence of the two tables of the law is denied without sufficient reasons; that the ten principal formulas of the Decalogue, as these are given in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, come from Moses, must be insisted upon, and that according to Exodus 34 other ten commandments had been written on these tables is incorrect. The laws in Exodus 34:17-26 are not at all declared there to be the ten words which God intended to write upon the tables. But if Moses had prepared the tables for the commandments, then it is

(2) only probable that he caused to be made a suitable chest for their preservation and their transportation through the desert. Now it might be thought that the view that the ark was so holy that it dared not be opened had originated only after the time of Moses. However, it is just as easily possible, that that importance had already been assigned by
Moses to the tables in the ark which the sealed and carefully preserved copy of a business agreement would have and which is to be opened only in case of necessity (Jeremiah 32:11-14). Such a case of necessity never afterward materialized, because the Israelites were never in doubt as to what was written on these tables. On a verbatim reading no stress was laid in olden times.

(3) With regard to the importance of the ark according to the estimate placed upon it in the earlier period of Israel, we shall see later that the traditions in reference to the tables harmonize fully with this importance.

Of the modern critics who have rejected this tradition, some have thought that the ark was empty, and that the Israelites thought that Yahweh dwelt in it (Guthe, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 39), or that the empty chest was a kind of fetish (Schwally, Semitische Kriegsaltertumer, 1901, I, 10). As a rule they believe that a stone image of Yahweh or two stones had been placed in the ark, these being possibly meteor stones, in which it was thought that some divine power was dwelling (Stade, Geschichte Israels, I, 458); or possibly stones that in some battle or other had been hurled and through which a victory had been won (Couard, ZATW, XII, 76); or possibly they were the stones which at the alliance of the tribes that dwelt about Mount Sinai were first set up as testimonials of this covenant (Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, 216). Of these views only the one which declares that the ark contained meteor stones deserves any notice, because it could indeed be thought possible that Israel would have taken with them on their journey through the desert such stones which they could have regarded as pledges of the Divine Presence fallen from heaven and could have preserved these in a sacred ark. But it is impossible to show that this view is probable, not to speak of proving it to be correct. The only extant tradition says that the ark contained the tables of the law, and this is the only view that is in harmony with what we must think of the whole work of Moses. Finally we must again remember that it is probable that Elohist and Jahwist, who speak both of the ark and also of the tables of the law, in the portions of these documents which have not been preserved, reported also that the tables were placed in the ark.
4. THE NAMES OF THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

The name “ark of the covenant of Yahweh” was not originally found everywhere where it now stands, but in many places the words “of the covenant” were added later. However, the expression “ark of the covenant” is found in the oldest source of the Book of Sam (2 Samuel 15:24), and in Kings 3:15 in the old source for the history of Solomon, of which the Deuteronomistic author of the Book of Kings made use; in Kings 8:1, a very old account of the building of the temple; and the genuineness of the expression “ark of the covenant” in these passages is not with any good reasons to be called into question. Further the expression is found in the books of Numbers and Joshua, in a number of passages (Numbers 10:33; 14:44; Joshua 3:3,6,8; 4:9,18; 6:6,8), which in all probability belong to the document of Elohist. It appears that the Elohist designates the ark as the “ark of the covenant of God,” or more briefly; as the “ark of the covenant,” unless in a connected narrative he writes only “the ark,” while in the Jahwist the principal appellation was “ark of Yahweh, the Lord of the whole earth” (compare Lotz, Die Bundeslade, 1901, 30-36). From this we must conclude that the appellation “ark of the covenant of Yahweh” must go back to very ancient times, and we must reject the view that this term took the place of the term “ark of Yahweh” in consequence of a change of views with reference to the ark, brought about through Deuteronomy. Indeed, since the name “ark of the covenant,” as is proved by the Elohist, was nowhere mor e in use than in Ephraim, where they did not possess the ark and accordingly would have had the least occasion to introduce a new name for it, it can be accepted that the name originated in the oldest times, namely those of Moses. The other expression “ark of Yahweh” may be just as old and need not be an abbreviation of the other. It was possible to designate the ark as “ark of Yahweh” because it was a sanctuary belonging to Yahweh; and it was possible to call it also “the ark of the covenant of Yahweh,” because it was a monument and evidence of the covenant which Yahweh had made with Israel. It is for this reason not correct to translate the expression ‘aron berith Yahweh by “the ark of the law of Yahweh,” as equivalent to “the ark which served as a place for preserving the law of the covenant.” For berith does not signify “law,” even if it was possible under certain circumstances to call a covenant “law” figuratively and synecdochically the “covenant”; and when Kings 8:21
speaks of “the ark wherein is the covenant of Yahweh,” the next words, “which he made with our fathers,” show that covenant does not here mean “law,” but rather the covenant relationship which in a certain sense is embodied in the tables.

In P the ark is also called “the ark of the testimony,” and this too does not signify “ark of the law.” For not already in P but only in later documents did the word `edhuth receive the meaning of “law” (Lotz, Die Bundeslade, 40). P means by “testimony” the Ten Words, through the proclamation of which the true God has given evidence of His real essence. But where this testimony is found engraved in the handwriting of God on the tables of stone, just there also is the place where He too is to be regarded as locally present.

5. THE HISTORY OF THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

According to the tradition contained in the Pentateuch the sacred ark was built at Mount Sinai and was taken by the Israelites along with them to Canaan. This must be accepted as absolutely correct. The supposition is groundless, that it was a shrine that the Israelites had taken over from the Canaanites. This view is refuted by the high estimate in which in Eli’s time the ark was held by all Israel (1 Samuel 1 ff; 2:22); and especially by the fact that the ark was at that time regarded as the property of that God who had brought Israel out of Egypt, and accordingly had through this ark caused the Canaanites to be conquered (1 Samuel 4:8; 6:6; 2 Samuel 7:6; 1 Kings 12:28). The opinion also that the ark was an ancient palladium of the tribe of Ephraim or of the descendants of Joseph and was only at a later period recognized by all Israel (Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I, 458) is not tenable, for we hear nothing to the effect that the descendants of Joseph concerned themselves more for the ark than the other tribes did. In the time of Eli the ark stood in the sanctuary at Shiloh. When Israel had been conquered by the Philistines, the ark was taken from Shiloh in order that Yahweh should aid His people. But notwithstanding this the Philistines yet conquered and captured the ark (1 Samuel 5). But the many misfortunes that overtook them made them think that the possession of the ark was destructive to them and they sent it back (1 Samuel 6). The ark first came to Bethshemesh, in the tribe of Judah, and then to Kiriath-jearim (or Baale-judah, 2 Samuel 6:2), about 7.5 miles
Northwest of Jerusalem. There the ark remained for many years until David, after he had taken possession of Mount Zion, took it there (2 Samuel 6) and deposited it in a tent. Solomon brought it into the Holy of Holies in the temple (1 Kings 8:3-8), where in all probability it remained until the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar; for Jeremiah 3:16 proves that the Israelites felt that they were in possession of the ark up to this time.

6. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ARK.

According to many investigators the ark was originally a war sanctuary. In favor of this it can be urged that Israel took it into their camp, in order that they might receive the help of Yahweh in the battle with the Philistines (1 Samuel 4); and further that also in the time of David the ark was again taken along into battle (2 Samuel 11:11; compare Psalm 24); note also the word of Moses, which he spoke when the ark was taken up to be carried: “Rise up, O Yahweh, and let thine enemies be scattered” (Numbers 10:35). However, nothing of what we know or presuppose concerning the form and the contents of the ark points to an original military purpose of the same; and in the other statements that are found elsewhere concerning the ark, a much more general significance is assigned to it. The significance which the ark had for the Israelites in connection with their wars is only the outcome of its signification as the symbol of the presence of Yahweh, who was not at all a God of war, but when His people were compelled to fight was their helper in the struggle.

A Symbol of the Divine Presence:

That the ark was designed to be a symbol of the presence of God in the midst of His people is the common teaching of the Old Testament. According to the Elohist the ark was made to serve as a comfort to the people for this, that they were to leave the mountain where God had caused them to realize His presence (Exodus 30:6). According to the Priestly Code (P), God purposed to speak with Moses from the place between the cherubim upon the ark. According to Judges 2:1 ff, the angel of Yahweh spoke in Bethel (Bochim) in reproof and exhortation to the people, after the ark of the covenant had been brought to that place; for the comparison of Numbers 10:33 ff and Exodus 23:20 ff shows that
Judges 2:1 is to be understood as speaking of the transfer of the ark to Bethel. When Israel in the time of Eli was overpowered by the Philistines, the Israelites sent for the ark, in order that Yahweh should come into the camp of Israel, and this was also believed to be the case by the Philistines (1 Samuel 4:3 ff). After the ark had come to Bethshemesh and a pestilence had broken out there, the people did not want to keep the ark, because no one could live in the presence of Yahweh, this holy God (1 Samuel 6:20); and Jeremiah says (3:16,17) that an ark of the covenant would not be again made after the restoration of Israel, but then Jerusalem would be called the “throne of Yahweh,” i.e. it would so manifestly be the city of God that it would guarantee the presence of God at least just as much as the ark formerly did.

In olden times these things appeared more realistic to the people than they do to us; and when the ark was considered the visible representation of the presence of Yahweh, and as guaranteeing His presence, a close material connection was thought to exist between the ark and Yahweh, by virtue of which Divine powers were also thought to be present in the ark. The people at Bethshemesh were not willing to keep the ark any longer in their midst, because they could not live in its near presence. David’s dancing before the ark is regarded by him and by the narrator of the event as a dancing before the Lord (2 Samuel 6:5,14,21), and in 2 Samuel 7:5 ff God says, through Nathan, that He had wandered around in a tent since He had led the Israelites out of Egypt.

But the view advocated by some of the modern critics, that the Israelites had thought that the ark was the dwelling-place or the throne-seat of Yahweh, is nevertheless not correct. This opinion cannot be harmonized with this fact, that in the sources, dating from the same olden times, mention is made of His dwelling in many places in Canaan and outside of Canaan, so that the idea that His presence or even He Himself is confined to the ark is impossible. The statement of Moses, “Rise up, O Yahweh, and let thine enemies be scattered” (Numbers 10:35), is not the command addressed to those who carry the ark to lift it up and thereby to lift Yahweh up for the journey, but is a demand made upon Yahweh, in accordance with His promise, to go ahead of Israel as the ark does.

According to 1 Samuel 4:3 the Israelites did not say “We want to go and get Yahweh,” but “We want to go and get the ark of Yahweh, so that He
may come into our midst.” They accordingly only wanted to induce Him to come by getting the ark. This, too, the priests and the soothsayers of the Philistines say: “Do not permit the ark of the God of the Israelites to depart without sending a gift along,” but they do not speak thus of Yahweh. That Samuel, who slept near the ark, when he was addressed by Yahweh, did not at all at first think that Yahweh was addressing him, proves that at that time the view did not prevail that He was in the ark or had His seat upon it. Ancient Israel was accordingly evidently of the conviction that the ark was closely connected with Yahweh, that something of His power was inherent in the ark; consequently the feeling prevailed that when near the ark they were in a special way in the presence of and near to the Lord. But this is something altogether different from the opinion that the ark was the seat or the dwelling-place of Yahweh. Even if the old Israelites, on account of the crudeness of antique methods of thought, were not conscious of the greatness of this difference, the fact that this difference was felt is not a matter of doubt. That the ark was built to embody the presence of God among His people is just as clear from the statements of the Elohist, and probably also of the Jahwist, as it is from those of the Priestly Code (P); and if these have accordingly regarded the tables of the law as constituting the contents of the ark, then this is in perfect harmony with their views of this purpose, and we too must cling to these same views. For what would have been better adapted to make the instrument which represents the presence of God more suitable for this than the stone tables with the Ten Words, through which Yahweh had made known to His people His ethical character? For this very purpose it had to be an ark. The words on these tables were a kind of a spiritual portrait of the God of Israel, who could not be pictured in a bodily form. In this shape nobody in ancient Israel has formulated this thought, but that this thought was present is certain.

Wilhelm Lotz

ARK, OF NOAH

<ark>, <no’-a>: A structure built by Noah at the command of God to preserve from the Flood a remnant of the human race and of the animals associated with man. It was constructed of “gopher wood” (Genesis 6:14) — very likely the cypress used extensively by the Phoenicians for
ship-building. It was divided into rooms or nests, and was three stories high, pitched within and without with bitumen or “asphalt,” of which there are extensive deposits at Hit, in the Euphrates valley, a little above Babylon. It was 300 cubits long, 50 cubits broad, 30 cubits high, which according to Petrie’s estimate of a cubit as 22.5 inches would make it to be 562 1/2 ft. long, 93 2/3 ft. wide, 56 1/4 ft. deep, which are natural proportions of a ship of that size. The dimensions of the “Great Eastern,” built in 1858, were 692 ft. long, 83 ft. broad, 58 ft. deep; those of the “Celtic” built in 1901 are 700 ft. long, 75 ft. wide, 49 1/3 ft. deep. It is extremely improbable that such reasonable dimensions should have been assigned to the Ark except they were based on fact. Unrestrained tradition would have been sure to distort the proportions, as is shown by what actually occurred in other accounts of the Ark. The cuneiform tablets represent it as six stories high, with the length, width, and depth, each as 140 cubits (262 ft.), and having a mast on top of all, and a pilot to guide the impossible craft (see Deluge Tablet, ll.22, 23, 38-41). Berosus, the Greek historian, represents it to have been five stadia (3,000 ft.) long and two stadia (1,200 ft.) broad, while Origen, in order to confound Celsus (Against Celsus 4.41) gave the figures an interpretation which made the Ark 25 miles long and 3/4 of a mile wide.

It is needless to speculate upon the capacity of the Ark for holding absolutely all the species of animals found in the world, together with the food necessary for them, since we are only required to provide for such animals as were native to the area to which the remnants of the human race living at that time were limited, and which (see DELUGE) may not have been large. But calculations show that the structure described contained a space of about 3,500,000 cubic feet, and that after storing food enough to support several thousand pairs of animals, of the average size, on an ocean voyage of a year, there would remain more than 50 cubic feet of space for each pair.

No mention is made in the Bible of a pilot for the Ark, but it seems to have been left to float as a derelict upon the waters. For that purpose its form and dimensions were perfect, as was long ago demonstrated by the celebrated navigator, Sir Walter Raleigh, who notes it had “a flat bottom, and was not raised in form of a ship, with a sharpness forward, to cut the waves for the better speed” — a construction which secured the maximum
of storage capacity and made a vessel which would ride steadily upon the water. Numerous vessels after the pattern of the Ark, but of smaller dimensions, have been made in Holland and Denmark and proved admirably adapted for freightage where speed was not of the first importance. They would hold one-third more lading than other vessels, and would require no more hands to work them. The gradual rise and subsidence of the water, each continuing for six months, and their movement inland, render the survival of such a structure by no means unreasonable. According to Genesis 6:3; 1 Peter 3:20; 2 Peter 2:5, warning of the Flood was given 120 years beforehand, and during that time Noah, while preparing the Ark, became a preacher of righteousness. For evidence that there was a gradual destruction of the race previous to the Flood, see DELUGE.

George Frederick Wright

ARK OF TESTIMONY

<test’-i-mo-ni>.

See ARK OF COVENANT.

ARKITE

<ark’-it> (יָקִירָא [‘arqi]): An inhabitant of the town of Arka, situated some ten or twelve miles Northeast of Tripoils, Syria, and about four miles from the shore of the sea. The Arkites are mentioned in Genesis 10:17 and 1 Chronicles 1:15 as being the descendants of Canaan, and they were undoubtedly of Phoenician stock. The place was not of much importance, but it is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions, under the name Irkatah and taken by Tiglathpilesar III in 738 BC. Not being on the sea its trade was small and it probably belonged to Tripoli or Botrys originally. It was the birthplace of Alexander Severus, hence its Roman name, Caesarea Libani. Its site is marked by a high mound near the foothills of Lebanon.

H. Porter
ARM

<arm> (אַרְמָה, [zeroa’], אַרְמַנָה [’ezroa’], אַרְמַנָה [dera’]; [βραχίων, brachion]; אַרְמַנָה [chotsen], אַרְמַנָה [katheph]): The usual form is [zeroa’] from the root [zara’], “to spread.” The arm may be “stretched out.” [’Ezroa’] is this form with prosthetic ‘aleph (Job 31:22; Jeremiah 32:21), and [dera’] is the Aramaic form. [Chotsen] is really “bosom,” thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Isaiah 49:22); and [katheph] is “shoulder,” thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Job 31:22). Compare [χειρ, cheir], also, in Acts 11:21.

Figurative: The arm denotes influence, power, means of support or conquest. The arms of Moab (Jeremiah 48:25) and of Pharaoh (Ezekiel 30:21 ff) are broken. The arm of Eli and the arm of his father’s house are to be cut off (1 Samuel 2:31). Because the arm wielded the sword it signified “oppression” (Job 35:9). The arms are the means of support, therefore to refuse to aid the fatherless is to break their arms (Job 22:9).

Applied anthropomorphically to God, the arm denotes also His power, power to deliver, support, conquer. His “outstretched arm” delivered Israel from Egypt (Exodus 6:6; Deuteronomy 4:34, etc.). They support: “Underneath are the everlasting arms” (Deuteronomy 33:27). His arm protects (Isaiah 40:11). Yahweh is sometimes likened to a warrior and smites with His arm (Psalm 89:10; Isaiah 63:5; Jeremiah 21:5). The arm of Yahweh is holy (Psalm 98:1; Isaiah 52:10). Many other passages of Scripture might be quoted showing how the power of God to redeem, judge, protect, punish is expressed by the idea of “the arm of Yahweh.”

S. F. Hunter

ARMAGEDDON

<ar-ma-ged’-on> [ Ἀρμαγέδδων, Armageddon]: Revelation 16:16; the Revised Version (British and American) “HAR-MAGEDDON”) (which see).
ARMENIA

<ar-me’-ni-a>:

1. GEOGRAPHY.


Throughout the Bible, this is a country, not a mountain. Armenia Major was bounded on the North by the River Cyrus (Kour), Iberia, Colchis, and the Moschici Mts.; on the West by Asia Minor and the Euphrates; on the South by Mesopotamia and Assyria; on the East by the Caspian and Media. (Armenia Minor lay between the Euphrates and the Halys.) Ararat was originally the name of the central district. Most of Armenia is between 8,000 and 3,000 feet above sea-level, and slopes toward Euphrates, Cyrus, and the Gaspian. Mt. Massis (generally called Greater Ararat) is 16,969 ft. and Lesser Ararat, 12,840 ft. Both are of igneous origin, as is Aragds (A`la Goz), 13,436 ft. Sulphur springs and earthquakes still attest volcanic activity. The largest rivers are the Euphrates, Tigris and Araxes. The latter, swift and famed for violent floods, joins the Cyrus, which falls into the Caspian. The lakes Van, Urmi and Sevan are veritable inland seas. The many mountain chains, impassable torrents and large streams divide the country into districts far less accessible from one another than from foreign lands. Hence, invasions are easy and national union difficult. This has sadly affected the history of Armenia. Xenophon (Anab. iv.5) describes the people as living in houses partly underground, such as are still found. Each village was ruled by its chief according to ancient customary laws. He well describes the severity of the winters. In summer the climate in some places is like that of Italy or Spain. Much of Armenia is extremely fertile, producing large herds of horses and cattle, abundant crops of cereals, olives and fruit. It is rich in minerals, and is probably the home of the rose and the vine.
2. ANCIENT HISTORY.

1. Turanian Armenians:

The country is first mentioned in Genesis 8:4 as the land upon (some one of) the mountains of which Noah’s Ark rested. (According to Jewish tradition this was one of the Kurdish mountains.) It is next spoken of by Sargon I of Agade, circa 3800 BC, as among his conquests. In early Babylonian legends Armenia figures as an almost unknown land far to the North, full of high mountains and dense forests, containing the entrance to the Lower World (Mad Nu-ga, “Land of No Return”). On its borders stood Mt. Nisir where the gods dwelt and Cit-napistim’s “ship” stopped. This “Mountain of the World” was the present Jabal Judi, South of Lake Van. Next came Egyptian influence. Thothmes III, in his twenty-third year (circa 1458 BC), after a great victory over the Rutennu or Ludennu (Mesopotamians and Lydians), received the submission of the “chiefs of Ermenen” and others. It is remarkable that the name by which the land is still known to foreigners (Armenians call it Chaiastan) should occur so early. In his thirty-third year, Thothmes III mentions the people of Ermenen as paying tribute when he held his court at Nineveh, and says that in their land “heaven rests upon its four pillars.” In Seti I’s Hall of Columns at Karnak we see the people of Ermenen felling trees in order to open a way through their forests for that king’s armies. Rameses II in his twenty-first year, in war with Kheta-sira, king of the Hittites, probably subdued Armenia (compare Tacitus Ann. ii.60). Many places conquered by Rameses III, and mentioned in the Medinet Habu lists, were probably in Armenia. The Assyrian king Uras-Pal-acur (circa 1190-1170 BC) made a raid into Armenia, and mentions the central district (UrarTu proper, near Lake Van), the land of the Manna (Minni, Jeremiah 51:27), Nahri (“the Rivers”), Ashguza (Ashkenaz, ib), etc. Another invader was Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1110-1090 BC). Asshut-nacir-pal in 883 BC advanced to UrarTu. A little later he mentions as articles of Armenian tribute chariots,
horses, mules, silver, gold, plates of copper, oxen, sheep, wine, variegated cloths, linen garments. Again and again he carried fire and sword through the country, but it constantly revolted. Under Shalmaneser II (860-825 BC) and afterward for centuries wars continued. By uniting and forming powerful kingdoms (of which the principal was Biainash around Lake Van) the Armenians resisted. Finally in 606 BC they took part in the destruction of Nineveh, and in that of Babylon later. Shalmaneser II tells of the wickerwork coracles on Lake Van. The Balawat bronzes depict Armenians dressed like the Hittites (to whom they were sometimes subject) in tunics and snow-shoes with turned-up and pointed ends, wearing helmets, swords, spears and small round shields. Sayce compares their faces in form to the Negro type. Possibly they were Mongolians.

The founder of the kingdom of Biainash was Sardurish I, about 840 BC, who built as his capital Tushpash, now Van. He ruled most of Armenia, defending it against the Assyrians, and apparently, inflicting a check on Shalmaneser II in 833 BC. He introduced the cuneiform characters, and his inscriptions are in Assyrian. His son Ishpuinish adapted the Assyrian syllabary to his own tongue, which bears a slight resemblance to Georgian in some points. The next king, Menuash, has left inscriptions almost all over Armenia, telling of his victories over the Hittites, etc. The kingdom of Biainash reached its acme under the great monarch Argishtish I, who succeeded in defending his country against Shalmaneser III (783-772 BC). But in his son’s reign Tiglath-pileser IV (748-727 BC: Pul) crushed the Armenians to the dust in a great battle near Commagene in 743. Pul failed to capture Van in 737, but he ravaged the country far and wide. Rusash I, at the head of an Armenian confederacy, began a great struggle in 716 with Sargon (722-705), who in 714 captured Van with Rusash’s family. After 5 months’ wandering Rusash committed suicide. His brother Argishtish II to some degree recovered independence. His successor Erimenash gave an asylum to Adrammelech and Sharezer (Assur-sar-ucur) in 680 (2 Kings 19:37; Isaiah 37:38) after the murder of their father Sennacherib. Invading Assyria in the same year, they were defeated by Esar-haddon I. Armenia from the Cyrus River to the South of Lake Van was ravaged by the Kimmerians (679-677). Rusash II (circa 660-645) and his son Sandurish III (the latter circa 640 or soon after) submitted to Assurbanipal (668-626). Nebuchadnezzar (604-561) boasts of reaching Van in his
conquests, though the Armenians had probably their share in the
destruction of Nineveh in 606. Jeremiah (51:27) mentioned the kingdoms
of Ararat, Minni and Ashkenaz about 595, and said they would help in the
overthrow of Babylon (in 538). Cyrus had therefore probably subdued or
won them over after capturing Ekbatana (549). After this the Turanians
gradually gave place in Armenia to the Aryan Armenians of later times.

Their Religion.
The supreme god of the Turanian Armenians was Chaldish, who was
father of all the rest. They were styled “children of mighty Chaldish.” He,
with Teishbash, god of the atmosphere, and Ardinish, the Sun-god, formed
“the company of the mighty gods.” Auish, god of water; Ayash, god of the
earth; Shelardish, the Moon-god; Sardish, the Year-god; and 42 other gods
are mentioned. Sari was a goddess, probably corresponding to Ishtar.
Adoration was offered to the spirits of the dead also. Somewhat strangely,
some of the divine names we have mentioned remind one of certain Aryan
(Greek and Old Pers) words, however this may be accounted for.
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2. Aryan Armenians: History to 114 AD:
The ancestors of the present Armenians (who call themselves Chaik’h, i.e.
Pati-s, “Lords”) may have settled in the country in the 8th century BC,
when Sargon mentions a king of part of Armenia who bore the Aryan name
Bagadatti (= Theodore). They came from Phrygia (Herod. vii.73), used the
Phrygian dress and armor (Dion. of Halicarnassus; Eudoxius; Herod.) and
spoke the same language (Herod. i.171). In the Bible they are called the
“House of Togarmah” (Genesis 10:3; 1 Chronicles 1:6; Ezekiel
27:14; 38:6) and “Ashkenaz” (Genesis 10:3; 1 Chronicles 1:6;
Jeremiah 51:27; the Assyrian Ashguza), as by their own writers of later
times. Xenophon in the Cyropedia mentions a Median conquest of
Armenia, Strabo their Median attire; yet Armenian girls could not understand Xenophon’s Persian interpreter (Anab. iv.5). Three of the four Armenians mentioned by Darius have Aryan names. The Armenians joined the Median noble Fravartish in his revolt against Darius I (519 BC). Much of the consequent fighting took place in Armenia, which was with difficulty subdued (517). It formed part of Darius’ thirteenth Nome, and afterward two satrapies (apparently Armenia Major and Minor). The government (of Armenia Major) was made hereditary in the family of Vidarna (Hydarnes) for helping to put down Fravartish. Xenophon’s interesting description of the country and people and the severity of its winters is well known. Herodotus tells of Armenians in skin and wicker-work coracles bringing wine, etc., to Babylon. Xenophon says they and the Chaldeans traded with India. Strabo mentions their caravan trade across central Asia. The satrap of Armenia had to present 20,000 young horses annually to the king of Persia at the great annual festival of Mithra. A large body of Armenian soldiers served in Xerxes’ invasion of Greece. At the battle of Arbela (331 BC), 40,000 of their infantry and 7,000 cavalry took part. Armenia then became a portion of Alexander’s empire, and later of that of Seleucus (301 BC), under a native satrap, Artavasdes. Armenia revolted after Antiochus’ defeat at Magnesia (190 BC), and the Romans encouraged the two satraps to declare themselves kings. Artaxias, king of Armenia Major, used Hannibal’s aid in fortifying his capital Artaxata (189 BC). Artaxias was overthrown by Antiochus Epiphanes in 165, but was restored on swearing allegiance. Civil confusion ensued. The nobles called in the Parthians under Mithridates I (150 BC), who became master of the whole Persian empire. He made his brother Valarsaces king of Armenia. Thus the Arsacide dynasty was established in that country and lasted till the fall of the Parthian empire (226 AD), the Armenian kings very generally recognizing the Parthian monarchs as their suzerains. The greatest Armenian king was Tigranes I. (96-55 BC), a warrior who raised Armenia for a time to the foremost position in Asia. He humbled the Parthians, joined Mithridates VI in war with Rome, ruled Syria for over 14 years, built near Mardin as his capital Tigranocerta, and assumed the Assyrio-Persian title of “King of Kings.” Lucullus defeated Tigranes and destroyed Tigranocerta in 69 BC. Tigranes surrendered to Pompey near Artaxata (66 BC), paid 6,000 talents, and retained only Armenia. Under him Greek art and literature flourished in the country. Armenia as a
subjectally of Rome became a “buffer state” between the Roman and Parthian empires. Tigranes’ son and successor Artevasdes joined in the Parthian invasion of Syria after Crassus’ overthrow at Sinnaca 53 BC. He treacherously caused great loss to Antony’s army in 36 BC. Antony carried him in chains to Egypt, where Cleopatra put him to death in 32 BC. After this, Armenia long remained subject to the Romans whenever not strong enough to join the Parthians, suffering much from intrigues and the jealousy of both powers. There is no proof of the later Armenian story that Armenia was subject to Abgarus, king of Edessa, in our Lord’s time, and that the gospel was preached there by Thaddaeus, though the latter point is possible. In 66 AD, Tiridates, elder brother of the Parthian king Vologeses, having defeated the Romans under Paetus and established himself on the throne of Armenia, went by land to Rome and received investiture from Nero. Peace between Rome and Parthia ensued, and Armenia remained closely united to Parthia till Trajan’s expedition in 114 AD.
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*W. St. Clair Tisdall*

**ARMENIAN; ARYAN; RELIGION**

<ar-me’-ni-an>, <ar’-i-an>. This greatly resembled that of Persia, though Zoroastrianism and its dualistic system were not professed. We are thus enabled to judge how far the religion of the Avesta is due to Zoroaster’s reformation. Aramazd (Ahura Mazda), creator of heaven and earth, was father of all the chief deities. His spouse was probably Spandaramet (Spenta Armaiti), goddess of the earth, who was later held to preside over the underworld (compare Persephone; Hellenistic). Among her assistants as genii of fertility were Horot and Morot (HaurvataT and AmeretaT), tutelary deities of Mt. Massis (now styled Ararat). Aramazd’s worship seems to have fallen very much into the background in favor of that of inferior deities, among the chief of whom was his daughter Anahit (Anahita), who had temples in many places. Her statues were often of the precious metals, and among her many names were “Golden Mother” and
“Goddess of the Golden Image.” Hence to the present day the word “Golden” enters into many Armenian names. White heifers and green boughs were offered her as goddess of fruitfulness, nor was religious prostitution in her honor uncommon. Next in popularity came her sister Astghik (“the little star”), i.e. the planet Venus, goddess of beauty, wife of the deified hero Vahagn (Verethraghna). He sprang from heaven, earth, and sea, and overthrew dragons and other evil beings. Another of Anahit’s sisters was Nane (compare Assyrian Nana, Nannaea), afterward identified with Athene. Her brother Mihr (Mithra) had the sun as his symbol in the sky and the sacred fire on earth, both being objects of worship. In his temples a sacred fire was rekindled once a year. Aramazd’s messenger and scribe was Tiur or Tir, who entered men’s deeds in the “Book of Life.” He led men after death to Aramazd for judgment. Before birth he wrote men’s fates on their foreheads. The place of punishment was Dzhokhk’h (= Persian Duzakh). To the sun and moon sacrifices were offered on the mountain-tops. Rivers and sacred springs and other natural objects were also adored. Prayer was offered facing eastward. Omens were taken from the rustling of the leaves of the sacred Sonean forest. Armavir was the religious capital.

Among inferior spiritual existences were the Arlezk’h, who licked the wounds of those slain in battle and restored them to life. The Parikk’h were evidently the Pairakas (Peris) of Persia. The Armenian mythology told of huge dragons which sometimes appeared as men, sometimes as worms, or basilisks, elves, sea-bulls, dragon-lions, etc. As in Persia, the demons made darts out of the parings of a man’s nails to injure him with. Therefore these parings, together with teeth and trimmings of hair, must be hidden in some sacred place.
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W. St. Clair Tisdall
1. ANCIENT ARMENIAN.

Armenia was in large measure Christianized by Gregory Lousavorich (“the Illuminator”: consecrated 302 AD; died 332), but, as Armenian had not been reduced to writing, the Scriptures used to be read in some places in Greek, in others in Syriac, and translated orally to the people. A knowledge of these tongues and the training of teachers were kept up by the schools which Gregory and King Tiridates had established at the capital Vagharshapat and elsewhere. As far as there was any Christianity in Armenia before Gregory’s time, it had been almost exclusively under Syrian influence, from Edessa and Samosata. Gregory introduced Greek influence and culture, though maintaining bonds of union with Syria also. When King Sapor of Persia became master of Armenia (378 AD), he not only persecuted the Christians most cruelly, but also, for political reasons, endeavored to prevent Armenia from all contact with the Byzantine world. Hence his viceroy, the renegade Armenian Merouzhan, closed the schools, proscribed Greek learning, and burnt all Greek books, especially the Scriptures. Syriac books were spared, just as in Persia itself; but in many cases the clergy were unable to interpret them to their people. Persecution had not crushed out Christianity, but there was danger lest it should perish through want of the Word of God. Hence several attempts were made to translate the Bible into Armenian. It is said that Chrysostom, during his exile at Cucusus (404–407 AD), invented an Armenian alphabet and translated the Psalter, but this is doubtful. But when Arcadius ceded almost all Armenia to Sapor about 396 AD, something had to be done. Hence in 397 the celebrated Mesrob Mashtots and Isaac (Sachak) the Catholicos resolved to translate the Bible. Mesrob had been a court secretary, and as such was well acquainted with Pahlavi, Syriac and Greek, in which three languages the royal edicts were then published. Isaac had been born at Constantinople and educated there and at Caesarea. Hence he too was a good Greek scholar, besides being versed in Syriac and Pahlavi, which latter was then the court language in Armenia. But none of these
three alphabets was suited to express the sounds of the Armenian tongue, and hence, an alphabet had to be devised for it.

2. The Translators:

A council of the nobility, bishops and leading clergy was held at Vagharshapat in 402, King Vramshapouch being present, and this council requested Isaac to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular. By 406, Mesrob had succeeded in inventing an alphabet — practically the one still in use — principally by modifying the Greek and the Pahlavi characters, though some think the Palmyrene alphabet had influence. He and two of his pupils at Samosata began by translating the Book of Proverbs, and then the New Testament, from the Greek Meanwhile, being unable to find a single Greek manuscript in the country, Isaac translated the church lessons from the Peshitta Syriac, and published this version in 411. He sent two of his pupils to Constantinople for copies of the Greek Bible. These men were present at the Council of Ephesus, 431 AD. Probably Theodoret (Deuteronomy Cura Graec. Affect., I, 5) learned from them what he says about the existence of the Bible in Armenian. Isaac’s messengers brought him copies of the Greek Bible from the Imperial Library at Constantinople — doubtless some of those prepared by Eusebius at Constantine’s command. Mesrob Mashtots and Isaac, with their assistants, finished and published the Armenian (ancient) version of the whole Bible in 436. Lamentations Croze is justified in styling it Queen of versions Unfortunately the Old Testament was rendered (as we have said) from the Septuagint, not from the Hebrew. But the Apocrypha was not translated, only “the 22 Books” of the Old Testament, as Moses of Khorene informs us. This was due to the influence of the Peshitta Old Testament.

Apocrypha Omitted.

Not till the 8th century was the Apocrypha rendered into Armenian: it was not read in Armenian churches until the 12th. Theodotion’s version of Daniel was translated, instead of the very inaccurate Septuagint. The Alexandrine text was generally followed but not always.
3. Revision:

In the 6th century the Armenian version is said to have been revised so as to agree with the Peshitta. Hence, probably in Matthew 28:18 the King James Version, the passage, “As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you,” is inserted as in the Peshitta, though it occurs also in its proper place (John 20:21). It reads “Jesus Barabbas” in Matthew 27:16,17 — a reading which Origen found “in very ancient manuscripts.” It contains Luke 22:43,44. As is well known, in the Etschmiadzin manuscript of 986 AD, over Mark 16:9-20, are inserted the words, “of Ariston the presbyter”; but Nestle (Text. Criticism of the Greek New Testament, Plate IX, etc.) and others omit to notice that these words are by a different and a later hand, and are merely an unauthorized remark of no great value.

4. Results of Circulation:

Mesrob’s version was soon widely circulated and became the one great national book. Lazarus Pharpetsi, a contemporary Armenian historian, says he is justified in describing the spiritual results by quoting Isaiah and saying that the whole land of Armenia was thereby “filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.” But for it, both church and nation would have perished in the terrible persecutions which have now lasted, with intervals, for more than a millennium and a half.

5. Printed Editions:

This version was first printed somewhat late: the Psalter at Rome in 1565, the Bible by Bishop Oskan of Erivan at Amsterdam in 1666, from a very defective MS; other editions at Constantinople in 1705, Venice in 1733. Dr. Zohrab’s edition of the New Testament in 1789 was far better. A critical edition was printed at Venice in 1805, another at Serampore in 1817. The Old Testament (with the readings of the Hebrew text at the foot of the page) appeared at Constantinople in 1892 ff.

2. MODERN ARMENIAN VERSIONS.

There are two great literary dialects of modern Armenian, in which it was necessary to publish the Bible, since the ancient Armenian (called Grapar, or “written”) is no longer generally understood. The American missionaries have taken the lead in translating Holy Scripture into both.
1. Ararat-Armenian:

The first version of the New Testament into Ararat Armenian, by Dittrich, was published by the British and Foreign Bible Society at Moscow in 1835; the Psalter in 1844; the rest of the Old Testament much later. There is an excellent edition, published at Constantinople in 1896.

2. Constantinopolitan-Armenian:

A version of the New Testament into Constantinopolitan Armenian, by Dr. Zohrab, was published at Paris in 1825 by the British and Foreign Bible Society. This version was made from the Ancient Armenian. A revised edition, by Adger, appeared at Smyrna in 1842. In 1846 the American missionaries there published a version of the Old Testament. The American Bible Society have since published revised editions of this version.

3. ARMENIAN LANGUAGE.

The Armenian language is now recognized by philologists to be, not a dialect or subdivision of ancient Persian or Iranian, but a distinct branch of the Aryan or Indo-European family, standing almost midway between the Iranian and the European groups. In some respects, especially in weakening and ultimately dropping “t” and “d” between vowels, it resembles the Keltic tongues (compare Gaelic A (th)air, Arm. Chair = Pater, Father). As early as the 5th century it had lost gender in nouns, though retaining inflections (compare Brugmann, Elements of Comp. Greek of Indo-German Languages).
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W. St. Clair Tisdall
**ARMHOLE**

<arm'-hol>: The Hebrew word לֹּאמִיק [’atstsil], is used in Jeremiah 38:12 in the sense of armpits. When the prophet was pulled up out of the pit by ropes, the armpits were protected with rags and old garments. The meaning in Ezekiel 13:18 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “elbows,” the Revised Version, margin “joints of the hands”) is far from clear. The phrase is used, without doubt, of some ornament or article of dress worn by the false prophetesses and priestesses of Ashtaroth in order to allure the unwary and tempt the simple. The “pillows” were probably “amulets” supposed to have magical virtues, and worn on the arms or wrists.

W. W. Davies

**ARMLET**

<arm'-let>: The word translated “bracelet” in 2 Samuel 1:10 the King James Version, probably denotes an “armlet,” or “arm-band,” worn on the upper arm. But it is the same word which with a different context is rendered “ankle-chains” (in Numbers 31:50 the Revised Version (British and American)). The “bracelet” of Sirach 21:21 the King James Version, worn upon the right arm, was an “armlet,” as is seen from the list given of Judith’s ornaments: who “decked herself bravely with her armlets (the Revised Version (British and American) `chains’) and her bracelets, and her rings, and her ear-rings, and all her ornaments” (Judith 10:4). The nature of the ornaments given in the Revised Version (British and American) as “armlets,” Exodus 35:22; Numbers 31:50, and in the King James Version as “tablets,” is uncertain. For full and distinguishing, descriptions of “arm-lets,” “anklets,” “bracelets,” etc., found in ancient graves, see PEFS, 1905, 318 ff.

See also ORNAMENTS.

George B. Eager
ARMONI

<ar-mo’-ni> (אַרְמוֹנִי, ’armoni), “belonging to the palace”): One of the two sons of Saul by Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah (2 Samuel 21:8). David delivered them over to the blood vengeance of the Gibeonites.

ARMOR; ARMS

<ar’-mer>, <arms>.

1. ARMOR IN GENERAL — OLD TESTAMENT.

(מָדִים, maddim; לְשֵׁנֵק, nesheq; קֶלִים, kelim; τὰ ὀπλὰ, ta hopla): Under this head it may be convenient to notice the weapons of attack and defense in use among the Hebrews, mentioned in Scripture. There are no such descriptions given by the sacred writers as are to be found in Homer, who sets forth in detail the various pieces of armor worn by an Achilles or a Patroclus, and the order of putting them on. There is an account of the armor offensive and defensive of the Philistine Goliath (1 Samuel 17:5-7); and from a much later time we read of shields and spears and helmets and habergeons, or coats of mail, and bows and slings with which Uzziah provided his soldiers (2 Chronicles 26:14). In Jeremiah’s ode of triumph over the defeat of Pharaoh-neco, there is mention of the arms of the Egyptians: “Prepare ye the buckler and shield, and draw near to battle. Harness the horses, and get up, ye horsemen, and stand forth with your helmets; furbish the spears, put on the coats of mail” (Jeremiah 46:3,4). Of the arms of Assyrian, Chaldean, Egyptian and Hittite soldiery there have come down to us sculptured representations from their ancient monuments, which throw light upon the battlepieces of the Hebrew historians and prophets.

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT; POLYBIUS.

In the New Testament, Paul describes the panoply of the Christian soldier, naming the essential pieces of the Roman soldier’s armor — the girdle, the breastplate, the footgear, the shield, the helmet, the sword — although it is
to be noticed that his most characteristic weapon, the pilum or spear, is omitted (Ephesians 6:10-17). In a similar context the same apostle speaks of “the armor” of light (Romans 13:12), “of righteousness on the right hand and on the left” (2 Corinthians 6:7). Of the equipment of the Roman soldier in detail, the most useful illustration is the account given by Polybius (vi.23): “The Roman panoply consists in the first place of a shield (thureos). .... Along with the shield is a sword (machaira). .... Next come two javelins (hussoi) and a helmet (perikephalaia), and a greave (knemis). ..... Now the majority, when they have further put on a bronze plate, measuring a span every way, which they wear on their breasts and call a heart-guard (kardiophulax), are completely armed, but those citizens who are assessed at more than 10,000 drachmae wear instead, together with the other arms, cuirasses made of chain mail (halusiditous thorakas).”

3. OFFENSIVE WEAPONS.

1. Rod:
The commonest weapon in the hands of the shepherd youth of Palestine today is the rod ([shebheT]; [ρῶβδός, rhabdos]), a stick loaded at one end, which he carries in his hand, or wears attached to his wrist by a loop of string, ready for use. It is of considerable weight and is a formidable weapon whether used in self-defense or in attacking a foe. With such a weapon David may well have overcome the lion and the bear that invaded the fold. This shepherd’s rod, while used for guidance, or comfort, or for numbering the flock (Psalm 23:4; Leviticus 27:32), was also a weapon with which to strike and punish (Psalm 2:9; Isaiah 10:5,15). In this sense it has for a synonym [maTTeh] (Isaiah 9:4; Ezekiel 7:11), and both came to have the derived meaning of spearheads (shebheT, 2 Samuel 18:14; maTTeh, 1 Samuel 14:27). They may have been the original of the maul or hammer (mephits, Proverbs 25:18; Jeremiah 51:20, where Cyrus, as God’s battle-axe, is to shatter Babylon and its inhabitants for the wrongs they have done to His people Israel).

2. Sling:
Scarcely less common and equally homely is the sling ([qela`]; [σφενδόνη, sphendone]) (1 Samuel 17:40). It consists of plaited thongs, or of one
strip of leather, made broad at the middle to form a hollow or pocket for the stone or other contents, the ends being held firmly in the hand as it is whirled loaded round the head, and one of them being at length let go, so that the stone may take its flight. It is used by the shepherd still to turn the straying sheep, and it can also be used with deadly effect as a weapon of war. The slingers ([ha-qalla`im], 2 Kings 3:25) belonged to the light infantry, like the archers. The Benjamites were specially skilled in the use of the sling, which they could use as well with their left hand as the right (Judges 20:16). The sling was a weapon in use in the armies of Egypt and Babylonia, and Jeremiah in a powerful figure makes the Lord say to Jerusalem in a time of impending calamity: “Behold, I will sling out the inhabitants of the land at this time” (Jeremiah 10:18; compare 1 Samuel 25:29).

3. Bow and Arrows:

A very important offensive weapon in the wars of Israel was the bow ([qesheth]) and arrows ([chitstsim]), and the archers whether mounted or on foot formed a powerful element of the fighting forces of the Philistines, Egyptians and Assyrians (s.v. ARCHER; BOW AND ARROWS).

4. Spear — Javelin:

The spear has various words to represent it.

(1) The [chanith] had a wooden staff or shaft of varying size and length with a head, or blade, of bronze, or, at a later time, of iron (1 Samuel 17:7). In the King James Version it is sometimes translated “javelin,” but in the Revised Version (British and American) “spear” (see 1 Samuel 13:22; 18:11). Saul’s spear, stuck in the ground, betokened the abode of the king for the time, just as today the spear in front of his tent marks the halting-place of the Bedouin Sheikh (1 Samuel 22:6; 26:7). Nahum, describing the arms of the Assyrians, joins together the flashing sword and the glittering spear (Nahum 3:3). The bearers of the chanith belonged to the heavy-armed troops.

(2) The romach, also translated in the King James Version “javelin,” was of the character of a lance. It does not appear to have differed much from the chanith — they appear as synonyms in Joel 3:10,
where romach is used, and in Isaiah 2,4 where chanith is used, of spears beaten into pruning hooks. It describes the Egyptian spear in Jeremiah 46:4. The bearers of the romach also belonged to the heavy-armed troops.

(3) The kidhon was lighter than either of the preceding and more of the nature of a javelin (gaison in the Septuagint, Joshua 8:18 and Polybius vi.39, 3; Job 41:29; Jeremiah 6:23).

(4) In the New Testament the word “spear” occurs only once and is represented by the Greek logche, the equivalent no doubt of [chanith] as above (John 19:34).

5. Sword:

The sword ([cherebh]) is by far the most frequently mentioned weapon in Scripture, whether offensive or defensive. The blade was of iron (1 Samuel 13:19; Joel 3:10). It was hung from the girdle on the left side, and was used both to cut and to thrust. Ehud’s sword (Judges 3:16) was double-edged and a cubit in length, and, as he was left-handed, was worn on his right thigh under his clothes. The sword was kept in a sheath (1 Samuel 17:51); to draw the sword was the signal for war (Ezekiel 21:3). Soldiers are “men who draw the sword.” It is the flashing sword (Nahum 3:3); the oppressing sword (Jeremiah 46:16); the devouring sword (2 Samuel 18:8; Jeremiah 12:12); the sword which drinks its fill of blood (Isaiah 34:5,6). The sword of the Lord executes God’s judgments (Jeremiah 47:6; Ezekiel 21:9,10 ff).

Figurative: In the highly metaphorical language of the prophets it stands for war and its attendant calamities (Jeremiah 50:35-37; Ezekiel 21:28).

In the New Testament machaira is employed for sword in its natural meaning (Matthew 26:47,51; Acts 12:2; Hebrews 11:34,37). Paul calls the Word of God the sword of the Spirit (Ephesians 6:17); and in the Epistle to Hebrews the Word of God is said to be sharper than any two-edged sword (Hebrews 4:12). As a synonym the word rhomphaia is used in the Apocrypha alone of the New Testament books, save for Luke 2:35. It was the Thracian sword with large blade, and is classed by
the ancients rather as a spear. The word is used frequently in the Septuagint like *machaira* to translate [cherebh]. In Revelation 1:16 the sharp two-edged sword of judgment, *rhomphaia* is seen in vision proceeding out of the mouth of the glorified Lord (compare Revelation 19:15). *Xiphos* is still another word for sword, but it is found only in the Septuagint, and not in the New Testament.

4. DEFENSIVE WEAPONS.

1. Shield:

The most ancient and universal weapon of defense is the shield. The two chief varieties are

(1) the [tsinnah], Latin scutum, the large shield, worn by heavy-armed infantry, adapted to the form of the human body, being made oval or in the shape of a door; hence, its Greek name, *thureos*, from *thura*, a door; and

(2) the [maghen], Latin clypeus, the light, round hand-buckler, to which *pelte* is the Greek equivalent. The two are often mentioned together (Ezekiel 23:24; 38:4; Psalm 35:2).

The [tsinnah] was the shield of the heavy-armed (1 Chronicles 12:24); and of Goliath we read that his shield was borne by a man who went before him (1 Samuel 17:7,41) The [maghen] could be borne by bowmen, for we read of men of Benjamin in Asa’s army that bare shields and drew bows (2 Chronicles 14:8). The ordinary material of which shields were made was wood, or wicker-work overlaid with leather. The wood-work of the shields and other weapons of Gog’s army were to serve Israel for fuel for seven years (Ezekiel 39:9). The anointing of the shield (2 Samuel 1:21; Isaiah 21:5) was either to protect it from the weather, or, more probably, was part of the consecration of the warrior and his weapons for the campaign. Solomon in his pride of wealth had 200 shields ([tsinnoth]) of beaten gold, and 300 targets ([maghinnim]) of beaten gold made for himself, and hung in the house of the forest of Lebanon (1 Kings 10:16,17). They were only for show, and when Shishak of Egypt came up against Rehoboam and carried them off, Rehoboam replaced them with others of bronze (1 Kings 14:27). On the march, the shield was
strapped over the shoulder and kept in a cover, which was removed before the battle (Isaiah 22:6). Both words are used of the mechanical device known to the Romans as the testudo employed by the besiegers of a city against the darts and stones and blazing torches thrown out by the besieged (Isaiah 37:33; Ezekiel 26:8).

Figurative: Yahweh is spoken of as the Shield and Protector of His people — of Abraham (Genesis 15:1); of Israel (Deuteronomy 33:29); of the Psalmist (Psalm 18:30; 35:2, and many other passages). In his description of the panoply of the Christian soldier, Paul introduces faith as the thureos, the large Greek-Roman shield, a defense by which he may quench all the fiery darts of the evil one.

2. Helmet:

The helmet, [qobha`] or [kobha`], seems to have been originally in the form of a skull-cap, and it is thus figured in representations of Hittites on the walls of Karnak in Egypt. In the earliest times it is found worn only by outstanding personages like kings and commanders. When King Saul armed David with his own armor he put a helmet of brass upon his head (1 Samuel 17:38). Uzziah at a later time provided his soldiers with helmets, as part of their equipment (2 Chronicles 26:14). The men of Pharaoh-neco’s army also wore helmets (Jeremiah 46:4), and the mercenaries in the armies of Tyre had both shield and helmet to hang up within her (Ezekiel 27:10). The materials of the helmet were at first of wood, linen, felt, or even of rushes; leather was in use until the Seleucid period when it was supplanted by bronze (1 Macc 6:35); the Greek and Roman helmets both of leather and brass were well known in the Herodian period.

Figurative: Paul has the helmet, perikephalaia, for his Christian soldier (Ephesians 6:17; 1 Thessalonians 5:8). In the Septuagint perikephalaia occurs eleven times as the equivalent of the Hebrew term.

3. Coat of Mail:

Body armor for the protection of the person in battle is mentioned in the Old Testament and is well known in representations of Egyptian, Persian and Parthian warriors. The [shiryon], translated “habergeon” in the King James Version, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American)
“coat of mail,” is part of the armor of Nehemiah’s workers (Nehemiah 4:16), and one of the pieces of armor supplied by King Uzziah to his soldiers (2 Chronicles 26:14). Goliath was armed with a shiryon, and when Saul clad David in his own armor to meet the Philistine champion he put on him a coat of mail, his shiryon (1 Samuel 17:5,38). Such a piece of body armor Ahab wore in the fatal battle of Ramoth-gilead (1 Kings 22:34). In the battle of Bethsura in the Maccabean struggle the Syrian war-elephants were protected with breastplates, the word for which, thorax, represents the [shiryon] in the Septuagint (1 Macc 6:43).

Figurative: Isaiah in a striking figure describes Yahweh as putting on righteousness for a coat of mail and salvation as a helmet, where thorax and perikephalaia are the Greek words of the Septuagint to render [shiryon] and [kobha`]. It is from this passage (Isaiah 59:17) that Paul obtains his “breastplate of righteousness” (Ephesians 6:14).

4. Greaves:

Greaves ([mitschah]; κνημίδες, knemides) are mentioned once in Scripture as part of the armor of Goliath (1 Samuel 17:6). They were of brass or leather, fastened by thongs round the leg and above the ankles.

5. Girdle:

The girdle ([chaghorah]; Greek zone) was of leather studded with nails, and was used for supporting the sword (1 Samuel 18:4; 2 Samuel 20:8).

See GIRDLE.

Figurative: For figurative uses see under the separate weapons.
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T. Nicol.
ARMOR-BEARER

<ar-mer-bar'-er> (נָשִּׂי [nose’ keli]; Greek uses a phrase, [ὁ αἴρων τὰ σκεῦα, ho airon ta skeuea], literally “the one carrying the armor”): One who carried the large shield and perhaps other weapons for a king (1 Samuel 31:4), commander-in-chief (2 Samuel 23:37), captain (1 Samuel 14:7) or champion (1 Samuel 17:7). All warriors of distinction had such an attendant. Rather than perish by the hand of a woman, Abimelech called upon his armor-bearer to give him the finishing stroke (Judges 9:54), and when King Saul’s armor-bearer refused to do this office for him that he might not become the prisoner of the Philistines, he took a sword himself and fell upon it (1 Samuel 31:4). David became Saul’s armor-bearer for a time, and Jonathan’s armor-bearer was a man of resource and courage (1 Samuel 14:7). The shield-bearer was a figure well known in the chariots of Egypt and Assyria and the Hittites, his business being to protect his fighting companion during the engagement.

T. Nicol.

ARMORY

<ar'-mer-i>:

(1) (אָצוֹר ['otsar]; [θησαυρός, thesauros]): A storehouse (1 Kings 7:51; Nehemiah 10:38), but employed figuratively of the stored-up anger of Yahweh which breaks forth in judgments (Jeremiah 50:25).

(2) ([nesheq]): Identical with Solomon’s “house of the forest of Lebanon,” the arsenal close to the temple (1 Kings 10:17; Nehemiah 3:19; Isaiah 22:8), in which were stored the shields and targets of beaten gold.

(3) ([talpiyoth]): A puzzling word rendered “armory” in our versions (Song 4:4) — ”the tower of David builded for an armory, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men.” the Revised Version margin renders “builded with turrets.”

T. Nicol.
The Israelites were not a distinctively warlike people and their glory has been won on other fields than those of war. But Canaan, between the Mediterranean and the desert, was the highway of the East and the battleground of nations. The Israelites were, by the necessity of their geographical position, often involved in wars not of their own seeking, and their bravery and endurance even when worsted in their conflicts won for them the admiration and respect of their conquerors.

1. THE FIRST CAMPAIGN OF HISTORY:

The first conflict of armed forces recorded in Holy Scripture is that in Genesis 14. The kings of the Jordan valley had rebelled against Chedorlaomer, king of Elam — not the first of the kings of the East to reach the Mediterranean with his armies — and joined battle with him and other kings in the Vale of Siddim. In this campaign Abraham distinguished himself by the rescue of his nephew Lot, who had fallen with all that he possessed into the hands of the Elamite king. The force with which Abraham effected the defeat of Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him was his own retainers, 318 in number, whom he had armed and led forth in person in his successful pursuit.

2. IN THE WILDERNESS:

When we first make the acquaintance of the Israelites as a nation, they are a horde of fugitives who have escaped from the bitter oppression and hard bondage of Pharaoh. Although there could have been but little of the martial spirit in a people so long and grievously oppressed, their journeyings through the wilderness toward Canaan are from the first described as the marching of a great host. It was according to their “armies” (“hosts” the Revised Version (British and American)) that Aaron and Moses were to bring the Children of Israel from the land of Egypt (Exodus 6:26). When they had entered upon the wilderness they went
up “harnessed” (“armed” the Revised Version (British and American)) for the journeyings that lay before them — where “harnessed” or “armed” may point not to the weapons they bore but to the order and arrangements of a body of troops marching five deep (hamushshim) or divided into five army corps (Exodus 13:18). On the way through the wilderness they encamped (Exodus 13:20; and passim) at their successive halting-places, and the whole army of 600,000 was, after Sinai, marked off into divisions or army corps, each with its own camp and the ensigns of their fathers’ houses (Numbers 2:2). “From twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel,” the males of the tribes were numbered and assigned to their place in the camp (Numbers 1:3). Naturally, in the wilderness they are footmen (Numbers 11:21), and it was not till the period of the monarchy that other arms were added. Bow and sling and spear and sword for attack, and shield and helmet for defense, would be the full equipment of the men called upon to fight in the desert. Although we hear little of gradations of military rank, we do read of captains of thousands and captains of hundreds in the wilderness (Numbers 31:14), and Joshua commands the fighting men in the battle against the Amalekites at Rephidim (Exodus 17:9 ff). That the Israelites acquired in their journeyings in the wilderness the discipline and martial spirit which would make them a warlike people, may be gathered from their successes against the Midianites, against Og, king of Bashan, toward the close of the forty years, and from the military organization with which they proceeded to the conquest of Canaan.

3. THE TIMES AFTER THE CONQUEST:

In more than one campaign the Israelites under Joshua’s leadership established themselves in Canaan. But it was largely through the enterprise of the several tribes after that the conquest was achieved. The progress of the invaders was stubbornly contested, but Joshua encouraged his kinsmen of Ephraim and Manasseh to press on the conquest even against the invincible war-chariots of the Canaanites — ”for thou shalt drive out the Canaanites, though they have iron chariots, and though they are strong” (Joshua 17:18). As it was in the early history of Rome, where the defense of the state was an obligation resting upon every individual according to his stake in the public welfare, so it was at first in Israel.
Tribal jealousies, however, impaired the sentiment of nationality and hindered united action when once the people had been settled in Canaan. The tribes had to defend their own, and it was only a great emergency that united them in common action. The first notable approach to national unity was seen in the army which Barak assembled to meet the host of Jabin, king of Hazor, under the command of Sisera (Judges 4:5). In Deborah’s war-song in commemoration of the notable victory achieved by Barak and herself, the men of the northern tribes, Zebulun, Naphtali, Issachar, along with warriors of Manasseh, Ephraim and Benjamin, are praised for the valor with which they withstood and routed the host — foot, horse and chariots — of Sisera. Once again the tribes of Israel assembled in force from “Daniel even to Beersheba, with the land of Gilead” (Judges 20:1) to punish the tribe of Benjamin for condoning a gross outrage. The single tribe was defeated in the battle that ensued, but they were able to put into the field “26,000 men that drew sword,” and they had also “700 chosen men left-handed; every one could sling stones at a hair-breadth, and not miss” (Judges 20:15,16).

4. IN THE EARLY MONARCHY:

Up to this time the fighting forces of the Israelites were more of the character of a militia. The men of the tribes more immediately harassed by enemies were summoned for action by the leader raised up by God, and disbanded when the emergency was past. The monarchy brought changes in military affairs. It was the plea of the leaders of Israel, when they desired to have a king, that he would go out before them and fight their battles (1 Samuel 8:20). Samuel had warned them that with a monarchy a professional soldiery would be required. “He will take your sons, and appoint them unto him, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and they shall run before his chariots; and he will appoint them unto him for captains of thousands, and captains of fifties; and he Will set some to plow his ground, and reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and the instruments of his chariots” (1 Samuel 8:11,12). That this was the course which military reform took in the period following the establishment of the monarchy may well be. It fell to Saul when he ascended the throne to withstand the invading Philistines and to relieve his people from the yoke which they had already laid heavily upon some
parts of the country. The Philistines were a military people, well disciplined and armed, with 30,000 chariots and 6,000 horsemen at their service when they came up to Michmash (1 Samuel 13:5). What chance had raw levies of vinedressers and herdsmen from Judah and Benjamin against such a foe? No wonder that the Israelites hid themselves in caves and thickets, and in rocks, and in holes, and in pits (1 Samuel 13:6). And it is quoted by the historian as the lowest depth of national degradation that the Israelites had to go down to the Philistines “to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock” (1 Samuel 13:20) because the Philistines had carried off their smiths to prevent them from making swords or spears.

It was in this desperate condition that King Saul was called to begin the struggle for freedom and national unity in Israel. The victories at Michmash and Elah and the hotly contested but unsuccessful and fatal struggle at Gilboa evince the growth of the martial spirit and advance alike in discipline and in strategy. After the relief of Jabesh-gilead, instead of disbanding the whole of his levies, Saul retained 3,000 men under arms, and this in all probability became the nucleus of the standing army of Israel (1 Samuel 13:2). From this time onward “when Saul saw any mighty man, or any valiant man, he took him unto him” (1 Samuel 14:52). Of the valiant men whom Saul kept round his person, the most notable were Jonathan and David. Jonathan had command of one division of 1,000 men at Gibeah (1 Samuel 13:2), and David was captain of the king’s bodyguard (1 Samuel 18:5; compare 18:13). When David fell under Saul’s jealousy and betook himself to an outlaw life in the mountain fastnesses of Judah, he gathered round him in the cave of Adullam 400 men (1 Samuel 22:1,2) who were ere long increased to 600 (1 Samuel 23:1,3). From the story of Nabal (1 Samuel 25) we learn how a band like that of David could be maintained in service, and we gather that landholders who benefited by the presence of an armed force were expected to provide the necessary supplies. On David’s accession to the throne this band of warriors remained attached to his person and became the backbone of his army. We can identify them with the gibborim — the mighty men of whom Benaiah at a later time became captain (2 Samuel 23:22,23; 1 Kings 1:8) and who are also known by the name of Cherethites and Pelethites (2 Samuel 8:18). These may have received
their name from their foreign origin, the former, in Hebrew [kerethi] being originally from Crete but akin to the Philistines; and the latter, in Hebrew [pelethi] being Philistines by birth. That there were foreign soldiers in David’s service we know from the examples of Uriah the Hittite and Ittai of Gath. David’s [gibborim] have been compared to the Praetorian Cohort of the Roman emperors, the Janissaries of the sultans, and the Swiss Guards of the French kings. Of David’s army Joab was the commander-in-chief, and to the military’ genius of this rough and unscrupulous warrior, the king’s near kinsman, the dynasty of David was deeply indebted.

5. FROM THE TIME OF SOLOMON ONWARD:

In the reign of Solomon, although peace was its prevailing characteristic, there can have been no diminution of the armed forces of the kingdom, for we read of military expeditions against Edom and Syria and Hamath, and also of fortresses built in every part of the land, which would require troops to garrison them. Hazor, the old Canaanite capital, at the foot of Lebanon; Megiddo commanding the rich plain of Jezreel; Gezer overlooking the Philistine plain; the Bethhorons (Upper and Nether); and Tadmor in the wilderness; not to speak of Jerusalem with Millo and the fortified wall, were fortresses requiring strong garrisons (<110915>1 Kings 9:15). It is probable that “the levy,” which was such a burden upon the people at large, included forced military service as well as forced labor, and helped to create the dissatisfaction which culminated in the revolt of Jeroboam, and eventually in the disruption of the kingdom. Although David had reserved from the spoils of war in his victorious campaign against Hadadezer, king of Zobah, horses for 100 chariots (<110804>2 Samuel 8:4), cavalry and chariots were not an effective branch of the service in his reign. Solomon, however, disregarding the scruples of the stricter Israelites, and the ordinances of the ancient law (<051716>Deuteronomy 17:16), added horses and chariots on a large scale to the military equipment of the nation (<111026>1 Kings 10:26-29). It is believed that it was from Musri, a country of northern Syria occupied by the Hittites, and Kue in Cilicia, that Solomon obtained horses for his cavalry and chariotry (<111029>1 Kings 10:29; <140116>2 Chronicles 1:16, where the best text gives Mutsri, and not the Hebrew word for Egypt). This branch of the service was not only looked upon with distrust by the stricter Israelites, but was expressly denounced in later times by the prophets.
In the prophets, too, more than in the historical books, we are made acquainted with the cavalry and chariots of Assyria and Babylon which in the days of Sargon, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar had become so formidable. Their lancers and mounted archers, together with their chariots, gave them a sure ascendancy in the field of war (Nahum 3:2,3; Habakkuk 1:8; Jeremiah 46:4). In comparison with these, the cavalry of the kings of Israel and Judah was insignificant, and to this Rabshakeh contemptuously referred (2 Kings 18:23) when he promised to the chiefs of Judah from the king of Assyria 2,000 horses if Hezekiah could put riders upon them.

6. ORGANIZATION OF THE HEBREW ARMY:

As we have seen, every male in Israel at the age of twenty, according to the ancient law, became liable for military service (Numbers 1:3; 26:2; 2 Chronicles 25:5), just as at a later time every male of that age became liable for the half-shekel of Temple dues. Josephus is our authority for believing that no one was called upon to serve after the age of fifty (Ant., III, xii, 4). From military service the Levites were exempt (Numbers 2:33). In Deuteronomic law exemption was allowed to persons betrothed but not married, to persons who had built a house but had not dedicated it, or who had planted a vineyard but had not eaten of the fruit of it, and to persons faint-hearted and fearful whose timidity might spread throughout the ranks (Deuteronomy 20:1-9). These exemptions no doubt reach back to a high antiquity and in the Maccabean period they still held good (1 Macc 3:56). The army was divided into bodies of 1,000, 100, 50, and in Maccabean times, 10, each under its own captain ([Sar]) (Numbers 31:14; 1 Samuel 8:12; 2 Kings 1:9; 2 Chronicles 25:5; 1 Macc 3:55). In the army of Uzziah we read of “heads of fathers’ houses,” mighty men of valor who numbered 2,600 and had under their hand a trained army of 307,500 men (2 Chronicles 26:12,13), where, however, the figures have an appearance of exaggeration.

Over the whole host of Israel, according to the fundamental principle of theocracy, was Yahweh Himself, the Supreme Leader of her armies (1 Samuel 8:7 ff); it was “the Captain of the Lord’s host,” to whom Joshua and all serving under him owned allegiance, that appeared before the walls of Jericho to help the gallant leader in his enterprise. In the times of the
Judges the chiefs themselves, Barak, Gideon, Jephthah, led their forces in person to battle. Under the monarchy the captain of the host was an office distinct from that of the king, and we have Joab, Abner, Benaiah, named as commanders-in-chief. An armor-bearer attended the captain of the host as well as the king (1 Samuel 14:6; 31:4,5; 2 Samuel 23:37). Mention is made of officers who had to do the numbering of the people, the [copher], scribe, attached to the captain of the host (2 Kings 25:19; compare 2 Samuel 24:2; 1 Macc 5:42), and the shoTer, muster-master, who kept the register of those who were in military service and knew the men who had received authorized leave of absence (Deuteronomy 20:5, Driver’s note).

7. THE ARMY IN THE FIELD:

Before the army set forth, religious services were held (Joel 3:9), and sacrifices were offered at the opening of a campaign to consecrate the war (Micah 3:5; Jeremiah 6:4; 22:7). Recourse was had in earlier times to the oracle (Judges 1:1; 20:27; 1 Samuel 14:37; 23:2; 28:6; 30:8), in later times to a prophet (1 Kings 22:5 ff; 2 Kings 3:13; 19:2; Jeremiah 38:14). Cases are mentioned in which the Ark accompanied the army to the field (1 Samuel 4:4; 14:18), and before the engagement sacrifices also were offered (1 Samuel 7:9; 13:9), ordinarily necessitating the presence of a priest (Deuteronomy 20:2). Councils of war were held to settle questions of policy in the course of siege or a campaign (Jeremiah 38:7; 39:3). The signal for the charge or retreat was given by sound of a trumpet (Numbers 10:9; 2 Samuel 2:28; 18:16; 1 Macc 16:8). The order of battle was simple, the heavy-armed spearmen forming the van, slingers and archers bringing up the rear, supported by horses and chariots, which moved to the front as need required (1 Samuel 31:3; 1 Kings 22:31; 2 Chronicles 14:9). Strategy was called into play according to the disposition of the opposing forces or the nature of the ground (Joshua 8:3; 11:7; Judges 7:16; 1 Samuel 15:5; 2 Samuel 5:23; 2 Kings 3:11 ff).

Although David had in his service foreign soldiers like Uriah the Hittite and Ittai of Gath, and although later kings hired aliens for their campaigns, it was not till the Maccabean struggle for independence that mercenaries came to be largely employed in the Jewish army. Mercenaries are spoken of in the prophets as a source of weakness to the nation that employs
them (to Egypt, Jeremiah 46:16,21; to Babylon, Jeremiah 50:16). From the Maccabean time onward the princes of the Hasmonean family employed them, sometimes to hold the troublesome Jews in check, and sometimes to support the arms of Rome. Herod the Great had in his army mercenaries of various nations. When Jewish soldiers, however, took service with Rome, they were prohibited by their law from performing duty on the Sabbath. Early in the Maccabean fight for freedom, a band of Hasideans or Jewish Puritans, allowed themselves to be cut down to the last man rather than take up the sword on the Sabbath (1 Macc 2:34 ff). Cases are even on record where their Gentile adversaries took advantage of their scruples to inflict upon them loss and defeat (Ant., XIII, xii, 4; XIV, iv, 2).

8. THE SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY:

Before the army had become a profession in Israel, and while the levies were still volunteers like the sons of Jesse, the soldiers not only received no pay, but had to provide their own supplies, or depend upon rich landholders like Nabal and Barzillai (1 Samuel 25; 2 Samuel 19:31). In that period and still later, the chief reward of the soldier was his share of the booty gotten in war (Judges 5:30 f; 1 Samuel 30:22 ff). By the Maccabean period we learn that an army like that of Simon, consisting of professional soldiers, could only be maintained at great expense (1 Macc 14:32).

9. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

Although the first soldiers that we read of in the New Testament were Jewish and not Roman (Luke 3:14; Mark 6:27), and although we read that Herod with his “men of war” joined in mocking Jesus (Luke 23:11), it is for the most part the Roman army that comes before us. The Roman legion, consisting roughly of 6,000 men, was familiar to the Jewish people, and the word had become a term to express a large number (Matthew 26:53; Mark 5:9). Centurions figure most honorably alike in the Gospels and the Acts (kenturion, Mark 15:39; hekatontarches, hekatontarchos, Matthew 8:5; Luke 23:47; Acts 10:1; 22:25,27). “The Pretorium” is the residence of the Roman procurator at Jerusalem, and in Caesarea (Matthew 27:27; Acts 23:35), or the praetorian guard at Rome
The Augustan band and the Italian band (Acts 10:1; Acts 27:1) are cohorts of Roman soldiers engaged on military duty at Caesarea. In Jerusalem there was one cohort stationed in the time of Paul under the command of a chiliarchos, or military tribune (Acts 22:24). It was out of this regiment that the dexiolaboi (Acts 23:23) were selected, who formed a guard for Paul to Caesarea, spearmen, or rather javelin-throwers.

Figurative: Among the military metaphors employed by Paul, who spent so much of his time in the later years of his life among Roman soldiers, some are taken from the weapons of the Roman soldier (see ARMS), and some also from the discipline and the marching and fighting of an army. Thus, “campaigning” is referred to (2 Timothy 2:3,4; 2 Corinthians 10:3-6); the “order and solid formation of soldiers” drawn up in battle array or on the march (Colossians 2:5); the “triumphal procession” to the capitol with its train of captives and the smoke of incense (2 Corinthians 2:14-16); and “the sounding of the trumpet,” when the faithful Christian warriors shall take their place every man in his own order or “division” of the resurrection army of the Lord of Hosts (1 Corinthians 15:52,53). (See Dean Howson, Metaphors of Paul — ”Roman Soldiers.”)

The armies which are in heaven (Revelation 19:14,19) are the angelic hosts who were at the service of their Incarnate Lord in the days of His flesh and in His exaltation follow Him upon white horses clothed in fine linen white and pure (see Swete’s note).

See further ARMOR, ARMS.

T. Nicol.

ARMY; ROMAN

<ar’-mi>, <ro’-man>; The treatment of this subject will be confined to (I) a brief description of the organization of the army, and (II) a consideration of the allusions to the Roman military establishment in the New Testament.
1. ORGANIZATION.

There were originally no standing forces, but the citizens performed military service like any other civic duty when summoned by the magistrates. The gradual development of a military profession and standing army culminated in the admission of the poorest class to the ranks by Marius (about 107 BC). Henceforth the Roman army was made up of a body of men whose character was essentially that of mercenaries, and whose term of continuous service varied in different divisions from 16 to 26 years.

The forces which composed the Roman army under the Empire may be divided into the following five groups:

(1) the imperial guard and garrison of the capital,
(2) the legions,
(3) the auxilia,
(4) the numeri,
(5) the fleet. We shall discuss their organization in the order mentioned.

1. The Imperial Guard:

The imperial guard consisted of the cohortes praetoriae, which together with the cohortes urbaneae and vigiles made up the garrison of Rome. In the military system as established by Augustus there were nine cohorts of the praetorian guard, three of the urban troops, and seven of the vigiles. Each cohort numbered 1,000 men, and was commanded by a tribune of equestrian rank. The praetorian prefects (praefecti praetorii), of whom there were usually two, were commanders of the entire garrison of the capital, and stood at the highest point of distinction and authority in the equestrian career.

2. The Legions:

There were 25 legions in 23 AD (Tacitus Annals 4, 5), which had been increased to 30 at the time of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, 160-180 AD (CIL, VI, 3492 a-b) and to 33 under Septimius Severus (Dio Cassius, iv. 23-24). Each legion was made up, ordinarily, of 6,000 men, who were
divided into 10 cohorts, each cohort containing 3 maniples, and each maniple in turn 2 centuries.

The legatus Augustus pro praetore, or governor of each imperial province, was chief commander of all the troops within the province. An officer of senatorial rank known as legatus Augusti legionis was entrusted with the command of each legion, together with the bodies of auxilia which were associated with it. Besides, there were six tribuni militum, officers of equestrian rank (usually sons of senators who had not yet held the quaestorship) in each legion. The centurions who commanded the centuries belonged to the plebeian class. Between the rank of common soldier and centurion there were a large number of subalterns, called principales, who correspond roughly to the non-commissioned officers and men detailed from the ranks for special duties in modern armies.

3. The “Auxilia”:

The auxilia were organized as infantry in cohortes, as cavalry in alae, or as mixed bodies, cohortes equitatae. Some of these divisions contained approximately 1,000 men (cohortes or alae miliariae), but the greater number about 500 (cohortes or alae quingenariae). They were commanded by tribuni and praefecti of equestrian rank. The importance of the auxilia consisted originally in the diversity of their equipment and manner of fighting, since each group adhered to the customs of the nation in whose midst it had been recruited. But with the gradual Romanization of the Empire they were assimilated more and more to the character of the legionaries.

4. The “Numeri”:

The numeri developed out of the provincial militia and began to appear in the 2nd century AD. They maintained their local manner of warfare. Some were bodies of infantry, others of cavalry, and they varied in strength from 300 to 90 (Mommsen, Hermes, XIX, 219 f, and XXII, 547 f). Their commanders were praepositi, praefecti or tribuni, all men of equestrian rank.
5. The Fleet:
The fleet was under the command of prefects (praefecti classis), who took rank among the highest officials of the equestrian class. The principal naval stations were at Misenum and Ravenna.

6. Defensive Arrangements:
Augustus established the northern boundary of the Empire at the Rhine and at the Danube, throughout the greater part of its course, and bequeathed to his successors the advice that they should not extend their sovereignty beyond the limits which he had set (Tacitus Annals i.11; Agricola 13); and although this policy was departed from in many instances, such as the annexation of Thrace, Cappadocia, Mauretania, Britain, and Dacia, not to mention the more ephemeral acquisitions of Trajan, yet the military system of the Empire was arranged primarily with the view of providing for the defense of the provinces and not for carrying on aggressive warfare on a large scale. Nearly all the forces, with the exception of the imperial guard, were distributed among the provinces on the border of the Empire, and the essential feature of the disposition of the troops in these provinces was the permanent fortress in which each unit was stationed. The combination of large camps for the legions with a series of smaller forts for the alae, cohorts, and numeri is the characteristic arrangement on all the frontiers. The immediate protection of the frontier was regularly entrusted to the auxiliary troops, while the legions were usually stationed some distance to the rear of the actual boundary. Thus the army as a whole was so scattered that it was a difficult undertaking to assemble sufficient forces for carrying out any considerable project of foreign conquest, or even to cope at once with a serious invasion, yet the system was generally satisfactory in view of the conditions which prevailed, and secured for the millions of subjects of the Roman Empire the longest period of undisturbed tranquillity known to European history.

7. Recruiting System:
In accordance with the arrangements of Augustus, the cohortes praetoriae and cohortes urbanae were recruited from Latium, Etruria, Umbria, and the older Roman colonies (Tacitus Annals 4, 5), the legions from the remaining
portions of Italy, and the auxilia from the subject communities of the Empire (Seeck, Rheinisches Museum, XLVIII, 616).

But in course of time the natives of Italy disappeared, first from the legions, and later from the garrison of the capital. Antoninus Plus established the rule that each body of troops should draw its recruits from the district where it was stationed. Henceforth the previous possession of Roman citizenship was no longer required for enlistment in the legions. The legionary was granted the privilege of citizenship upon entering the service, the auxiliary soldier upon being discharged (Seeck, Untergang der antiken Welt, I, 250).

2. ALLUSIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT TO THE ROMAN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Such references relate chiefly to the bodies of troops which were stationed in Judea. Agrippa I left a military establishment of one ala and five cohorts at his death in 44 AD (Josephus, Ant, XIX, ix, 2; BJ, III, iv, 2), which he had doubtless received from the earlier Roman administration. These divisions were composed of local recruits, chiefly Samaritans (Hirschfeld, Verwaltungsbeamte, 395; Mommsen, Hermes, XIX, 217, note 1).

The Ala I gemina Sebastenorum was stationed at Caesarea (Josephus, Ant, XX, 122; BJ, II, xii, 5; CIL, VIII, 9359).

1. Augustan Band:

Julius, the centurion to whom Paul and other prisoners were delivered to be escorted to Rome (Acts 27:1), belonged to one of the five cohorts which was stationed at or near Caesarea. This *Speira Sebaste* (Westcott-Hort), “Augustus’ Band” (the Revised Version (British and American) “Augustan band”; the Revised Version, margin “cohort”), was probably the same body of troops which is mentioned in inscriptions as Cohors I Augusta (CIL, Supp, 6687) and Speira Augouste (Lebas-Waddington 2112). Its official title may have been Cohors Augusta Sebastenorum (GVN). It will be observed that all divisions of the Roman army were divided into companies of about 100 men, each of which, in the infantry, was commanded by a centurion, in the cavalry, by a decurion.
2. Italian Band:

There was another cohort in Caesarea, the “Italian band” (Cohors Italica, Vulgate) of which Cornelius was centurion (Acts 10:1: ek speires tes kaloumenes Italikes). The cohortes Italicae (civium Romanorum) were made up of Roman citizens (Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, II, 467).

3. Praetorian Guard:

One of the five cohorts was stationed in Jerusalem (Mark 15:16), the “chief captain” of which was Claudius Lysias. His title, chiliarchos in the Greek (Acts 23:10,15,17,19,22,26; 24:7 the King James Version), meaning “leader of a thousand men” (tribunus, Vulgate), indicates that this body of soldiers was a cohors miliaria. Claudius Lysias sent Paul to Felix at Caesarea under escort of 200 soldiers, 70 horsemen, and 200 spearmen (Acts 23:23). The latter (dexiolaboi, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek) are thought to have been a party of provincial militia. Several centurions of the cohort at Jerusalem appear during the riot and subsequent rescue and arrest of Paul (Acts 21:32; 22:25,26; 23:17,23). The cohortes miliariae (of 1,000 men) contained ten centurions. A centurion, doubtless of the same cohort, was in charge of the execution of the Saviour (Matthew 27:54; Mark 15:39,44,45; Luke 23:47). It was customary for centurions to be entrusted with the execution of capital penalties (Tacitus Ann. i.6; xvi.9; xvi.15; Hist. ii.85).

The the King James Version contains the passage in Acts 28:16: “The centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard” (stratopedarches), which the Revised Version (British and American) omits. It has commonly been held that the expression stratopedarches was equivalent to praetorian prefect (praefectus praetorius), and that the employment of the word in the singular was proof that Paul arrived in Rome within the period 51-62 AD when Sex. Afranius Burrus was sole praetorian prefect. Mommsen (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie (1895), 491-503) believes that the sentence in question embodies an ancient tradition, but that the term stratopedarches could not mean praefectus praetorius, which is never rendered in this way in Greek. He suggests that it stands for princeps castrorum peregrinorum, who was a centurion in command of the frumentarii at Rome. These were detachments
of legionary soldiers who took rank as principales. They served as military couriers between the capital and provinces, political spies, and an imperial police. It was probably customary, at least when the tradition under discussion arose, for the frumentarii to take charge of persons who were sent to Rome for trial (Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, II, 491-94).

**LITERATURE.**

Comprehensive discussions of the Roman military system will be found in Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, II, 319-612, and in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopadie, article “Exercitus.”

George H. Allen

**ARNA**

<ar'-na> (Latin Arna): One of the ancestors of Ezra given in 2 Esdras 1:2, evidently identical with Zerahiah of Ezra 7:4 and Zaraias of 1 Esdras 8:2.

**ARNAN**

<ar'-nan> ([`arnan], “joyous”): A descendant of David and founder of a family (1 Chronicles 3:21). The Septuagint has Orna.

**ARNI**

<ar'-ni> ([ `Arvei, Arnei], found only in Luke 3:33 the Revised Version (British and American), following Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek): The name of an ancestor of Jesus Christ. But in the King James Version, following Textus Receptus of the New Testament, and in the genealogical list of Matthew 13:4 the same person is called Aram (Greek: [ `Arama, Aram]) in both the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin. In Matthew the Revised Version (British and American), however, the form is Ram, which is nearest to the Old Testament name Ram ([ ram], “high”). Ram was great-grandson of Judah and ancestor of David (Ruth 4:19; 1 Chronicles 2:9,10).
ARNON

<ar’-non> (אֲרֹנָן) ['aron]; [ Ἀρνών, Arnon]): Is first mentioned in Numbers 21:24 as the border between Moab and the Amorites. “The valleys of Arnon” in the next verse undoubtedly indicate the numerous wadies contributary to the main stream. It formed the southern boundary of the land assigned to Reuben (Deuteronomy 3:12). The city of Aroer stood on the northern edge of the valley (Deuteronomy 2:36; Judges 12:2, etc.). Arnon was claimed by the Ammonites as having marked the southern limit of their territory when Israel invaded the land (Judges 11:13). They, however, had already been driven out by the Amorites, and the region north of Arnon was held by Sihon. From the inscription of Mesha on the Moabite Stone we gather that Moab had established herself on the north of the Arnon before the time of Omri. Under Omri and Ahab she was confined to the south of the river. A rebellion under Mesha was put down by Jehoram son of Ahab (2 Kings 3), and the expedition of Hazael against Israel reached the valley of the Arnon (2 Kings 10:33). But according to Mesha he regained for Moab the lost land; and this agrees with Isaiah 15; 16, where cities north of Arnon are located in Moab, e.g. Heshbon.

The modern name of Arnon is Wady el-Mojib, which enters the Dead Sea from the East about 11 miles North of el-Lisan. Some 13 miles East of the Dead Sea two streams, Seil es-Sa`ideh from the South, and Wady Enkeileh from the East, unite their waters and flow westward in the bottom of an enormous trench. The waters of Wady Welch come in from the Northeast. A wide stretch of country thus drains into the valley by means of a great network of smaller wadies — the “valleys of Arnon.” The “fords of the Arnon” (Isaiah 16:2) were doubtless crossed by Mesha’s highway which he claims to have built in Arnon; and may be marked by the traces of the old Roman road and bridge immediately to the West of where, on the northern edge of the Wady, stands `Ara`ir, the ancient Aroer.

W. Ewing
AROD

<\textit{a'-rod}>, <\textit{ar'-od}> (ארוד [‘arodh]): The sixth son of Gad (Numbers 26:17). His descendants are called Arodi or Arodites (Genesis 46:16; Numbers 26:17).

ARODI

<\textit{ar'-o-di}>.

See AROD.

ARODITES

<\textit{a'-rod-its}>.

See AROD.

AROER

<\textit{a-ro'-er}> (ארור [‘aro’er]; [ ’Αροηρ, Aroer]):

(1) A city of the Amorites which stood on the northern edge of the Arnon (Deuteronomy 2:36, etc.). Taken by Israel, it shared the vicissitudes of the country north of the river, and when last named (Jeremiah 48:19) is again in the hands of Moab. It is one of the cities which Mesha claims to have built, i.e. fortified. It was within the territory allotted to Reuben, yet its building (fortification) is attributed to Gad (Numbers 32:34). Thus far came the Syrian, Hazael, in his raid upon Israel (2 Kings 10:33). The Roman road across the valley lay about an hour to the West of Khirbet `Ara`ir.

(2) A city in Gilead described as “before Rabbah,” on the boundary between Gad and the Ammonites (Joshua 13:25). No name resembling this has yet been recovered in the district indicated.

(3) A city in the territory of Judah named only in 1 Samuel 30:28. Probably however in Joshua 15:22 we should read [`ar`arah] instead of [‘adh`adah], which may be the same city, and may be identical with
`Ar`ara, a site with cisterns and some remains of ancient buildings about 14 miles Southeast of Beersheba.

W. Ewing

AROERITE

<ar-ro’-er-it> (חֹרֶה [ha-`aro`eri]): A native of Aroer. The Aroerite was Hotham, father of two of David’s heroes (1 Chronicles 11:44).

AROM

<a’-rom> ([Ἀρόμ, Arom]): The sons of Arom returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:16). Omitted in Ezra and Nehemiah. Hashum is found in place of Arom in Ezra 2:19.

ARPACHSHAD

<ar-pak’-shad>.

See ARPHAXAD.

ARPAD; ARPHAD

<ar’-pad>; <ar’-fad> (ארPopular, [`arpadh], “support”): A city of Syria, captured frequently by the Assyrians, and finally subjugated by Tiglath-pileser III in 740 BC, after a siege of two years. It is now the ruin Tell Erfad, 13 miles Northwest of Aleppo. Arpad is one of the conquered cities mentioned by Rabshakeh, the officer of Sennacherib, in his boast before Jerusalem (2 Kings 18:34; 19:13; Isaiah 36:19; 37:13; the King James Version Arphad). Isaiah puts a boast about its capture in the mouth of the Assyrian king (Isaiah 10:9), and Jeremiah mentions it as “confounded” because of evil tidings, in the oracle concerning Damascus (Jeremiah 49:23). On every occasion Arpad is mentioned with Hamath.

S. F. Hunter

ARPHAXAD

<ar-fak’-sad>: 
(1) the King James Version form (Genesis 10:22,24; 11:12,13; 1 Chronicles 1:17) of the Revised Version (British and American) **ARPACHSHAD**, which see. See also **TABLE OF NATIONS**.

(2) In Apocrypha (Judith 1) a king of the Medes, who reigned in Ecbatana. He was defeated and slain by Nebuchadrezzar.

**ARRAY**

**<a-ra’>** ((1) $\text{labhesh}$, $\text{[aTah]}$; $\text{[periballo]}$, \text{[endomai]}, \text{[himatismos]}$.

(2) $\text{[arakh]}$, $\text{[shith]}$): “Array,” composed of prefix “ar-” and “rai,” “order,” is used in two senses,

(1) in reference to clothing and

(2) in reference to the disposition of an army.

(1) (a) [Labhesh] is the most common Hebrew word meaning “to clothe,” and is used in all cases but one in the Old Testament for “array” (compare Genesis 41:42: Pharaoh “arrayed him (Joseph) in vestures of fine linen”; see also 2 Chronicles 28:15; Est 6:9,11; Job 40:10; 2 Chronicles 5:12). (b) [\`aTah], meaning “to veil,” “to cover,” is once used. Nebuchadrezzar “shall array himself with the land of Egypt” (Jeremiah 43:12). (c) Periballo, “to throw around,” is used 6 times in the New Testament. It is the word used of Herod’s “arraying” Jesus “in gorgeous apparel” (Luke 23:11; the other references are Matthew 6:29; Luke 12:27; Revelation 7:13; 17:4; 19:8). (d) Enduomai, middle or passive of enduo, “to enter,” means, therefore, “to be entered into” clothing. Once it is used in reference to Herod (Acts 12:21). (e) Himatismos, “clothing,” is translated once “array” = raiment (from same root). This is the only occurrence of “array” in this sense (1 Timothy 2:9).

(2) (a) [\`arakh] is the common word in the Old Testament, used in reference to the disposition of an army, and is translated “to put in array,” “to set in array,” the object being “the battle” or the army. The root meaning is that of orderly arrangement, and the verb is used in other senses than the military, e.g. arranging the table of shewbread. In 1 Chronicles
12:33 the Revised Version (British and American) has “order the battle array” for the King James Version “keep rank,” translation of Hebrew [‘adhar]. (b) [Shith], “to set, to place,” used once for battle array: “and the horsemen set themselves in array at the gate” (Isaiah 22:7).

S. F. Hunter

ARREST, AND TRIAL OF JESUS

<a-rest’>, see JESUS CHRIST, ARREST AND TRIAL OF.

ARRIVE

<a-riv’>: Originally a nautical term (Latin: ad ripam) for reaching shore, is used in the literal sense in Luke 8:26, and, in the figurative sense for Greek phthano, instead of “attain to,” the Revised Version (British and American) in Romans 9:31.

ARROGANCY

<ar’-o-gan-si>: Excessive pride, leading to boastfulness and insolence (1 Samuel 2:3; Proverbs 8:13; Isaiah 13:11; Jeremiah 48:29).

ARROW

<ar’-o>. See ARCHERY; ARMOR.

ARROWS, DIVINATION BY

See AUGURY, IV, 1.

ARROWSNAKE

<ar’-o-snak>: In Isaiah 34:15 the Hebrew word [kippoz], which in the King James Version is rendered “great owl,” is in the English Revised Version rendered “arrowsnake,” and in the American Standard Revised Version “dart-snake.” Gesenius, who translates “arrowsnake,” says “so called from the spring with which it propels itself.” Others, from
the mention of “make her nest, lay, and hatch,” think some kind of bird is meant.

See OWL; SERPENT.

ARSACES

<ar-sa’-sez> <ar’-sa-sez> ([Ἀρσάκης, Arsakes]): The common name assumed by all the Parthian kings, is mentioned in 1 Macc 14:1-3, and in 15:22 in connection with the history of Demetrius, one of the Greek, or Seleucid, kings of Syria, and successor to Antiochus Epiphanes, the oppressor of the Jews, who caused the uprising against the Syrian domination under the leadership of the Maccabees. This particular Arsaces was the sixth of the line of independent Parthian rulers which had been founded in 250 BC by Arsaces I, who revolted from Antiochus Theos, killed the Syrian satraps, and with his successor Tiridates I firmly established the independence of the Parthian kingdom. About 243 BC, Tiridates added Hyrcania to his dominions; but it was not till the reign of Arsaces VI, whose pre-regnal name was Mithridates, that Parthia through the conquest of Bactria, Media, Persia, Armenia, Elymais and Babylonia, threatened the very existence of the kingdom of the Seleucids and became a dangerous competitor of Rome itself. It was this king who about 141 BC was attacked by Demetrius Nicator, king of Syria. According to the account preserved in 1 Macc 14:1-3, Arsaces sent one of his captains, who went and smote the host of Demetrius, and took him alive, and brought him to Arsaces, by whom he was put in ward. At first, the captive king was treated with great severity, being carried in triumph from city to city and exhibited to his enemies. Later, however, Arsaces gave him his daughter in marriage and assigned him a residence in Hyrcania. Some time after the death of Arsaces, Demetrius was sent back to Syria by Phraates, the son of Mithridates, and reigned from 128 to 125 BC. Arsaces VI is mentioned, also, in 1 Macc 15:22, as one of the kings whom the Romans forbade to make war on their Jewish allies.

LITERATURE.

See 1 Macc 14:1-3, and 15:22; Ant, XIII, v, 11; XIV, vili, 5; Appian, Syria, 67; Strabo, XI, 515; XV, 702; Justin, XLI, 5, 6; XXXVI, 1; Orosius,
ARSARETH

<ar’-sa-reth>.

See ARZARETH.

ARSIPHURITH

<ar-si-fu’-rith> ([ʾAṛṣīfūrīθ, Arsiphourith]; the King James Version Azephurith): 112 of the sons of Arsiphurith returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:16). The name is omitted in Ezra and Nehemiah, but the number corresponds to those mentioned with Jorah (<sup>1</sup>Ezra 2:18) and Hariph (<sup>2</sup>Nehemiah 7:24).

ARTAXERXES

<ar-taks-urk’-sez> ([ʾAṛtaζέρζης, Artaxerxes]): Is the Greek and Latin form of one, and perhaps of two or three kings of Persia mentioned in the Old Testament.

(1) All are agreed that the Artaxerxes at whose court Ezra and Nehemiah were officials is Artaxerxes I, the son of Xerxes, commonly called Longimanus, who reigned from 465 to 424 BC. This Artaxerxes was the third son of Xerxes and was raised to the throne by Artabanus, the murderer of Xerxes. Shortly after his accession, Artaxerxes put his older brother Darius to death; and a little later, Artabanus, who perhaps aimed to make himself king, was killed. Hystaspes, the second brother, who seems to have been satrap of Bactria at the time of his father’s death, rebelled, and after two battles was deprived of his power and probably of his life. The reign of Artaxerxes was further disturbed by the revolt of Egypt in 460 BC, and by that of Syria about 448 BC. The Egyptians were assisted by the Athenians, and their rebellion, led by Inarus and Amyrtaeus, was suppressed only after five years of strenuous exertions on the part of the Persians under the command of the great general
Megabyzus. After the re-conquest of Egypt, Artaxerxes, fearing that the Athenians would make a permanent subjugation of Cyprus, concluded with them the peace of Callias, by which he retained the island of Cyprus; but agreed to grant freedom to all Greek cities of Asia Minor. Shortly after this Megabyzus led a revolt in Syria and compelled his sovereign to make peace with him on his own terms, and afterward lived and died in high favor with his humiliated king. Zopyrus, the son of Megabyzus at a later time, while satrap of Lycia and Caria, led a rebellion in which he was assisted by the Greeks. It is thought by some that the destruction of Jerusalem which is lamented by Nehemiah occurred during the rebellion of Syria under Megabyzus. Artaxerxes I died in 424 BC, and was succeeded by his son Xerxes II, and later by two other sons, Sogdianus and Ochus, the last of whom assumed the regnal name of Darius, whom the Greeks surnamed Nothus.

(2) Ewald and others have thought that the Artaxerxes of Ezra 4:7 was the pseudo-Smerdis. The principal objection against this view is that we have no evidence that either the pseudo-Smerdis, or the real Smerdis, was ever called Artaxerxes. The real Smerdis is said to have been called Tanyoxares, or according to others Oropastes. Ewald would change the latter to Ortosastes, which closely resembles Artaxerxes, and it must be admitted that many of the Persian kings had two or more names. It seems more probable, however, that Artaxerxes I is the king referred to; and there is little doubt that the identification of the Artaxerxes of Ezra 4:7 with the pseudo-Smerdis would never have been thought of had it not been for the difficulty of explaining the reference to him in this place.

(3) The Greek translation of the Septuagint renders the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther by Artaxerxes, and is followed in this rendering by Josephus. There is no doubt that by this Artaxerxes Josephus meant the first of that name; for in the Antiquities, XI, vi, 1 he says that “after the death of Xerxes, the kingdom came to be transferred to his son Cyrus, whom the Greeks called Artaxerxes.” He then proceeds to show how he married a Jewish wife, who was herself of the royal family and who is related to have saved the nation of the Jews. In a long chapter, he then gives his account of the story of Vashti, Esther and Mordecai. In spite of this rendering of the Septuagint and Josephus, there is no doubt that the
Hebrew [achashwerosh] is the same as the Greek Xerxes; and there is no
evidence that Artaxerxes I was ever called Xerxes by any of his
contemporaries. The reason of the confusion of the names by the
Septuagint and Josephus will probably remain forever a mystery.

R. Dick Wilson

ARTEMAS

<ar'-te-mas> ([ʼΑρτεμάς, Artemas]): One of the seventy disciples and
bishop of Lystra, according to Dorotheus (Bibl. Maxima (Lugd. 1677), III,
429). He is mentioned in Titus 3:12 as one of the faithful companions of
Paul. The name is probably Greek, a masculine form of Artemis, or, as has
been suggested, a short form of Artemidorus, a common name in Asia
Minor. These contracted forms were by no means rare in the Greek world.
The Athenian orator, Lysias, was doubtless named after his grandfather,
Lysanias, and at first may even have been called Lysanias himself.

ARTEMIS

<ar’-te-mis>.

See DIANA.

ARTIFICER

<ar-tif’-i-ser>.

See CRAFTS.

ARTILLERY

<ar-til’-er-i> ([κῆλι] [keli]): In 1 Samuel 20:40 (the King James Version)
of Jonathan’s bow and arrows, replaced in the Revised Version (British
and American) by WEAPONS; and in 1 Macc 6:51 (the King James
Version) where the Greek words are translated in the Revised Version
(British and American) “instruments for casting fire and stones.”

ARTISAN

<ar’-ti-zan>.
See CRAFTS.

ARTS

See CRAFTS.

ARUBBOTH; ARUBOTH

\(<a\text{-}rub\text{-}o\text{th}>, \ <ar\text{-}u\text{-}both> \ (\text{חָֽרֵבֹת} [ha\text{-}arubboth]; \text{the King James Version Aruboth})\): One of the 12 districts from which victuals for Solomon’s household were obtained (\text{\text{\text{1} Kings}} 4:10). With Arubboth are mentioned “Socoh, and all the land of Hepher,” and as Socoh lay in the Shephelah (\text{\text{Joshua}} 15:35), Arubboth probably lay in the southern part of the Shephelah.

ARUMAH

\(<a\text{-}roo\text{-}ma} > \ (\text{אַרְוָאָה} [arumah], “lofty”): The town in which Abimelech, the son of Jerubbaal (Gideon), dwelt when driven from Shechem (\text{\text{Judges}} 9:41). The ruins El-Ormeh, 6 miles Southeast of Shechem, may be on the site, though its position is not known with certainty.

ARVAD; ARVADITES

\(<a\text{-}vad\>, \ <ar\text{-}vad\text{-}its} > \ (\text{אָרָד} \ [\text{Arados}]; \text{modern Ruad})\): An island city off the coast of Syria some 30 miles North of Tripolis, and the race inhabiting it. It was a barren rock covered with fortifications and houses several stories in height. The island was about 800 ft. long by 500 wide, surrounded by a massive wall, and an artificial harbor was constructed on the East toward the main land. It developed into a trading city in early times, as did most of the Phoenician cities on this coast. It had a powerful navy, and its ships are mentioned in the monuments of Egypt and Assyria. It seems to have had a sort of hegemony over the northern Phoenician cities, from Mt. Cassius to the northern limits of Lebanon, something like that of Sidon in the South. It had its own local dynasty and coinage, and some of the names of its kings have been recovered. Its inhabitants are mentioned in the early lists of
Genesis (10:18), and Ezekiel (27:8,11) refers to its seamen and soldiers in the service of Tyre. It brought under its authority some of the neighboring cities on the main land, such as Marathus and Simyra, the former nearly opposite the island and the latter some miles to the South. Thothmes III, of Egypt, took it in his campaign in north Syria (1472 BC) and it is noticed in the campaigns of Rameses II in the early part of the 13th century BC (Breasted, Ancient Records). It is also mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters as being in league with the Amorites in their attacks upon the Egyptian possessions in Syria (44 and 28, B.M. Tell el-Amarna Letters). About the year 1200, or later, it was sacked by invaders from Asia Minor or the islands, as were most of the cities on the coast (Paton, Syria and Palestine, 145) but it recovered when they were driven back. Its maritime importance is indicated by the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings. Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1020) boasts that he sailed in the ships of Arvad. Asshur-nazir-pal (circa 876) made it tributary, but it revolted and we find 200 men of Arvad mentioned among the allies of Benhadad, of Damascus, at the great battle of Quarqar, when all Syria seems to have been in league against Shalmaneser II (circa 854). At this time the king of Arvad was Mattan Baal. It was afterward tributary to Tiglath-pileser III and Sennacherib, the king who paid it to the latter being Abd-ilihit (circa 701). Ashurbanipal (circa 664) compelled its king Yakinlu to submit and send one of his daughters to become a member of the royal harem (Rawlinson, Phoenicia, 456-57). Under the Persians Arvad was allowed to unite in a confederation with Sidon and Tyre, with a common council at Tripolis (ib 484). When Alexander the Great invaded Syria in 332 BC Arvad submitted without a struggle under her king Strato, who sent his navy to aid Alexander in the reduction of Tyre. It seems to have received the favor of the Seleucid kings of Syria and enjoyed the right of asylum for political refugees. It is mentioned in a rescript from Rome about 138 BC, in connection with other cities and rulers of the East, to show favor to the Jews. It was after Rome had begun to interfere in the affairs of Judea and Syria, and indicates that Arvad was of considerable importance at that time (see 1 Macc 15:16-23). The town is not mentioned in the New Testament, and in modern times has sunk to a small village, chiefly inhabited by fishermen.

See ARADUS.

H. Porter
ARZA

<ar'-za> (אرزא ['artsa']): A steward of King Elah, in whose house at Tirzah Zimri murdered the king at a drinking debauch. The text is not quite clear, and Arza might have been a servant of Zimri (1 Kings 16:9).

ARZARETH

<ar'-za-reth>, <ar'-sareth> (the King James Version, Arsareth): This is the land to which the ten tribes were deported (2 Esdras 13:45). It is described as “another land” lying a year and a half’s journey beyond the river, i.e. the Euphrates. It probably answers to the Hebrew רֶץ [‘erets ‘achereth] (Deuteronomy 29:28). In Josephus’ time the people were still believed to be there in countless numbers (Ant., XI, v, 2).

AS

<az>: Conj. and adverb (usually Greek ὅσος, hos [ὁσπερ, hosper], καθὼς, kathos), designating:

(1) Likeness: (a) between nouns (Genesis 3:5; Judges 6:5; Philippians 2:8; Hebrews 11:27,29); (b) between verbs (Luke 6:36; John 5:30; 1 Corinthians 10:7); (c) between adjectives (1 Corinthians 15:48).

(2) Limitation (with respect to a particular aspect or relation) (Peter 4:15,16).


(4) Cause (1 Corinthians 4:1).

(5) Concession (John 7:10; 2 Corinthians 11:21).

(6) Illustration, in numerous passages, beginning “as it is written,” “as it is said,” etc.

ASA

<a’-sa> (עָזא ['aca’], “healer”; 'Asá, Asa):
A king of Judah, the third one after the separation of Judah and Israel. He was the son of Abijah and grandson of Rehoboam. Maacah, his mother, or rather grandmother, was daughter of Abishalom (Absalom) (1 Kings 15:1 ff). The first ten years of his reign were prosperous and peaceful (2 Chronicles 14:1). He introduced many reforms, such as putting away the sodomites or male prostitutes, removing idols from holy places, breaking down altars, pillars and Asherim. He even deposed the “queen mother” because of her idolatrous practices, and of the image which she had made for Asherah (1 Kings 15:12 ff; 2 Chronicles 14:3). Though the king himself, in the main, was a zealous reformer, his subjects did not always keep pace with him (1 Kings 15:17). With an army of 580,000 he repelled an attack of Zerah, the Ethiopian, and routed him completely at Mareshah in the lowlands of Judah (2 Chronicles 14:6 ff). Directed and encouraged by Azariah the prophet, he carried on a great revival. Having restored the great altar of burnt offering in the temple, he assembled the people for a renewal of their covenant with Yahweh. On this occasion 700 oxen and 7,000 sheep were offered in sacrifice. For the next twenty years there was apparently great prosperity and peace throughout his kingdom, but in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, Judah was attacked by Baasha, king of Israel, at all times hostile to Judah (1 Kings 15:32). Baasha continued to encroach and finally fortified Ramah as a frontier fortress. Asa, faint-hearted, instead of putting his entire trust in Yahweh, made an alliance with Ben-hadad, of Damascus. The Syrian king, in consideration of a large sum of money and much treasure from the temple at Jerusalem, consented to attack the northern portion of Baasha’s territory. It was at this favorable moment that Asa captured Ramah, and with the vast building material collected there by Baasha, he built Geba of Benjamin and Mizpah (1 Kings 15:16-22). This lack of faith in Yahweh was severely criticized by Hanani the prophet. Asa, instead of listening patiently to this prophet of God, was greatly offended and enraged and Hanani was put in prison (2 Chronicles 16:1-10). Three years later, Asa was attacked by gout or some disease of the feet. Here again he is accused of lack of faith, for “he sought not to Yahweh, but to the physicians” (2 Chronicles 16:12). Having ruled forty-one years, he died and was buried with great pomp in a tomb erected by himself in the city of David, i.e. Jerusalem. On the whole his reign was very successful, but it is sad to chronicle that as the years rolled on he became less and less faithful to Yahweh and His law.
(2) A son of Elkanah, a Levite, who dwelt in one of the villages of the Netophathites (1 Chronicles 9:16).

W. W. Davies

ASADIAS

<as-a-di’-as> ([ Ἄσαδίας, Asadias]): An ancestor of Baruch (Baruch 1:1).

ASAEL

<a’-sa-el>, <as’-a-el>.

See ASIEL (Apocrypha).

ASAHEL

<as’-a-hel> (כָּשַׁה, “God hath made”; [ Ἀσαήλ, Asael]):

(1) The brother of Joab and Abishai. The three were sons of Zeruiah, one of David’s sisters (1 Chronicles 2:15,16; 2 Samuel 2:18, etc.). The three brothers seem to have been from the beginning members of David’s troop of strangely respectable brigands. Asahel was distinguished for his swift running, and this fact brought misfortune upon him and upon Israel. When Abner and the forces of Ish-bosheth were defeated near Gibeon, Asahel pursued Abner. Abner knew that he could outright Asahel, though he could not outrun him. He also knew that the time had come for making David king, and that a blood feud among the leaders would be a calamity. He expostulated with Asahel, but in vain. It came to a fight, and Abner slew Asahel (2 Samuel 2:3). As a result the coming of David to the throne of all Israel was delayed; and when at last Abner brought it about, he himself was treacherously killed by Joab in alleged blood revenge for Asahel. Asahel is mentioned as sixth in the list of David’s “mighty men” (2 Samuel 23:24; 1 Chronicles 11:26). The earlier of the names in this list are evidently arranged in the order of seniority. If it be assumed that the list was not made till after the death of Asahel, still there is no difficulty in the idea that some of the names in the list were placed there posthumously. Asahel is also mentioned as the fourth of David’s month-
by-month captains (1 Chronicles 27:7). Superficial criticism describes this position as that of “commander of a division of David’s army,” and regards the statement, “and Zebadiah his son after him,” as a note added to explain the otherwise incredible assertion of the text. This criticism is correct in its implication that the fourth captain was, as the text stands, the dead Asahel, in the person of his son Zebadiah. Coming from an annotator, the criticism regards this meaning as intelligible; is it any the less so if we regard it as coming from the author? In fact, the statement is both intelligible and credible. The second of David’s month-by-month captains is Dodai, the father of the second of David’s “mighty men”; and the fourth is Asahel, with his son Zebadiah. With these two variations the twelve month-by-month captains are twelve out of the nineteen seniors in the list of mighty men, and are mentioned in practically the same order of seniority. The 24,000 men each month were not a fighting army mobilized for war. The position of general for a month, whatever else it may have involved, was an honor held by a distinguished veteran. There is no absurdity in the idea that the honor may in some cases have been posthumous, the deceased being represented by his father or his son or by someone else.

(2) A Levite member of the commission of captains and Levites and priests which Jehoshaphat, in his third year, sent among the cities of Judah, with the book of the law, to spread information among the people (2 Chronicles 17:7-9).

(3) One of the keepers of the storechambers in the temple in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 31:13).

(4) The father of Jonathan who was one of the two men who “stood upon this,” at the time when Ezra and the people appointed a court to consider the cases of those who had married foreign wives (Ezra 10:15). The text of the Revised Version (British and American) translates “stood up against this,” while the margin has “were appointed over this.” — Willis J. Beecher
ASAHIAH

<as-a-hi’-a> (עַשַּׁיָּהוּ [asayah], “Yahweh hath made”; the King James Version form; the Revised Version (British and American) ASAILAH): “The king’s servant” sent by Josiah with Hilkiah, the priest, and others to inquire of Yahweh concerning the words of the book found in the temple (2 Kings 22:12,14; 2 Chronicles 34:20).

ASAIAH

<as-a’-ya> (עַשַּׁיָּהוּ, “Yahweh has made,” written Asahiah twice in the King James Version (2 Kings 22:12,14)):

(1) A Levite of the family of Merari, and one of those who helped bring the ark from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 6:30; 15:6,11).

(2) A leading man of the tribe of Simeon. He was in the incursion which attacked and dispossessed the MEUNIM (which see), or the shepherd people, in the valley of Gedor (1 Chronicles 4:36).

(3) An officer of Josiah sent to Huldah the prophetess for advice regarding the law book found by Hilkiah (2 Kings 22:12,14; see ASAHIAH).

(4) A Shilonite resident of Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 9:5). He is called Maaseiah in Nehemiah 11:5.

W. W. Davis

ASANA

<as’a-na> ([ʾAsana], Asana, Assana) = Asnah (Ezra 2:50); omitted in Nehemiah. The sons of Asana (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:31).

ASAPH

<as’a-saf> (אַסַּף [’acaph]): Is the name of three men in the Old Testament, of whom one is the reputed author of Psalms 50 and 73 through 83. He
was one of David’s three chief musicians, the other two being Heman, and Ethan or Jeduthun, and we first hear of him when the ark was taken to Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 15:16-19). He conducted with cymbals the music performed in the tent where the ark was housed (1 Chronicles 16:4,5,7,37), while his two coadjutors discharged the same office at Gibeon (1 Chronicles 16:41,42). In 1 Chronicles 25:1 ff we are told that four of his sons were appointed to conduct under him detachments of the great chorus, the families of Heman and Jeduthun also furnishing leaders, and all took part at the dedication of the temple (2 Chronicles 5:12). A., H., and J. were called the king’s seers (1 Chronicles 25; 2 Chronicles 35:15), no doubt an official title of rank or dignity. The “Sons of Asaph” are mentioned in later times. They formed a guild, and played a prominent part at each revival of the national religion.

See MUSIC; PSALMS.

James Millar

ASARA

<as’-a-ra> ([’Asαρά, Asara]; the King James Version Azara): The sons of Asara (temple-servants) returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:31). Omitted in Ezra and Nehemiah.

ASARAMEL

<a-sar’-a-mel> ([’Aσαραμέλ, Asaramel] or Saramel): A name of uncertain origin occurring in 1 Macc 14:28, in the inscription set up in memory of Simon and the Maccabean family. “On the eighteenth day of Elul, in the hundred and seventy and second year, and this is the third year of Simon the high priest, in Asaramel, in a great congregation of priests and people and princes of the nation, and of the elders of the country,” etc. The phrase “in Asaramel” has been taken as referring to a place, and as the name of a title of Simon. Ewald and others take it to be the equivalent of [ba-chatsar `am ‘el], “in the court of the people of God.” Another reading is “in Saramel.” The majority prefer to take the phrase as a title of Simon; the original phrase is then taken to have been [wesar `am ‘el], “and prince of the people of God,” i.e. ethnarch. If
the translator mistook the waw \(\text{w}\) for beth \(\text{b}\) and read [’en], he might have left the phrase untranslated because he supposed it to be the name of a place. Schurer disposes of the [\text{en}] by taking it as a corruption of [\text{segen}] = \[\text{cgeh}\] [ceghen], which is equivalent to the Greek [\text{strategos}] (GVI, I, 197, note 17).

_H. J. Wolf_

**ASAREEL**

\(<\text{a-sa’-re-el}\>, \(<\text{a-sar’-e-el}\>.

*See ASAREL.*

**ASAREL**

\(<\text{as’-ar-el}\> ([’asar’el], “God is ruler”; the King James Version Asareel): A descendant of Judah and a son of Jehallelel (\text{\textsuperscript{1}} Chronicles 4:16).

**ASARELAH**

\(<\text{as-a-re’-la}\>.

*See ASHARELAH.*

**ASBACAPHATH**

\(<\text{as-bak’-a-fath}\>.

*See ASBASARETH.*

**ASBASARETH**

\(<\text{as-bas’-a-reth}\> (Septuagint: [’\text{Asbakaphath}], or [’\text{Asbasareth}]: The Greek rendering of the Assyrian [Asshur-ach-iddina] (“Esarhaddon”) (1 Esdras 5:69; compare also Ezra 4:2,10).

*See OSNAPPAR.*
ASCALON

<as’-ka-lon> ([ Ἀσκάλων, Askalon]): In Apocrypha, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) (Judith 2:28; 1 Macc 10:86; 11:60; 12:33).

See ASHKELON.

ASCEND

<a-send’>: By derivation the English word implies motion from a lower place to (not merely toward) a higher one; and usage tends to restrict it to cases where the beholder is in the lower, not the higher, position. the King James Version uses it 39 times in all:

1. of the going up of vapor (<Psalm 135:7), flame (<Judges 20:40), or smoke (<Revelation 8:4);
2. of travel from one place to another (<Acts 25:1) or of the course of a boundary (<Joshua 15:3);
3. of coming up from the underworld (<1 Samuel 28:13; Revelation 11:7; 17:8); and
4. of the going up (of men, angels, our Lord) from earth to the skies or to heaven (<Genesis 28:12; John 3:13). the Revised Version (British and American) uses the appropriate form of “to go up” in all cases falling under
1. and 2; in those under
2 and 3; in those under
4. it retains “ascend” with an occasional change in tense; under

F. K. Farr
ASCENSION

"<a-sen’-shun>" : Most modern Lives of Christ commence at Bethlehem and end with the Ascension, but Christ’s life began earlier and continued later. The Ascension is not only a great fact of the New Testament, but a great factor in the life of Christ and Christians, and no complete view of Jesus Christ is possible unless the Ascension its consequences are included. It is the consummation of His redemptive work. The Christ of the Gospels is the Christ of history, the Christ of the past, but the full New Testament picture of Christ is that of a living Christ, the Christ of heaven, the Christ of experience, the Christ of the present and the future. The New Testament passages referring to the Ascension need close study and their teaching careful observation.

1. IN THE GOSPELS.

1. Anticipations:

The Ascension is alluded to in several passages in the Gospels in the course of our Lord’s earthly ministry (Luke 9:31,51; John 6:62; 7:33; 12:32; 14:12,28; 16:5,10,17,28; 20:17). These passages show that the event was constantly in view, and anticipated by our Lord. The Ascension is also clearly implied in the allusions to His coming to earth on clouds of heaven (Matthew 24:30; 26:64).

2. Records:

If with most modern scholars we regard Mark’s Gospel as ending with 16:8, it will be seen to stop short at the resurrection, though the present ending speaks of Christ being received up into heaven, of His sitting at the right hand of God, and of His working with the disciples as they went preaching the word (Mark 16:19,20). In any case this is a bare summary only. The close of the Third Gospel includes an evident reference to the fact of the Ascension (Luke 24:28-53), even if the last six words of Luke 24:51, “and was carried up into heaven” are not authentic. No difficulty need be felt at the omission of the Fourth Gospel to refer to the fact of the Ascension, though it was universally accepted at the time the apostle wrote (John 20:17). As Dr. Hort has pointed out, “The Ascension did not lie within the proper scope of the Gospels .... its true
place was at the head of the Acts of the Apostles” (quoted Swete, The Ascended Christ, 2).

2. IN THE ACTS.

1. Record:
The story in Acts 1:6-12 is clear. Jesus Christ was on the Mount of Olives. There had been conversation between Him and His disciples, and in the course of it He was taken up; and a cloud received Him out of their sight (Acts 1:9). His body was uplifted till it disappeared, and while they continued to gaze up they saw two men who assured them that He would come back exactly as He had gone up. The three Greek words rendered “taken up” (ἐπήρθη, eperthe) (Acts 1:9); “went” (πορευομένου, poreuomenou) (Acts 1:10); “received up” (ἀναλημφθείς, analemphtheis) (Acts 1:11); deserve careful notice. This account must either be attributed to invention, or to the testimony of an eye-witness. But Luke’s historicity now seems abundantly proved.

2. References:
The Ascension is mentioned or implied in several passages in Acts 2:33 ff; 3:21; 7:55 f; 9:3-5; 22:6-8; 26:13-15. All these passages assert the present life and activity of Jesus Christ in heaven.

3. IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

1. Romans:
In Romans 8:34 the apostle states four facts connected with Christ Jesus: His death; His resurrection; His session at God’s right hand; His intercession. The last two are clearly the culminating points of a series of redemptive acts.

2. Ephesians:
While for its purpose Romans necessarily lays stress on the Resurrection, Ephesians has as part of its special aim an emphasis on the Ascension. In 1:20 God’s work wrought in Christ is shown to have gone much farther than the Resurrection, and to have “made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places,” thereby constituting Him the supreme authority over all
things, and especially Head of the church (1:20-23). This idea concerning Christ is followed in 2:6 by the association of believers with Christ “in the heavenly places,” and the teaching finds its completest expression in 4:8-11, where the Ascension is connected with the gift of the heavenly Christ as the crowning feature of His work. Nothing is more striking than the complementary teaching of Romans and Ephesians respectively in their emphasis on the Resurrection and Ascension.

3. Philippians:

In Philippians 2:6-11 the exaltation of Christ is shown to follow His deep humiliation. He who humbled Himself is exalted to the place of supreme authority. In 3:20 Christians are taught that their commonwealth is in heaven, “whence also we wait for a Saviour.”

4. Thessalonians:

The emphasis placed on the second advent of Christ in 1 Thessalonians is an assumption of the fact of the Ascension. Christians are waiting for God’s Son from heaven (1:10) who is to “descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God” (4:16).

5. Timothy:

The only allusion to the Ascension in the Pastoral Epistles is found in the closing statement of what seems to be an early Christian song in Timothy 3:16. He who was “manifested in the flesh .... received up in glory.”

4. IN HEBREWS.

In Hebrews there is more recorded about the Ascension and its consequences than in any other part of the New Testament. The facts of the Ascension and Session are first of all stated (1:3) with all that this implies of definite position and authority (1:4-13). Christians are regarded as contemplating Jesus as the Divine Man in heaven (2:9), though the meaning of the phrase, “crowned with glory and honor” is variously interpreted, some thinking that it refers to the result and outcome of His death, others thinking that He was “crowned for death” in the event of the Transfiguration (Matheson in Bruce, Hebrews, 83). Jesus Christ is
described as “a great High Priest, who hath passed through the heavens” (4:14), as a Forerunner who is entered within the veil for us, and as a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (6:20). As such He “abideth for ever,” and “ever liveth to make intercession” (7:24,25). The chief point of the epistle itself is said to be “such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens” (8:1), and His position there implies that He has obtained eternal redemption for His people and is appearing before God on their behalf (9:12,24). This session at God’s right hand is also said to be with a view to His return to earth when His enemies will have become His footstool (10:12,13), and one of the last exhortations bids believers to look unto Jesus as the Author and Perfecter of faith who has “sat down at the right hand of the throne of God” (12:2).

5. IN THE PETRINE EPISTLES.

The only reference to the Ascension is in 1 Peter 3:22, where Christ’s exaltation after His sufferings is set forth as the pattern and guarantee of Christian glorification after endurance of persecution.

6. IN THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS.

1. Epistles:

Nothing is recorded of the actual Ascension, but 1 John 2:1 says that “we have an Advocate with the Father.” The word “Advocate” is the same as “Comforter” in John 14:16, where it is used of the Holy Spirit. Christ is the Comforter “in relation to the Father,” and the Holy Spirit is the Comforter dwelling in the soul.

2. Apocalypse:

All the references in the Apocalypse either teach or imply the living Christ who is in heaven, as active in His church and as coming again (Revelation 1:7,13; 5:5-13; 6:9-17; 14:1-5).
7. SUMMARY OF NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING.

1. The Fact:

The New Testament calls attention to the fact of Ascension and the fact of the Session at God’s right hand. Three words are used in the Greek in connection with the Ascension: anabainein (ascendere), “to go up”; analambanesthai (adsumi), “to be taken up”; poreuesthai “to go.” The Session is connected with Psalm 110, and this Old Testament passage finds frequent reference or allusion in all parts of the New Testament. But it is used especially in He in connection with Christ’s priesthood, and with His position of authority and honor at God’s right hand (Swete, The Ascended Christ, 10-15). But the New Testament emphasizes the fact of Christ’s exaltation rather than the mode, the latter being quite secondary. Yet the acceptance of the fact must be carefully noticed, for it is impossible to question that this is the belief of all the New Testament writers. They base their teaching on the fact and do not rest content with the moral or theological aspects of the Ascension apart from the historic reality. The Ascension is regarded as the point of contact between the Christ of the gospels and of the epistles. The gift of the Spirit is said to have come from the ascended Christ. The Ascension is the culminating point of Christ’s glorification after His Resurrection, and is regarded as necessary for His heavenly exaltation. The Ascension was proved and demanded by the Resurrection, though there was no need to preach it as part of the evangelistic message. Like the Virgin birth, the Ascension involves doctrine for Christians rather than non-Christians. It is the culmination of the Incarnation, the reward of Christ’s redemptive work, and the entrance upon a wider sphere of work in His glorified condition, as the Lord and Priest of His church (John 7:39; 16:7).

2. The Message:

We may summarize what the New Testament tells us of our Lord’s present life in heaven by observing carefully what is recorded in the various passages of the New Testament. He ascended into heaven (Mark 16:19; Luke 24:51; Acts 1:9); He is seated on the right hand of God (Colossians 3:1; Hebrews 1:3; 8:1; 10:12); He bestowed the gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 4:9,33); He added disciples to the church (Acts 2:47); He worked with the disciples as
they went forth preaching the gospel (Mark 16:20); He healed the impotent man (Acts 3:16); He stood to receive the first martyr (Acts 7:56); He appeared to Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9:5); He makes intercession for His people (Romans 8:26; Hebrews 7:25); He is able to succor the tempted (Hebrews 2:18); He is able to sympathize (Hebrews 4:15); He is able to save to the uttermost (Hebrews 7:25); He lives forever (Hebrews 7:24; Revelation 1:18); He is our Great High Priest (Hebrews 7:26; 8:1; 10:21); He possesses an intransmissible or inviolable priesthood (Hebrews 7:24); He appears in the presence of God for us (Hebrews 9:24); He is our Advocate with the father (1 John 2:1); He is waiting until all opposition to Him is overcome (Hebrews 10:13). This includes all the teaching of the New Testament concerning our Lord’s present life in heaven.

8. PROBLEMS.

There are two questions usually associated with the Ascension which need our attention.

1. Relation to the Laws of Nature:

There is no greater difficulty in connection with the Ascension than with the Resurrection, or the Incarnation. Of our Lord’s resurrection body we know nothing. All we can say is that it was different from the body laid in the tomb and yet essentially the same; the same and yet essentially different. The Ascension was the natural close of Our Lord’s earthly life, and as such, is inseparable from the Resurrection. Whatever, therefore, may be said of the Resurrection in regard to the laws of nature applies equally to the Ascension.

2. Localization of the Spiritual World:

The record in Acts is sometimes objected to because it seems to imply the localization of heaven above the earth. But is not this taking the narrative in too absolutely bald and literal a sense? Heaven is at once a place and a state, and as personality necessarily implies locality, some place for our Lord’s Divine, yet human person is essential. To speak of heaven as “above” may be only symbolical, but the ideas of fact and locality must be carefully adhered to. And yet it is not merely local, and “we have to think
less of a transition from one locality than of a transition from one condition to another. .... the real meaning of the ascension is that .... our Lord withdrew from a world of limitations” to that higher existence where God is (Milligan, Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood, 26). It matters not that our conception today of the physical universe is different from that of New Testament times. We still speak of the sun setting and rising, though strictly these are not true. The details of the Ascension are really unimportant. Christ disappeared from view, and no question need be raised either of distance or direction. We accept the fact without any scientific explanation. It was a change of conditions and mode of existence; the essential fact is that He departed and disappeared. Even Keim admits that “the ascension of Jesus follows from all the facts of His career” (quoted, Milligan, 13), and Weiss is equally clear that the Ascension is as certain as the Resurrection, and stands and fails therewith (Milligan, 14).

9. ITS RELATION TO CHRIST HIMSELF.

The Ascension was the exaltation and glory of Jesus Christ after His work was accomplished (Philippians 2:9). He had a threefold glory:

1. as the Son of God before the Incarnation (John 17:5);
2. as God manifest in the flesh (John 1:14);
3. as the exalted Son of God after the Resurrection and Ascension (Luke 24:26; 1 Peter 1:21). The Ascension meant very much to Christ Himself, and no study of subject must overlook this aspect of New Testament teaching. His exaltation to the right hand of meant

1. the proof of victory (Ephesians 4:8);
2. the position of honor (Psalm 110:1);
3. the place of power (Acts 2:33);
4. the place of happiness (Psalm 26:11);
5. the place of rest (“seated”);
6. the place of permanence (“for ever”).
10. ITS TEACHING FOR CHRISTIANS.

The importance of the Ascension for Christians lies mainly in the fact that it was the introduction to our Lord’s present life in heaven which means so much in the believer’s life. The spiritual value of the Ascension lies, not in Christ’s physical remoteness, but in His spiritual nearness. He is free from earthly limitations, and His life above is the promise and guarantee of ours. “Because I live ye shall live also.”

1. Redemption Accomplished:

The Ascension and Session are regarded as the culminating point of Christ’s redemptive work (Hebrews 8:1), and at the same time the demonstration of the sufficiency of His righteousness on man’s behalf. For sinful humanity to reach heaven two essential features were necessary:

(a) the removal of sin (negative); and

(b) the presence of righteousness (positive).

The Resurrection demonstrated the sufficiency of the atonement for the former, and the Ascension demonstrated the sufficiency of righteousness for the latter. The Spirit of God was to convict the world of “righteousness” “because I go to the Father” (John 16:10). In accord with this we find that in the Epistle to the He every reference to our Lord’s atonement is in the past, implying completeness and perfection, “once for all.”

2. High Priesthood:

This is the peculiar and special message of He. Priesthood finds its essential features in the representation of man to God, involving access into the Divine presence (Hebrews 5:1). It means drawing near and dwelling near to God. In He, Aaron is used as typical of the work, and Melchizedek as typical of the person of the priest; and the two acts mainly emphasized are the offering in death and the entrance into heaven. Christ is both priest and priestly victim. He offered propitiation and then entered into heaven, not “with,” but “through” His own blood (Hebrews 9:12), and as High Priest, at once human and Divine, He is able to
sympathize (Hebrews 4:15); able to succor (Hebrews 2:18); and able to save (Hebrews 7:25).

See CHRIST AS PRIEST.

3. Lordship:

The Ascension constituted Christ as Head of the church (Ephesians 1:22; 4:10,15; Colossians 2:19). This Headship teaches that He is the Lord and Life of the church. He is never spoken of as King in relation to His Body, the Church, only as Head and Lord. The fact that He is at the right hand of God suggests in the symbolical statement that He is not yet properly King on His own throne, as He will be hereafter as “King of the Jews,” and “King of Kings.”

4. Intercession:

In several New Testament passages this is regarded as the crowning point of our Lord’s work in heaven (Romans 8:33,34). He is the perfect Mediator between God and man (1 Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 8:6); our Advocate with the Father (1 John 2:1). His very presence at God’s right hand pleads on behalf of His people. There is no presentation, or representation, or pleading, of Himself, for His intercession is never associated with any such relation to the sacrifice of Calvary. Nor is there any hint in the New Testament of a relation between the Eucharist and His life and work in heaven. This view popularized by the late Dr. William Milligan (The Ascension, etc., 266), and endorsed from other standpoints in certain aspects of Anglican teaching (Swete, The Ascended Christ, 46), does not find any support in the New Testament. As Westcott says, “The modern conception of Christ, pleading in heaven His passion, ‘offering His blood,’ on behalf of man, has no foundation in this epistle” (Hebrews, 230). And Hort similarly remarks, “The words, ‘Still .... His prevailing death He pleads’ have no apostolic warrant, and cannot even be reconciled with apostolic doctrine” (Life and Letters, II, 213). our Lord’s intercession is He says as in what He is. He pleads by His presence on His Father’s throne, and he is able to save to the uttermost through His intercession, because of His perpetual life and His inviolable, undelegated, intransmissible priesthood (Hebrews 7:24,25).
5. The Gift of the Spirit:

There is an intimate and essential connection between the Ascension of Christ and the descent of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was given to Christ as the acknowledgment and reward of His work done, and having received this “Promise of the Father” He bestowed Him upon His people (Acts 2:33). By means of the Spirit the twofold work is done, of convincing sinners (John 16:9), and of edifying believers (John 14:12; see also John 14:25,26; 16:14,15).

6. Presence:

It is in connection with the Ascension and our Lord’s life in heaven that we understand the force of such a passage as “Lo, I am with you always” (Matthew 28:20). “He ever liveth” is the supreme inspiration of the individual Christian and of the whole church. All through the New Testament from the time of the Ascension onward, the one assurance is that Christ is living; and in His life we live, hold fellowship with God, receive grace for daily living and rejoice in victory over sin, sorrow and death.

7. Expectation:

Our Lord’s life in heaven looks forward to a consummation. He is “expecting till his enemies be made his footstool” (Hebrews 10:13 the King James Version). He is described as our Forerunner (Hebrews 6:18 ff), and His presence above is the assurance that His people will share His life hereafter. But His Ascension is also associated with His coming again (Philippians 3:20,21; 1 Thessalonians 4:16; Hebrews 9:28). At this coming there will be the resurrection of dead saints, and the transformation of living ones (1 Thessalonians 4:16,17), to be followed by the Divine tribunal with Christ as Judge (Romans 2:16; 2 Timothy 4:1,8). To His own people this coming will bring joy, satisfaction and glory (Acts 3:21; Romans 8:19); to His enemies defeat and condemnation (1 Corinthians 15:25; Hebrews 2:8; 10:13).

Reviewing all the teaching of our Lord’s present life in heaven, appearing on our behalf, interceding by His presence, bestowing the Holy Spirit, governing and guiding the church, sympathizing, helping and saving His
people, we are called upon to up “lift our hearts,” for it is in occupation with the living that we find the secret of peace, the assurance of access, and the guaranty of our permanent relation to God. Indeed, we are clearly taught in He that it is in fellowship with the present life of Christ in heaven that Christians realize the difference between spiritual immaturity and maturity (Hebrews 6:1; 10:1), and it is the purpose of this epistle to emphasize this truth above all others. Christianity is “the religion of free access to God,” and in proportion as we realize, in union with Christ in heaven, this privilege of drawing near and keeping near, we shall find in the attitude of “lift up your hearts” the essential features of a strong, vigorous, growing, joyous Christian life.

**LITERATURE.**

ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ASCENT

(a-sent'):

(1) The rendering in the King James Version twice, the Revised Version (British and American) 14 times correctly, of Hebrew [ma`aleh], “ascent,” “pass,” as a geographical term (the King James Version Numbers 34:4; 2 Samuel 15:30; the Revised Version (British and American) Joshua 10:10; Judges 8:13, etc.).

(2) The rendering in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of [`olah] in 1 Kings 10:5, “his ascent by which he went up unto the house of Yahweh”; but [`olah] everywhere else means “burnt-offering,” and all ancient versions support the Revised Version, margin, “his burnt-offering which he offered” (caused to go up), etc.

(3) In 2 Chronicles 9:4 (parallel 1 Kings 10:5) a very slight textual correction (supported by Septuagint) gives us the same words as in 1 Kings instead of the difficult [`aliyah], “upper chamber,” not “ascent” as the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render it against all usage elsewhere.

(4) In the Revised Version (British and American) Ezekiel 40:31,34,37; Nehemiah 12:37, of a flight of steps, stairs.

(5) In the Revised Version (British and American) (Hebrew [`aliyah]), Nehemiah 3:31,32, margin “upper chamber” is to be preferred to text “ascent.”

F. K. Farr
ASCHENAZ

<ash’-e-naz>.

See ASHKENAZ.

ASEAS

<a-se’-as> ([’Ασαίας, Asaias] = Isshijah (\textsuperscript{\textit{Ezra 10:31}})) A son of Annas, who put away his “strange wife” (1 Esdras 9:32).

ASEBEBIAS

<a-seb-e-bi’-as>, <a-seb-e-bi’-a> ([’Ασεβήβιας, Asebebias]; the King James Version Asebebia): Asebebias his sons and brethren returned with Ezra to perform the functions of priesthood in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:47). Compare Sherebiah (\textsuperscript{\textit{Ezra 8:18}}).

ASEBIAS

<as-e-bi’-as>, <as-e-bi’-a> ([’Ασεβίας, Asebias]; the King James Version Asebia): Asebias returned with Ezra to perform the function of a priest in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:48). Compare Hashabiah (\textsuperscript{\textit{Ezra 8:19}}).

ASENATH

<as’-e-nath> ([’Ασενάθ, Aseneth]): The wife of Joseph, daughter of Potiphera, mother of Manasseh and Ephraim (\textsuperscript{\textit{Genesis}} 41:45,50; 46:20). She was evidently an Egyptian woman and bore an Egyptian name. 

\textsuperscript{\textit{Genesis}} [’-c-n-t], pointed by the Massoretes as \textsuperscript{\textit{Genesis}} [’acenath], appears in the Septuagint as aseneth or asenneth. The last two consonants appear to represent the name of the Egyptian goddess Neith. The first part of the name will then represent either ns = “belonging to” (so Brugsch and generally), or ‘ws-n (note the doubled “n” in the Septuagint transcription) = “she belongs to” (so Spiegelberg). It is possible that these four letters represent the Egyptian name Sn-t (so Lieblein and others), though the ‘aleph (‘) must then be explained as ‘aleph prostheticum and the taw (t) would be less regular than a he (h) to stand for the Egyptian feminine t. 

\textit{J. Oscar Boyd}
ASER

<a'-ser> ([ Ἄσήρ, Aser]): the King James Version: Greek form of Asher (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Luke 2:36; Revelation 7:6).

ASERER

<as'-e-rer>

See SERAR.

ASH (1)

<ash> ([ ὄρν, ['oren]; the Revised Version (British and American) &FIR TREE; the Revised Version, margin Ash): A maker of idols “planteth a fir-tree (margin, “ash”), and the rain doth nourish it” (Isaiah 44:14). It is a suggestion as old as Luther that the final letter "n", was originally a "z", and that the word should be ['erez], “cedar”; the chief objection is that cedar occurs just before in the same verse. The word ['oren] seems to be connected with the Assyrian irin, meaning fir or cedar or allied tree. “Fir” has support from the Septuagint and from the rabbis. Post (HDB) suggests as probable the stone pine, Pinus pinea, which has been extensively planted round Beirut and unlike most planted trees flourishes without artificial watering — ”the rain doth nourish it.”

The translation “ash” was probably suggested by the fanciful resemblance of the Hebrew ['oren] and the Latin ornus, the manna ash of Europe. Three varieties of ash flourish in Syria, Fraxinus ornus, F. excelsior and F. oxycarpa. The last mentioned, which is common in parts of North Palestine, being a large tree some 30 to 40 ft. high, might suit the context were there anything philological to support the idea.

E. W. G. Masterman

ASH (2)

(Bear).

See ASTRONOMY.
ASHAMED

*a-sham’d*': Almost exclusively moral in significance; confusion or abashment through consciousness of guilt or of its exposure. Often including also a sense of terror or fear because of the disgrace connected with the performance of some action. Capacity for shame indicates that moral sense (conscience) is not extinct. “Ashamed” occurs 96 out of 118 times in the Old Testament. Hebrew הָוֹשׁ [bosh], “to feel shame” (Latin, pudere), with derivatives occurs 80 times; לָטָם [kalam], “to shame,” including the thought of “disgrace,” “reproach”; גַּפֵּר [chapher], “to blush”: hence shame because of frustrated plans (uniformly in the Revised Version (British and American) “confounded”); Greek αἰσχύνομαι, aischunomai], “suffused with shame,” passive only and its compounds. Uses:

(1) A few times, of actual embarrassment, as of Hazael before the steadfast look of Elisha (2 Kings 8:11; see also 2 Samuel 10:5; 2 Kings 2:17; Ezra 8:22).

(2) Innocence not capable of shame: “both naked .... and .... not ashamed” (Genesis 2:25; see SHAME); the redeemed no occasion for (Psalm 34:5 the King James Version; John 2:28); Christ not of “brethren” (Hebrews 2:11); nor Christian of gospel (Romans 1:16); nor God of men of faith (Hebrews 11:16); nor they who trust in God (Isaiah 50:7; 54:4; Joel 2:26).

(3) Sense of guilt: “I am ashamed .... for our iniquities” (Ezra 9:6); “of thy lewd way” (Ezekiel 16:27,61); ascribed to idolaters chagrined at worthlessness of idols (Isaiah 1:29; 44:9,11; 45:16; Jeremiah 2:26); to enemies (Psalm 6:10); to wicked (Psalm 31:17); to all who forsake God (Jeremiah 17:13); to those who trust in human help, as Israel of Egypt and Assyria, and Moab of Chemosh (Jeremiah 2:36; 48:13); to a mother of wicked children (Jeremiah 50:12).

(4) Repentance causes shame for sin (Jeremiah 31:19; Romans 6:21).

(5) Calamities also, and judgments (Jeremiah 14:3,4; 15:9; 20:11).
(6) Capacity for shame may be lost through long-continued sin (Jeremiah 6:15; 8:12; compare 3:3), exceptionally striking passages on the deadening power of immorality, suggestive of 1 Timothy 4:2; Titus 1:15.

(7) The grace of Christ delivers from the shame of moral timidity (Romans 1:16; 2 Timothy 18,12,16; 1 Peter 4:16).

(8) At Christ’s second coming His followers will “not be ashamed before him” (1 John 2:28); at the final judgment He will be ashamed of all who have been ashamed of Him (Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26; compare Matthew 10:33; Hebrews 11:16).

(9) The word lends itself to rich poetic use, e.g. Lebanon, with faded and falling foliage, “is ashamed” (the Revised Version (British and American) “confounded”) at the desolations of the land under Sennacherib (Isaiah 33:9); so great is God’s glory in the new Jerusalem that “the sun (is) ashamed” in His presence (Isaiah 24:23), explaining the glorious figure in Revelation 21:23; 22:5. (The references in this article are from the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) frequently replaces ‘ashamed’ by ‘put to shame.’)

See SHAME.

Dwight M. Pratt

ASHAN

<\texttt{\textasciitilde a\textasciitilde}-shan\texttt{\textasciitilde}>(
\texttt{\textasciitilde ashan\texttt{\textasciitilde}}): An unknown site in the domain of Judah (Joshua 15:42), possessed by Simeon (Joshua 19:7), and mentioned among the priests’ cities in 1 Chronicles 6:59. (44) = Joshua 21:16 (\texttt{\textasciitilde ayin\texttt{\textasciitilde}}) is a corruption of \texttt{\textasciitilde ashan\texttt{\textasciitilde}}. Chorashan (or Borashan), which was probably the site of some reservoir in the Southwest part of Judah (1 Samuel 30:30), is the same as Ashan.
ASHARELAH; ASARELAH

<ash-a-re’-la> (אֲשָרֶלאֹה ‘asar’elah): One of the Asaphites appointed by David to the temple service (1 Chronicles 25:2); in Chronicles 25:14 he is called Jesharelah. The latter element in both forms may be (‘el) “God,” but the meaning of the former part in the first form is doubtful. Thes. compares [‘acar], “to bind,” “whom God has bound (by a vow).”

ASHBEA

<ash’-be-a>, <ash-be’-a> (אָשָׂבָא [’ashbea`]): “The house of Ashbea,” a family of linen-workers mentioned in 1 Chronicles 4:21. We might render [beth ‘ashbea`] as their dwelling-place; nothing is known of such a place nor is this house of weavers referred to in any other place.

ASHBEL; ASHBELITE

<ash’-bel>, <ash’-bel-it> (אָשֶׁב לִי [’ashbel]): The gentilic name “Ashbelite” is found in Numbers 26:38, second son of Benjamin (Genesis 46:21). In 1 Chronicles 7:6-11

(6) “Jediael” (“known to God”) is substituted for the heathen-sounding “Ashbel” (“Ishbaal,” “man of Baal”). The chronicler, in this case, conforms literally to the principle laid down in Hosea 2:17; the title “Baal” (“lord”) was applied in early days (e.g. in the days of Saul) to the national God of Israel, but in later days the prophets objected to it because it was freely applied to heathen gods (compare ISHBOSHETH). In 1 Chronicles 8:1 the three names Bela, Ashbel, Aharah (= Ahiram) are taken from Numbers 26:38, however, without change.

H. J. Wolf

ASHDOD

<ash’-dod> (אֲשָׂדֹד [’ashdodh]; [ Αζωτός, Azotos]; modern Esdud): One of the five chief cities of the Philistines. The name means
stronghold or fortress, and its strength may be inferred by the fact that Psammetik I, of Egypt, besieged it for many years (Herodotus says 29). Some of the Anakim were found there in the days of Joshua (Joshua 11:22), and the inhabitants were too strong for the Israelites at that time. It was among the towns assigned to Judah, but was not occupied by her (Joshua 13:3; 15:46,47). It was still independent in the days of Samuel, when, after the defeat of the Israelites, the ark was taken to the house of Dagon in Ashdod (1 Samuel 5:1,2). We have no account of its being occupied even by David, although he defeated the Philistines many times, and we have no definite knowledge of its coming into the hands of Judah until the time of Uzziah (2 Chronicles 26:6). Ashdod, like the other Philistine towns, came under the authority of the Assyrian monarchs, and we have mention of it in their records. It revolted against Sargon in 711 BC, and deposed the Assyrian governor, Akhimiti, who had been appointed by him in 720. Sargon at once dispatched a force to subdue the rebels and the city was severely punished. This is referred to by Isaiah (Isaiah 20:1). Amos had prophesied such a calamity some years before (1:8), and Jeremiah refers to “the remnant of Ashdod” as though it had continued weak until his day (Jeremiah 25:20). Zephaniah (Zephaniah 2:4) refers to the desolation of Ashdod and Zechariah to its degraded condition (Zechariah 9:6). It continued to be inhabited, however, for we find the Jews intermarried with them after the return from Babylon (Nehemiah 13:23,24). In the Maccabean period we are told that Judas and Jonathan both took it and purified it of idolatry (1 Macc 5:68; 10:84). In these passages it is called Azotus, as it is also in the New Testament (Acts 8:40). In the 4th century AD it became the seat of a bishopric. It had been restored in the time of Herod, by the Roman general Gabinius, and was presented to Salome, the sister of Herod, by the emperor Augustus. It is now a small village about 18 miles Northeast of Gaza.

H. Porter

ASHDODITES

Inhabitants of &ASHDOD (which see) (Joshua 13:3; the King James Version Ashdothites, Nehemiah 4:7).
ASHDOOTH PISGAH

Thus the King James Version for the Revised Version (British and American) “The slopes (the Revised Version, margin springs) of Pisgah.” The spurs and ravines, or the “shoulders” of Pisgah are meant. ['Ashedah] is “a pouring out,” and ['ashedoth] are the slopes of a mountain from which springs gush forth. In Joshua 10:40; 12:8, ['Ashedoth], translated “springs” in the King James Version, is “slopes” in the Revised Version (British and American) (Deuteronomy 3:17; Joshua 12:3; 13:20).

See PISGAH.

ASHER (1)

According to the Biblical account Asher was the eighth of Jacob’s sons, the second borne to him by Zilpah the handmaid of Leah. His uterine brother was Gad (Genesis 35:26). With four sons and one daughter he went down into Egypt (Genesis 46:17). At his birth Leah exclaimed, “Happy am I! for the daughters will call me happy: and she called his name Asher,” i.e. Happy (Genesis 30:13). This foreshadowing of good fortune for him is repeated in the blessing of Jacob: “His bread shall be fat, and he shall yield royal dainties” (Genesis 49:20); and again in that of Moses: “Blessed be Asher with children; let him be acceptable unto his brethren, and let him dip his foot in oil” (Deuteronomy 33:24). His family prospered in Egypt, and at the Exodus the tribe of Asher is numbered at 41,500 adult males (Numbers 1:41). At the second census the number is given 53,400 (Numbers 26:47). The place of Asher in the desert march was with the standard of the camp of Dan, on the north of the tabernacle, along with Daniel and Naphtali; the prince of the tribe being Pagiel the son of Ochran (Numbers 2:27 ff). Among the spies Asher was represented by Sethur (Numbers 13:13). The tribe seems to have taken no important part in the subsequent history. It raised no hero, and gave no deliverer to the nation. In the time of David it was of so little consequence
that the name is not found in the list of chief rulers (1 Chronicles 27:16 ff). The rich land assigned to Asher sloped to the Phoenician seaboard, and brought him into touch with the Phoenicians who were already world-famous in trade and commerce. He probably soon became a partner in their profitable enterprises, and lost any desire he may ever have had to eject them from their cities (Judges 1:31). He cared not who ruled over him if he were free to pursue the ends of commerce. Zebulun might jeopard their lives unto the death, and Naphtali upon the high places of the field, to break the power of the foreign oppressor, but Asher “sat still at the haven of the sea, and abode by his creeks” (Judges 5:17 ff). He was probably soon largely absorbed by the people with whose interests his were so closely identified: nevertheless “divers of Asher,” moved by the appeal of Hezekiah, “humbled themselves, and came to Jerus” (2 Chronicles 30:11 the King James Version). To this tribe belonged the prophetess Anna (Luke 2:36 ff).

2. MODERN THEORY:

According to a modern theory, the mention of the slave girl Zilpah as the mother of Asher is meant to indicate that the tribe was of mixed blood, and arose through the mingling of Israelites with the Canaanites. It is suggested that the name may have been taken from that of the Canaanite clan found in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, Mari abd-Ashirti, “sons of the servant of Asherah.” A similar name occurs in the inscriptions of the Egyptian Seti I (14th century BC), ’Aseru, a state in western Galilee (W. Max Muller, As. und Eur., 236-39). This people it is thought may have associated themselves with the invaders from the wilderness. But while the speculations are interesting, it is impossible to establish any relationship between these ancient tribes and Asher.

3. TERRITORY OF ASHER:

The boundaries of the territory are given in considerable detail in Joshua 19:25 ff (compare Judges 1:31 f; Joshua 17:10 f). Only a few of the places named can be identified with certainty. Dor, the modern Tan-Turah, although occupied by Manasseh belonged to Asher. Wady ez-Zerqa, possibly identical with Shihor-libnath, which enters the sea to the South of Dor, would form the southern boundary. The lot of Asher formed a strip
of land from 8 to 10 miles wide running northward along the shore to the neighborhood of Sidon, touching Issachar, Zebulun and Naphtali on the East Asher seems to have taken possession of the territory by a process of peaceful penetration, not by conquest, and as we have seen, he never drove out the Phoenicians from their cities. The rich plain of Acre, and the fertile fiats between the mountain and the sea near Tyre and Sidon therefore remained in Phoenician hands. But the valleys breaking down westward and opening on the plains have always yielded fine crops of grain. Remains of an ancient oak forest still stand to the North of Carmel. The vine, the fig, the lemon and the orange flourish. Olive trees abound, and the supplies of olive oil which to this day are exported from the district recall the word of the old-time blessing, “Let him dip his foot in oil.”

W. Ewing

ASHER (2)

<ash’-er> (אשֶׁר [’asher]):

(1) See preceding article.

(2) A town on the southern border of Manasseh (Joshua 17:7). The site is unknown.

(3) A place of this name is mentioned in Apocrypha (Tobit 1:2), identified with Hazor, in Naphtali.

See HAZOR.

ASHERAH

<a-she’-ra>, <ash’-er-im> (אשֶרָה [’asherah]; [άλσος, alsos], mistranslated “grove” in the King James Version, after the Septuagint and Vulgate):

Was the name of a goddess whose worship was widely spread throughout Syria and Canaan; plural Asherim.
1. REFERENCES TO THE GODDESS:

Her “image” is mentioned in the Old Testament (1 Kings 15:13; 2 Kings 21:7; 2 Chronicles 15:16), as well as her “prophets” (1 Kings 18:19) and the vessels used in her service (2 Kings 23:4). In Assyria the name appears under the two forms of Asratu and Asirtu; it was to Asratu that a monument found near Diarbekir was dedicated on behalf of Khammu-rabi (Amraphel) “king of the Amorites,” and the Amorite king of whom we hear so much in Tell el-Amarna Letters bears the name indifferently of EbedAsrati and Ebed-Asirti.

2. ASSYRIAN ORIGIN OF THE GODDESS:

Like so much else in Canaanite religion, the name and worship of Asherah were borrowed from Assyria. She was the wife of the war-god Asir whose name was identified with that of the city of Assur with the result that he became the national god of Assyria. Since Asirtu was merely the feminine form of Asir, “the superintendent” or “leader,” it is probable that it was originally an epithet of Ishtar (Ashtoreth) of Nineveh. In the West, however, Asherah and Ashtoreth came to be distinguished from one another, Asherah being exclusively the goddess of fertility, whereas Ashtoreth passed into a moon-goddess.

3. HER SYMBOL:

In Assyrian asirtu, which appears also under the forms asratu, esreti (plural) and asru, had the further signification of “sanctuary.” Originally Asirtu, the wife of Asir, and asirtu, “sanctuary,” seem to have had no connection with one another, but the identity in the pronunciation of the two words caused them to be identified in signification, and as the tree-trunk or cone of stone which symbolized Asherah was regarded as a Bethel or “house of the deity,” wherein the goddess was immanent, the word Asirtu, Asherah, came to denote the symbol of the goddess. The trunk of the tree was often provided with branches, and assumed the form of the tree of life. It was as a trunk, however, that it was forbidden to be erected by the side of “the altar of Yahweh” (Deuteronomy 16:21; see Judges 6:25,28,30, 2 Kings 23:6). Accordingly the symbol made for Asherah by his mother was “cut down” by Asa (1 Kings 15:13). So, too, we hear of
Asherim or symbols of the goddess being set up on the high places under the shade of a green tree (Jeremiah 17:2; see 2 Kings 17:10). Manasseh introduced one into the temple at Jerusalem (2 Kings 21:3,7).

4. THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE GODDESS:

Asherah was the goddess of fertility, and thus represented the Babylonian Ishtar in her character as goddess of love and not of war. In one of the cuneiform tablets found at Taanach by Dr. Sellin, and written by one Canaanite sheikh to another shortly before the Israelite invasion of Palestine, reference is made to “the finger of Asherah” from which oracles were derived. The “finger” seems to signify the symbol of the goddess; at any rate it revealed the future by means of a “sign and oracle.” The practice is probably alluded to in Hosea 4:12. The existence of numerous symbols in each of which the goddess was believed to be immanent led to the creation of numerous forms of the goddess herself, which, after the analogy of the Ashtaroth, were described collectively as the Asherim.

A. H. Sayce

ASHERITES

<ash’-er-its> (ha-’asheri): The descendants of Asher, Jacob’s eighth son (Judges 1:32).

ASHES

<ash’-iz>: Among the ancient Hebrews and other Orientals, to sprinkle with or sit in ashes was a mark or token of grief, humiliation, or penitence. Ashes on the head was one of the ordinary signs of mourning for the dead, as when “Tamar put ashes on her head .... and went on crying” (2 Samuel 13:19 the King James Version), and of national humiliation, as when the children of Israel were assembled under Nehemiah “with fasting, and with sackcloth, and earth (ashes) upon them” (Nehemiah 9:1), and when the people of Nineveh repented in sackcloth and ashes at the preaching of Jonah (Jonah 3:5,6; compare 1 Macc 3:47). The afflicted or penitent often sat in ashes (compare Job 2:8; 42:6: “I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes”), or even wallowed in ashes, as Jeremiah
exhorted sinning Israel to do: “O daughter of my people .... wallow thyself in ashes” (Jeremiah 6:26), or as Ezekiel in his lamentation for Tyre pictures her mariners as doing, crying bitterly and `casting up dust upon their heads’ and `wallowing themselves in the ashes’ (in their weeping for her whose head was lifted up and become corrupted because of her beauty), “in bitterness of soul with bitter mourning” (Ezekiel 27:30,31).

However, these and various other modes of expressing grief, repentance, and humiliation among the Hebrews, such as rending the garments, tearing the hair and the like, were not of Divine appointment, but were simply the natural outbursts of the impassioned oriental temperament, and are still customary among eastern peoples.

Figurative: The term “ashes” is often used to signify worthlessness, insignificance or evanescence (Genesis 18:27; Job 30:19). “Proverbs of ashes,” for instance, in Job 13:12, is Job’s equivalent, says one writer, for our modern “rot.” For the ritual use of the ashes of the Red Heifer by the priests, see RED HEIFER.

**George B. Eager**

**ASHHUR**

<ash’-ur> (אשֵׁר [ashchur], the King James Version Ashur): The “father of Tekoa” (1 Chronicles 2:24; 4:5), probably the founder of the village. The original meaning of the name is the “man of Horus,” Ashurites (אשּׁר [ha-’ashuri]). This name occurs in the list of Ish-bosheth’s subjects (2 Samuel 2:9). The Syriac, Arabic, and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) versions read [ha-geshuri], “the Geshurites,” designating the small kingdom to the South or Southeast of Damascus. This reading, though adopted by Ewald, Thenius and Wellhausen, is untenable, for during the reign of Ish-bosheth Geshur was ruled by its own king Talmai, whose daughter was married to David (2 Samuel 3:3; 13:37). Furthermore Geshur was too far away from the rest of Ishbosheth’s territory. A more consistent reading is [ha-’asheri], as given in the Targum of Jonathan and accepted by Kohler, Klost, Kirkpatrick and Budde, “those of the house of Asher” (compare Judges
1:32). The term would, then, denote the country to the West of Jordan above Jezreel.

Samuel Cohon

ASHIMA

\(<\textit{a-shi'-ma}\>, \(<\textit{ash'-i-ma}\>\) (אֲשִׁימָה [‘ashima’]; [ Ἄσιμαθ, Asimath]): A deity worshipped at Hamath (\(<\text{2 Kings 17:30}\) of whom nothing further is known. It has been suggested that the name is the same as that of the goddess Simi, the daughter of the supreme god Hadad, who was worshipped at Membij, but there is nothing to support the suggestion.

ASHKELON

\(<\textit{ask'-ke-lon}\>, \(<\textit{esh'-ka-lon}\>, \(<\textit{as'-ke-lon}\>)\) (the King James Version Eshkalon, (Eshkalonites; \(<\text{Joshua 13:3}\); Askelon, (\(<\text{Judges 1:18; 1 Samuel 6:17; 2 Samuel 1:20}\); Ἀσκέλων [‘ashqelon]; modern Askelan): A maritime town between Jaffa and Gaza, one of the five chief cities of the Philistines. The Ashkelonites are mentioned by Joshua (\(<\text{Joshua 13:3}\)\), and the city was taken by the tribe of Judah (\(<\text{Judges 1:18}\)\). One of the golden tumors (the King James Version “emerods”) sent back with the ark by the Philistines was from Ashkelon (\(<\text{1 Samuel 6:17}\)\). David couples Ashkelon with Gath in his lament over Saul and Jonathan (\(<\text{2 Samuel 1:20}\)\) indicating its importance, and it is joined with Gaza, Ashdod and Ekron in the denunciations of Amos (1:7,8). It is referred to in a similar way by Jeremiah (\(<\text{Jeremiah 25:20; 47:5,7}\)\). Zephaniah (2:4,7) speaks of the desolation of Ashkelon and Zechariah announces the fear of Ashkelon on the destruction of Tyre (9:5). The city is mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, and a certain Yitia is referred to as king. It revolted against Rameses II and was subdued, and we have mention of it as being under the rule of Assyria. Tiglath-pileser III names it among his tributaries, and its king, Mitinti, is said to have lost his reason when he heard of the fall of Damascus in 732 BC. It revolted in the reign of Sennacherib and was punished, and remained tributary to Assyria until the decay of that power. In Maccabean times we learn of its capture by Jonathan (1 Macc 10:86; 11:60, the Revised Version (British and American) “Ascalon”). Herod the Great was born there (BJ, III, ii, 1 ff). In the 4th century AD it was the
seat of a bishopric. It became subject to the Moslems in the 7th century and was taken by the Crusaders. It was taken in 1187 by Saladin, who dismantled it in 1191 to make it useless to Richard of England, into whose hands it was expected to fall. Richard restored it the next year but it was again destroyed by Saladin. It was an important fortress because of its vicinity to the trade route between Syria and Egypt.

H. Porter

ASHKELONITES

<ash’-ke-lon-its> (Joshua 13:3): The people of Ashkelon, who were Philistines.

ASHKENAZ

<ash’-ke-naz> (['ashkenaz]): The name occurs in Genesis 10:3; 1 Chronicles 16, in the list of the sons of Japheth as a son of Gomer. See TABLE OF NATIONS. It occurs also in Jeremiah 51:27 (the King James Version “Ashchenaz”) in connection with the kingdoms of Ararat and Minni, which suggests a location about Armenia.

ASHNAH

<ash’-na> (['ashnah]): Two sites,

(1) Joshua 15:33, a site in the lowlands of Judah, probably near Estaol and Zorah. The small ruin Aslin between those two places may retain an echo of the old name;

(2) Joshua 15:43 an unknown site farther south.

ASHPENAZ

<ash’-pe-naz> (['ashpenaz]): The master of the eunuchs of Nebuchadnezzar was an officer into whose hands the king entrusted those of the children of Israel, and of the princes, and of the seed of the king of Judah, whom he had carried captive to Babylon, that they might be taught the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans in order to serve in the king’s palace. He is mentioned by name in Daniel 1:3 only. It used to be
supposed that the name was Persian; but it now seems more probable that it is Babylonian. We would suggest Ashipu-Anu-Izzu, “the Aship-priest of Ann is mighty,” as a possible form of the original.

R. Dick Wilson

**ASHRIEL**

*<ash’-re-el>.*

*See ASRIEL.*

**ASHTAROTH; ASHTEROTH-KARNAIM; BEESHTERAH**

*<ash’-ta-roth>, <as’-ta-roth>* (עשתרוֹת [‘ashtaroth]; the King James Version Astaroth; [ Ἀσταρόθ, Astaroth], the city of Og, king of Bashan (Deuteronomy 14, etc.); עשתרוהוֹת קראניים [‘ashteroth qarnayim], the scene of the defeat of the Rephaim by Chedorlaomer (Genesis 14:5): (ב‘השטרה [be’eshterah]) a Levitical city in Manasseh East of the Jordan (Joshua 21:27)): The name probably means “house” or “temple of Ashtoreth.” It is identical with Ashtaroth of 1 Chronicles 6:71. Ashtaroth is the plural of ASHTORETH (which see). The name denotes a place associated with the worship of this goddess. Ashteroth-karnaim is mentioned only once in canonical Scripture unless we accept Gratz’s restoration, when Karnaim appears as a city taken by Israel: “Have we not taken to us horns ([qarnayim]) by our own strength?” (Amos 6:13). It is identical with Carnion or Carnaim of 1 and 2 Macc, a city of Gilead with a temple of Atar-gatis. The name Ashtaroth has been identified with Astertu in the lists of Tahutmes III of the XVIIIth Egyptian Dynasty; and with Ashtarti of the Tell el-Amarna Letters. Its claim to antiquity is therefore well established.

As far as the Biblical record is concerned, the names at the head of this article might stand for one and the same city, Ashtaroth being a contraction from Ashteroth-karnaim. But in the days of Eusebius and Jerome, we learn from the Onomasticon, there were two forts of this name 9 miles apart, lying between Adara (Der’ah) and Abila (Abil), while Ashtaroth, the
ancient city of Og, king of Bashan, lay 6 miles from Adara. Carnaim Ashtaroth, which is evidently identical with Ashteroth-karnaim, they describe as a large village in the angle of Bashan where tradition places the home of Job. This seems to point to Tell `Ashtara, a hill which rises about 80 ft. above the plain, 2 miles South of el-Merkez, the seat of the governor of the Chauran. Three-quarters of a mile North of el-Merkez, at the south end of a ridge on which the village of Sheikh Ca’ad is built, stands the weley of the stone of Job, Weley Sakhret ʿAyyub. By the large stone under the dome Job was said to have sat to receive his friends during his affliction. An Egyptian inscription, found by Schumacher, proves the stone to be a monument of the time of Rameses II. At the foot of the hill is pointed out the bath of Job. In el-Merkez the building known as Deir ʿAyyub, “Monastery of Job,” is now part of the barracks. There is also shown the tomb of Job. The stream which flows southward past Tell `Ashtara, is called Moyet en-Neby ʿAyyub, “stream of the prophet Job,” and is said to have risen where the patriarch stamped his foot on his recovery. It is to be noted also that the district lying in the angle formed by Nahr er-Raqqad and the Yarmuk River is called to this day ez-Zawiyet esh-sharqiyyeh, “the eastern angle” (i.e. of the Jaulan). The term may in Jerome’s time have covered the land east of the `Allan, although this is now part of the Chauran. At Tell `Ashtara there are remains pointing to a high antiquity. The site was also occupied during the Middle Ages. Perhaps here we should locate Carnaim Ashtaroth of the Onomasticon. It does not, however, agree with the description of Carnaim in 1 and 2 Macc. The Ashtaroth of the Onomasticon may have been at el-Muzerib, on the great pilgrimage road, about 6 Roman miles from [Der`ah] — the distance indicated by Eusebius. The old fortress here was situated on an island in the middle of the lake, Baheiret el-Bajjeh. A full description of the place is given in Schumacher’s Across the Jordan, 137 ff. It must have been a position of great strength in antiquity; but the ancient name has not been recovered.

Some would place Ashteroth-karnaim, the Carnaim of the Maccabees, at Tell ʿAshʿari, a site 10 Roman miles North of Derʿah, and 4 1/2 Roman miles S 2 of Tell `Ashtara. This clearly was “a place hard to besiege, and difficult of access by reason of the narrowness of the approaches on all sides” (2 Macc 12:21). It crowns a promontory which stands out between
the deep gorge of the Yarmuk River and a great chasm, at the head of which is a waterfall. It could be approached only by the neck connecting it with the mainland; and here it was guarded by a triple wall, the ruins of which are seen today. The remains of a temple close by the bridge over the Yarmuk may mark the scene of the slaughter by Judas.

The whole question however is obscure. Eusebius is clearly guilty of confusion, with his two Ashtaroth-karnaims and his Carnaim Ashtaroth. All the places we have named lie considerably North of a line drawn from Tell Abel to Der`ah. For light upon the problem of identification we must wait the results of excavation.

W. Ewing

ASHTAROTH

Plural of Ashtoreth.

See ASHTORETH.

ASHTERATHITE

<ash’-te-rath-it>, <ash-ter’-ath-it> (חֶשֶׁת רָתִית [ha-`asherathiti]): A native of Ashtaroth: Uzzia, one of David’s heroes (1 Chronicles 11:44).

ASHTEROTH-KARNAIM

<ash’-te-roth kar-na’-im>: I.e. “Ashteroth of the two horns,” mentioned in Genesis 14:5 as the place of Chedorlaomer’s defeat of the Rephaim. See ASHTAROTH. A Carnaim or Carnion in Gilead, with a temple of Atargatis attached, was captured by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:43,44; 2 Macc 12:26).

ASHTORETH

<ash’-to-reth>, <ash-to reth> (יָשְׁתֹּרֵת [‘ashtoreth]; plural יָשְׁתֹּרֵת [‘ashtoarth]; [ ‘Aσταρτῆ, Astarte]):
1. NAME AND ORIGIN:

The name of the supreme goddess of Canaan and the female counterpart of Baal.

The name and cult of the goddess were derived from Babylonia, where Ishtar represented the evening and morning stars and was accordingly androgynous in origin. Under Semitic influence, however, she became solely female, but retained a memory of her primitive character by standing, alone among the Assyro-Bab goddesses, on a footing of equality with the male divinities. From Babylonia the worship of the goddess was carried to the Semites of the West, and in most instances the feminine suffix was attached to her name; where this was not the case the deity was regarded as a male. On the Moabite Stone, for example, `Ashtar is identified with Chemosh, and in the inscriptions of southern Arabia `Athtar is a god. On the other hand, in Atar-gatis or Derketo (2 Macc 12:26), Atar, without the feminine suffix, is identified with the goddess `Athah or `Athi (Greek Gatis). The cult of the Greek Aphrodite in Cyprus was borrowed from that of Ashtoreth; whether the Greek name also is a modification of Ashtoreth, as has often been maintained, is doubtful.

2. ATTRIBUTES OF THE GODDESS:

In Babylonia and Assyria Ishtar was the goddess of love and war. An old Babylonian legend related how the descent of Ishtar into Hades in search of her dead husband, Tammuz, was followed by the cessation of marriage and birth in both earth and heaven, while the temples of the goddess at Nineveh and Arbela, around which the two cities afterward grew up, were dedicated to her as the goddess of war. As such she appeared to one of Assur-bani-pal’s seers and encouraged the Assyrian king to march against Elam. The other goddesses of Babylonia, who were little more than reflections of the god, tended to merge into Ishtar who thus became a type of the female divinity, a personification of the productive principle in nature, and more especially the mother and creatress of mankind.

The chief seat of the worship of Ishtar in Babylonia was Erech, where prostitution was practiced in her name, and she was served with immoral rites by bands of men and women. In Assyria, where the warlike side of the goddess was predominant, no such rites seem to have been practiced,
and, instead, prophetesses were attached to her temples to whom she delivered oracles.

3. ASHTORETH AS A MOON-GODDESS:

In Canaan, Ashtoreth, as distinguished from the male `Ashtar, dropped her warlike attributes, but in contradistinction to Asherah, whose name and cult had also been imported from Assyria, became, on the one hand, the colorless consort of Baal, and on the other hand, a moon-goddess. In Babylonia the moon was a god, but after the rise of the solar theology, when the larger number of the Babylonian gods were resolved into forms of the sun-god, their wives also became solar, Ishtar, “the daughter of Sin” the moon-god, remaining identified with the evening-star. In Canaan, however, when the solar theology had absorbed the older beliefs, Baal, passing into a sun-god and the goddess who stood at his side becoming a representative of the moon — the pale reflection, as it were, of the sun — Ashtoreth came to be regarded as the consort of Baal and took the place of the solar goddesses of Babylonia.

4. THE LOCAL ASHTAROTH:

Hence there were as “many Ashtoreths” or Ashtaroth as Baals. They represented the various forms under which the goddess was worshipped in different localities (<sup>Judges 10:6;</sup> <sup>1 Samuel 7:4; 12:10, etc.</sup>). Sometimes she was addressed as Naamah, “the delightful one,” Greek Astro-noe, the mother of Eshmun and the Cabeiri. The Philistines seem to have adopted her under her warlike form (<sup>1 Samuel 31:10 the King James Version reading “Ashtoreth,” as Septuagint), but she was more usually the moon-goddess (Lucian, Deuteronomy Dca Syriac., 4; Herodian, v.6, 10), and was accordingly symbolized by the horns of a cow. See ASHTAROTH-KARNAIM. At Ashkelon, where Herodotus (i.105) places her most ancient temple, she was worshipped under the name of Atar-gatis, as a woman with the tail of a fish, and fish were accordingly sacred to her. Elsewhere the dove was her sacred symbol. The immoral rites with which the worship of Ishtar in Babylonia was accompanied were transferred to Canaan (<sup>Deuteronomy 23:18</sup>) and formed part of the idolatrous practices which the Israelites were called upon to extirpate.
ASHUR

<ash’-ur>.

See ASHHUR.

ASHURBANIPAL

<a-shoor-ba’-ne-pal> ([Ashur-bani-apal], “Ashur creates a son”): Before setting out on his last campaign to Egypt, Esarhaddon king of Assyria doubtless having had some premonition that his days were numbered, caused his son Ashurbanipal to be acknowledged the crown prince of Assyria (668 BC). At the same time he proclaimed his son Shamash-shum-ukin as the crown prince of Babylonia. At the father’s death the latter, however, was only permitted to become viceroy of Babylonia.

Ashurbanipal is generally believed to be the great and noble Osnappar (<Ezra 4:10>). See OSNAPPAR. If this identification should not prove correct, the king is not mentioned by name in the Old Testament. In the annals of Ashurbanipal there is a list of twenty tributary kings in which Manasseh (written Minse) of the land of Judah is mentioned. With a few exceptions the list is the same as that given by Esarhaddon, his father. In <2 Chronicles 33:11 ff we learn that the captains of the host of the king of Assyria took Manasseh with hooks and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon. The king to whom reference is made in this passage was either Esarhaddon or Ashurbanipal. If the latter, his restoration of Manasseh was paralleled in the instance of Necho, the vassal king of Memphis and Sais, who also had revolted from Assyria; for he was accorded similar treatment, being sent back to Egypt with special marks of favor, and reinstated upon his throne.

Another reference in the Old Testament, at least to one of the acts of Ashurbanipal, is the prophecy of Nahum, who in predicting the downfall of Nineveh, said, “Art thou (Nineveh) better than No-amon?” This passage is illustrated by the annals of the king, in which he recounts the destruction of the city. No (meaning “city”) is the name of Thebes, while Amon (or Amen) was the chief deity of that city.
Esarhaddon died on his way to Egypt, which he had previously conquered, an insurrection having taken place. Tirhakah, whom Esarhaddon had vanquished, and who had fled to Ethiopia, had returned, and had advanced against the rulers appointed by Assyria. He formed a coalition with Necho and others. Not long after Ashurbanipal came to the throne, he set out for Egypt and defeated the forces. The leaders of the insurrection were carried to Nineveh in fetters. Necho, like Manasseh, as mentioned above, was restored to his rule at Sais. Tirhakah died shortly after. His sister’s son Tanut-Amon (Tandami) then took up the cause, and after the departure of the Assyrian army he advanced against the Assyrian vassal governors. The Assyrian army returned and relieved the besieged. Tanut-Amon returned to Thebes, which was conquered and which was spoiled by the rapacious Assyrians, 663 BC. This is what the prophet Nahum referred to (3:8). A few years later Psammetik, the son of Necho, who had remained faithful after his restoration, declared his independence. As the Assyrian army was required elsewhere, Egypt was henceforth free from the yoke of the Assyrian.

Ba‘al of Tyre, after a long siege, finally submitted. Yakinlu, king of Arvad, paid tribute and sent hostages. Other rebellious subjects, who had become emboldened by the attitude of Tirhakah, were brought into submission. Under Urlaki, the old enemy Elam, which had been at peace with Assyria since the preceding reign, now became aggressive and made inroads into Babylonia. Ashurbanipal marched through the Zagros mountains, and suddenly appeared before Susa. This move brought Teumman, who had in the meanwhile succeeded Urlaki, back to his capital. Elam was humiliated.

In 652 BC the insurrection of Shamash-shumukin, the king’s brother, who had been made viceroy of Babylon, broke out. He desired to establish his independence from Assyria. After Ashurbanipal had overcome Babylon, Shamash-shum-ukin took refuge in a palace, set it on fire, and destroyed himself in the flames.

There is much obscurity about the last years of Ashurbanipal’s reign. The decadence of Assyria had begun, which resulted not only in the loss to the title of the surrounding countries, but also in its complete annihilation before the century was over. Nineveh was finally razed to the ground by the Umman-Manda hordes, and was never rebuilt.
Ashurbanipal is also distinguished for his building operations, which show remarkable architectural ingenuity. In many of the cities of Assyria and Babylonia he restored, enlarged or embellished the temples or shrines. In Nineveh he reared a beautiful palace, which excelled all other Assyrian structures in the richness of its ornamentations.

During his reign the study of art was greatly encouraged. Some of his exquisite sculptures represent not only the height of Assyrian art, but also belong to the most important aesthetic treasures of the ancient world. The themes of many of the chief sculptures depict the hunt, in which the king took special delight.

Above all else Ashurbanipal is famous for the library he created, because of which he is perhaps to be considered the greatest known patron of literature in the pre-Christian centuries.

For Bibliography see ASSYRIA. — A. T. Clay

ASHURITES

<ash’-ur-its> (ע”שורי [ha’-ashuri]): According to the Massoretic Text of 2 Samuel 2:9, a tribe included in the short-lived kingdom of Ish-bosheth, Saul’s son. A slight textual correction gives “Asherites,” that is, the tribe of Asher; with this the Targum of Jonathan agrees. The tribe of Asher lay where it would naturally fall to Ish-bosheth’s kingdom. The reading “Geshurites” (Vulgate and Syriac) is excluded by the known independence of Geshur at this time (2 Samuel 3:3; 13:37). For similar reasons we cannot think of Assyria (Hebrew [Asshur]) nor of the Arabic Asshurim of Genesis 25:3.

ASHVATH

<ash’-vath> (ע”שד [`ashwath]): A man of Asher, of the house of Japhlet (1 Chronicles 7:33).

ASIA

<a’-shi-a> ([’Aσία, Asia]): A Roman province embracing the greater part of western Asia Minor, including the older countries of Mysia, Lydia,
Caria, and a part of Phrygia, also several of the independent coast cities, the Troad, and apparently the islands of Lesbos, Samos, Patmos, Cos and others near the Asia Minor coast (Acts 16:6; 19:10,27). It is exceedingly difficult to determine the exact boundaries of the several countries which later constituted the Roman province, for they seem to have been somewhat vague to the ancients themselves, and were constantly shifting; it is therefore impossible to trace the exact borders of the province of Asia. Its history previous to 133 BC coincides with that of Asia Minor of which it was a part. However, in that year, Attalus III (Philometer), king of Pergamos, bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman Empire. It was not until 129 BC that the province of Asia was really formed by Rome. Its first capital was Pergamos, the old capital of Mysia, but in the time of Augustus, when Asia had become the most wealthy province of the Empire, the seat of the government was transferred to Ephesus. Smyrna was also an important rival of Ephesus. The governor of Asia was a pro-consul, chosen by lot by the Roman senate from among the former consuls who had been out of office for at least five years, and he seldom continued in office for more than a single year. The diet of the province, composed of representatives from its various districts, met each year in the different cities. Over it presided the asiarch, whose duty it was, among other things, to offer sacrifices for the welfare of the emperor and his family.

In 285 AD the province was reduced in size, as Caria, Lydia, Mysia and Phrygia were separated from it, and apart from the cities of the coast little remained. The history of Asia consists almost entirely of the history of its important cities, which were Adramyttium, Assos, Cnidus, Ephesus, Laodicea, Miletus, Pergamos, Philadelphia, Sardis, Smyrna, Thyatira, Troas, etc.

E. J. Banks

ASIA MINOR

<ā’-shi-a mi’ner>:

INTRODUCTORY:

Technically, it is only on sufferance that an account of “Asia Minor” can find a place in a Biblical encyclopedia, for the country to which this name
applies in modern times was never so called in Old Testament or New Testament times. The term first appears in Orosius, a writer of the 5th century AD, and it is now applied in most European languages to the peninsula forming the western part of Asiatic Turkey.

The justification for the inclusion in this work of a summary account of Asia Minor as a whole, its geography, history, and the social and political condition of its people in New Testament times, is to be found in the following sentence of Gibbon: “The rich provinces that extend from the Euphrates to the Ionian Sea were the principal theater on which the Apostle to the Gentiles displayed his zeal and piety”; and no region outside the city of Rome has preserved to modern times so many records of the growth and character of its primitive Christianity.

I. THE COUNTRY.

1. Position and Boundaries:

Asia Minor (as the country was called to distinguish it from the continent of Asia), or Anatolia, is the name given to the peninsula which reaches out between the Black Sea (Pontus Euxinus) on the North and the Mediterranean on the South, forming an elevated land-bridge between central Asia and southeastern Europe. On the Northwest corner, the peninsula is separated from Europe by the Bosporus, the Sea of Marmora and the hellespont. On the West the peninsula borders on the Aegean Sea, whose numerous islands tempted the timid mariner of ancient times on toward Greece. The West coast, with its alternation of mountain and river-valley, is deeply indented: there is a total coast line of four times the length of a line drawn from North to South The numerous land-locked bays and harbors of this coast have made it the happy hunting-ground of Mediterranean traders in all ages. On the East it is usual to delimit Asia Minor by a line drawn from Alexandretta to Samsun, but for the purposes of New Testament history it must be remembered that part of Cilicia, Cappadocia and Pontus (Galatia) lie to the East of this line (Longitude 26 degrees to 36 degrees East; latitude 36 degrees to 42 degrees North).
2. General Description:

There are two distinct countries, implying distinct historical development, in the Anatolian peninsula, the country of the coast, and the country of the central plateau. The latter takes its shape from that of the great mountain ranges which bound it on the West, East and North. The high central tableland is tilted down toward the North and West; the mountain ranges on these sides are not so lofty as the Taurus chain on the South and Southeast. This chain, except at its Southeast corner, rises sharply from the South coast, whose undulations it determines. On the North, the mountains of Pontus (no distinctive name), a continuation of the Armenian range, give the coast-line a similar character. On the inhospitable North coast, there is only one good harbor, that of Sinope, and no plain of any extent. The South coast can boast of the plains of Pamphylia and Cilicia, both highly fertile, the harbors of Makri and Marmariki, and the sheltered bays of Adalia and Alexandretta. On the West, the ascent from the littoral to the plateau is more gradual. A distance of over 100 miles separates the Phrygian mountains where the oriental plateau begins, from the West seaboard with its inlets and trading cities. These hundred miles are composed of river valleys, divided off by mountain ranges, and forming the channels of communication between the interior and the coast. While these two regions form part of a single country it is obvious that — in all that gives individuality to a country, their flora, fauna, climate, conditions of life and history — the one region is sharply marked off from the other. For the plateau naturally connects itself with the East In its vegetation and climate, its contrasts of temperature, its dry soil and air, it forms part of the region extending eastward to central Asia. The coast land recalls the scenery and general character of the Greek mainland and islands. It naturally looked to, it influenced and was influenced by, the populations on the other side of the Aegean Sea. At Smyrna, the traveler in all ages recognizes the bright, active life of southern Europe; at Iconium he feels the immobile and lethargic calm of the East. Asia Minor in its geographical structure as well as in its population, has been throughout history the meeting-place, whether for peaceful intermixture or for the clash in war, of the eternally contrasted systems of East and West.
3. Mountains:

The Armenian mountains reach westward, and fork, close to the line we have chosen as the East boundary of Asia Minor, into two ranges, the Taurus Mountains on the South, and the mountains of Pontus on the North. Mount Argeus (over 12,000 ft.) stands in the angle formed by these ranges, nearer to Taurus than to the northern system. Taurus is pierced on the northern side of the Cilician plain by the pass, easy to traverse and still more easy to defend, of the Cilician Gates, while another natural route leads from central Cappadocia to Amisus on the Black Sea. These mountain ranges (average height of Taurus 7,000 to 10,000 ft.; the North range is much lower) enfold the central Galatian and Lycaonian plains, which are bounded on the West by the Sultan Dagh and the Phrygian mountains. From the latter to the west coast extend three mountain ranges, delimiting the valleys of the Caicus, Hermus and Meander. These valleys lie East and West, naturally conducting traffic in those directions.

4. Rivers, Lakes and Plains:

The great plains of the interior, covering parts of Galatia, Lycaonia and Cappadocia, lie at an altitude of from 3,000 to 4,000 ft. Rivers enter them from the adjoining mountains, to be swallowed up in modern times in salt lakes and swamps. In ancient times much of this water was used for irrigation. Regions which now support only a few wretched villages were covered in the Roman period by numerous large cities, implying a high degree of cultivation of the naturally fertile soil. The remaining rivers cut their way through rocky gorges in the fringe of mountains around the plateau; on the West side of the peninsula their courses open into broad valleys, among which those of the Caicus, Hermus and Meander are among the most fertile in the world. Down those western valleys, and that of the Sangarius on the Northwest, ran the great highways from the interior to the seaboard. In those valleys sprang up the greatest and most prosperous of the Hellenistic and Greek-Roman cities, from which Greek education and Christianity radiated over the whole country. The longest river in Asia Minor is the Halys, which rises in Pontus, and after an enormous bend south-westward flows into the Black Sea. This, and the Iris, East of Amisus, are the only rivers of note on the North coast. The rivers on the
South coast, with the exception of the Sarus and the Pyramus which rise in Cappadocia and water the Cilician plain, are mere mountain torrents, flowing immediately into the sea. A remarkable feature of Asia Minor is its duden, rivers disappearing underground in the limestone rock, to reappear as springs and heads of rivers many miles away. Mineral and thermal springs abound all over the country, and are especially numerous in the Meander valley. There are several salt lakes, the largest being Lake Tatta in Lycaonia. Fresh-water lakes, such as Karalis and the Limucae, abound in the mountains in the Southwest.

5. Roads

The road-system of Asia Minor is marked out by Nature, and traffic has followed the same lines since the dawn of history. The traveler from the Euphrates or from Syria enters by way of Melitene and Caesarea, or by the Cilician Gates. From Caesarea he can reach the Black Sea by Zela and Amisus. If he continues westward, he must enter the Aegean area by one of the routes marked out, as indicated above, by the valleys of the Meander, Hermus or Caicus. If his destination is the Bosporus, he travels down the valley of the Sangarius. Other roads lead from the bay of Adalia to Antioch in Pisidia or to Apameia, or to Laodicea on the Lycus and thence down the Meander to Ephesus. The position of the Hittite capital at Pteria fixed the route North of the central plain in general usage for travelers from East to West, and this was the route followed by the Persian Royal Road. Later, traffic from the East took the route passing along the South side of the Axylon, North of Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch to the Lycus, Meander and Ephesus. This route coincides with that from the Cilician Gates, from a point Northeast of Iconium. The need to control the Pisidian tribes in the reign of Augustus led to the building of a series of roads in Pisidia, radiating from Antioch; one of these roads led from Antioch to Lystra, and it was the one traversed by Paul on his journey from Antioch to Iconium (Acts 13:51).

6. Climate and Products:

The winter on the central plateau is long and severe, the summer is short and hot: but a cool breeze from the North (the inbat) tempers the hot afternoons. The south coast in summer is hot and malarious; in winter its climate is mild. Much snow fails in the regions adjacent to the Black Sea.
The climate of the west coast resembles that of southern Europe. The country contains vast mineral wealth; many of the mines were worked by the ancients. There are forests of pine, oak and fir in the mountains of the North and South. The central plateau has always been famous for its vast flocks of sheep. King Amyntas of Galatia owned enormous flocks which pastured on the Lycaonian plain. Carpets and rugs and other textile products have always been characteristic of Asia Minor. The wealth of the cities in the province of Asia depended largely on textile and dyeing industries (Revelation 1 through 3).

2. HISTORY.

It follows from what has been said above that the clue to the history of Asia Minor more almost than in the case of any other country, lies in its geographical position and structure. “Planted like a bridge between Asia and Europe,” it has been throughout human history the meeting-place and the battle ground of the peoples of the East and those of the West. From the earliest period to which our records reach, we find it inhabited by an amalgam of races, religions and social systems, none of which has ever quite died out. And throughout history new races, religions and social systems, alike imperishable in many of their features, have poured into the peninsula to find a home there.

1. The Hittites:

At the dawn of history, Asia Minor was ruled by a non-Aryan people, the Hatti or Hittites about which knowledge is at present accumulating so fast that no final account of them can be given. See HITTITES. Asia Minor is now recognized to have been the center of their civilization, as against the older view that they were a Mesopotamian people. Sculptures and hieroglyphs belonging to this people have long been known over the whole country from Smyrna to the Euphrates, and it is almost unanimously assumed that their capital was at Boghaz Keui (across the Halys from Ancyra). This site has been identified with much probability with the Pteria of Herodotus, which Croesus captured when he marched against the Persians, the inference being that the portion of the Hittite land which lay East of the Halys was at that time a satrapy of the Persian Empire. Excavations in the extensive ancient city at Boghaz Keui have recently
been carried out by Winckler and Puchstein, who have discovered remains of the royal archives. These records are written on clay tablets in cuneiform script; they are couched partly in Babylonian, partly (presumably) in the still undeciphered native language. The documents in the Babylonian tongue prove that close political relations existed between the Hatti and the eastern monarchy. In the 14th century BC the Hittites appear to have conquered a large part of Syria, and to have established themselves at Carchemish. Thenceforth, they were in close touch with Mesopotamia. From about the beginning of the first millennium, the Hittites “were in constant relations, hostile or neutral, with the Ninevites, and thenceforward their art shows such marked Assyrian characteristics that it hardly retains its individuality.”

2. Phrygian and Bithynian Immigrations:

The date of the Phrygian and Bithynian immigrations from southeastern Europe cannot be fixed with certainty, but they had taken place by the beginning of the first millennium BC. These immigrations coincide in time with the decline of the Hittite power. After many wanderings, the Phrygians found a home at the western side of the plateau, and no power exercised such an influence on the early development of Asia Minor as the Phrygian, principally in the sphere of religion. The kings of Phrygia “bulked more impressively in the Greek mind than any other non-Gr monarchy; their language was the original language and the speech of the goddess herself; their country was the land of great fortified cities, and their kings were the associates of the gods themselves.” The material remains of the “Phrygian country” — the tomb of Midas with the fortified acropolis above it, and the many other rock-tombs around — are the most impressive in Asia Minor. Inscriptions in a script like the early Ionian are cut on some of the tombs. The Phrygian language, an Indo-Germanic speech with resemblances to both Greek and the Italian languages, is proved by some seventy inscriptions (a score of them still unpublished) to have been in common use well into the Christian period. Two recently found inscriptions show that it was spoken even in Iconium, “the furthermost city of Phrygia,” on the Lycaonian side, until the 3rd century of our era. Those inscriptions mention the names of Ma (Cybele) and Attis, whose cult exercised a profound influence on the religions of Greece and Rome.
3. Lydians, Greeks and Persians:

The next monarchy to rise in Asia Minor is that of Lydia, whose origin is obscure. The Phrygian empire had fallen before an invasion of the Cimmerii in the 9th or 8th century BC; Alyattes of Lydia, which lay between Phrygia and the Aegean, repelled a second invasion of the Cimmerii in 617 BC. Croesus, king of Lydia (both names afterward proverbial for wealth), was lord of all the country to the Halys, as well as of the Greek colonies on the coast. Those colonies — founded from hellas — had reached their zenith by the 8th century, and studded all three coasts of Asia Minor. Their inability to combine in a common cause placed them at the mercy of Croesus, and later of his conquerors, the Persians (546 BC). The Persians divided Asia Minor into satrapies, but the Greek towns were placed under Greek dynasts, who owned the suzerainty of Persia, and several of the inland races continued under the rule of their native princes. The defeat of Xerxes by Hellas set the Greek cities in Asia Minor free, and they continued free during the period of Athenian greatness. In 386 BC they were restored to the king of Persia by the selfish diplomacy of Sparta.

4. Alexander and His Successors:

When Alexander the Great crossed the Hellespont in 334 BC, a new era opened for the Asiatic Greeks. Hitherto the Greek cities in Asia Minor, apart from spasmodic efforts at combination, had been mere trading communities, independent of each other, in competition with each other, and anxious for reasons of self-interest to bring each other to ruin. These colonies had moreover been confined to the coast, and to the open river valleys of the west. The idea of a Greek empire in Asia Minor was originated by Alexander, and materialized by his successors. Henceforward the city rivalries certainly lasted on, and at a later period excited the scorn of the stolid Romans; but henceforward the Greek cities were members of a Greek empire, and were conscious of an imperial mission. It is to this period that the Hellenization or, as Mommsen would translate the term, the civilization of the interior of Asia Minor belongs. The foundations of Alexander’s successors, the Attalids and Seleucids, covered the peninsula; their object was to consolidate the Greek rule over the native races, and, most important of all, to raise those races to the Greek level of civilization
and education. The experiment succeeded only partially and temporarily; but such success as it and the later Roman effort in the same direction had, exercised a profound influence on the early growth of Christianity in the country (see below).

5. The Galatians:

In their manner of entering and settling in the country, in the way in which they both came under the influence of the Asiatic environment, and impressed the stamp of their vigorous individuality on the culture and the history of the land, the Galatae, a Celtic nation who crossed from Europe in 278-277 BC, to establish themselves ultimately on the East of ancient Phrygia and on both sides of the Halys, recall the essential features of the Phrygian immigration of a thousand years earlier. “The region of Galatia, at a remote period the chief seat of the oriental rule over anterior Asia, and preserving in the famed rock-sculptures of the modern Boghaz Keui, formerly the royal town of Pteria, reminiscences of an almost forgotten glory, had in the course of centuries become in language and manners a Celtic island amidst the waves of eastern peoples, and remained so in internal organization even under the (Roman) empire.” But these Gauls came under strong oriental influence; they modified to some extent, the organization of the local religion, which they adopted; but they adopted it so completely that only one deity with a Celtic name has so far appeared on the numerous cult-inscriptions of Galatia (Anderson in Journal of Hellenistic Studies, 1910, 163 ff). Nor has a single inscription in the Galatian language been found in the country, although we know that that language was spoken by the lower classes at least as late as the 4th century AD. The Galatian appears to have superseded the Phrygian tongue in the part of Galatia which was formerly Phrygian; no Phrygian inscriptions have been found in Galatia, although they are common in the district bordering on its southern and western boundaries. But Galatian was unable to compete with Greek as the language of the educated classes, and even such among the humbler orders as could write, wrote in Greek, and Greek-Roman city-organization replaced the Celtic tribal system much earlier and much more completely in Galatia than Roman municipal organization did in Gaul. Still, the Galatians stood out in strong contrast both to the Greeks and to the Orientals. Roman diplomacy recognized and encouraged this sense of isolation, and in her struggle against the Orientals and the Greeks
under Mithridates, Rome found trusty allies in the Galatians. In the Imperial period, the Galatians were considered the best soldiers in Asia Minor.

See GALATIA.

6. The Romans in Asia Minor:

The Romans exercised an effective control over the affairs of Asia Minor after their defeat of Antiochus the Great in 189 BC, but it was only in 133 BC, when Attalus of Pergamus bequeathed his kingdom of “Asia” to the Roman state, that the Roman occupation began. This kingdom formed the province Asia; a second inheritance which fell to Rome at the death of Nicomedes III in 74 BC became the province Bithynia, to which Pontus was afterward added. Cilicia, the province which gave Paul to the empire and the church, was annexed in 100 BC, and reorganized by Pompey in 66 BC. These provinces had already been organized; in other words the Roman form of government had been definitely established in them at the foundation of the empire, and, in accordance with the principle that all territory which had been thoroughly “pacified” should remain under the administration of the senate, while the emperor directly governed regions in which soldiers in numbers were still required, the above-mentioned provinces, with the exception of Cilicia, fell to the senate. But all territory subsequently annexed in Asia Minor remained in the emperor’s hands. Several territories over which Rome had exercised a protectorate were now organized into provinces, under direct imperial rule. Such were: Galatia, to which under its last king Amyntas, part of Phrygia, Lycaonia, Pisidia and Pamphylia had been added, and which was made a Roman province at his death in 25 BC (the extension of Galatia under Amyntas to include Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe and the consequent incorporation of these cities in the province Galatia, forms the ultimate historical basis of the “South Galatian Theory”); Paphlagonia, annexed in 7 BC; Cappadocia, in 17 AD; Lycia, in 43 AD, and in 63 AD the part of Pontus lying between the Iris and Armenia. This formed the Roman Asia Minor of Paul’s time.

See ASIA; BITHYNIA, etc.
3. ASIA MINOR IN THE FIRST CENTURY AD.

1. The Population:

The partition of Asia Minor into Roman provinces did not correspond to its ethnological divisions, and even those divisions were not always clearly marked. As is clear from the brief historical sketch given above, the population of Asia Minor was composed of many overlying strata of races, which tended in part to lose their individuality and sink into the original Anatolian type. Answering roughly to the above-mentioned separation of Asia Minor into two countries, and to its characterization as the meeting-place of East and West, we can detach from among a medley of races and institutions two main coexistent social systems, which we may call the native system, and the hellenistic system. These systems (especially as the result of Roman government) overlap and blend with each other, but they correspond in a general way to the distinction (observed in the country by Strabo) between city-organization and life on the village system. A deep gulf separated these forms of society.

2. The Native Social System:

Under the Roman Empire, there was a continuous tendency to raise and absorb the Anatolian natives into Greek cities and Roman citizenship. But in the Apostolic Age, this process had not gone far in the interior of the country, and the native social system was still that under which a large section of the population lived. It combined the theocratic form of government with institutions derived from a preexistent matriarchal society. The center of the native community was the temple of the god, with its great corporation of priests living on the temple revenues, and its people, who were the servants of the god (hierodouloi; compare Paul’s expression, “servant of God”), and worked on the temple estates. The villages in which these workers lived were an inseparable adjunct of the temple, and the priests (or a single priest-dynast) were the absolute rulers of the people. A special class called hieroi performed special functions (probably for a period only) in the temple service. This included, in the ease of women, sometimes a service of chastity, sometimes one of ceremonial prostitution. A woman of Lydia, of good social position (as implied in her Roman name) boasts in an inscription that she comes of ancestors who had served before the god in this manner, and that she has
done so herself. Such women afterward married in their own rank, and incurred no disgrace. Many inscriptions prove that the god (through his priests) exercised a close supervision over the whole moral life and over the whole daily routine of his people; he was their Ruler, Judge, helper and healer.

3. Emperor Worship:

Theocratic government received a new direction and a new meaning from the institution of emperor-worship; obedience to the god now coincided with loyalty to the emperor. The Seleucid kings and later the Roman emperors, according to a highly probable view, became heirs to the property of the dispossessed priests (a case is attested at Pisidian Antioch); and it was out of the territory originally belonging to the temples that grants of land to the new Seleucid and Roman foundations were made. On those portions of an estate not gifted to a polis or colonia, theocratic government lasted on; but alongside of the Anatolian god there now appeared the figure of the god-emperor. In many places the cult of the emperor was established in the most important shrine of the neighborhood; the god-emperor succeeded to or shared the sanctity of the older god, Grecized as Zeus, Apollo, etc.; inscriptions record dedications made to the god and to the emperor jointly. Elsewhere, and especially in the cities, new temples were founded for the worship of the emperor. Asia Minor was the home of emperor-worship, and nowhere did the new institution fit so well into the existing religious system. Inscriptions have recently thrown much light on a society of Xe

Xenoi Tekmoreioi (“Guest-Friends of the Secret Sign”) who lived on an estate which had belonged to Men Askaenos beside Antioch of Pisidia, and was now in the hands of the Roman emperor. A procurator (who was probably the chief priest of the local temple) managed the estate as the emperor’s representative. This society is typical of many others whose existence in inner Asia Minor has come to light in recent years; it was those societies which fostered the cult of the emperor on its local as distinct from its provincial side (see ASIARCH), and it was chiefly those societies that set the machinery of the Roman law in operation against the Christians in the great persecutions. In the course of time the people on the imperial estates tended to pass into a condition of serfdom; but occasionally an emperor raised the whole or part of an estate to the rank of a city.
Much of inner Asia Minor must originally have been governed on theocratic system; but the Greek city-state gradually encroached on the territory and privileges of the ancient temple. Several of these cities were “founded” by the Seleucids and Attalids; this sometimes meant a new foundation, more often the establishment of Greek city-government in an older city, with an addition of new inhabitants. These inhabitants were often Jews whom the Seleucids found trusty colonists: the Jews of Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:14 ff) probably belong to this class. The conscious aim of those foundations was the Hellenization of the country, and their example influenced the neighboring cities. With the oriental absolutism of the native system, the organization of the Greek and Roman cities was in sharp contrast. In the earlier centuries of the Roman Empire these cities enjoyed a liberal measure of self-government. Magistracies were elective; rich men in the same city vied with each other, and city vied with city, in erecting magnificent public buildings, in founding schools and promoting education, in furthering all that western nations mean by civilization. With the Greek cities came the Greek Pantheon, but the gods of Hellas did little more than add their names to those of the gods of the country. Wherever we have any detailed information concerning a cult in inner Anatolia, we recognize under a Greek (or Roman) disguise the essential features of the old Anatolian god.

The Greeks had always despised the excesses of the Asiatic religion, and the more advanced education of the Anatolian Greeks could not reconcile itself to a degraded cult, which sought to perpetuate the social institutions under which it had arisen, only under their ugliest and most degraded aspects. “In the country generally a higher type of society was maintained; whereas at the great temples the primitive social system was kept up as a religious duty incumbent on the class called Hieroi during their regular periods of service at the temple. .... The chasm that divided the religion from the educated life of the country became steadily wider and deeper. In this state of things Paul entered the country; and wherever education had already been diffused, he found converts ready and eager.” This accounts for “the marvelous and electrical effect that is attributed in Acts to the preaching of the Apostle in Galatia” (Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, 96).
5. Roman “Coloniae”:

Under the Roman Empire, we can trace a gradual evolution in the organization of the Greek cities toward the Roman municipal type. One of the main factors in this process was the foundation over inner Asia Minor of Roman colonies, which were “bits of Rome” set down in the provinces. These colonies were organized entirely on the Roman model, and were usually garrisons of veterans, who kept unruly parts of the country in order. Such in New Testament time were Antioch and Lystra (Iconium, which used to be regarded as a colony of Claudius, is now recognized to have been raised to that rank by Hadrian). In the 1st century Latin was the official language in the colonies; it never ousted Greek in general usage, and Greek soon replaced it in official documents. Education was at its highest level in the Greek towns and in the Roman colonies, and it was to those exclusively that Paul addressed the gospel.

4. CHRISTIANITY IN ASIA MINOR.

Already in Paul’s lifetime, Christianity had established itself firmly in many of the greater centers of Greek-Roman culture in Asia and Galatia. The evangelization of Ephesus, the capital of the province Asia, and the terminus of one of the great routes leading along the peninsula, contributed largely to the spread of Christianity in the inland parts of the province, and especially in Phrygia. Christianity, in accordance with the program of Paul, first took root in the cities, from which it spread over the country districts.

Christian Inscriptions, etc.:

The Christian inscriptions begin earliest in Phrygia, where we find many documents dating from the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd centuries AD. The main characteristic of those early inscriptions — a feature which makes them difficult to recognize — is their suppression as a rule of anything that looked overtly Christian, with the object of avoiding the notice of persons who might induce the Roman officials to take measures against their dedicators. The Lycaonian inscriptions begin almost a century later, not, we must suppose, because Christianity spread less rapidly from Iconium, Lystra, etc., than it did from the Asian cities, but because Greek education took longer to permeate the sparsely populated
plains of the central plateau than the rich townships of Asia. The new religion is proved by Pliny’s correspondence with Trajan (111-13 AD) to have been firmly established in Bithynia early in the 2nd century. Farther east, where the great temples still had much influence, the expansion of Christianity was slower, but in the 4th century Cappadocia produced such men as Basil and the Gregories. The great persecutions, as is proved by literary evidence and by many inscriptions, raged with especial severity in Asia Minor. The influence of the church on Asia Minor in the early centuries of the Empire may be judged from the fact that scarcely a trace of the Mithraic religion, the principal competitor of Christianity, has been found in the whole country. From the date of the Nicene Council (325 AD) the history of Christianity in Asia Minor was that of the Byzantine Empire. Ruins of churches belonging to the Byzantine period are found all over the peninsula; they are especially numerous in the central and eastern districts. A detailed study of a Byzantine Christian town of Lycaonia, containing an exceptionally large number of churches, has been published by Sir W. M. Ramsay and Miss G. L. Bell: The Thousand and One Churches. Greek-speaking Christian villages in many parts of Asia Minor continue an unbroken connection with the Roman Empire till the present day.

LITERATURE.

Ramsay’s numerous works on Asia Minor, especially Paul the Traveler, etc., The Church in the Roman Empire, The Cities of Paul, The Letters to the Seven Churches, and Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia have been freely drawn upon in this account. For a fuller bibliography, see Encyclopedia Biblica (11th edition), article “Asia Minor” (Hogarth and Wilson).

W. M. Calder

ASIA MINOR, THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF

At the present stage of our information it is difficult to write with acceptance on the archaeology of Asia Minor. Views unquestioned only a few years ago are already passing out of date, while the modern archaeologist, enthusiastically excavating old sites, laboriously deciphering worn inscriptions, and patiently collating
documentary evidence, has by no means completed his task. But it is now clear that an archaeological field, worthy to be compared with those in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile, invites development in Asia Minor.

1. EARLIEST INFLUENCES FROM MESOPOTAMIA:

In the Contemporary Review for August, 1907, Professor Sayce reminded his readers that the Greek geographers called Cappadox the son of Ninyas, thereby tracing the origin of Cappadocian culture to Nineveh, and similarly they derived the Merm had Dynasty of Lydia from Ninos the son of Belos, or from Babylonia through Assyria. Actual history is probably at the back of these legends, and the Table of Nations supports this (Genesis 10:22), when it calls Lud, or Lydia, a son of Shem and brother of Asshur. This is not to assert, however, that any great number of Semitic people ever made Asia Minor their home. But Professor Winckler and others have shown us that the language, script, ideas and institutions characteristic of the Babylonian civilization were widespread among the nations of western Asia, and from very early times Asia Minor came within their sphere of influence. Strabo records the tradition that Zile, as well as Tyana, was founded upon “the mound of Semiramis,” thus connecting these ancient sites with the Mesopotamian culture. Dr. David Robinson in his Ancient Sinope (145 ff), argues that “the early foundations of Sinope are probably Assyrian,” though established history cannot describe in detail what lay back of the Milesian settlement of this the northern point and the best harbor of the peninsula. Neither could Strabo go back of the Milesian colonists for the foundation of Samsoun, the ancient Amisus, an important commercial city east of Sinope, but the accompanying illustration (Fig. 1) seems clearly to show the influence of Assyria. The original is a terra cotta figure of gray clay found recently in Old Samsoun. Mesopotamian religious and cultural influences thus appear to have tinged Asia Minor, at least at certain points, as far as the coast of the Black Sea, and indeed the great peninsula has been what its shape suggests, a friendly hand stretching out from the continent of Asia toward the continent of Europe.
2. THIRD MILLENNIUM BC:

Professor Sayce’s article referred to above was based upon the evidence furnished by cuneiform tablets from Kara Eyuk, the “Black Mound,” an ancient site just within the ox-bows of the Halys River near Caesarea Mazaca. These tablets, as deciphered by himself and Professor Pinches, were of the period of Abraham, or of Hammurabi, about 2250 BC, and were written in a dialect of Assyrian. The settlers were soldier colonists from the Assyrian section of the Babylonian empire, engaged in mining and in trade. Silver, copper and perhaps iron were the metals sought. “Time was reckoned as in Assyria by means of officials called limmi, who gave their name to the year.” The colonists had a temple with its priests, where financial transactions were carried on under the sanctity of religion. There were roads, mail carriers whose pouches were filled with cuneiform bricks, and commercial travelers who made a speciality of fine clothing. This makes quite natural the finding of a goodly Babylonian mantle by Achan at the pillage of Ai (Joshua 7:21). Slavery is a recognized institution; a boy is sent to a barber for circumcision; a house, wife and children are pledged as security for a debt. An oath is taken “on the top of a staff,” an interesting fact that sheds its light on the verses describing the oath and blessing of dying Jacob (Genesis 47:31; Hebrews 11:21). Early Asia Minor is thus lighted up at various points by the culture of Mesopotamia, and transmits some of the scattered rays to the Greek world.

3. SECOND MILLENNIUM BC:

The earliest native inhabitants to be distinguished in Asia Minor are the Hittites (see HITTITES). Ever since 1872, when Dr. Wright suggested that the strange hieroglyphics on four black basalt stones which he had discovered at Hamath were perhaps the work of Hittite art, there has been an ever-growing volume of material for scholars to work upon. There are sculptures of the same general style, representing figures of men, women, gods, lions and other animals, eagles with double heads, sphinxes, musical instruments, winged discs and other symbols, all of which can be understood only in part. These are accompanied by hieroglyphic writing, undeciphered as yet, and the inscriptions read “boustrophedon,” that is from right to left and back again, as the oxen go in plowing an oriental field. There have also been discovered great castles with connecting walls and
ramparts, gates, tunnels, moats, palaces, temples and other sanctuaries and
dBuildings. More than this, occasional fragments of cuneiform tablets picked
up on the surface of the ground led to the belief that written documents of
value might be found buried in the soil. Malatia, Marash, Sinjirli, Sakje
Geuzi, Gurun, Boghaz-keuy, Eyuk, Karabel, not to mention perhaps a
hundred other sites, have offered important Hittite remains. Carchemish
and Kedesh on the Orontes were capital cities in northern Syria. The
Hittites of the Holy Land, whether in the days of Abraham or in those of
David and Solomon, were an offshoot from the main stem of the nation.
Asia Minor was the true home of the Hittites.

Boghaz-keuy has become within the last decade the best known Hittite
site in Asia Minor, and may be described as typical. It lies in northern
Cappadocia, fifty muleteer hours South of Sinope. Yasilikaya, the
“written” or “sculptured” rocks, is a suburb, and Eyuk with its sphinx-
guarded temple is but 15 miles to the North. It was the good fortune of
Professor Hugo Winckler of the University of Berlin to secure the funds,
obtain permission from the Turkish government, and, in the summer of
1906 to unearth over 3,000 more or less fragmentary tablets written in the
cuneiform character and the Hittite language. This is the first considerable
store of the yet undeciphered Hittite literature for scholars to work upon.
These tablets are of clay, written on both sides, and baked hard and red.
Often the writing is in ruled columns. The cuneiform character, like the
Latin alphabet in modern times, was used far from its original home, and
that for thousands of years. The language of a few Boghaz-keuy tablets is
Babylonian, notably a copy of the treaty between Rameses II of Egypt
and Khita-sar, king of the Hittites in central Asia Minor. The scribes
adopted not only the Babylonian characters but certain ideographs, and it
is these ideographs which have furnished the key to provisional
vocabularies of several hundred words which have been published by
Professors Pinches and Sayce. When Professor Winckler and his German
collaborators publish the tablets they have deposited in the
Constantinople museum, we may listen to the voice of some Hittite
Homer speaking from amid the dusty bricks written in the period of
Moses. Beside Boghaz-keuy the beetling towers of lofty Troy sink to the
proportions of a fortified hamlet.
Hittite sculptures show a very marked type of men, with squat figures, slant eyes, prominent noses and Mongoloid features. We suppose they were of Turanian or Mongolian blood; certainly not Semitic and probably not Aryan. As they occupied various important inland centers in Asia Minor before, during and after the whole of the second millennium BC, it is probable that they occupied much or most of the intervening territory (see Records of the Past for December, 1908). A great capital like Boghaz-keuy, with its heavy fortifications, would require extensive provinces to support it, and would extend its sway so as to leave no enemy within striking distance. The “Amazonas” are now generally regarded as the armed Hittite priestesses of a goddess whose cult spread throughout Asia Minor. The “Amazon Mountains,” still known locally by the old name, run parallel with the coast of the Black Sea near the Iris River, and tradition current there now holds that the women are stronger than the men, work harder, live longer and are better at a quarrel! A comparative study of the decorated pottery, so abundant on the old sites of the country, makes it more than possible that the artificial mounds, which are so common a feature of the Anatolian landscape, and the many rockhewn tombs, of which the most famous are probably those at Amasia, were the work of Hittite hands.

The Hittite sculptures are strikingly suggestive of religious rather than political or military themes. The people were pagans with many gods and goddesses, of whom one, or one couple, received recognition as at the head of the pantheon. Such titles as Sutekh of Carchemish, Sutekh of Kadesh, Sutekh of the land of the Hittites, show that the chief god was localized in various places, perhaps with varying attributes. A companion goddess was named Antarata. She was the great Mother Goddess of Asia Minor, who came to outrank her male counterpart. She is represented in the sculptures with a youthful male figure, as a consort, probably illustrating the legend of Tammuz for whom the erring Hebrew women wept (Ezekiel 8:14). He was called Attys in later days. He stands for life after death, spring after winter, one generation after another. The chief god worshipped at Boghaz-keuy was Teshub. Another was named Khiba, and the same name appears in the Tell el-Amarna correspondence from Jerusalem. This affords a remarkable illustration of the prophet’s address to Jerusalem, “Your mother was a Hittite” (Ezekiel 16:45).
The worship of the Hittites of the era of the Exodus is still seen pictured on the rocks at Yasilikaya. This spot was the sanctuary of the metropolis. There are two hypaethral rock galleries, the larger of which has a double procession of about 80 figures carved on the natural rock walls, which have been smoothed for the purpose, and meeting at the inmost recess of the gallery. The figures nearest the entrance are about half life-size. As the processions advance the height of the figures increases, until the two persons at the head, the chief priest and priestess or the king and queen, are quite above life-size. These persons advance curious symbols toward each other, each is followed by a retinue of his or her own sex, and each is supported — the priest-king upon the heads of two subjects or captives, and the priestess-queen upon a leopard. The latter figure is followed by her consort son.

The ruins at Eyuk are compact, and consist of a small temple, its sphinx-guarded door, and a double procession of approaching worshippers to the number of about 40. The main room of the sanctuary is only 7 yds. by 8 in measurement. This may be compared with the Holy Place in the tabernacle of the Israelites, which was approximately contemporary. Neither could contain a worshipping congregation, but only the ministering priests. The solemn sphinxes at the door suggest the cherubim that adorned the Israelite temple, and winged eagles with double heads decorate the inner walls of the doorway. Amid the sculptured processions moving on the basalt rocks toward the sanctuary is an altar before which stands a bull on a pedestal, and behind which is a priest who wears a large earring. Close behind the priest a flock of three sheep and a goat approach the sacrificial altar. Compare the description in Exodus 32. The Israelites said to Aaron, “Up, make us gods”; he required their golden earrings, made a calf, “and built an altar before it”; they offered burnt offerings and brought peace offerings; they sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. Israelite worship was in certain forms similar to the worship of the Hittites, but its spiritual content was wholly different. For musical instruments the Eyuk procession exhibits a lituus, a (silver?) trumpet and a shapely guitar. The animal kingdom is represented by another bull with a chest or ark on its back, a well-executed lion and two hares held in the two talons of an eagle. A spring close by furnished all the water required by the worshippers and for ritual purposes.
Professor Garstang in The Land of the Hittites shows that the power which had been waning after about 1200 BC enjoyed a period of recrudescence in the 10th and 9th centuries. He ascribes to this period the monuments of Sakje Geuzi, which the professor himself excavated, together with other Hittite remains in Asia Minor. The Vannic power known as Urartu, akin to the Hittites but separate, arose in the Northeast; the Phrygians began to dominate in the West; the Assyrians pressed upon the Southeast. The overthrow of the Hittites was completed by the bursting in of the desolating Cimmerian hordes, and after 717, when Carchemish was taken by the Assyrians, the Hittites fade from the archaeological records of their home land.

See ASIA MINOR, II, 1.

4. FIRST MILLENIUM BC:

Before the Hittites disappeared from the interior of Asia Minor, sundry Aryan peoples, more or less closely related to the Greeks, were established at various points around the coast. Schliemann, of Trojan fame, was the pioneer archaeologist in this field, and his boundless enthusiasm, optimism and resourcefulness recovered the treasures of Priam’s city, and made real again the story of days when the world was young. Among the most valuable collections in the wonderful Constantinople Museum is that from Troy, which contains bronze axes and lance heads, implements in copper, talents of silver, diadems, earrings and bracelets of gold, bone bodkins and needles, spindle whorls done in baked clay, numbers of idols or votive offerings, and other objects found in the Troad, at the modern Hissarlik. Phrygian, Thracian and subsequently Galatian immigrants from the Northwest had been filtering across the Hellespont, and wedging themselves in among the earlier inhabitants. There were some points in common between the Cretan or Aegean civilization and that of Asia Minor, but Professor Hogarth in his Ionia and the East urges that these resemblances were few. It was otherwise with the Greeks proper. Herodotus gave the names of twelve Aeolian, twelve Ionian and six Dorian cities on the west coast, founded by colonists who came across the Aegean Sea, and who leavened, led and intermarried with the native population they found settled there. One of these Asiatic Greek colonies, Miletus, was sufficiently populous and vigorous to send out from 60 to 80 colonies
of its own, the successive swarms of adventurers moving North and East, up the coast of the Aegean, through the Bosphorus and along the south shore of the Black Sea. In due season Xenophon and the Ten Thousand, and then Alexander with his Macedonians, scattered yet more widely the seeds of Hellenic culture upon a soil already prepared for its reception. The inscriptions, sculptures, temples, tombs, palaces, castles, theaters, jewelry, figurines in bronze or terra cotta, coins of silver or copper and other objects remaining from this period exhibit a style of art, culture and religion which may best be named Anatolian, but which are akin to those of Greece proper. The excavations at Ephesus, Pergamus, Sardis and other important sites show the same grafting of Greek scions upon the local stock.

One marked feature survived as a legacy from Hittite days in the worship of a great Mother Goddess. Whether known as Ma, or Cybele, or Anaitis, or Diana, or designated by some other title, it was the female not the male that headed the pantheon of gods. With the Greek culture came also the city-state organization of government. The ruder and earlier native communities were organized on the village plan. Usually each village had its shrine, in charge of priests or perhaps more often priestesses; the land belonged to the god, or goddess; it paid tithes to the shrine; sacrifices and gifts were offered at the sacred center; this was often on a high hill, under a sacred tree, and beside a holy fountain; there was little of education, law or government except as guiding oracles were proclaimed from the temple.

In the early part of this millennium the Phrygians became a power of commanding importance in the western part of the peninsula, and Professor Hogarth says of the region of the Midas Tomb, “There is no region of ancient monument’s which would be better worth examination” by excavators. Then came Lydia, whose capital, Sardis, is now in process of excavation by Professor Butler and his American associates. Sardis was taken and Croesus dethroned by the Persians about 546 BC, and for two centuries, until Alexander, Persian authority overshadowed Asia Minor, but permanent influences were scanty.
5. THE ROMANS IN ASIA MINOR:

By about the year 200 BC the Romans began to become entangled in the politics of the four principal kingdoms that then occupied Asia Minor, namely Bithynia, Pergamus, Pontus and Cappadocia. By slow degrees their influence and their arms advanced under such leaders civil and military as Sulla, Lucullus, Pompey, Cicero and Julius Caesar, while Attalus of Pergamus and Prusias of Bithynia bequeathed their uneasy domains to the steady power arising from the West. In 133 BC the Romans proceeded to organize the province of Asia, taking the name from a Lydian district included in the province. Step by step the Roman frontiers were pushed farther to the East. Mithridates VI, king of Pontus, was called “the most formidable enemy the republic ever had to contend with,” but he went down before the conquering arms of Rome. See PONTUS. Caesar chastised the unfortunate Pharnaces at Zile in central Asia Minor, and coolly announced his success in the memorable message of three words, “veni, vidi, vici.” Ultimately all of this fair peninsula passed under the iron sway, and the Roman rule lasted more than 500 years, until in 395 AD Theodosius divided the empire between his sons, giving the East to Arcadius and the West to Honorius, and the Roman Empire was cleft in twain.

True to their customs elsewhere the Romans built roads well paved with stone between the chief cities of their eastern provinces. The archaeologist or common traveler often comes upon sections of these roads, sometimes in the thickest forests, as sound and as rough as when Roman chariots rumbled over them. Milestones were erected to mark the distances, usually inscribed in both Latin and Greek, and the decipherment of these milestone records contributes to the recovery of the lost history. Bridges over the important streams have been rebuilt and repaired by successive generations of men, but in certain cases the Roman character of the original stands clearly forth. The Romans were a building people, and government houses, aqueducts, baths, theaters, temples and other structures confront the archaeologist or await the labor of the spade. Epigraphical studies such as those of Professor Sterrett indicate what a wealth of inscriptions is yet to be recovered, in Latin as well as in Greek
It was during the Roman period that Christianity made its advent in the peninsula. Christian disciples as well as Roman legions and governors used the roads, bridges and public buildings. Old church buildings and other religious foundations have their stories to tell. It is very interesting to read on Greek tombstones of the 1st or 2nd century AD such inscriptions as, “Here lies the servant of God, Daniel,” “Here lies the handmaid of God, Maria.” Our great authority for this period is Sir William M. Ramsay, whose Historical Geography of Asia Minor and other works must be read by anyone who would familiarize himself with this rich field.

6. THE BYZANTINE PERIOD:

By almost imperceptible degrees the Roman era was merged into the Byzantine. We are passing so rapidly now from the sphere of archaeology to that of history proper that we must be brief. For a thousand years after the fall of Rome the Eastern Empire lived on, a Greek body pervaded with lingering Roman influences and with Constantinople as the pulsating heart. The character of the times was nothing if not religious, yet the prevailing Christianity was a syncretistic compound including much from the nature worship of earlier Anatolia. The first great councils of the Christian church convened upon the soil of Asia Minor, the fourth being held at Ephesus in 431, and at this council the phrase “Mother of God” was adopted. We have seen that for fifty generations or more the people of Asia Minor had worshipped a great mother goddess, often with her consort son. It was at Ephesus, the center of the worship of Diana, that ecclesiastics, many of whom had but a slight training in Christianity, adopted this article into their statement of religious faith.

7. THE SELJUKIAN TURKS:

Again the government of the country, the dominant race, the religion, language and culture, all are changed — this time with the invasions of the Seljukian Turks. This tribe was the precursor of the Ottoman Turks and later became absorbed among them. These Seljukians entered Asia Minor, coming up out of the recesses of central Asia, about the time that the Normans were settling along the coasts of western Europe. Their place in history is measurably clear, but they deserve mention in archaeology by reason of their remarkable architecture. Theirs was a branch of the
Saracenic or Moorish architecture, and many examples remain in Asia Minor Mosques, schools, government buildings, khans, fortifications, fountains and other structures remain in great numbers and in a state of more or less satisfactory preservation, and they are buildings remarkably massive, yet ornate in delicacy and variety of tracery.

The Ottoman Turks, cousins of the Seljukians, came up out of the central Asian hive later, and took Constantinople by a memorable siege in 1453. With this event the archaeology of Asia Minor may be said to close, and history to cover the field instead.

George E. White

ASIARCH

<α’-shi-ark> ([ʼΑσιάρχης, Asiarches]; the English Revised Version “the chief officers of Asia,” the King James Version “the chief of Asia”): The title given to certain men of high honorary rank in the Roman province of Asia. What their exact functions were is not altogether clear. They derived their appellation from the name of the province over which they presided (compare BITHYNIARCH; CARIARCH; SYRIARCH). Brandis has shown that they were not “high priests of Asia,” as some have thought, but delegates of individual cities to the provincial Council (Commune Asioe; see ASIA MINOR) which regulated the worship of Rome and of the emperor. They were probably assembled at Ephesus, among other places, to preside over the public games and the religious rites at the festival, in honor of the gods and the emperor, when they sent word to Paul and gave him a bit of friendly advice, not to present himself at theater (μὲ δουναὶ ἑαυτόν εἰς τὸ θέατρον, Acts 19:31). The title could be held along with any civil office and with the high-priesthood of a particular city. They served for one year, but re-election was possible (the tenure of office, according to Ramsay, was four years). The municipalities must have shown the Asiarchs high honor, as we find the names of many perpetuated on coins and inscriptions. The office could only be held by men of wealth, as the expenses of the provincial games were for the greater part defrayed by the Asiarchs.
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M. O. Evans

ASIBIAS

<as-i-bi’-as> ([Ἀσιβιας, Asibias] and Asebias): Asibias put away his “strange wife” (1 Esdras 9:26). Compare Malchijah (Ezra 10:25).

ASIDE

<a-sid’>: “Distinct from others,” “privately,” such is the sense of the word in 2 Kings 4:4; Mark 7:33. Also “to withdraw” (Luke 9:10 the King James Version; Acts 23:19: ὑποχορέω, hupochoreo], also anachoreo). One is said to have turned aside when he departs from the path of rectitude (Psalm 14:3; Sirach 2:7; 1 Timothy 1:6). In a figurative sense it is used to express the thought of putting aside, to renounce, every hindrance or impediment to a consecrated earnest Christian life (Hebrews 12:1: ἀποτίθημι, apotithemi]).

ASIEL

<a-si-el>, <as-i-el> ([Ἀσιηλ, Asiel]; the King James Version Asael (Tobit 1:1)):

(1) Grandfather of Jehu, one of the Simeonite “princes” mentioned in 1 Chronicles 4:35 as sharing Judah’s inheritance (see Joshua 19:9).

(2) A swift writer engaged by Ezra to transcribe the law (2 Esdras 14:24).

(3) An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit 1:1). Compare Jahzeel or Jahziel (Genesis 46:24).
ASIPHA

<as’-i-fa> (Codex Alexandrinus, [ Ἀσιφά, Aseipha]; Codex Vaticanus, Taseipha) = Hasupha (Ezra 2:43; Nehemiah 7:46). The sons of Asipha (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:29).

ASK

<ask> (シャル [sha’al] “to inquire,” “to seek for counsel,” “to demand”): It is the word commonly used in the Old Testament and is equivalent to ἐπερωτάω, eperotao, “to request,” used in the New Testament. It does not imply any inferiority on the part of the person asking (Psalm 2:8). It is the Son who is bidden to ask, and therefore the word expresses the request of an equal. It has also the meaning “to inquire”: “Wherefore .... ask after my name?” (Genesis 32:29) signifying, “Surely you must know who I am.” “Ye shall ask me no question” (John 16:23), i.e. “about the true meaning of My words, for all will then be clear to you” (Dummelew). αἰτέω, aiteo], is the word commonly used with reference to prayer. It means “to ask,” “to implore,” and presents the petitioner as an inferior asking from a superior (Matthew 6:8; 7:7,8; Mark 10:35; John 14:13, and in many other places). It is not, however, asking in the sense of the word beg, but rather that of a child making request of its father. The petitioner asks both because of his need and of the assurance that he is welcome. He is assured before he asks that the petition will be granted, if he asks in accordance with God’s will (1 John 3:22; 5:15). Moreover the Spirit leads us to such asking in that He reveals our need and the goodness of God to us.

See AMISS; PRAYER.

Jacob W. Kapp

ASKELON

<as’-ke-lon>: the King James Version form in Judges 1:18; 1 Samuel 6:17; 2 Samuel 1:20, for &ASHKELON (which see).
ASLEEP

&lt;a-slep’&gt; ( יָשֹה [yashen], “sleeping,” רָדַמ [radham], “deep sleep”; כָּפָרֶה [katheudo], “to fall asleep,” ἀσφυνόω, aphupnoo], “to fall asleep”): A state of repose in sleep, Nature’s release from weariness of body and mind, as of Jonah on shipboard (Jonah 1:5); of Christ in the tempest-tossed boat (Matthew 8:24); of the exhausted disciples in Gethsemane (Matthew 26:43 the King James Version). Used with beautiful and comforting significance of death (κοιμάομαι, koimaomai], “to put to sleep”). Sleep implies a subsequent waking, and as a symbol of death implies continued and conscious life beyond the grave. In the presence of death no truth has been so sustaining to Christian faith as this. It is the distinct product of Christ’s resurrection. Paul speaks of departed believers as having “fallen asleep in Christ” (1 Corinthians 15:6,18); as proof of the soul’s immortality he terms the risen Christ “the first-fruits of them that are asleep.” Lazarus and Stephen, at death, are said to have “fallen asleep” (John 11:11; Acts 7:60); so of David and the ancient patriarchs (Acts 13:36; 2 Peter 3:4). The most beautiful description of death in human language and literature is Paul’s characterization of the dead as “them also which sleep in Jesus” (1 Thessalonians 4:14 the King James Version). This blessed hope has wrought itself permanently into the life and creed and hymnology of the Christian church, as in the hymn often used with such comforting effect at the burial service of believers: “Asleep in Jesus! blessed sleep!”

Dwight M. Pratt

ASMODAEUS

&lt;az-mo-de’-us&gt; ( שִד [shem] [‘ashmedhai]; Άσμοδαίος, Asmodaios]): An evil spirit first mentioned in Tobit 3:8. Older etymologists derived the name from the Hebrew verb [shamadh], “destroy”; but it is now generally held to be associated with Zoroastrianism, with which the Jews became acquainted during the exile, and by which later Jewish views on the spirit-world were greatly influenced. It is now held to be the equivalent of the Persian Aeshma-Deva, the spirit of concupiscence. The spirit is at times reckoned as the equal in power of “Abaddon” (Job 31:12) and of “Apollyon” (Revelation 9:11), and in Tobit is represented as loving
Sara, only daughter of Raguel of Ecbatana, and as causing the death on the bridal night of seven husbands who had in succession married her. His power was broken by the young Tobias acting on the advice of the angel Raphael (Tobit 6:15). He burnt on the “ashes of incense” the heart and liver of a fish which he caught in the Tigris. “But when the devil smelled the smell, he fled into the uppermost parts of Egypt, and the angel bound him” (Tobit 8:3). Milton refers to the incident in Paradise Lost, 4, 168-71, founding on Jewish demonology and the “loves of the angels” (Gen. Genesis 6:2).

**J. Hutchison**

**ASMONEANS**

<as-mo-ne’-ans>: A remarkable priestly family of Modin, in Judea, also called Hasmoneans or Maccabees. They belonged to that portion of the Jewish nation which under all trials and temptations remained loyal to Yahweh, even when the national life and religion seemed at their lowest ebb, and they succeeded, for a while at least, in restoring the name and fame of Israel. All in all they were an extremely warlike family. But the entire Asmonean history affords abundant proof of the bitter partisanship which, even more than the persecutions of their enemies, sapped the national strength and divided the nation into bitterly hostile factions. The Asmoneans never, in all their history, or at any given period in it, had a united people behind their backs. They had to fight disloyalty at home, as well as deadly enmity abroad. A considerable portion of the people was unable to withstand the paganizing influence of the Macedonian and Syrian periods, and in this direction the thousands of Hebrew soldiers, who fought under the Greek banners, must have exerted an inestimable influence. The Asmonean struggle is therefore, in all its phases, a three-sided one, and it makes the ascendancy of the family all the more remarkable. The sources of our knowledge of this period are mainly found in the Books of the Macc, in the Josephus, Antiquities and Josephus, Jewish Wars of Josephus, and in occasional references of Strabo, Livy and other classic historians. The contents of Josephus, Antiquities plainly prove that Josephus used the Books of the Macc as far as possible, but that besides he was possessed of sources of information now wholly lost. The name “Asmonean” is derived from the Hebrew
[Chashman], “wealthy.” Chashman was a priest of the family Joarib (Ant., XII, vi, 1; 1 Macc 2:1; 1 Chronicles 24:7). The name “Maccabee,” from the surname of Judas, the son of Mattathias, may be derived from the Hebrew [maqqdbhah], “a hammer”; [makhbi], “an extinguisher”; or from the first letters of the Hebrew sentence, [Mi Khamokhah Ba-’elim YHWH?] “Who among the gods, O Lord, can be likened unto thee,” inscribed on the Maccabean banner in the word [Makhbiy].

1. THE ASMONEAN REVOLT:

Antiochus Epiphanes returned in 169 BC from the Egyptian wars, the fruits of which had been wrested from him by the Roman power, which a year later, in his fourth war, in the person of Pompilius Laenas, was to order him peremptorily to leave Egypt once and for all time. Thus his four campaigns against his hereditary foe were made utterly barren. Grave suspicions had been aroused in the king’s heart against the Jews, and when their wrangling about the high-priesthood afforded him an opportunity, he resolved forever to crush the power of Judaism and to wipe out its detested religion. Thus Apollonius (Josephus tells us, the king himself, BJ, V, ix, 4) in 168 BC appeared before Jerusalem, devastated the city, defiled the temple by the sacrifice of swine on the altar of burnt offering, destroyed all the holy writings that could be obtained, sold numberless Jews and their families into slavery, forbade circumcision on pain of death and inaugurated the dark period spoken of by Daniel (9:27; 11:31). Thus Antiochus marked his name in blood and tears on the pages of Jewish history. Against this cruel tyranny and this attempt to root out the religion of Israel and their ancient faith, the Maccabean family revolted and thus became the leaders in a desperate struggle for Jewish independence. How far they succeeded in these efforts the following sketch will show.

2. MATTATHIAS:

Mattathias was a priest of the house of Joarib, at the time of the breaking out of the revolt most likely a refugee from Jerusalem, living at Modin, West of the city, in the highlands of Judea, where he may have owned an estate. When compulsion was tried by the Syrians to make him sacrifice to idols, he not only refused to obey, but slew a Jew, who came forward to the altar, as well as Apelles, the Syrian commander and a portion of his
guard (Ant., XII, vi, 2). Overthrowing heathen altars as he went, he was
followed into the wilderness by large bands of loyal Jews. And when the
refusal to fight on the Sabbath day had led to the slaughter of a thousand of
his followers, he gave liberty to the Jews to give battle on that day. In 167
BC, soon after the beginning of the conflict, he sank under the unequal
task, leaving the completion of the work to his five sons, John (Gaddis),
Simon (Matthes), Judas (Maccabaeus), Eleazar (Auran) and Jonathan
(Apphes). On his deathbed he appointed Simon as the counselor and Judas
as the military leader of the movement (Ant., XII, vi, 1). These two with
Jonathan were to carry the work to completion.

3. JUDAS MACCABEUS, 166-160 BC:

Judas proved himself full worthy of his father’s foresight and trust. His
military talent was marvelous, his cunning baffling, his courage leonine, his
swiftness that of the eagle. He reminds one strongly of Joshua, the ancient
military genius of Israel. Nearly all his battles were fought against
impossible odds and his victories inspired the Syrians with awe. In sudden
night attacks he surprised the Syrian generals, Apollonius and Seron (1
Macc 3:10,13), and scattered their armies. Antiochus, ready to chastise the
countries eastward, who appeared on the point of rebellion, entrusted the
conduct of the Judean war to Lysias, his kinsman and favorite, who was
charged to wipe Israel and its hated religion off the face of the earth. The
latter entrusted the actual conduct of hostilities to a great and well-
equipped army, under Ptolemeus, Nicanor and Gorgias. This army was
encamped at Emmaus, South of Modin, while Judas lay with his small
force a little to the Southeast. When Gorgias attempted to surprise him by
night, Judas himself fell like an avalanche on the rest of the Syrian army
and crushed it, then met and defeated the returning Gorgias and gained an
immense booty. Equally successful in the campaign of 165 BC Judas
captured Jerusalem and purified and rededicated the temple, just five years
after its defilement. Thus the Jewish “Festival of Lights” came into
existence. The next year was spent in the reduction of Idumaea, the Jordan
territory, the Ammonites, and several important strongholds of the enemy,
whilst Simon marched northward and brought back the Jewish captives
from Galilee and the sources of the Jordan.
Meanwhile Antiochus had died in the eastern campaign and his death inaugurated the collapse of the Syrian empire. Philip was appointed guardian of the infant king, while his uncle Demetrius sought to dethrone him by the aid of the Romans. The siege of the stronghold of Jerusalem, still in the hands of the Syrians, by the Maccabees, led Philip to make a heroic effort to crush Judas and his growing power, and he swiftly marched upon Judea with a large and well-equipped army. The odds were too strong for Judas, his band was frightened by the Syrian war-elephants and in the battle of Bethzacharias the Maccabees were defeated and Eleazar, the youngest brother, was killed. Jerusalem was taken by the Syrians, the temple wall broken down and only the threatening danger of an attack from the king’s southern foes saved the Maccabean cause. Lysias retreated but left a strong garrison in Jerusalem. All seemed lost. Alcimus, leader of the disloyal Jews and a mortal enemy of Judas, was made high priest and he prayed Demetrius, who had captured the Syrian throne, to come to his aid against the Maccabees in 162 BC. Bacchides was sent with a strong force and sought in vain to obtain possession of the person of Judas by treachery. He made havoc of the Jews, by killing friend and foe alike, and returned to the East to be succeeded by Nicanor, who also failed to dispose of Judas by treachery. In the ensuing battle at Capharsalama he was defeated and compelled to fall back on Jerusalem and thence on Bethhoron, where Judas attacked, again defeated and killed him. In this hour of hope and fear Judas was led to seek a Roman alliance whose consummation he never saw. From that day his fortune changed. A new Syrian army under Bacchides and the false priest Alcimus approached Jerusalem. Judas gave them battle at Elasa, in April, 161 BC. With only 3,000 men he engaged the Syrian forces. He succeeded in defeating the left wing of the Syrians under Bacchides, but was in turn surrounded and defeated by the right wing. All hope of escape being cut off, Judas surrounded himself with his best warriors and fell at last surrounded by heaps of slain foes. Strange to say the Syrians surrendered his body to Simon and Jonathan his brother, who buried him by his father’s side at Modin.
The death of Judas for the moment paralyzed the revolutionary movement, while it increased the determination of the Syrians. All previous privileges were revoked, and the Maccabean sympathizers were rigorously persecuted. But all this served only to bind the party closer together, and the chief command was conferred on Jonathan, the youngest brother, as daring as, and perhaps more crafty than, Judas. He plunged into the wilderness, relieved himself of the burden of the women and children, and when the latter under the care of John, his brother, were exterminated by the Amri, he took bloody vengeance on them. Surprised by Bacchides, the Syrian general, he inflicted great losses on the latter and escaped across the Jordan. The death of the traitor Alcimus, in 160 BC, for a while relieved the situation and the strength of the Maccabees rapidly grew. A second campaign of Bacchides proved fruitless against the daring and cunning of Jonathan and Simon, and they succeeded in making peace with the Syrians (Ant., XIII, i, 5, 6), but the citadel of Jerusalem and other strongholds remained in the hands of the enemy. The events of the year 153 BC however changed the entire aspect of affairs. Demetrius saw his throne menaced by Alexander Balas, a Roman favorite. Trying to secure the aid of the Maccabees, he greatly extended the former concessions, and when Balas outstripped him in generosity and appointed Jonathan high priest with practically royal powers, the Maccabees craftily played out the one against the other. Since the death of Alcimus the high-priesthood had now been vacant for seven years (Ant., XIII, ii, 3); for which reason the appointment was exceedingly gratifying to the Jews. In his extremity, Demetrius offered the practical equivalent of independence, but the Maccabees had learned the value of these promises by bitter experience. The shrewdness of Jonathan led him to turn a cold shoulder to all the fine promises of Demetrius and to entrust his fortunes to Balas, and not in vain, for the former died in battle with the latter (Ant., XIII, ii, 4).

Jonathan excelled all his brothers in craft and ever embraced the most promising side, as is evident from his relations with Ptolemy Philometer, Balas and Demetrius. When the latter’s cause was embraced in 148 BC by Apollonius, governor of Syria, Jonathan revealed the true Maccabean military genius, by gaining a signal victory over him. Balas now gave the long-coveted permission to break down the old Syrian tower at Jerusalem,
which for so long had been a thorn in the sides of the Maccabeans. Alas, during the siege both Balas and Philometer died and Demetrius breathed vengeance against Jonathan. But the latter dexterously won over the king by large presents (Ant., XIII, iv, 9) and accepted the restricted liberties offered. Profiting however by the endless cabals of the Syrian court, he soon sided with Tryphon, the new claimant, and with the aid of his brother Simon extended the Maccabean power over nearly all Palestine. In the next Syrian war he gained an almost miraculous victory over the enemy (Ant., XIII, v, 7; 1 Macc 11:67 ff). Tired of the endless struggle and longing for a strong arm to lean on, like Judas, he sought a renewal of the Roman alliance, but never saw its realization. Tryphon, who feared him, treacherously made him prisoner at Ptolemais; all his followers were immediately killed and he himself subsequently executed at Basca in Cœle-Syria (Ant., XIII, vi, 2, 6).

5. SIMON, 143-135 BC:

Thus again the Maccabees faced a great crisis. But Simon, the sole survivor of the sons of Mattathias, now stepped in the breach, foiled all the treacherous plans of Tryphon, met strategy with strategy, renewed the alliance with Demetrius and obtained from him the high-priesthood. All the old privileges were renewed, the alliance with Tryphon was condoned by the king, and the Maccabees resolved to count this era as the beginning of their true freedom (1 Macc 13:41). The hated stronghold of Gazara fell and last of all the citadel of Jerusalem was reduced, and even the hill, on which it had stood, was completely leveled in the following three years (Ant., XIII, vi, 7). Simon, favored by the decadence of the Syrian power, brought the rule of the Maccabeans to the zenith of its glory. The only considerable architectural work undertaken in the whole period was the magnificent tomb of the Asmoneans at Modin, built by Simon, which was visible even from the Mediterranean. He was the first of the Maccabees to strike his own coinage, maintained himself, with the aid of his sons, John and Judas, against the new Syrian pretender, Antiochus Sidetes, 139 BC, but fell at last a victim to the treachery of his own son-in-law, Ptolemeus (Ptolemy, 1 Macc 16:11) at a banquet prepared for him (135 BC). His wife and sons, Mattathias and Judas, were made captives at the same time (Ant., XIII, vii, 4; BJ, I, ii, 3).
6. JOHN HYRCANUS, 135-105 BC:

John succeeded his father both as prince and high priest, and his long reign displayed all the characteristics of the true Maccabees. The older sources here are lost sight of, and nearly all we know is derived from Josephus. The reign of John Hyrcanus started amid great difficulties. Hardly was Ptolemeus disposed of before Antiochus appeared before Jerusalem with a strong army and closely invested it. In a truce with the king, Hyrcanus obtained as favorable conditions as possible, paid a ransom and had to permit the razing of the city wall. To obtain money he opened and spoiled the tomb of David (Ant., XIII, viii, 4) and thus obtained a standing army for the defense of the country. With this army he accompanied the king to the Parthian war, in which Antiochus was killed. Hyrcanus now threw off the Syrian yoke and began a war of conquest. In a quick campaign he conquered the trans-Jordanic territory, destroyed Samaria and its temple and devastated the land of Idumaea, whose people were now embodied in the Jewish commonwealth by an enforced circumcision (Ant., XIII, ix, 1). By an embassy, the third in the Asmonean history, he made an alliance with Rome. Meanwhile a strong partisan spirit had been aroused against him at home, on account of his leaving the party of the Pharisees, to affiliate himself with that of the Sadducees, their bitter enemies. Thus the men who had been the very core of the Maccabean revolt from the beginning now raised a sedition against him. The hagiocratic view of Jewish life, from the start, had been the essence of the Asmonean movement and, as the years rolled on, the chasm between the two great parties in Israel grew ever wider. The break with the Pharisees seemed like a break with all Asmonean antecedents. The core of the trouble lay in the double power of Hyrcanus, who, against the Pharisaic doctrine, combined in one person both the royal and priestly dignities. And as the Pharisees grew in strength they also grew in reverence for the traditions of the fathers, whilst the Sadducees paid attention only to the written testimony, and besides were very liberal in their views in general. Only the immense popularity of Hyrcanus enabled him to weather this storm. After a reign of nearly three decades he died in peace, envied for three things — the possession of the supreme power in Israel, the possession of the high-priesthood and the gift of prophecy (Ant., XIII, x, 7).
7. A DYING HOUSE, 105-37 BC:

With John Hyrcanus the glory of the Maccabean house passed away. What remains is only the sad tale of outward and inward decay. The period covered is only six or seven decades. Knowing his family, Hyrcanus had nominated his wife to the supreme power, while Aristobulus, his oldest son, was to take the high-priesthood. But the latter was no sooner installed in this office than he threw off the mask, assumed the royal title, imprisoned and starved to death his mother and incarcerated his three youngest brothers, leaving at liberty only Antigonus, whom he soon after caused to be murdered in a frenzy of jealousy of power (Ant., XIII, xi, 1, 2, 3). Shortly after this he died of an intestinal disease, little lamented by his people. His childless widow elevated the oldest of the surviving sons of Hyrcanus, Janneus Alexander, to the throne and married him. This man began his reign with the murder of one of his remaining brothers and, following the example of his father, affiliated himself with the party of the Sadducees. Involved in bitter wars, which arose on every hand, he proved that the old military genius of the Maccabees had not wholly perished. When the Pharisees aroused a widespread sedition against him, he crushed the movement in a torrent of blood (Ant., XIII, xiv, 2). In the internecine war that followed, he killed some 50,000 of his own people and was practically an exile from his own city and government. Ruling only by brute force, he made the last years of his reign dark and gloomy. Josephus touches but lightly on the bitter events of this sedition, on both sides marked with great barbarity (Ant., XIII, xiv, 2). Though suffering from an incurable form of quartan fever, he waged war to the last and died during the siege of Ragaba. On his deathbed he advised his queen to cast herself upon the mercy of the Pharisees: a wise counsel as the event proved, for she was permitted to retain the crown and to place her son Hyrcanus in the high-priestly office. Thus she ruled for nine years (78-69 BC). On her death, her son Aristobulus, whom she had kept from public affairs and who espoused the cause of the Sadducees, aspired to the crown. Another internecine war resulted, in which Aristobulus was victorious. Hyrcanus agreed, for a large financial consideration, to leave public affairs entirely alone. The Herodian family, which owed everything to the Maccabees (Ant., XIV, i, 3), now appears on the scene. Antipater, a friend of Hyrcanus, induced him to escape to Aretas, king of Arabia, at Petra, with
whom he made an alliance. In the ensuing war, Aristobulus was conquered, shut up in Jerusalem and compelled to invoke the aid of the Romans, with whose assistance the Arabs were repelled (Ant., XIV, ii, 3). In this same year Pompey came to Damascus, where he found himself between three fires, for not only the two brothers, but a large hagiocratic party of Pharisees as well clamored for a hearing. This last party refused both Aristobulus and Hyrcanus as rulers. Through the machinations of Antipater, Pompey sided with Hyrcanus, upon which Aristobulus prepared for war. Pompey promptly marched on Jerusalem and the irresolute Aristobulus met him with promises of subjection and presents. When his followers however refused to carry out these promises, Aristobulus was imprisoned and Pompey at once invested Jerusalem, which was taken by assault on the passover of 63 BC, after a siege of three months. Pompey entered the holiest place of the temple, thus forever estranging the Pharisac party from Rome. But he did not spoil the temple, and appointed Hyrcanus high priest. This event marks the collapse of the Maccabean power. What follows are only the throes of death. Aristobulus, and his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, were taken to Rome as prisoners. On the way Alexander escaped and renewed the fruitless struggle in Judea, only to be at once crushed by the Roman general Gabinius. A little later both Aristobulus and Antigonus also escaped. Returning to the homeland, the former, like his son, fought a brief and valiant but fruitless campaign and was returned captive to Rome, where he died by poison, on the eve of beginning service under the Roman standards, 49 BC. Alexander was executed at Antioch by Pompey. Of all the Maccabean princes thus only Antigonus and Hyrcanus remained. The Idumean power was now about to supplant the Maccabean. Herod the son of Antipater sided, as his father had done, with Hyrcanus against Antigonus. The factional disturbances at Rome and throughout the empire permitted of the enactment of the last stage of the Asmonean drama, in the final contest of Hyrcanus and Antigonus. Herod was in Judea with Hyrcanus, when Antigonus with the Parthian hordes overran the country, caused Herod precipitately to evacuate Palestine, and after capturing Jerusalem in 40 BC, sent his uncle Hyrcanus as a captive to the East, after having cropped off his ears, to incapacitate him forever for the high-priestly office (Ant., XIV, xiii, 10). Herod now obtained the aid of the Romans and permission to reconquer Judea. In a furious campaign, marked
by the most shocking barbarities, he occupied the greater part of the country, and finally in 37 BC succeeded in taking Jerusalem. Antigonus surrendered but was executed at Antioch by Antony, at the instigation of Herod (Ant., XIV, xvi, 4). The fate of the remnants of the Maccabean stem, at the hands of Herod, may be found by consulting the article under MACCABEES.

Henry E. Dosker

ASNAH

<as'-na> (אֶשנָּה [’acnah], “thornbush”): One of the Nethinim, who returned with Zerubbabel from the exile (<Ezra 2:50>).

ASNAPPER

<as-nap’-er>.

See OSNAPPAR.

ASOCHIS, PLAIN OF

<a-so’-kis>.

See CANA OF GALILEE.

ASOM

<a’-som> (H, [ Ἄσόμ, Asom]) = Hashum (<Ezra 10:33>): The sons of Asom put away their “strange wives” (1 Esdras 9:33).

ASP

([pethen] (Deuteronomy 32:33; Job 20:14,16; Isaiah 11:8); [ἀσπίς, aspis] (Romans 3:13)); Any poisonous snake, or even poisonous snakes in general, would satisfy the context in all the passages cited. Pethen is also translated ADDER (which see) in Psalm 58:4; 91:13. Most authors have supposed the Egyptian cobra (Naia haje, L.) to be the snake meant, but while this is widely distributed throughout Africa, its occurrence in Southern Palestine seems to rest solely on the authority of Canon Tristram, who did not collect it. There are Other poisonous
snakes in Palestine, any one of which would satisfy the requirements of these passages. See SERPENT. While the aspis of classical Greek literature may well have been the Egyptian cobra, it is to be noted that Vipera aspis, L., is confined to central and western Europe.

Alfred Ely Day

ASPALATHUS

<as-pal’-a-thus> ([ἀσπάλαθος, aspalathos]): An aromatic plant mentioned in Ecclesiasticus 24:15 the King James Version, where “wisdom” says, “I gave a sweet smell like cinnamon and aspalathus,” etc. It would appear, from a reference in Pliny, to have been a prickly shrub, the wood of which was scented, but nothing certain is known about it.

ASPATHA

<as-pa’-tha> (אֶפֶר, [‘acpatha’]): One of the ten sons of Haman (Est 9:7) (Pers aspadata, “given by a sacred horse,” according to Thesaurus, Add. 71, after Pott and Benfey).

ASPHALT

<as’-falt>.

See SLIME.

ASPHAR, THE POOL

<as’-far>, ([לָקָקָו וָאֱסָפָר, lakkos Asphar]): When Jonathan and Simon fled from Bacchides they encamped by this pool in the wilderness of Tekoa (1 Macc 9:33; Ant, XIII, i, 2). It is probably identical with Ez-Zaferaneh, a ruined site with an ancient cistern, to the South of Tekoa, and East of Chalchul. Bir Selhub about 6 miles Southwest of Ain Jidy is favored by some (EB, under the word), the hills around it being known as Cafra, in which there may be a survival of the old name.
ASPHARASUS

<as-far’-a-sus> ([Ἀσφάρασσος, Aspharasos] = Mispar (Ezra 2:2; Mispereth, Nehemiah 7:7)): A leader of the captives, who returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:8).

ASRIEL

<as’-ri-el> (产业园区, “Vow of God”?): A man of Manasseh (Numbers 26:31; Joshua 17:2). The form Asrielites, i.e. family of Asriel, occurs in Numbers 26:31. According to Chronicles 7:14, Asriel was born to Manasseh by an Aramitess concubine. the King James Version has “Ashnel.”

ASS

<as> (חמור [chamorr] or חמור [chamor], compare Arabic chamar, apparently connected with Arabic root ‘achmar, “red,” but referred by some to root hamal, “to carry”; also, but less commonly, both in Hebrew and in Arabic, [athon], Arabic ‘atan, used in Arabic only of the females; [pereh], or [pere’], and [’aradh], or [’arodh], Arabic ‘ard, “wild ass,” and also [’ayir], Arabic ‘air, “a young” or “wild ass”).

1. NAMES:

The name [’arodh] (Job 39:5) is rare; [ονος, onos] (Matthew 21:2).

2. MEANING:

(1) [Chamor] is derived from the root which means, in all probability, “to carry a burden” (see Furst, Handworterbuch, [ch-m-r] ii), or “heap up.” While no analogies are contained in the Old Testament this root occurs in New Hebrew. The Aramaic [chamer], means “to make a ruin-heap” (from which the noun [chamor], “a heap,” used in Judges 15:16 in a play of words: “With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, with the jawbone of an ass have I smitten a thousand men”). The root may
also mean “to be red.” In this case the nominal form [chamor] may have been derived from the reddish-brown skin of a certain type of the ass.

(2) [’Athon], Assyrian [’atanu] and Aramaic [’atha’], is derived from [’athan], Aramaic [’adhan], “to be slender,” “docile,” etc.; [’athonoth tsechoroth], “red-white asses” (Judges 5:10) designates a better breed.

(3) `Ayir, Arabic `airu (“male ass”) used of the young and vigorous animal, is derived from the root [’y-r], “to go away,” “escape through swiftness” (Hommel, Namen der Saugethiere, 121-23). This name is used as a parallel to [beni ‘athono] (Genesis 49:11) and as a compound of [ayir pere’] (Job 11:12), “a wild ass’s colt.”

(4) Pere’, “wild ass,” is derived from the root which means “to run,” suggestive of the animal’s swiftness.

(5) `Arodh, is, in all probability, an Aramaic loan-word for the Hebrew [pere’]. The Targum uses [’arodha’] and [’aradha’].

3. USES:

From the references to these various names in the Old Testament it is clear that

(1) [chamor] was used for riding purposes: (a) by men (2 Samuel 16:2,23; 19:26; Kings 2:40; 13:13,23,24,27); (b) by women (Exodus 4:20; Joshua 15:18; Judges 1:14; 1 Samuel 25:20,23,42; compare 2 Chronicles 28:15). [tsemedh chamorim], “a pair of asses” was used for riding as well as for burdens (Judges 19:3,10,19,21, etc.).

(2) It was also used in tillage (Isaiah 32:20). In this connection the law prohibits the use of an ass in plowing with an ox (Deuteronomy 22:10). The she-ass ([’athon]) was used as a beast of burden (Genesis 45:23) and for riding (Judges 5:10; Numbers 22:21,22;
The ‘ayir is also referred to as used in riding (Judges 10:4), carrying (Isaiah 30:6) and tilling (Isa. 30:24).

4. AS A DOMESTIC ANIMAL:

Besides the use of the ass in agriculture and riding it was employed in the caravans of commerce, and sent even upon long expeditions through the desert. The ass is and always has been one of the most common domestic animals. It is a much more important animal in Bible lands than in England and America. The humblest peasant owned his own ass. It is associated throughout the Bible with peaceful pursuits (Genesis 42:26 f; 22:3; 1 Samuel 16:20; 2 Samuel 19:26; Nehemiah 13:15), whereas the horse is referred to in connection with war and armies. Reference is also made to the use of the flesh of the ass in time of famine (2 Kings 6:25). The origin of the ass like that of most domestic animals is lost in antiquity and it cannot be confidently stated from what species of wild ass it was derived. There are three races of wild asses in Asia, one of which is found in Syria, but they may all be referred to one species, Equus hemionus. The African species is East asinus, and good authorities consider our domestic asses to have descended from this, and to have been introduced at an early period into the entire Orient. The Sulaib Arabs of the Syrian desert, who have no horses, have a famous breed of swift and hardy gray asses which they assert they cross at intervals with the wild asses of the desert. It is not unlikely that domestic asses like dogs are the result of crosses with more than one wild species.

As a domestic animal it preceded the horse, which was first introduced into Egypt by the Hyksos about 1800 BC.

*See HORSE.*

5. FIGURATIVE USES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

(1) [chamorr garem], “an ass of strong bones,” is used metaphorically of Issachar (Genesis 49:14); [besar chamor], “the genital organ of an ass,” is used in contempt (Ezekiel 23:20); [qebhurath chamor], “the burial of an ass,” is applied to ignominious treatment of a corpse (Jeremiah 22:19); [chamor]
is used as a symbol of peace and humility (2 Samuel 19:26). Zechariah speaks of the future Messiah as “lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass” (Zechariah 9:9; compare Matthew 21:5,7).

(2) Pere’ is used as a symbol of wildness (Hosea 8:9), and [pere’ ‘adham], ‘a wild ass of man’ (Genesis 16:12), referring to Ishmael, designates a free nomad. In Job the name pere’ is applied to the desert dwellers (Job 24:5). Jeremiah employs this name as a symbol of lust. He compares Israel’s love of idolatry to the lust of the wild ass (Jeremiah 2:24).

6. WIDER USE IN LITERATURE:

The ass ([‘athon]) figures prominently in the Balaam story (Numbers 22; 2 Peter 2:16. See Gray, ICC, “Numbers,” at the place). It is interesting to note that Apion charged the Jews that they “placed an ass’s head in their holy place,” affirming that “this was discovered when Antiochus Epiphanes spoiled our temple, and found that ass’s head there made of gold, and worth a great deal of money.” Josephus, refuting this absurdity, states that the Roman conquerors of Judea found nothing in the temple “but what was agreeable to the strictest piety.” He goes on to say: “Apion ought to have had a regard to these facts. .... As for us Jews, we ascribe no honor or power to asses, as do the Egyptians to crocodiles and asps. .... Asses are the same with us which they are with other wise men; namely, creatures that bear the burdens that we lay upon them” (Apion, II, 7).

LITERATURE.

G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, I, 307 ff; Gesenius’ and Furst’s Lexicons to the Old Testament; articles in Encyclopedia Biblica and HDB.

Samuel Cohon

ASSALIMOTH

< a-sal’-i-moth >.

See SALIMOTH (Apocrypha).
ASSAMIAS

<sa-mi’-as> (Codex Vaticanus, [ Ἀσσαμίας, Assamias]; Codex Alexandrinus, [ Ἀσσαμίας, Asamias]; the King James Version Assanias; compare Hashabiah (Ezra 8:24)): Assamias (chief priest) returned with Ezra to Jerusalem. He was one of twelve who had charge of the silver, gold and the temple-vessels (1 Esdras 8:54).

ASSAPHIOTH

<sa’-fi-oth> (Codex Alexandrinus, [ Ἀσαφθιῶθ, Asaphphioth]; Codex Vaticanus, [ Ἀσαφθιῶθ, Assapheioth]; the King James Version Azaphion): The head of a family, which returned with Zerubbabel from captivity, called also the servants of Solomon (1 Esdras 5:33). Probably the same as Hassophereth of Ezra 2:55 and Sophereth of Nehemiah 7:57.

ASSARION

<as-a’-ri-on>.

See FARTHING.

ASSASSINATION

<a-sas-i-na’-shun>.

1. MEANING OF THE TERM:

The language of Scripture distinguishes less clearly than the modern juridical between assassination and murder. “Murderer” = ṣāḇ [rotsach] (Numbers 35:16-19,21,30,31; 2 Kings 6:32; Job 24:14); ḫū [horegh], from ḫā [haragh] = “to slay,” “kill,” the King James Version translation “murderer” in Hosea 9:13; but “slayer” in Ezekiel 21:11. Where the Revised Version (British and American) renders “slayers,” we find ṣāḇ [ratsach], in Numbers 35:11,25-28; Deuteronomy 4:42; 19:3,4,6; Joshua 20:3,5,6; 21:13,21,27,32,38, irrespective of whether willful, deliberate killing is spoken of, or hasty or merely accidental; and ḫō [nakhah] = “to strike,” “wound,” “kill,”
“slay,” in Numbers 35:24. The prohibition against killing is all-inclusive, even to suicide, placing the ban not only on deliberate, purposeful slaying (Exodus 21:12,14,18), but on all endangering of life through negligence (Deuteronomy 22:8) or recklessness (Leviticus 19:14) or hatred, anger and revengefulness (Leviticus 19:17 ff).

2. PUNISHMENT OF THE ACT:

The Mosaic law presupposes the punishment of all killing of human beings on the ground of Genesis 9:6, and repeatedly reiterates it (Exodus 21:12,14 ff; Leviticus 24:17,21; Numbers 35:33; Deuteronomy 19:11 ff), the reason assigned being that man is made in the image of God; hence to slay a man is paramount to lifting the hand against the Creator. And while the degrees of guilt are not indicated by the language, they are closely distinguished by the punishments prescribed. Not only notorious enmity against the slain and deliberate lying-in-wait on the part of the murderer (Exodus 21:13; Numbers 35:20 ff; Deuteronomy 19:4,11), but also the nature of the instrument was taken into account to determine the nature of the crime (Numbers 35:16 ff).

See CRIMES.

Frank E. Hirsch

ASSASSINS

<as-as-inz> ([σικάριοι, sicarioi]; the King James Version murderers): Josephus (BJ, II, xiii, 3, xvii) relates that “there sprang up in Jerusalem a class of robbers called Sicarii, who slew men in the daytime, and in the midst of the city. This they did chiefly when they mingled with the populace at the festivals, and, hiding short daggers in their garments, stabbed with them those that were their enemies. The first to be assassinated by them was Jonathan the high priest, and after him many were slain daily” (see also Ant, XX, viii, 6, ix). The name is derived from Latin sica, “a dagger.” The sicarioi were implacable in their hatred to Rome and to those Jews who were suspected of leaning toward Rome. They took a leading part in the Jewish rebellion and in the disturbance previous to it, and also in the faction quarrels during the war. After the war they
continued their nefarious practices in Egypt and Cyrene whither they had fled.

Lysias mistook Paul for `the Egyptian who .... led out into the wilderness the 4,000 men of the sicarioi’ (Acts 21:38).

S. F. Hunter

ASSAULT

<asolt’> (tsur; ὀρμή, horme]): The Hebrew verbal form is used of pressing forward a siege (see SIEGE), but also of a hostile attack upon a person then translated “assault” (Est 8:11). The Greek word [horme] used of an attack upon persons in Acts 14:5 (the King James Version) is rendered “onset” in the Revised Version (British and American). The word “assault” remains in Acts 17:5, of attacking the house of Jason in Thessalonica, where the verb is ephistanai, “to come suddenly upon.”

ASSAY

<asa’> (ya’al; נפסח [nachah]; [πειράζειν, peirdzein]; [πειράσθαι, peirasthai]; [πείραν λαμπάνειν, peiran lambanein]): The Hebrew and Greek words which are rendered in the King James Version “assay” are so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American), and the use of it is extended in the Revised Version (British and American) in two additional cases. The Hebrew word [ya’al] (1 Samuel 17:39) is used of David clad in Saul’s armor, who “assayed,” that is, “tried unsuccessfully,” to go and attack Goliath in it, for “he had not proved it,” where [nachah] is the verb. In Deuteronomy 4:34 and Job 4:2 [nachah] is rendered “assay,” in the sense of “attempt,” “venture.” In Acts 16:7 Paul is said to have “assayed,” that is, “attempted” (but was hindered), to go into Bithynia, and now in Acts 24:6 Paul is charged with having “assayed,” that is, “having had the audacity,” to profane the temple, where peirazein is the verb used in both cases. In Acts 9:26, and now in the Revised Version (British and American) Acts 26:21, “assay,” renders the verb peirasthai, “to attempt,” in both cases unsuccessfully. In Hebrews 11:29 it translates two Greek words peiran lambanein “to make an attempt unsuccessfully.”
ASSEMBLIES, MASTERS OF

<as-em’-bliz> (>םֲזֵלָא יָבָשָׁת, [ba’ale ‘acuppoth], Ecclesiastes 12:11): the American Revised Version, margin “collectors of sentences,” thus Qimchi, Grotius and others. This has been variously interpreted. Tyler translates “editors of collections.” Klienert renders “protectors of the treasure-chambers,” [’acuppoth] being considered equivalent to the [’acuppim] of Chronicles 26:15,17; Nehemiah 12:25 (see ASSUPPIM). The proverbs are like nails guarding the sacred storehouse, the book closing with this warning against touching the collection (compare Revelation 22:18,19). Delitzsch translates “like fastened nails which are put together in collections.” “As [ba’ale berith] (Genesis 14:13) signifies, ’the confederates,’ [ba’ale shebhu’ah] (Nehemiah 6:18) ’the sworn,’ and the frequently occurring [ba’ale ha-`ir] ’the citizens’: so [ba’ale ‘acuppoth] means, the possessors of assemblies and of the assembled themselves, or the possessors of collections and of things collected. Thus [ba’ale ‘acuppoth] will be a designation of the ’words of the wise’ (as in [shalishim], ’choice men’ = choice proverbs, Proverbs 22:20, in a certain measure personified), as of those which form or constitute collections and which stand together in order and rank” (“Eccl,” English translation, 434).

The Jerusalem Talmud takes [’acuppoth] as the Sanhedrin. On the whole it is better to interpret the phrase “persons skilled in collections” of wise sayings, grouped in a compact whole (compare Wright, Eccl, 102).

S. F. Hunter

ASSEMBLY

<as-em’-bli> (>שָׂנַע [qahal]; [ἐκκλησία, ekklesia]): The common term for a meeting of the people called together by a crier. It has reference therefore to any gathering of the people called for any purpose whatsoever (Exodus 12:6; Psalm 22:16 the King James Version; Psalm 89:7 the King James Version; Acts 19:32,41). The solemn assemblies of the Jews were their feasts or religious gatherings of any kind (Isaiah 1:13). The
word paneguris, “a general festal assembly” (Hebrews 12:23), is transferred from the congregation of the people of Israel to the Christian church of which the congregation of Israel was a figure. In the same passage, ekklesia has the sense of calling, summoning. In classical Greek ekklesia was the name for the body of free citizens summoned by a herald. In this sense the church calls all the world to become identified with it. It denotes the whole body of believers, all who are called. Or it may refer to a particular congregation or local church (sunagoge, “synagogue” James 2:2 the Revised Version, margin).

See CALLED; CHURCH; CONGREGATION.

Jacob W. Kapp

ASSEMBLY, SOLEMN

See CONGREGATION; FEASTS.

ASSENT

<a-sent’>: Twice used in the King James Version as equivalent to “voice,” and to “consent,” and displaced in both instances in the Revised Version (British and American) by the literal rendering of the Hebrew [peh], “mouth” (2 Chronicles 18:12); and the Greek suntithemi, “agree to,” i.e. “affirm” (Acts 24:9).

ASSESSOR

<a-ses’-er>: Lit. one who sits by another, an assistant; among the ancients especially an assistant to the king (compare “The assessor of his throne,” Dryden, Milton’s P.L., Book vi), or to the judge (see Dryden, Virgil’s Aeneid, vi.583). Later it came to mean one who assesses people or property for purposes of taxation.

Royal officials in Israel have the general title [sarim], “princes,” and this general title included the officer who was “over the tribute,” who seems to have had charge of the assessment, as well as the collection of taxes. In the days of the later monarchy “the governor of the royal household,” “the royal steward and high chamberlain,” seems to have held some such important position (Isaiah 22:15; 36:3,22).
(2) The early kings do not seem to have subjected the people to heavy taxes, but we find much in the prophets about the injustice and extortion practiced by these officials on the poor of the land (compare Amos 2:6,7; Isaiah 5:8; Jeremiah 5:28; Micah 3:11). Special taxes seem to have been imposed to meet emergencies (compare 2 Kings 23:35), but it is not clear that anything of the nature of a regular land tax, or property tax, existed in early times; though something of the kind may be referred to in the reward promised by Saul to the slayer of Goliath (1 Samuel 17:25) and the tenth mentioned in 1 Samuel 8:15-17. The kings of Judah, it would seem, made free use of the temple treasures.

(3) Later the Roman government “farmed out” the taxes of the provinces. The publicans, or tax-gatherers of the Gospels, seem to have been agents of the imperial procurator of Judea, instead of direct agents of the great Roman financial companies, who ordinarily let out the business of the collection of the taxes to officers of their own.

During the Empire there was ample imperial machinery provided for the regular collection of the taxes, and the emperor appointed a procurator in each province whose business it was to supervise the collection of revenue. Some Jews found the business profitable, but these were objects of detestation to their countrymen.

See PUBLICAN.

George B. Eager

ASSHUR; ASSUR

<ash’-oor>, <as’-oor>.

See ASSYRIA.

ASSHURIM

<a-shoo’-rim> [’ashshurim]: Mentioned among the sons of Dedan, son of Jokshah, son of Abraham by Keturah (Genesis 25:3).
ASSIDAEANS

<as-i-de’-ans>.

See HASIDAEANS (Apocrypha).

ASSIDUOUS

<a-sid’-u-us>: Occurs only in The Wisdom of Solomon 8:18 the Revised Version (British and American), “In assiduous communing with her is understanding,” i.e. “in continued exercise of fellowship.” The idea expressed in the adjective is contained in the prepositional prefix, sun of the original suggumnasia, giving the verb intensive force.

ASSIGN

<a-sin> ([nathan], “to give,” or “grant,” i.e. apportion): Used (Joshua 20:8) of Moses setting apart Bezer as one of the three cities of refuge on the East of the Jordan (compare Deuteronomy 4:41-43); also of Joab’s stationing Uriah in a place of mortal peril in battle (2 Samuel 11:16).

ASSIR

<as’-er> ([accir], “captive”):

(1) A Levite of the family of Korah (Exodus 6:24; 1 Chronicles 6:22).

(2) A son of Ebiasaph and grandson of Assir. Samuel was descended from him (1 Chronicles 6:23).

(3) A son of Jeconiah, king of Judah, according to the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin and the American Revised Version, margin. It is a question whether the Assir of this passage (1 Chronicles 3:17) is not a common adjective modifying Jeconiah. The the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render it “the captive.” It is to be noticed, however, that there is no definite article in the Hebrew.
ASSOCIATE

<\textit{a-so’-shi-at}>: Only in ☞ Isaiah 8:9 the King James Version, where the Hebrew יָרָע [ro`u], is variously interpreted, according to differences of opinion as to the verb whence it comes. The Revised Version (British and American) “make an uproar”; the Revised Version, margin “break”; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) “Congregamini”; Septuagint [\textgreek{γνωτε}, gnote] (“know ye”); Luther: seid boese (“be wicked”).

ASSOS

<\textit{as’-os}>({\textit{Ἀσσος}, Assos})): An ancient city of Mysia in the Roman province of Asia, at which, according to ☞ Acts 20:13, Paul and Luke rested while on their way from Troas to Mitylene. Standing upon a conical-shaped rock on the southern coast of the Troad, it occupied one of the finest sites in Asia. The rock is about 700 ft. high; its sides are covered with terraces, both natural and artificial, and so steep is it that Straticicus wrote of it: “If you wish to hasten your death, try and climb Assos.” The view from the summit is extensive and magnificent.

The city, which is very ancient, is said to have been rounded by the Aeolians, and to have always been singularly Greek. As early as the 5th century BC it struck its own coins, and its coinage system continued until 235 AD. One of its early rulers or tyrants was Hermeas, a eunuch, once a slave, who gave his niece in marriage to Aristotle. There the great Greek philosopher lived three years, from 348 to 345 BC. During the time of the kings of Pergamus, the city bore the name of Apollonia. To the Byzantines it was known as Machramion, and at present the town, which has dwindled in importance under Turkish rule, is called Bekhram, a Turkish corruption of the Byzantine name.

The ruins of Assos are among the most imposing in Asia Minor, and yet they have long served as a quarry; from its public buildings the stones for the Constantinople docks were taken. The Turkish sultan Murad II presented the many beautiful bas-reliefs of the Doric temple of Athene to the French government, which are now preserved in the Louvre. The ruins were carefully explored and partially excavated in 1882-83 by Mr. Clarke for the Archaeological Institute of America, and the entire plan of the
ancient city is clear. Upon the very summit of the hill stood the temple of Athena which is said to have been erected about 470 BC. Among its ruins Clarke found eight other bas-reliefs which are now in the Boston Museum and which possess a special interest because of their connection between the art of the Orient and of Greece. Upon the several natural terraces of the hill which have been enlarged by artificial means, stood the many public buildings, as the gymnasium, the public treasury, the baths, the market place and theater, of which but little now remains. The city was surrounded by a double wall which in places is still well preserved. The inner wall of dressed stones laid without mortar, and filled with loose stones, is 8 ft. thick, and the larger outer wall was protected with towers at intervals of 60 ft. The ancient road leading to Troas was well paved. The harbor from which Paul sailed has now been filled up and is covered with gardens, but at its side is the modern harbor protected by an artificial mole, about which are clustered the few houses bearing the name of Bekhram. Upon the summit of the hill, by the ruins of the temple, are cisterns, a Turkish fortress and a Byzantine church which has been converted into a mosque. Without the city walls is a necropolis. Its many sarcophagi of all ages and sizes and shapes are made of the native trachyte stone which, so the ancients believed, possessed the quality of consuming the bodies buried in it. The stone is the famous “Lapis Assius,” or the flesh-eating, hence the word sarcophagus. In former times wheat was raised extensively in the fields about Assos, but now valonia, or acorn cups, form the chief article for export.

E. J. Banks

ASSUAGEMENT

<"a-swaj"> (the King James Version Asswage) :Lit., “sweeten,” “soften down”; then, “mitigate,” “abate”; used of “flood,” Genesis 8:1 (“subside”); of grief, Job 16:5,6 (“restrain”); also applied to any strong emotion; not used in the New Testament.

ASSUMPTION OF MOSES

<"a-ump’-shun">.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.
ASSUR

<as’-ur>.

See ASUR.

ASSURANCE

<a-shoor’-ans>: A term exceptionally rich in spiritual meaning. It signifies the joyous, unwavering confidence of an intelligent faith; the security of a fearless trust. The original words have to do with the heart of vital religion. [baTach], “trust”; [’aman], “to prop,” “to support,” hence to confide in, to trust. Jesus repeatedly used this word “amen” to express the trustworthiness and abiding certainty of his sayings. [πίστις, pistis], “faith”; [πληροφορία, plerophoria], “full assurance.” The confidence of faith is based, not on “works of righteousness which we have done” (compare Titus 3:4,5 the King James Version) but on the highpriesthood and atoning sacrifice of Christ (Hebrews 10:21,22; compare 10:19, “boldness to enter .... by the blood of Jesus,” the King James Version). Assurance is the soul’s apprehension of its complete emancipation from the power of evil and from consequent judgment, through the atoning grace of Christ. It is the exact opposite of self-confidence, being a joyous appropriation and experience of the fullness of Christ — a glad sense of security, freedom and eternal life in Him. This doctrine is of immeasurable importance to the life of the church and of the individual believer, as a life of spiritual doubt and uncertainty contradicts the ideal of liberty in Christ Jesus which is the natural and necessary fruitage of “the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit .... shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.” Paul unhesitatingly said, “I know” (2 Timothy 1:12) — a word which, oft-repeated in 1 Jn, furnishes the groundwork of glad assurance that runs through the entire epistle. For the classic passage on “full assurance” see Colossians 2:1-10.

Dwight M. Pratt

ASSURBANIPAL

<as-ur-ba’-ni-pal>. 
ASSYRIA

<α-σιρ’-ι-α>:

Assyria, a Greek name formed from Assur (עַשָּׂר [’ashshur]; [Ἀσσοῦρ, ‘Assour]; Assyrian Assur): The primitive capital of the country.

1. GEOGRAPHY.

The origin of the city (now Kala’at Shergat), which was built on the western bank of the Tigris between the Upper and Lower Zab, went back to pre-Sem times, and the meaning of the name was forgotten (see Genesis 2:14, where the Hiddekel or Tigris is said to flow on the eastern side of Asshur). To the North of the junction of the Tigris and Upper Zab, and opposite the modern Mossul, was a shrine of the goddess Ishtar, around which grew up the town of Nina, Ninua or Nineveh (now Kouyunjik and Nebi Yunus). Another early sanctuary of Ishtar was at Urbillu, Arbailu or Arbela, East of the Upper Zab. North of Nineveh was Dur-Sargina (now Khorsabad) where Sargon built his palace (720 BC). All this district was embraced in the kingdom of Assyria which extended from Babylonia northward to the Kurdish mountains and at times included the country westward to the Euphrates and the Khabur.

2. EARLY HISTORY.

The whole region was known to the early Babylonians as Subartu. Its possession was disputed between Semitic Amurru or AMORITES (which see) and a non-Semitic people from the North called Mitannians. The earlier high priests of Assur known to us bear Mitannian names. About 2500 BC the country was occupied by Babylonian Semites, who brought with them the religion, law, customs, script and Semitic language of Babylonia (genesis 10:11,12, where we should read “He went forth to Asshur”; see Micah 5:6). The foundation of Nineveh, Rehoboth-’Ir (Assyrian Rebit-Ali, “the suburbs of the city”), Calah and Resen (Assyrian Res-eni, “head of the spring”) is ascribed to them. The triangle formed by the Tigris and Zab, which enclosed these cities, was in later
times included within the fortifications of the “great city” (Genesis 10:12; Jonah 3:3). Assyria is always distinguished from Babylonia in the Old Testament, and not confounded with it as by Herodotus and other classical writers.

3. CLIMATE AND PRODUCTIONS.

Assyria, speaking generally, was a limestone plateau with a temperate climate, cold and wet in winter, but warm during the summer months. On the banks of the rivers there was abundant cultivation, besides pasture-land. The apple of the North grew by the side of the palm-tree of the South. Figs, olives, pomegranates, almonds, mulberries and vines were also cultivated as well as all kinds of grain. Cotton is mentioned by Sennacherib (King, PSBA, December, 1909). The forests were tenanted by lions, and the plains by wild bulls (rimi, Hebrew [re’emim]), wild asses, wild goats and gazelles. Horses were imported from Cappadocia; ducks were kept, and mastiffs were employed in hunting.

4. POPULATION.

The dominant type was Semitic, with full lips, somewhat hooked nose, high forehead, black hair and eyes, fresh complexion and abundance of beard. In character the Assyrians were cruel and ferocious in war, keen traders, stern disciplinarians, and where religion was concerned, intense and intolerant. Like the Ottoman Turks they formed a military state, at the head of which was the king, who was both leader in war and chief priest, and which offered a striking contrast to theocratic state of the Babylonians. It seems probable that every male was liable to conscription, and under the Second Empire, if not earlier, there was a large standing army, part of which consisted of mercenaries and recruits from the subject races. One result of this was the necessity for constant war in order to occupy the soldiery and satisfy their demands with captured booty; and the result, as in the Northern Kingdom of Israel, was military revolution, with the seizure of the throne by the successful general. As might be expected, education was confined to the upper classes, more especially to the priests and scribes.
5. TRADE AND LAW.

As far back as the age of Abraham, when Assyria was still a dependency of Babylonia, trade was carried on with Cappadocia and an Assyrian colony of merchants settled at Kara Eyuk near Kaisariyeh. Down the Euphrates came the silver, copper and bronze of Asia Minor, together with horses. Cedar wood was brought from Mount Amanus, and there was already trade, through Syria, with the Mediterranean. Nineveh itself was probably founded in the interests of the trade with the North. In later days commercial reasons had much to do with the efforts of the Assyrian kings to conquer eastern Asia Minor and the Mediterranean coast of Syria and Pal: under the Second Empire no pains were spared to obtain possession of the Phoenician cities and divert their commerce into Assyrian hands. Hence the importance of the capture of the Hittite stronghold, Carchemish, by Sargon in 717 BC, as it commanded the road to Syria and the passage across the Euphrates. Nineveh had at that time already become a great resort of merchants, among whom the Semitic Arameans were the most numerous. Aramaic, accordingly, became the language of trade, and then of diplomacy (compare 2 Kings 18:26), and commercial documents written in cuneiform were provided with Aramaic dockets. As in Babylonia, land and houses were leased and sold, money was lent at interest, and the leading firms employed numerous damgari or commercial agents.

Assyrian law was, in general, derived from Babylonia and much of it was connected with trade. The code of Khammu-rabi (Code of Hammurabi) or AMRAPHEL (which see) underlay it, and the same system of judicial procedure, with pleading before judges, the hearing of witnesses, and an appeal to the king, prevailed in both countries.

6. ART.

Unlike Babylonia, Assyria abounded in stone; the brick buildings of Babylonia, accordingly, were replaced by stone, and the painted or tiled walls by sculptured slabs. In the bas-reliefs discovered at Nineveh three periods of artistic progress may be traced. Under Assur-nazir-pal the sculpture is bold and vigorous, but the work is immature and the perspective faulty. From the beginning of the Second Empire to the reign of Esar-haddon the bas-reliefs often remind us of embroidery in stone.
Attempts are made to imitate the rich detail and delicate finish of the ivory carvings; the background is filled in with a profusion of subjects, and there is a marked realism in the delineation of them. The third period is that of Assur-bani-pal, when the overcrowding is avoided by once more leaving the background bare, while the animal and vegetable forms are distinguished by a certain softness, if not effeminacy of tone. Sculpture in the round, however, lagged far behind that in relief, and the statuary of Assyria is very inferior to that of Babylonia. It is only the human-headed bulls and winged lions that can be called successful: they were set on either side of a gate to prevent the entrance of evil spirits, and their majestic proportions were calculated to strike the observer with awe (compare the description of the four cherubim in Ezekiel 1).

In bronze work the Assyrians excelled, much of the work being cast. But in general it was hammered, and the scenes hammered in relief on the bronze gates discovered by Mr. Rassam at Balawat near Nineveh are among the best examples of ancient oriental metallurgy at present known. Gold and silver were also worked into artistic forms; iron was reserved for more utilitarian purposes. The beautiful ivory carvings found at Nineveh were probably the work of foreign artificers, but gems and seal cylinders were engraved by native artists in imitation of those of Babylonia, and the Babylonian art of painting and glazing tiles was also practiced. The terracotta figures which can be assigned to the Assyrian period are poor. Glass was also manufactured.

7. MECHANICS.

The Assyrians were skilled in the transport of large blocks of stone, whether sculptured or otherwise. They understood the use of the lever, the pulley and the roller, and they had invented various engines of war for demolishing or undermining the walls of a city or for protecting the assailants. A crystal lens, turned on the lathe, has been found at Kouyunjik: it must have been useful to the scribes, the cuneiform characters inscribed on the tablets being frequently very minute. Water was raised from the river by means of a shaduf.
8. FURNITURE, POTTERY AND EMBROIDERY.

The furniture even of the palace was scanty, consisting mainly of couches, chairs, stools, tables, rugs and curtains. The chairs and couches were frequently of an artistic shape, and were provided with feet in the form of the legs of an ox. All kinds of vases, bowls and dishes were made of earthenware, but they were rarely decorated. Clothes, curtains and rugs, on the other hand, were richly dyed and embroidered, and were manufactured from wool and flax, and (in the age of the Second Empire) from cotton. The rug, of which the Persian rug is the modern representative, was a Babylonian invention.

9. LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

The Assyrian language was Semitic, and differed only dialectically from Semitic Babylonian. In course of time, however, differences grew up between the spoken language and the language of literature, which had incorporated many Summerian words, and retained grammatical terminations that the vernacular had lost, though these differences were never very great. Assyrian literature, moreover, was mainly derived from Babylonia. Assur-bani-pal employed agents to ransack the libraries of Babylonia and send their contents to Nineveh, where his library was filled with scribes who busied themselves in copying and editing ancient texts. Commentaries were often written upon these, and grammars, vocabularies and interlinear translations were compiled to enable the student to understand the extinct Sumerian, which had long been the Latin of Semitic Babylonia. The writing material was clay, upon which the cuneiform characters were impressed with a stylus while it was still moist: the tablet was afterward baked in the sun or (in Assyria) in a kiln. The contents of the library of Nineveh were very various; religion, mythology, law, history, geography, zoology, philology, mathematics, astronomy, astrology and the pseudo-science of omens were all represented in it, as well as poetry and legendary romance.

See NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF.
10. GOVERNMENT AND ARMY.

Assyria was a military kingdom which, like the Northern Kingdom of Israel, had established itself by a successful revolt from Babylonia. In contradistinction to Babylonia, which was a theocratic state, the king being subordinate to the priest, the Assyrian king was supreme. Whereas in Babylonia the temple was the chief public building, in Assyria the royal palace dominated everything, the temple being merely a royal chapel attached to the palace. The king, in fact, was the commander of an army, and this army was the Assyrian people. How far the whole male population was liable to conscription is still uncertain; but the fact that the wars of Assur-bani-pal so exhausted the fighting strength of the nation as to render it unable to resist the invaders from the North shows that the majority of the males must have been soldiers. Hence the constant wars partly to occupy the army and prevent revolts, partly for the sake of booty with which to pay it. Hence too, the military revolutions, which, as in the kingdom of Israel, resulted in changes of dynasty and the seizure of the throne by successful generals. The turtannu or commander-in-chief, who took the place of the king when the latter was unable or unwilling to lead his forces, ranked next to the sovereign. From the reign of Tiglath-pileser IV onward, however, the autocracy was tempered by a centralized bureaucracy, and in the provinces a civil governor was appointed by the side of the military commander. Among the high officials at court were the rab-saki or “vizier,” and the rab-sa-risi or “controller,” the [rabhcaric] (&RAB-SARIS (which see)) of the Old Testament.

The army consisted of cavalry, infantry, bowmen and slingers, as well as of a corps of charioteers. After the rise of the Second Empire the cavalry were increased at the expense of the chariots, and were provided with saddles and boots, while the unarmed groom who had run by the side of the horse became a mounted archer. Sennacherib further clothed the horseman in a coat of mail. The infantry were about ten times as numerous as the calvary, and under Sargon were divided into bowmen and spearmen, the bowmen again being subdivided into heavy-armed and light-armed, the latter being apparently of foreign origin. Sennacherib introduced a corps of slingers, clad in helmet and cuirass, leather drawers and boots. He also deprived the heavy-armed bowmen of the long robes they used to wear, and established a body of pioneers with double-headed axes, helmets and
buskins. Shields were also worn by all classes of soldiers, and the army carried with it standards, tents, battering-rams and baggage-carts. The royal sleeping-tent was accompanied by tents for cooking and dining. No pains, in fact, were spared to make the army both in equipment and discipline an irresistible engine of war. The terror it excited in western Asia is therefore easily intelligible (Isaiah 10:5-14; Nahum 2:11-13; 3:1-4).

11. RELIGION.

The state religion of Assyria was derived from BABYLONIA (which see) and in its main outlines is Babylonian. But it differed from the religion of Babylonia in two important respects:

(1) the king, and not the high priest, was supreme, and

(2) at the head of it was the national god Asur or Assur, whose high priest and representative was the king. Asur was originally Asir, “the leader” in war, who is accordingly depicted as a warrior-god armed with a bow and who in the age when solar worship became general in Babylonia was identified with the sun-god. But the similarity of the name caused him to be also identified with the city of Asur, where he was worshipped, at a time when the cities of northern Babylonia came to be deified, probably under Hittite influence. Later still, the scribes explained his name as a corruption of that of the primeval cosmogonic deity An-sar, the upper firmament, which in the neo-Babylonian age was pronounced Assor. The combination of the attributes of the warrior-god, who was the peculiar god of the commander of the army, with the deified city to which the army belonged, caused Assur to become the national deity of a military nation in a way of which no Babylonian divinity was capable. The army were “the troops of Assur,” the enemies were “the enemies of Assur” who required that they should acknowledge his supremacy or be destroyed. Assur was not only supreme over the other gods, he was also, in fact, unlike them, without father or wife. Originally, it is true, his feminine counterpart, Asirtu, the ASHERAH (which see) of the Old Testament, had stood at his side, and later literary pedants endeavored to find a wife for him in Belit, “the Lady,” or Ishtar, or some other Babylonian goddess, but the attempts remained purely literary. When Nineveh took the place of
Assur as the capital of the kingdom, Ishtar, around whose sanctuary Nineveh had grown up, began to share with him some of the honor of worship, though her position continued to be secondary to the end. This was also the case with the war-god Nin-ip, called Mas in Assyria, whose cult was specially patronized by the Assyrian kings.

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

12. EXCAVATIONS.

Rich, who had first visited Mossul in 1811, examined the mounds opposite in 1820 and concluded that they represented the site of Nineveh. The few antiquities he discovered were contained in a single case in the British Museum, but the results of his researches were not published until 1836. In 1843-45 the Frenchman Botta disinterred the palace of Sargon at Khorsabad, 15 miles North of Nineveh, while at Nimrud (Calah) and Kouyunjik (Nineveh) Layard (1845-51) brought to light the ruins of the great Assyrian palaces and the library of Assur-bani-pal. His work was continued by Rassam (1851-54). Nothing more was done until 1873-75 when George Smith resumed excavations on the site of Assur-bani-pal’s library; this was followed in 1877-79 by the excavations of Rassam, who discovered among other things the bronze gates of Balawat. At present a German expedition under Andrae is working at Kala’at Shergat (Assur) where the English excavators had already found the cylinder-inscription of Tiglath-pileser I (see SHERGAT).

13. CHRONOLOGY.

The Assyrians reckoned time by means of limmi, certain officials appointed every New Year’s day, after whom their year of office was named. The lists of limmi or “Eponyms” which have come down to us form the basis of Assyrian chronology. Portions of a “synchronous” history of Assyria and Babylonia have also been discovered, as well as fragments of two “Babylonian Chronicles” written from a Babylonian point of view. The “Eponym” lists carry back an exact dating of time to the beginning of the 10th century BC. Before that period Sennacherib states that Tiglath-pileser I reigned 418 years before himself. Tiglath-pileser, moreover, tells us that Samas-Ramman son of Isme-Dagon had
built a temple at Assur 641 years earlier, while Shalmaneser I places Samas-Ramman 580 years before his own reign and Erisu 159 years before Samas-Ramman, though Esar-haddon gives the dates differently. Apart from the native documents, the only trustworthy sources for the chronology (as for the history) of Assyria are the Old Testament records. In return the “Eponym” lists have enabled us to correct the chronology of the &BOOKS OF KINGS (which see).

14. HISTORY.

1. Early Period:

Assyrian history begins with the high priests (patesis) of Assur. The earliest known to us are Auspia and Kikia, who bear Mitannian names. The early Semitic rulers, however, were subject to Babylonia, and under Khammurabi (AMRAPHEL) Assyria was still a Babylonian province. According to Esar-haddon the kingdom was founded by Bel-bani son of Adasi, who first made himself independent; Hadad-nirari, however, ascribes its foundation to Zulili. Assyrian merchants and soldiers had already made their way as far as Cappadocia, from whence copper and silver were brought to Assyria, and an Assyrian colony was established at Kara Eyuk near Kaisariyeh, where the Assyrian mode of reckoning time by means of limmi was in use. In the age of Tell el-Amarna Letters (1400 BC) Assur-uballid was king of Assyria. He corresponded with the Egyptian Pharaoh and married his daughter to the Bah king, thereby providing for himself a pretext for interfering in the affairs of Babylonia. The result was that his son-in-law was murdered, and Assur-uballid sent troops to Babylonia who put the murderers to death and placed the grandson of the Assyrian king on the Babylonian throne. Babylonia had fallen into decay and been forced to protect herself from the rising power of Assyria by forming an alliance with Mitanni (Mesopotamia) and Egypt, and subsequently, when Mitanni had been absorbed by the Hittites, by practically becoming dependent on the Hittite king. Shalmaneser I (1300 BC), accordingly, devoted himself to crippling the Hittite power and cutting it off from communication with Babylonia. Campaign after campaign was undertaken against the Syrian and more eastern provinces of the Hittite empire, Malatiyeh was destroyed, and Carehemish threatened. Shalmaneser’s son and successor Tukulti-Mas entered into the fruits of his
father’s labors. The Hittites had been rendered powerless by an invasion of the northern barbarians, and the Assyrian king was thus left free to crush Babylonia. Babylon was taken by storm, and for seven years Tukulti-Mas was master of all the lands watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. The image of Merodach was carried to Assur as a sign that the scepter had passed from Babylon to the parvenu Assyria. A successful revolt, however, finally drove the Assyrian conqueror back to his own country, and when he was murdered soon afterward by his own son, the Babylonians saw in the deed a punishment inflicted by the god of Babylon.

2. The Older Empire:

A few years later the Assyrian king Bel-kudur-uzur lost his life in battle against the Babylonians, and a new dynasty appears to have mounted the Assyrian throne. About 1120 BC the Assyrian king was Tiglath-pileser I, whose successful wars extended the Assyrian empire as far westward as Cappadocia. In one of his campaigns he made his way to the Mediterranean, and received presents from the king of Egypt, which included a crocodile. At Assur he planted a botanical garden stocked with trees from the conquered provinces. After his death the Assyrian power declined; Pitru (Pethor, Numbers 22:5) fell into the hands of the Arameans and the road to the Mediterranean was blocked. A revival came under Assur-nazir-pal III (884-860 BC) who rebuilt CALAH (which see) and established the seat of the government at Nineveh, where he erected a palace. Various campaigns were carried on in the direction of Armenia and Comagene, the brutalities executed upon the enemy being described in detail by their conqueror. He then turned westward, and after receiving homage from the Hittite king of Carchemish, laid the Phoenicians under tribute. The road to the West was thus again secured for the merchants of Assyria. Assur-nazir-pal was succeeded by his son Shalmaneser II (859-825 BC), who, instead of contenting himself, like his father, with mere raids for the sake of booty, endeavored to organize and administer the countries which his armies had subdued. The famous bronze gates of Balawat were erected by him in commemoration of his victories. In his reign the Israelites and Syrians of Damascus first came into direct relation with the Assyrians. In 854 BC he attacked Hamath and at Qarqar defeated an army which included 1,200 chariots, 1,200 cavalry and 20,000
infantry from Ben-hadad of Damascus, 2,000 chariots, and 10,000 infantry from “Ahab of Israel,” besides considerable contingents from Ammon, Arvad, Arabia and elsewhere. In 842 BC Shalmaneser penetrated to Damascus where Hazael, the successor of Ben-hadad, who had already been defeated in the open field, was closely besieged. The surrounding country was ravaged, and “Jehu son of Omri” hastened to offer tribute to the conqueror. The scene is represented on the Black Obelisk found at Nimrud and now in the British Museum. Shalmaneser’s campaigns were not confined to the West. He overran Armenia, where the kingdom of Van had just been established, made his way to Tarsus in Cilicia, took possession of the mines of silver, salt and alabaster in the Taurus mountains among the Tabal or Tubal, and obliged the Babylonian king to acknowledge his supremacy. In his later days, when too old to take the field himself, his armies were led by the turtannu or commander-in-chief, and a rebellion, headed by his son Assur-danin-pal (Sardanapalus) broke out at home, where Nineveh and Assur were jealous of the preference shown for Calah. Nineveh, however, was captured and the revolt suppressed after two years’ duration by another son, Samas-Ramman IV, who shortly afterward, on his father’s death, succeeded to the throne (824-812 BC). His chief campaigns were directed against Media. His son Hadad-nirari III (811-783 BC) was the next king, whose mother was Sammu-ramat (Semiramis). He claims to have reduced to subjection the whole of Syria, including Phoenicia, Edom and Philistia, and to have taken Mari’a, king of Damascus, prisoner in his capital city. After this, however, Assyria once more fell into a state of decay, from which it was delivered by the successful revolt of a military officer Pulu (Pul), who put an end to the old line of kings and took the name of Tiglath-pileser IV (745-727 BC).

3. The Second Empire:

Tiglath-pileser founded the second Assyrian empire, and made Assyria the dominant power in western Asia. The army was reorganized and made irresistible, and a new administrative system was introduced, the empire being centralized at Nineveh and governed by a bureaucracy at the head of which was the king. Tiglath-pileser’s policy was twofold: to weld western Asia into a single empire, held together by military force and fiscal laws, and to secure the trade of the world for the merchants of Nineveh. These objects were steadily kept in view throughout the reigns of Tiglath-pileser
and his successors. For the history of his reign, see TIGLATH-PILESER. In 738 BC Tiglath-pileser put an end to the independent existence of the kingdom of Hamath, Menahem of Samaria becoming his tributary, and in 733 BC he commenced a campaign against Rezin of Damascus which ended in the fall of Damascus, the city being placed under an Assyrian governor. At the same time the land of Naphtali was annexed to Assyria, and Yahu-khazi (Ahaz) of Judah became an Assyrian vassal, while in 731 BC, after the murder of Pekah, Hoshea was appointed king of Israel (compare 2 Kings 15 through 17). In 728 BC Tiglath-pileser was solemnly crowned at Babylon and the following year he died. His successor was another military adventurer, Shalmaneser IV (727-722 BC), whose original name was Ulula. While engaged in the siege of Samaria Shalmaneser died or was murdered, and the throne was seized by another general who took the name of Sargon (722-705 BC). Sargon, for whose history see SARGON, captured Samaria in 722 BC, carrying 27,290 of its inhabitants into captivity. A large part of his reign was spent in combating a great confederation of the northern nations (Armenia, Manna, etc.) against Assyria. Carchemish, the Hittite capital, was captured in 717 BC, a revolt of the states in southern Palestine was suppressed in 711 BC and Merodach-Baladan, the Chaldean, who had possessed himself of Babylonia in 722 BC, was driven back to the marshlands at the head of the Persian Gulf. In 705 BC Sargon was murdered, and succeeded by his son SENNACHERIB (which see). Sennacherib (705-681 BC) had neither the military skill nor the administrative abilities of his father. His campaign against Hezekiah of Judah in 701 BC was a failure; so, also, was his policy in Babylonia which was in a constant state of revolt against his rule, and which ended in his razing the sacred city of Babylon to the ground in 689 BC. Nine years previously his troops had been called upon to suppress a revolt in Cilicia, where a battle was fought with the Greeks.

4. Last Period and Fall of the Empire:

His son Esar-haddon, who succeeded him (681-669 BC) after his murder by two other sons on the 20th Tebet (compare 2 Kings 19:37), was as distinguished a general and administrator as his father had been the reverse. For his history see ESAR-HADDON. Under him the Second Empire reached the acme of its power and prosperity. Babylon was rebuilt and made the second capital of the empire, Palestine became an obedient...
province, and Egypt was conquered (674 and 671 BC), while an invasion of the Cimmerians (Gomer) was repelled, and campaigns were made into the heart of both Media and Arabia. Esar-haddon died while on his way to repress a revolt in Egypt, and his son Assur-bani-pal succeeded him in the empire (669-626 BC), while another son Samas-sum-ukin was appointed viceroy of Babylonia. Assur-bani-pal was a munificent patron of learning, and the library of Nineveh owed most of its treasures to him, but extravagant luxury had now invaded the court, and the king conducted his wars through his’ generals, while he himself remained at home. The great palace at Kouyunjik (Nineveh) was built by him. Egypt demanded his first attention. Tirhakah the Ethiopian who had headed its revolt was driven back to his own country, and for a time there was peace. Then under Tandamane, Tirhakah’s successor, Egypt revolted again. This time the Assyrian punishment was merciless. Thebes — ”No-amon” (Nahum 3:8) — was destroyed, its booty carried away and two obelisks transported to Nineveh as trophies of victory. Meanwhile Tyre, which had rebelled, was forced to sue for peace, and ambassadors arrived from Gyges of Lydia asking for help against the Cimmerians. Elam still remained independent and endeavored to stir up disaffection in Babylonia. Against his will, therefore, Assur-bani-pal was obliged to interfere in the internal affairs of that country, with the result that the Elamites were finally overthrown in a battle on the Eulaeus beneath the walls of Susa, and the conquered land divided between two vassal kings. Then suddenly a revolt broke out throughout the greater part of the Assyrian empire, headed by Assur-bani-pal’s brother, the viceroy of Babylonia. For a time the issue was doubtful. Egypt recovered its independence under Psammetichus, the founder of the XXVIth Dynasty (660 BC) who had received help from Lydia, but Babylonia was reconquered and Babylon after a long siege was starved out, Samas-sum-ukin burning himself in the ruins of his palace. Elam remained to be dealt with, and an Assyrian army made its way to Susa, which was leveled to the ground, the shrines of its gods profaned and the bones of its ancient kings torn from their graves. Then came the turn of northern Arabia, where the rebel sheikhs were compelled to submit. But the struggle had exhausted Assyria; its exchequer was empty, and its fighting population killed. When the Cimmerians descended upon the empire shortly afterward, it was no longer in a condition to resist them. Under Assur-etil-ilani, the son and successor of Assur-bani-pal, Calah was taken
and sacked, and two reigns later, Sin-sar-iskun, the last king of Assyria, fell fighting against the Scythians (606 BC). Nineveh was utterly destroyed, never again to be inhabited, and northern Babylonia passed into the hands of Nabopolassar, the viceroy of Babylon, who had joined the northern invaders. Assur, the old capital of the country, was still standing in the age of Cyrus, but it had become a small provincial town; as for Nineveh and Calah, their very sites were forgotten.
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**ASSYRIA AND BABYLONIA, RELIGION OF**

*See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.*

**ASSYRIAN AND BABYLONIAN LIBRARIES**

*See NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF.*

**ASSYRIANS**

<as’-tad>: The reading of the English versions of 1 Esdras 5:13 for the name which appears as Azgad in Ezra 2:12 and Nehemiah 7:17. In the different Greek copies of 1 Esdras the name varies.
See AZGAD; ASTATH.

ASTAROTH

<as’-ta-roth>.

See ASHTAROTH.

ASTARTE; ASTORETH

<as-tar’-te>.

See ASHTAROTH.

ASTATH

<as’-tath> ([ Αστάθ, Astath]): The form given in 1 Esdras 8:38 to the name which in Ezra 8:12 appears as Azgad.

See AZGAD.

ASTONISHED; ASTONIED

<as-ton’-isht>, <as-ton’-id> ([شميم, shamem], “astonished,” the root idea being “silent,” i.e. struck dumb with amazement; [ἐκπλήσσομαι, ekplessomai], “to be struck with astonishment,” as if by a blow or a shock; [ἐξίστημι, existemi], “to amaze,” “to throw into wonderment”; [θαμβέωμαι, thambeomai], “to astonish” to the point of fright): The state of being surprised, startled, stunned by some exceptional wonder, some overwhelming event or miracle, as e.g. Nebuchadnezzar’s amazement at the miracle in the burning fiery furnace (Daniel 3:24) ([تهاء, tewah], “astonished”); of the passer-by at the desolation of Babylon (Jeremiah 50:13). The personality, teaching and works of Jesus were so wonderful, Divine, supernatural, as to awaken emotions of surprise and awe never before known in the presence of man. The people “were astonished out of measure” at His doctrine (Mark 10:26 the King James Version); “astonished with a great astonishment” at His raising the dead (Mark 5:42 the King James Version). The gift of the Holy Ghost to the Gentiles was in like manner a source of astonishment to those Jews who believed through the power of Peter’s preaching (Acts 10:45 the King James Version).
The miracle of regeneration today, which renews and transforms debased and fallen men into saints, makes the same impression on an observing world. — Dwight M. Pratt

ASTONISHMENT

<as-ton’-ish-ment>: Amazement; mental surprise, excitement, wonder; often the cause of the startled emotion, as in Deuteronomy 28:37: “Thou shall become an astonishment.” The chosen people, visited with calamities for idolatry would become a source of amazement to all nations (Jeremiah 25:9,11,18); Solomon’s’ lofty and beautiful temple would be “an astonishment” (2 Chronicles 7:21 the King James Version). For original terms and fuller study see ASTONISHED.

ASTRAY

<a-str’a> (תַּאַה, “to wander,” “to err”; πλανάομαι, planaomai], “to go astray,” each carrying the idea of being lost): With one exception (Exodus 23:4 “his ass going astray”) used metaphorically of moral wandering, going astray in paths of error and sin, like “sheep going astray” (1 Peter 2:25 the King James Version; Isaiah 53:6; Psalm 119:176). This wandering may be due

(1) to inherent evil (Psalm 58:3);

(2) to false shepherds (Jeremiah 50:6); contrast the beautiful and classic passage, Matthew 18:12,13, the Son of man (verse 12) seeketh that which is gone astray. No word more vividly portrays sin as a straying, a separation from God. To be morally “astray” is to be “lost.”

Dwight M. Pratt

ASTROLOGY

<as-tro’-lo-ji>: 
1. THE DESIRE TO FORECAST THE FUTURE.

The desire to penetrate the future and influence its events has shown itself in all lands and ages. But it is clear that a knowledge of the future does not lie within the scope of man’s natural powers; “divination” therefore has always been an attempt to gain the help of beings possessing knowledge and power transcending those of man. The answer of the Chaldeans to King Nebuchadnezzar when he demanded that they should tell his dream was a reasonable one: “There is not a man upon the earth that can show the king’s matter: .... there is no other that can show it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh” (Daniel 2:10,11).

“Divination,” therefore, in all its forms is but an aspect of polytheism. It was for the twofold reason that the arts of divination were abominable in themselves, and gave to their votaries no knowledge of the will of God, that such arts were forbidden in the Law (Deuteronomy 18:9-15). Israel was to be perfect with God and He would reveal to them His will perfectly through that prophet like unto Moses whom He would send. Keil and Delitzsch in commenting on this passage well remark: “Moses groups together all the words which the language contained for the different modes of exploring the future and discovering the will of God, for the purpose of forbidding every description of soothsaying, and places the prohibition of Molochworship at the head, to show the inward connection between soothsaying and idolatry, possibly because februation, or passing children through the fire in the worship of Moloch, was more intimately connected with soothsaying and magic than any other description of idolatry” (Commentary on the Pentateuch, III, 393).

1. Methods of Soothsaying:

The forms of soothsaying mentioned in this catalogue are as follows: “One that practiceth augury” ([me`onen]) is of uncertain etymology, but the tabbins connect it with [ayin], “an eye”; literally therefore one who ogles, or who bewitches with the evil eye. “An enchanter” ([menachesh]), sometimes supposed to be a snakecharmer, is probably one who fascinates like a snake; in other words a mesmerist or hypnotist. The word occurs in connection with Joseph’s divining-cup, and such cups were employed both in Babylon and Egypt, and their use was akin to the more modern crystal-gazing, the hypnotic state being induced by prolonged staring, as in
the fascination ascribed to serpents. On this account, snakes were sometimes figured upon such cups. Thus in Talmud we read: “If one finds vessels with delineations of the sun, the moon, or of a serpent upon them, let him cast them into the salt sea” (Abho-dhah-Zarah, fol 42, col. 2). “A sorcerer” ([mekhashsheph]) is one who mutters incantations or speaks in ventriloquial whispers, as if under the influence of the spirits of the dead. “A charmer” ([chobher chebher]), is one who inflicts a spell by weaving magical knots. “A consulter with a familiar spirit” ([‘obh]), denotes one who is possessed of a python or soothsaying demon. Such were the woman of Endor whom Saul consulted on the eve of the battle of Gilboa (1 Samuel 28) and the pythoness of Philippi out of whom Paul cast the spirit (Acts 16:16-18). The word ([‘obh]) means “bottle” and either indicates that the medium was the receptacle of the spirit or is a relic of the old tradition that genii (jinns) might be enslaved and imprisoned in bottles by means of magical incantations. “A wizard” ([yidh’oni]) means a wise man, “a knowing one.” The word in Old Testament is always used in connection with [‘obh], and denotes a man who could interpret the ravings of the medium. “A necromancer” ([doresh ‘el ha-methim]) is one who calls up the spirits of the dead and has intercourse with them. “Consulting the teraphim” (Ezekiel 21:21) may have been a form of consulting the dead, if, as is probable, the teraphim were ancestral images, raised by superstition to the rank of household gods. The manner of consultation we do not know; but as an illustration of the use of the image of a dead person, we may remember that a modern medium will often ask for a portrait of a deceased relative for the alleged purpose of entering into communication with the departed spirit.

It will be seen that these forms of soothsaying are allied to the arts which in modern times bear the names of hypnotism and mediumship. They are more briefly referred to in Isaiah 8:19, “When they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards, that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?” Here again mediumship and spiritism are connected with the ventriloquial whispers and mutterings, which are supposed to be characteristic of the utterances of the dead.
2. Divination:

But the first term in the catalogue, “one that useth divination” ([qecem]) is of wider application. It signifies a “divider” and refers to the practice which men have followed in an infinite variety of ways for trying to get light upon the future by resorting to what seems to them the arbitrament of chance. The results of a battle and of the fall of dice are alike unknown beforehand. But the second can be tested, and men assume that the result of the first will correspond to the second. Any chance will serve; the shuffling of a pack of cards; the flight of birds; the arrangement of dregs in a cup; nothing is too trivial for the purpose. The allotment of a particular interpretation to a particular sign was of course purely arbitrary, but the method could be applied in an infinite number of ways, every one of which could be worked out to an extent only limited by the limits of the misdirected ingenuity of man. Two such forms of “divination,” that is of “dividing,” are mentioned by Ezekiel in his description of the king of Babylon: “The king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination ([qecem]): he shook the arrows to and fro, he consulted the teraphim, he looked in the liver” (Ezekiel 21:21). The arrows were either marked to represent certain courses of action, and one was drawn out or shaken out, or else they were thrown promiscuously up into the air, and the augury was deduced from the way in which they fell.

3. “Looking in the Liver”:

“Looking in the liver” is one of the most venerable forms of divination. Here again it was a question of “division.” Each of the various parts of the liver, its lobes, the gall bladder, the ducts and so forth, had a special significance allotted to it, theory, apparently, being that the god to whom the animal was sacrificed revealed his will by the way in which he molded the organ which was supposed to be the seat of the victim’s life.

It will be noted that no explicit mention is made of astrology in this catalogue of the modes of soothsaying. But astrology was, as will be shown, closely connected with Moloch-worship, and was most directly a form of “divination,” that is of division. Morris Jastrow the Younger indeed considers that astrology rose from hepatoscopy, and points out that, the common designation for “planet” amongst the Babylonians is a
compound ideograph, the two elements of which signify “sheep” and “dead.” He considers that the sacrificial sheep was offered to the deity specially for the purpose of securing an omen. Hence, when the planets were used as omens, this name of “slain sheep” was naturally applied to them, even as “augury,” divination by the flight of birds, came to represent amongst the Romans all kinds of divination. “On the famous bronze model of a liver found near Piacenza and which dating from about the 3rd century BC was used as an object-lesson for instruction in hepatoscopy, precisely as the clay model of a liver dating from the Hammurabi period was used in a Babylonian temple school, we find the edge of the liver divided into sixteen regions with names of the deities inhabiting them corresponding to divisions of the heavens in which the gods have their seats, while on the reverse side there is a line dividing the liver into `day’ and `night.’

Professor Korte, in a study of this remarkable object, summing up the results of many years of research, explains this by showing that the liver was regarded as a microcosm reflecting the macrocosm, or, in other words, the liver of the sacrificial animal from being originally a reflection of the soul or mind of the god to whom the animal was offered, was brought into connection with the observation of the heavenly bodies revealing the intention of the gods acting in concert” (Morris Jastrow, Jr., “Hepatoscopy and Astrology in Babylonia and Assyria,” in Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc., 665-66).

Three well-marked classes of astrology, that is to say of divination by the heavenly bodies, are mentioned in Isaiah 47:13, as being practiced in Babylon. “Let now the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee.”

4. The Astrologers, or Dividers of the Heavens:

The astrologers are the “dividers of the heavens” ([hobhere shamayim]); that is to say the significance of any stellar conjunction was made to depend upon the division of the heavens in which it occurred. The earliest of such divisions appears to have been into the four quarters, North, South, East, West, and astrological tablets of this character have been discovered in considerable numbers. Thus tablet W.A.I. III, 56, 1, gives a table of eclipses for each day of the month Tammuz up to the middle of the month, and the significance of the eclipse is connected with the quarter
in which it was seen. On the first day the eclipse is associated with the South, on the second with the North, on the third with the East, and on the fourth with the West (Sayce, Astronomy and Astrology of the Babylonians, 222). Tablets of this description are very instructive since they prove that those who drew up such lists of omens had not even a rudimentary knowledge of astronomy. For the Babylonian months were intended to be natural months, yet at this time it was not realized that an eclipse of the sun could only take place when the moon was invisible, that is to say about the 28th or 29th day of the month, if the calendar was correct. Further, it was not realized that neither sun nor moon can ever be in the North in the latitude of Babylon. Such tables of omens then were not derived, as has sometimes been supposed, from a striking event having occurred near the time of an observed eclipse, but they must have been drawn up on an entirely arbitrary plan.

The same principle of “division” was applied to the moon itself for the purpose of drawing omens from its eclipses. Thus in R. C. Thompson’s Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon we read in No. 268, “The omens of all lands. The right of the moon is Akkad, the left Elam, the top Aharru, the bottom Subartu.” The constellations of the zodiac also had omens allotted to them in a similar manner.

5. The Star-gazers, or Seers of the Constellations:

The astrologers mentioned in the Book of Daniel ([ʿashshaphim]) were not “dividers of the heavens,” but mutterers of incantations. The star-gazers or seers of the stars or constellations ([chozim ba-kokhabhim]) may be illustrated from two of Thompson’s Reports. No. 216, “Saturn has appeared in Leo. When Leo is obscured, for three years lions and jackals .... and kill men”; and No. 239, “When Mars (apin) approaches Scorpio the prince will die by a scorpion’s sting and his son after him will take the throne.” It may be remarked that as the planet Saturn takes three years to pass through the constellation Leo, the ravages of lions are predicted to last for that time.

At a later date we find a complete system of astrology based upon the constellations of the zodiac which happen to be rising at the moment when the stars were consulted. Examples of this form of divination are found in the works of Zeuchros of Babylon, who flourished about the beginning of
our era. By his day the system had received a considerable development. Twelve signs did not give much scope for prediction, so each sign had been divided into three equal portions or “decans”; each decan therefore corresponding nearly to the part of the ecliptic which the sun would pass through in a decade or “week” of 10 days of the Egyptians. A yet further complexity was brought about by associating each one of the 36 decans with one of the 36 extra-zodiacal constellations, and a further variety was obtained by associating each zodiacal constellation with its sunanatellon, or constellation rising with it; that is, at the same time; or with its paranatellon, or constellation rising beside it; that is, a constellation on the same meridian. At what time these particular forms of augury by the constellations came into use we do not know, but the division into the decans is distinctly alluded to in the 5th tablet of the Bah Creation Epic: “4. For the twelve months he (Marduk) fixed three stars.”

6. The Monthly Prognosticators, or Men Who Knew the Omens of the New Moon:

The monthly prognosticators were the men who knew the omens of the new moon ([modhi`im le-chodh-ashim]). At one time the error of the calendar was made the basis of prediction. This is seen in the great astrological work based on the omens drawn up for Sargon of Agade, and entitled from its opening phrase Enuma anu Bel, “When the heaven god Bel” (the “Illumination of Bel”), as, for instance, “The moon as on the 1st day is seen in its appearance on the 27th day; evil is fixed for the land of Elam”; and “The moon as on the 1st day is seen on the 28th day: evil is fixed for the land of the Ahurru.” Other omens were drawn from the position of the horns of the new moon when first seen; the right horn being assigned to the king and the left to his enemies, as in Thompson’s Reports, No. 25: “When at the moon’s appearance its right horn is high (literally, “long”) and its left horn is low (literally, “short”) the king’s hand will conquer land other than this.” The “monthly prognosticators” had not learned that the righthand horn is always the higher and that the amount of its elevation depends on the time of the year, or they kept the knowledge to themselves.
2. THE WORSHIP OF THE HEAVENLY BODIES THE FORM OF IDOLATRY TO WHICH THE ISRAELITES WERE MOST PRONE.

As we should naturally expect, the earliest astrological tablets relate chiefly to omens dependent upon the two great lights, the sun and moon. There is no evidence at present available to fix the date when the planets were first recognized as distinct from the fixed stars. Probably this discovery was intimately connected with the formation of the constellations; it cannot have been long delayed after it. Certainly planet-worship, and as connected with it, planetary divination, prevailed in the Euphrates valley at a very early period.

1. Chiun, Certainly the Planet Saturn:

One planet is certainly mentioned in Old Testament, and we may safely infer that the other four were known, since this particular planet is the least conspicuous both in brightness and in motion, and was therefore probably the last to be discovered. The reference to Saturn occurs in Amos 5:25,26: “Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? Yea, ye have borne the tabernacle of your king (the King James Version Moloch) and the shrine of (the King James Version Chiun) your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves.” This passage was quoted from Septuagint by Stephen in his defense, “And they made a calf in those days, and brought a sacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their hands. But God turned, and gave them up to serve the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets,

“Did ye offer unto me slain beasts and sacrifices
Forty years in the wilderness, O house of Israel?
And ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch,
And the star of the god Rephan,
The figures which ye made to worship them”


The difference between the names Chiun and Rephan, is due either to Rephan being local Egyptian name for the planet Saturn, and therefore used by the Septuagint as its equivalent, or to an actual error of
transcription in the text from which they were translating: the initial of the word being taken as resh (r) when it should have been kaph (k), r instead of k. The word should therefore be transliterated Kaivan, which was the name of the planet Saturn amongst the ancient Arabs and Syrians, while kaimanu, “constant” or “regular,” was its name with the Assyrians. The English Revised Version in Amos 5:26 adopts the reading of the King James Version margin, “Siccuth your king,” Moloch meaning king; but the authority of the Septuagint and the parallelism of the text and its general line of thought support the reading given by some of the ancient versions and followed by the King James Version.

2. Saturn or Moloch Worship:

The difficulty of the passage is that both Amos and Stephen appear to represent the worship of the golden calf as identical with the worship of Moloch and of the planet Saturn; yet though Kaivan is only mentioned here, the nature of the reference would imply that this deity was one familiar both to speaker and hearers. The difficulty vanishes at once, if the plain statement of Stephen be accepted, that when God permitted Israel to “go after the stubbornness of their heart, that they might walk in their own counsels” (Psalm 81:12) He “gave them up to serve the host of heaven.” The worship of the golden calf was star worship; it was the solar bull, the constellation Taurus, in which the sun was at the time of the spring equinox, that was thus represented. The golden calf was therefore analogous to the familiar symbol of the Mithraic cult, the bull slain by Mithra, Sol Invictus, if indeed the latter did not take its origin from this apostasy of Israel.

See CALF, GOLDEN.

And Moloch the king, the idol of the Ammonites and Phoenicians, was intimately connected both with the solar bull and the planet Saturn. According to the rabbins, his statue was of brass, with a human body but the head of an ox. On the Carthaginian worship of Moloch or Saturn, Diodorus (book xx, chapter i) writes: “Among the Carthaginians there was a brazen statue of Saturn putting forth the palms of his hands bending in such a manner toward the earth, as that the boy who was laid upon them, in order to be sacrificed, should slip off, and so fall down headlong into a deep fiery furnace. Hence it is probable that Euripides took what he
fabulously relates concerning the sacrifice in Taurus, where he introduces Iphigenia asking Orestes this question: ‘But what sepulchre will me dead receive, shall the gulf of sacred fire me have?’ The ancient fable likewise that is common among all the Grecians, that Saturn devoured his own children, seems to be confirmed by this law among the Carthaginians.” The parallelism of the text therefore is very complete. The Israelites professed to be carrying the tabernacle of Yahweh upon which rested the Shekinah glory; but in spirit they were carrying the tabernacle of the cruelest and most malignant of all the deities of the heathen, and the light in which they were rejoicing was the star of the planet assigned to that deity.

Moloch then was the sun as king, and especially the sun as he entered upon what might be considered his peculiar kingdom, the zodiac from Taurus to Serpens and Scorpio, the period of the six summer months. The connection of the sun with Saturn may seem to us somewhat forced, but we have the most direct testimony that such a connection was believed in by the Babylonians. In Thompson’s Reports, obverse of No. 176 reads: “When the sun stands in the place of the moon, the king of the land will be secure on his throne. When the sun stands above or below the moon, the foundation of the throne will be secure.” The “sun” in this inscription clearly cannot be the actual sun, and it is explained on the reverse as being “the star of the sun,” the planet Saturn. No. 176 rev. reads: “Last night Saturn drew near to the moon. Saturn is the star of the sun. This is the interpretation: it is lucky for the king. The sun is the king’s star.” The connection between the sun and Saturn probably arose from both being taken as symbols of Time. The return of the sun to the beginning of the zodiac marked the completion of the year. Saturn, the slowest moving of all the heavenly bodies, accomplished its revolution through the signs of the zodiac in about 30 years, a complete generation of men. Saturn therefore was in a peculiar sense the symbol of Time, and because of Time, of Destiny.

3. Mazzaloth, or Planet Worship:

The connection between the worship of the golden calves, of the heavenly host and of Moloch, and of these with divination and enchantments, is brought out very clearly in the judgment which the writer of the Book of Ki pronounces upon the apostate ten tribes: “They forsook all the
commandments of Yahweh their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made an Asherah, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal. And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments” (2 Kings 17:16,17). The sin of apostate Judah was akin to the sin of apostate Israel. In the reformation of Josiah, he put down the idolatrous priests that “burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets ([mazzaloth]), and to all the host of heaven” (2 Kings 23:5). He also destroyed the [’asherah] and he “defiled Topheth .... that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech” (2 Kings 23:10). “Moreover them that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols, and all the abominations that were seen in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away” (2 Kings 23:24). The idolatries to which the Israelites of both kingdoms were especially prone were those of the heavenly bodies, and inextricably woven with them was the passion for employing those heavenly bodies as omens, and in consequence for every kind of divination and witchcraft.

The word translated “planets” in 2 Kings 23:5 is [mazzaloth], closely akin to the [mazzaroth] of Job 38:32. This rendering probably reproduces correctly the meaning of the original. R. C. Thompson in his introduction to the Reports writes (xxvii): “The places where the gods stood in the zodiac were called manzalti, a word which means literally ‘stations,’ and we are probably right in assuming that it is the equivalent of the [mazzaloth] mentioned in 2 Kings 23:5. The use of the word in late Hebrew is, however, somewhat more vague, for [mazzal], though literally meaning a constellation of the zodiac, is also applied to any or every star, and in the [Ber’shith Rabba’], cx, it is said ‘One [mazzal] completeth its circuit in thirty days, another completeth it in thirty years.’ “ The two bodies referred to are evidently the moon with its lunation of about 30 days, and Saturn with its revolution of about 30 years; these being the two planets with the shortest and longest periods respectively. By a natural metonymy, [mazzaloth], the complete circuit of the zodiac, came also to mean [mazzaloth], the bodies that performed that circuit, just as in the present day we speak of a railway, which means literally the “permanent way,” when we really mean the trains that travel upon it.
4. Gadh and Meni or Star Worship:

The references in Old Testament to the planets other than Saturn are not so clear. In Isaiah 65:11 two deities are apparently referred to: “Ye that forsake Yahweh, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for Fortune (Gad), and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny (Meni); I will destine you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter.” It is clear that Gad and Meni are the titles of two closely associated deities, and Gesenius identifies them with Jupiter and Venus, the Greater and Lesser Good Fortunes of the astrologers; But as I have suggested in the Astronomy of the Bible (133, 217), if any of the heavenly bodies are here intended (which cannot as yet be considered certain), it is more probable that they are the two beautiful starclusters that stand on the head and the shoulder of the Bull at the old commencement of the zodiac, as if they marked the gateway of the year — the Hyades and Pleiades. Both groups were considered traditionally as composed of seven stars; and the two names [Gadh] (the Hyades) and [Meni] (the Pleiades) taken together give the meaning of the “Fortunate Number,” i.e. seven. The lectisternia — the spreading the table and mingling the wine to [Gadh] and [Meni] — at the beginning of the year to secure good fortune throughout its course, were therefore held about the time of the Passover, as if in parody, if indeed they were not a desecration of it: heathen rites added to one of the most solemn services of Yahweh.

5. Lucifer, the Shining Star:

The planet Venus is more distinctly referred to in Isaiah 14:12: “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!” (the King James Version). The word here rendered Lucifer, that is, “light-bearer,” is the word [helel] corresponding to the Assyrian mustelil, “the shining star,” an epithet to which the planet Venus has a preeminent claim.

Mars and Mercury, the two remaining planets, are not mentioned as such in Old Testament, but the deities connected with them, Nergal = Mars (2 Kings 17:30) and Nebo = Mercury (Isaiah 46:1), both occur.
3. SYSTEMS OF ASTROLOGY.

1. Names of the Week-Days, Due to an Astrological System:

In astrology the planets were regarded as being 7 in number, but the idea that the number 7 derived its sacredness from this fact is an inversion of the true state of the case. It was that 7 being regarded as a sacred number, the number of the planets was artificially made to correspond by including in the same class as the five wandering stars, bodies that differed so widely from them in appearance as the sun and moon. So artificial a classification cannot have been primitive, and it is significant that in Genesis 1:14 the sun and moon are presented as being (as indeed they appear to be) of an altogether different order from the rest of the heavenly bodies. Yet there is one feature that they have in common with the five planets: all move among the stars within the band of the zodiac; each of the seven makes the circuit of the [mazzaloth].

We owe the names of the days of the week to this astrological conception of the planets as being 7 in number, and some writers (e.g. R. A. Proctor in his Myths and Marvels of Astronomy, 43-47) have supposed that the week of 7 days owed its origin to this astrological conception and that the 7th day — Saturn’s Day — became the Sabbath, the Day of Rest, because Saturn was the planet of ill-omen and it was then unlucky to undertake any work. The way in which the allotment of the planets to the days of the week was arrived at was the following. The Greek astronomers and mathematicians concluded that the planet Saturn was the most distant from the earth and that the others followed in the descending order of Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, Moon. In the progress of astrology there came a time when it was found necessary to assign a planet to every hour so as to increase the number of omens it could afford. Starting then with Saturn as presiding over the first hour of the first day, each planet was used three times over on that day, and three planets were used a fourth time. The sun, the fourth planet, took therefore the first hour of the second day, and gave it its name, so that Sunday followed Saturday. In like manner the third day became the moon’s day, and so on with the other planets which followed in the order Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, and again Saturn. This idea of the relative distances of the planets was that arrived at by the astronomers of Alexandria, and was necessarily
subsequent to the reduction of the planetary motions to a mathematical system by Eudoxus and his successors. The division of the day implied was one of 24 hours, not of 12; the Egyptian division, not the Babylonian. But the Egyptian week was one of 10 days, the 7-day week was Semitic, and the week implied in the system is the free week, running on continuously, the Jewish week, not the Babylonian. For the Babylonians, though they paid some attention to the 7th day, began their reckoning afresh at the beginning of each month. This particular astrological system therefore owed its origin to four distinct nationalities. The conception of the influence of the planets was Babylonian; the mathematical working out of the order of the planets was exclusively Gr; the division of the day into 24 hours was Egyptian; the free continuous 7-day week was particularly Jewish. These four influences were brought together in Alexandria not very long before the Christian era. Here therefore and at this time, this particular system of astrology took its origin.

This form of astrology was readily adopted by the Jews in their degenerate days, as we find from references in Talmud. Thus, Rabbi Chanena said to his disciples, “Go and tell Ben Laive, the planetary influence does not depend upon days but hours. He that is born under the influence of the sun (no matter on what day) will have a beaming face”; and so the rabbi went through the whole list of the planets ([Shabbath], fol 156, col. 1). The above was spoken as a criticism of Rabbi Shimon Ben Laive who had written, “Whoever is born on the first day of the week will be either a thoroughly good or a thoroughly bad man; because light and darkness was created on that day”; and the rabbi spoke similarly for the other days. We get a relic of this superstition in our nursery rhyme, “Monday’s child is full of grace; Tuesday’s child is fair of face,” etc.; and some present-day astrologers still use the system for their forecasts. It will of course be noted that the system takes no account of the actual positions of the heavenly bodies; the moon does not shine more or less on Monday than on any other day.

2. Origin of Modern Astrology:

It was from Alexandrian astrology that modern astrology immediately derived its form; but the original source of all astrology in the ancient world lay in the system of planetary idolatry prevalent in the Euphrates
valley, and in the fact that this idolatry was practiced chiefly for the purpose of divination. At one time it was supposed that a real astronomy was cultivated at an early time in Babylonia, but Jastrow, Kugler and others have shown that this idea is without basis. The former writes, “The fact however is significant that, with perhaps some exceptions, we have in the library of Ashurbanipal representing to a large extent copies from older originals, no text that can properly be called astronomical ..... It is certainly significant that the astronomical tablets so far found belong to the latest period, and in fact to the age following on the fall of the Babylonian empire. According to Kugler the oldest dated genuinely astronomical tablet belongs to the 7th year of Cambyses, i.e. 522 BC” (“Hepatoscopy and Astrology in Babylonia and Assyria,” in Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc., 667).

The conquests of Alexander the Great brought into close connection with each other the Babylonian and Greek systems of thought, and Babylonian astrology was introduced to the Greeks by Berosus the Chaldean priest. In Greek hands, astrology was changed from its character of an oriental religion into the appearance of a science. In Babylonia the stars had been consulted for the benefit of the king as representing the state; amongst the Greeks, with their strong individualistic tendency, the fortunes of the individual became the most frequent subject of inquiry, and the idea was originated of determining the character and fortune of a man from the position of the stars at his birth — genethlialogy — a phase of astrology which never existed in the Euphrates valley. This extension rendered it necessary to increase greatly the complexities of the omens, and the progress which the Greeks had made in mathematics supplied them with the means of doing so. Thus came into existence that complex and symmetrical system of divination of which we have the earliest complete exposition in the writings of Claudius Ptolemy about 130 AD; a system which, though modified in details, is in effect that in use today.

3. “Curious Arts” of Ephesus:

Since this mathematical astrology did not come into existence until about the commencement of the Christian era, it is clear that there could not be any reference to its particular form in the Old Testament. We may probably see one reference in the New Testament (Acts 19:19). Of the converts at Ephesus it is written, “Not a few of them that practiced
magical arts brought their books together and burned them in the sight of all; and they counted the price of them, and found it 50,000 pieces of silver.” Books of magical incantations and prescriptions were certainly included, but it is also likely that the almanacs, tables and formulas, essential to the astrologer for the exercise of his art, were also in the number. It was of course impossible then, as now, for the convert to Christianity to consult astrologers or to practice astrological divination. Partly because it was an absurdity, for the divisions of the heavens upon which the predictions are based, are purely imaginary; the “signs” of the zodiac, and the “houses” have nothing whatsoever corresponding to them in Nature; such division is exactly that denounced by the prophets of old as [qecem], “divination.” Next, and of more importance, it ascribes to mere creatures, the planets or the spirits supposed to preside over them, the powers that belong to God alone; it was and is essentially idolatrous. As one of the chief living astrologers puts it, “The True astrologer believes that the sun is the body of the Loges of this solar system, `in Him we live and move and have our being.’ The planets are his angels, being modifications in the consciousness of the Loges” (Knowledge, XXIII, 228). Astrology is indeed referred to in the Old Testament, with other forms of divination, and the idolatry inherent in them, but they are only mentioned in terms of the most utter reprobation. The Jews alone of all the nations of antiquity were taught by their religion neither to resort to such arts nor to be afraid of the omens deduced from them. Isaiah knew the Lord to be He that “frustrateth the signs of the liars, and maketh diviners mad” (Isaiah 44:25), and Jeremiah declared, “Thus saith Yahweh, Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the nations are dismayed at them” (Jeremiah 10:2). And what held good for the Jews of old holds good for us today. Above all, astrology is an attempt to ascertain the will of God by other means than those which He has appointed — His Son, who is the Way and the Truth and the Life, and His Holy Scriptures in which we learn of Him, and which are able to make us “wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus” (2 Timothy 3:15).
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ASTRONOMY

<as-tron’-omi>:

The keynote of the Hebrew writers respecting the heavenly bodies is sounded in Psalm 8:

“When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him but little lower than God, And crownest him with glory and honor. Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet” (*Psalm 8:3-6*).

The heavenly bodies were inexpressibly glorious, and they were all the handiwork of Yahweh — without power or vitality of their own — and man, not by any inherent virtue, but by the will and grace of God, was superior to them in importance. Thus there was a great gulf fixed between the superstitions of the heathen who worshipped the sun, moon and stars
as gods, and the faith of the pious Hebrew who regarded them as things made and moved by the will of one only God. And it followed from this difference that the Hebrew, beyond all nations of like antiquity, was filled with a keen delight in natural objects and phenomena, and was attentively observant of them.

1. THE HEAVENLY BODIES.

1. The Ordinances of Heaven:

To the sacred writers, the ordinances of heaven taught the lesson of Order — great, magnificent and immutable. Day by day, the sun rose in the east, “as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber” (Psalm 19:5), and pursued unswervingly his appointed path across the sky, to his going down. Night by night, the stars, the “host of heaven,” moved in their “highways” or “courses” ([mecillah]), and the words of Joel (2:7) respecting the Assyrian army might be applied to them. “They march every one on his ways, and they break not their ranks. Neither doth one thrust another; they march every one in his path.” Some wheeled in northern circuits that were wholly seen; some swept in long courses from their rising in the East to their setting in the West; some scarcely lifted themselves above the southern horizon. Little wonder that this celestial army on the march, “the host of heaven,” suggested to the Hebrews a comparison with the “angels,” the unseen messengers of God who in their “thousands of thousands ministered unto him” (Daniel 7:10).

But, as the year revolved, the dial of stars in the North shifted round; whilst of the other stars, those in the West disappeared into the light of the setting sun, and new stars seemed to spring out of the dawning light. There was thus a yearly procession of the stars as well as a nightly one.

And to this “ordinance of the heaven” the Hebrews noted that there was an answer from the earth, for in unfailing correspondence came the succession of seasons, the revival of vegetation, the ripening of harvest and of fruits, the return of winter’s cold. Of them God asked the question: “Knowest thou the ordinances of the heavens? Canst thou establish the dominion thereof in the earth?” (Job 38:33), and they recognized that to this question no answer could be given, for these ordinances of heaven were the sign and evidence of Almighty wisdom, power and
unchangeableness. “Thus saith Yahweh, who giveth the sun for a light by
day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night ....
Yahweh of hosts is his name” (Jeremiah 31:35).

We have no writings of the early Hebrews other than the books of the Old
Testament, and in them there is no record of any research into the
mechanical explanation of the movements of the heavenly bodies. Nor
should we expect to find in them a record of the research if such were
made, since the purpose of Holy Scripture was, not to work out the
relation of thing to thing — the inquiry to which modern science is devoted
— but to reveal God to man. Therefore the lesson which is drawn from the
observed ordinances of heaven is, not that the earth rotates on its axis or
revolves round the sun, but that God is faithful to His purpose for
mankind. “Thus saith Yahweh: If my covenant of day and night stand not,
if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I also
cast away the seed of Jacob, and of David my servant” (Jeremiah
33:25,26). And “the glory of God” which “the heavens declare” is not only
His almighty power, but the image which the order and perfection of the
heavenly movements supply of the law which He has revealed unto man.
The “speech” that they “utter,” the “knowledge” that they “show” is:
“The law of Yahweh is perfect, restoring the soul” (Psalm 19:7).

2. The Sun:

(1) The Names for the Sun.

Four words are translated “sun” in the Old Testament:

(a) Or simply means “light” and is usually rendered thus, but in one
instance (Job 31:26), being in antithesis to “moon,” it is given as “sun,”
the great light-giver.

(b) Chammah means “heat” and is used for the sun when this is in
association with lebhanah or “snow-white” for the moon, as in Isaiah
24:23, ‘Then the snow-white (moon) shall be confounded, and the heat
(sun) ashamed,’ the antithesis being drawn between the cold light of the
silver moon and the fiery radiance, of the glowing sun.

(c) [Shemesh], the Samas of the Babylonians, is a primitive word,
probably with the root meaning of “ministrant.” This is the word most
frequently used for the sun, and we find it used topographically as, for instance, in Beth-shemesh, “the house of the sun.” Four places of this name are mentioned in the Old Testament: one in Judah, a Levitical city, to which the two milch kine bearing the ark took their straight way from the country of the Philistines; one on the border of Issachar; one in Naphtali, a fenced city; and one in Egypt, supposed to be the same as Heliopolis or On, the city of Asenath, wife of Joseph.

(d) [Cherec] means “blister” or “burning heat,” from a root “to scratch” or “be rough,” and is an unusual term for the sun, and its precise rendering is sometimes in doubt. Once it is translated as “itch,” when it occurs amongst the evils threatened in the “cursings” that the six tribes uttered from Mount Ebal (Deuteronomy 28:27). Once it is certainly used of the sun itself when Job (9:7) said of God, He “commandeth the sun ([cherec] or [cheres]), and it riseth not.” Once it is certainly the name of a hill, for Mount Heres was near Aijalon, on the borders of Judah and Dan. In another passage, authorities differ in their rendering, for when Gideon overcame Zebah and Zalmunna (Judges 8:13), he “returned from the battle,” according to the King James Version, “before the sun was up,” but according to the Revised Version (British and American), “from the ascent of Heres.” In yet another passage (Judges 14:18), when the Philistines answered Samson’s riddle, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) translation [cherec] as sun — ”before the sun went down.” We moreover get slight variants of the same word, joined with [qir] (“wall” or “fortress”), in [Qir-Chareseth] (2 Kings 3:25; Isaiah 16:7) and [Qir-Cheres] (Isaiah 16:11; Jeremiah 48:31,36). These are probably to be identified with the modern Kerak of Moab.

(2) The “City of the Sun”.

But the most interesting reference is found in Isaiah 19:18: “In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Yahweh of hosts; one shall be called The city of destruction.” The word here rendered “destruction” is in Hebrew [herec], which has that meaning, but Gesenius and other authorities would substitute for the initial letter, he, the letter, [cheth], which it so closely resembles, and so read it “The city of the sun.” With this reading it was identified with On, that is, Heliopolis (the city of the sun), and on this
belief Onias, the son of Onias the high priest, persuaded Ptolemy Philometor to allow him to build a temple to Yahweh in that prefecture, 149 BC (Ant., XIII, iii, 1).

(3) The Greater Light-Giver.

Yet a fifth expression is used to denote the sun, and in one respect it is the most important and significant of all. In the creation narrative it is called the greater light or rather light-giver (ma’or): `And God made the two great light-givers; the greater light-giver to rule the day, and the lesser light-giver to rule the night: He made the stars also’ (Genesis 1:16). The extreme simplicity of this passage is most significant. In marked contrast to the Bah creation poem, which by its more complex astronomy reveals its later origin (see post, section II, 12, Mazzaroth), the sun and moon have no distinctive names assigned to them; there is no recognition of the grouping of the stars into constellations, none of any of the planets. The celestial bodies could not be referred to in a more simple manner. And this simplicity is marred by no myth; there is not the faintest trace of the deification of sun or moon or stars; there is no anthropomorphic treatment, no suggestion that they formed the vehicles for spirits. They are described as they were observed when they were first noticed by men, simply as “light-givers” of different brightness. It is the expression of man’s earliest observation of the heavenly bodies, but it is real observation, free from any taint of savage fantasies; it marks the very first step in astronomy. No record, oral or written, has been preserved to us of a character more markedly primitive than this.

(4) The Purpose of the Sun.

Two purposes for the great heavenly bodies are indicated in Genesis 1:14,15. The sun and moon are appointed to give light and to measure time. These, from the human and practical point of view, are the two main services which they render to us.

Their purpose for measuring time by their movements will be taken up under another heading; but here it may be pointed out that when it is stated in the Book of The Wisdom of Solomon (7:18) that King Solomon knew “the alternations of the solstices and the changes of seasons,” the reference is to the whole cycle of changes from winter through summer
back to winter again. From winter onward the places of sunrise and sunset move northward along the horizon until midsummer when for some days they show no change — the “solstice” is reached; then from midsummer onward the movement “turns” southward until midwinter, when again a “solstice” is reached, after which the places of sunrise and sunset again move northward. This changing place of sunrise is also referred to when God asked Job (38:12-14): Hast thou “caused the dayspring to know its place,” and the passage goes on, “It (the earth) is changed as clay under the seal; and all things stand forth as a garment.” As the shapeless clay takes form under the pressure of the seal, as the garment, shapeless while folded up, takes form when the wearer puts it on, so the earth, shapeless during the darkness, takes form and relief and color with the impress upon it of the dawning light. In the New Testament when James (1:17) speaks of “the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation (parallage), neither shadow that is cast by turning (trope)” he is using astronomical technical terms for these same apparent movements of the sun.

(5) The Sun as a Type.

But the apparent unchangeability of the sun makes it, as it were, a just measure of eternal duration (Psalm 72:5,17). The penetration of its rays renders “under the sun” (Ecclesiastes 1:9) a fit expression for universality of place, and on the other hand the fierceness of its heat as experienced in Palestine makes it equally suitable as a type of oppression and disaster, so the sun is said, in Scripture, to “smite” those oppressed by its heat (Psalm 121-6).

But it was in its light-giving and ministering power that the Hebrew writers used the sun as a type to set forth the power and beneficence of God. Words are the symbols of ideas and it was only by this double symbolism that it was possible to express in intelligible human speech, and to make men partly apprehend some of the attributes of God. So we find in the Psalm of pilgrimage (Psalm 84:11) “Yahweh God is a sun and a shield”; Malachi (4:2) foretells that “the sun of righteousness shall arise with healing in its wings.” But the old Hebrew writers were very guarded and careful in the symbolism they used, whether of word or illustration. Men in those days terribly perverted the benefits which they received through the sun, and made them the occasion and excuse for plunging into
all kinds of nature worship and of abominable idolatries. It was not only clear thinking on the part of the sacred writers that made them refer all the benefits that came to them in the natural world direct to the action of God; it was a necessity for clean living. There is no bottom to the abyss in which men plunged when they “worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever” (Romans 1:25).

In New Testament times, though men were no less prone to evil, the fashion of that evil was changing. “The pillars of Beth-shemesh” were broken down (Jeremiah 43:13), idolatry was beginning to fall into disrepute and men were led away rather by “the knowledge (gnosis) which is falsely so called” (1 Timothy 6:20). The apostles could therefore use symbolism from the natural world more freely, and so we find John speaking of our Lord as “There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world” (John 1:9), and again, “God is light, and in him is no darkness at all” (1 John 1:5); and again, that the glory of the New Jerusalem shall be that “the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb” (Revelation 21:23); while the great modern discovery that nearly every form of terrestrial energy is derived ultimately from the energy of the sun’s rays, gives a most striking appropriateness to the imagery of James that “Every good gift and perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning’ (James 1:17 the English Revised Version).

3. The Moon:

(1) The Names for the Moon.

Three words are translated “moon” in the Old Testament, not including cases where “month” has been rendered “moon” for the sake of a more flowing sentence:

(a) [Lebhanah], “white”; a poetic expression, used in connection with chammah, “heat,” for the sun.

(b) [Chodhesh], “new moon,” meaning “new,” “fresh.” As the Hebrews reckoned their months from the actual first appearance of the young
crescent, chodhesh is most frequently translated “month.” Thus “In the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month” (Genesis 7:11), and in the great majority of cases, the word for month is [chodhesh], “new moon.” In Isaiah 66:23, “from one new moon to another,” should be literally, “from new moon to new moon.” Once it is rendered “monthly” (Isaiah 47:13), when it is used to denote the astrologers who fixed the omens of the opening month. [Chodhesh], therefore, when translated “new moon” is not a designation of the actual heavenly body, but denotes the first day of the month. It is a term directly or indirectly connected with the calendar.

(Yareach), probably “wandering,” a very appropriate primitive term for the moon, since her motion among the stars from night to night is sufficiently rapid to have caught the attention of very early observers. Its use therefore as the proper name for the “lesser light” indicates that the systematic observation of the heavenly bodies had commenced, and that the motion of the moon, relative to the stars, had been recognized.

[Yerach], “month,” is twice translated “moon” (Deuteronomy 33:14; Isaiah 60:20), but without any great reason for the variation in either case.

(2) The Lesser Light-Giver.

The direct references in Scripture to the moon as a light-giver are not numerous, but those that occur are significant of the great importance of moonlight in ancient times, when artificial lights were few, expensive and dim, and the lighting of streets and roads was unthought of. To shepherds, the moon was of especial assistance, and many of the people of Israel maintained the habits of their forefathers and led the shepherd’s life long after the settlement of the nation in Palestine. The return of the moonlit portion of the month was therefore an occasion for rejoicing and for solemn thanks to God, and the “new moon” as well as the Sabbath was a day of special offerings. On the other hand one of the judgments threatened against the enemies of God was that the light of the moon should be withheld. The threat made against Pharaoh is “I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give its light” (Ezekiel 32:7); and in the day of the Lord denounced against Babylon, “The sun shall be
darkened in its going forth, and the moon shall not cause its light to shine” (Isaiah 13:10). But among the glories of the restoration of Israel it is promised that “the light of the moon (lebhanah) shall be as the light of the sun (chammah)” (Isaiah 30:26).

(3) Phases of the Moon.

There is no direct mention of the phases of the moon in Scripture; a remarkable fact, and one that illustrates the foolishness of attempting to prove the ignorance of the sacred writers by the argument from silence, since it is not conceivable that men at any time were ignorant of the fact that the moon changes her apparent shape and size. So far from the Hebrews being plunged in such a depth of more than savage ignorance, they based their whole calendar on the actual observation of the first appearance of the young crescent. In two passages in the Revised Version (British and American) we find the expression “at the full moon,” keceh (Psalm 81:3; Proverbs 7:20), but though this is what is intended, the literal meaning of the word is doubtful, and may be that given in the King James Version, “at the day appointed.” In another passage already quoted, there is a reference to the dark part of the month. “Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon (yerach, “month”) withdraw itself” — the “withdrawn” part of the month being the time near new moon when the moon is nearly in conjunction with the sun and therefore invisible.

The periodical changes of the moon are its ordinances (Jeremiah 31:35). It was also appointed for “seasons” (Psalm 104:19), that is, for religious assemblies or feasts (mo`adhim). Two of these were held at the full of the moon, the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles; one at the new moon, the Feast of Trumpets; but the ordinary new moon did not rank among the great “appointed feasts” (mo`adhim). As light-giver, assisting men in their labors with the flock and in the field and helping them on their journeys; as time-measurer, indicating the progress of the months and the seasons for the great religious festivals, the moon was to the pious Hebrew an evidence of the goodness and wisdom of God.

The “round tires like the moon” worn by the daughters of Zion (Isaiah 3:18 the King James Version), and those on the camels of Zeba and Zalmunna (Judges 8:21 King James Version, margin), were designated by the same Hebrew word, saharonim, translated in the Vulgate (Jerome’s
Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) as lunulae, and were little round ornaments, probably round like crescents, not discs like the full moon.

Jericho possibly means “the city of the moon,” and Jerah, “moon,” was the name of one of the sons of Joktan.

4. Signs:

(1) Solar and Lunar Eclipses.

The sun and moon were not only given “for days and years” (Genesis 1:14), but also “for signs,” and in no way do they better fulfill what was in the old time understood by this word than in their eclipses. Nothing in Nature is more impressive than a total eclipse of the sun; the mysterious darkness, the sudden cold, the shining forth of the weird corona, seen at no other time, affect even those who know its cause, and strike unspeakable terror in those who cannot foresee or understand it. In bygone ages an eclipse of the sun was counted an omen of disaster, indeed as itself the worst of disasters, by all nations except that one to whom the word of the prophet came: “Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the nations are dismayed at them” (Jeremiah 10:2). To the Hebrew prophets, eclipses were “signs” of the power and authority of God who forbade them to be alarmed at portents which distressed the heathen.

The phenomena of both solar and lunar eclipses are briefly but unmistakably described by several of the prophets. Joel refers to them twice (2:10,31), the second time very definitely: “The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood,” and this was quoted by Peter on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:19,20). John also says that when the sixth seal was opened “the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the whole moon became as blood” (Revelation 6:12). When the new moon in its revolution or turning comes exactly between the earth and the sun, and its shadow — the “shadow that is cast by turning” of James 1:17 — falls on the earth, the sun is completely hidden and its glowing discovered is replaced by the dark body of the moon; “the sun is turned into darkness.” When the shadow of the earth falls upon the full moon, and the only rays from the sun that reach it have passed through an immense thickness of
our atmosphere and are therefore of a dull copper-red color like clotted blood, “the moon is turned into blood.”

(2) The Wings of the Morning.

But a solar eclipse is not solely darkness and terror. Scarcely has the dark moon hidden the last thread of sunlight than a beautiful pearly halo, the corona, is seen surrounding the blackness. This corona changes its shape from one eclipse to another, but the simplest form is that of a bright ring with outstretched wings, and is characteristic of times when the sun has but few spots upon it. This form appears to have been the origin of the sacred symbol of the ring or discovered with wings, so frequently figured on Egyptian, Babylonian and Persian monuments. It is possible that these coronal “wings of the sun” may have been in the mind of the prophet Malachi when he wrote, “Unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in its wings” (Malachi 4:2). The metaphor “wings of the morning” of Psalm 139:9 is however more probably due to the long streamers, the crepuscular rays, seen at dawn when the sun rises behind a low bank of clouds.

Total eclipses of the moon must frequently have been visible in Palestine as in other countries, but only two or three total eclipses of the sun were visible there during Old Testament history; that of 831 BC, August 15, was total in Judea, and that of 824 BC, April 2, very nearly total. It has been suggested that two eclipses of the sun were predicted in the Old Testament — that of Nineveh, 763 BC, June 15, in Amos 8:9, and that of Thales, 585 BC, May 28, in Isaiah 13:10, but the suggestion has little to support it.

5. Seasons:

(1) The Meaning of the Word.

The sun and moon were appointed “to give light upon the earth,” and “for signs,” and “for days and years.” They were also appointed “for seasons” (mo`adhim), i.e. “appointed assemblies.” These seasons were not primarily such seasons as the progress of the year brings forth in the form of changes of weather or of the condition of vegetation; they were seasons for worship. The word mo`edh occurs some 219 times; in 149, it is
translated “congregation,” and in about 50 other instances by “solemn assembly” or some equivalent expression. Thus before ever man was created, God had provided for him times to worship and had appointed two great lights of heaven to serve as signals to call to it.

The appointed sacred seasons of the Jews form a most complete and symmetrical series, developing from times indicated by the sun alone to times indicated by the sun and moon together, and completed in times indicated by luni-solar cycles.

(2) Natural Seasons for Worship.

The sun alone indicated the hours for daily worship; at sunrise, when the day began, there was the morning sacrifice; at sunset, when the day closed, there was the evening sacrifice.

The moon indicated the time for monthly worship; when the slender crescent of the new moon was first seen in the western sky, special sacrifices were ordained with the blowing of trumpets over them.

The sun and moon together marked the times for the two great religious festivals of the year. At the beginning of the bright part of the year, when the moon was full in the first month of spring, the Passover, followed by the Feast of Unleavened Bread, was held. At the end of the bright part of the year, when the moon was full in the first month of autumn, the Feast of Tabernacles was held. These may all be termed natural seasons for worship, obviously marked out as appropriate. The beginning and close of the bright part of the day, and of the bright part of the year, and the beginning of the bright part of the month, have been observed by many nations.

(3) The Hallowing of the Seventh.

But that which was distinctive in the system of the Jewish festivals was the hallowing of the seventh: the seventh day, the seventh week, the seventh month, the seventh year were all specially marked out. The sun alone indicated the Sabbath by the application of the sacred number seven to the unit of time given by the day. For the period of seven days, the week was not dependent upon any phase of the moon’s relation to the sun; it was not a quarter month, but a free week, running on independently
of the month. The Jewish Sabbath therefore differed from the Babylonian, which was tied to the lunar month. The same principle was applied also to the year; every seventh year was set apart, as a period of rest, the Sabbatic year.

Every seventh day, every seventh year, was thus observed. But for the week and month, the principle of hallowing the seventh came into operation only once in each year. The Feast of Pentecost, or as it was also called, the Feast of Weeks, was held at the close of the seventh week from the morrow after the Sabbath of Unleavened Bread; and the new moon of the seventh month was held as a special feast, the Feast of Trumpets, “a holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work” (Leviticus 23:24,25). The other new moons of the year were not thus distinguished.

The weekly Sabbath, the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feasts of Trumpets and of Tabernacles, with one other day of solemnity, were in an especial sense, the mo`adhim of the Lord.

The seventh day was especially the day of worship, and to correspond, the seventh month was especially the month of worship; and this, not only because it was ushered in with peculiar solemnity, and included one of the chief great feasts of the year, but because it furnished the culminating ceremony of the entire Jewish system, the great Day of Atonement, held on the tenth day of the month, and therefore on a day not marked directly by any phase of the moon. The Day of Atonement purged away the offenses of the past year, and restored Israel to the full enjoyment of the Divine favor.


The Jewish month was a natural month, based upon the actual observation of the young crescent. The Jewish year was a natural year, that is, a solar tropical year, based upon actual observation of the ripening of the grain. But there is not an exact number of days in a lunar month, nor is there an exact number of months in a solar year; twelve lunar months falling short of the year, by eleven days; so that in three years the error would amount to more than a complete month, and to restore the balance a thirteenth month would have to be intercalated. As the months were determined from actual observation, and as observation would be interrupted from time to
time by unfavorable weather, it was necessary to have some means for
determining when intercalation would take place, irrespective of it. And
this was provided by carrying the principle of hallowing the seventh, one
stage farther. Not only was the seventh of the day, week, month and year
distinguished, but the seventh week of years was marked by the blowing
of the trumpet of Jubilee on the Day of Atonement. The Day of
Atonement meant the restitution of Israel to the Divine favor; the blowing
of the trumpet of Jubilee every forty-ninth year meant “the restitution of
all things”; every Hebrew in servitude returned to freedom, all land,
mortgaged or sold, returned to its original owner.

And this period of 49 solar years was astronomically a period of
restitution, for the sun and moon returned nearly to their original positions
relative to each other, since 49 solar years are 606 lunar months with an
error of only 32 hours. So that though the Jubilee period is not a perfect
lunar cycle, it was quite exact enough to guide the Jewish priests in
drawing up their calendar in cases where the failure of observation had
given rise to some doubt.

The beginning of each month was marked by the blowing of the two silver
trumpets (chatsotserah: Numbers 10:2,10). The beginning of the civil,
that is to say, of the agricultural year, was marked by a special blowing of
trumpets (teru`ah), giving the name “Feast of Trumpets” to that new
moon (Leviticus 23:24; Numbers 29:1). And the beginning of a new
cycle of 49 years was marked by the Jubilee, the loud trumpet (shophar:
Leviticus 25:9). Thus the cycle of the Jubilee made symmetrical,
completed, and welded together all the mo`adhim of the Lord — the two
great lights were set “for seasons.”


The cycle of the Jubilee was sufficient for the purposes of the religious
calendar so long as the nation inhabited its own land, since from its small
extent there would be no conflict of time reckoning and it would be easy to
notify the appearance of the new moon from one end of the country to the
other. But after the captivities, when the people were scattered from
Gozan of the Medes to Syene on the Nile, it was necessary to devise some
method by which the Jews, however far they had been dispersed, would
be able to reckon for themselves as to when the moon was new for
Jerusalem. We have lately learned from the discovery of a number of Aramaic papyri at Syene that there was a colony of Jews there who used a calendar constructed, not from observation, but from calculation based upon a very exact luni-solar cycle (E. B. Knobel, “Ancient Jewish Calendar Dates in Aramaic Papyri,” Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, LXVIII, 334). This cycle, known to us by the name of its supposed discoverer, Meton, is one of 19 years, which is only two hours short of 235 complete months. As this Jewish colony appears to have been founded after Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction of Jerusalem by some of the refugees who fled into Egypt with Johanan the son of Kareah (Jeremiah 40 through 44), this acquaintance with the Metonic cycle cannot have been due to Babylonian influence. Nor can it have been due to Egyptian, since the Egyptians did not use or require any such cycle, their year being a solar one of 365 days. Indeed no other nation appears to have been aware of it until, a generation later, Meton, the Athenian, won immortal fame by announcing it. The evidence of these Syene papyri renders it probable that Meton did not himself discover the cycle but learned it from Jewish sources. Many of the Semitic nations used, like the Jews, a natural month in conjunction with the natural year, but the Jews were the most likely to have discovered this cycle, since they alone had their worship centralized at a single shrine which became, in consequence, their standard observatory for their observation of the new moon. These observations, therefore, would all be comparable, and during the 400 years that the Temple stood, it must have been quite clear to them that the 19-year cycle not only gave them seven, the sacred number, of intercalated months, but brought the setting places of the new moons to the same points of the western horizon and in the same order.

It is clear from the evidence of these Syene papyri that the Jews, there, used the 19-year cycle both for fixing the day of the new moon, and in order to determine when a thirteenth month had to be intercalated, an illustration of the futility of “the argument from silence,” for so far from there being any notice in Scripture of the use of a cycle for determining intercalation, there is no mention of intercalation at all.
(6) The Jewish Ritual Preexilic.

Ever since this date of the Captivity, the 19-year cycle has been used by the Jews, and it gives to us the “Golden Number” which is employed in fixing the date of Easter in our own ecclesiastical calendar. Since the 19-year cycle has been in use ever since the Captivity, the 49-year cycle, the Jubilee, cannot have been an exilic or post-exilic innovation. In this fact we find the decision of the controversy which has so long divided critics as to whether the ritual legislation of the Jews dated from before or from after their captivity. We may take Kuenen as representing the more recent school: “Even the later prophets and historians, but more especially and emphatically those that lived before the Exile, were unacquainted with any ritual legislation, and specifically with that which has come down to us” (The Hexateuch, 273-74). “In determining its antiquity we must begin by considering its relation to Deuteronomy, to which it is evidently subsequent. .... This comes out most clearly in the legislation concerning the feasts. Other indications though less unequivocal, plead for the same relationship. In the next place the legislation itself gives evidence of the date of its origin, and those data which justify a positive inference point to the Babylonian captivity. .... It would follow that the ‘legislation of sanctity’ arose in the second half of the Babylonian captivity, presumably shortly before its close; and there is not a single valid objection to this date” (ibid., 276). Kuenen was evidently unaware of the astronomical relations concerned in the ritual legislation, and was unable to anticipate the striking discoveries made from the Syene papyri. More recent knowledge has reversed the verdict which he pronounced so confidently. The traditional view, that the Hebrew ritual preceded the Captivity, was correct. For the Jubilee, with which the Day of Atonement was bound up, was both the culmination and the completion of the entire ritual, and, since the period of the Jubilee, as a luni-solar cycle, was preexilic, the ritual, as a system, must have been preexilic likewise.

(7) The Luni-solar Cycles of Daniel.

The seasons for which the sun and moon were appointed are mentioned in yet another connection. In the last vision given to Daniel the question was asked, “How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?” and it was answered, “It shall be for a time, times (dual), and a half; and when they
have made an end of breaking in pieces the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished” (Daniel 12:6,7). From the parallel passage in Daniel 7:25, where it is said of the fourth beast, “He shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time (‘iddan) and times (dual) and half a time,” it is inferred that mo`edh in the first instance stands, like `iddan in the second, for a year; or the period is equivalent to half a week of years. The parallel passages in Revelation 11:2,3; 12:6,14; 13:5 have caused these years to be taken as conventional years of 360 days, each year being made up of 12 conventional months of 30 days, and on the year-day principle of interpretation, the entire period indicated would be one of 1,260 tropical years. This again is a luni-solar cycle, since 1,260 years contain 15,584 months correct to the nearest day. To the same prophet Daniel a further chronological vision was given, and a yet more perfect cycle indicated. In answer to the question, “How long shall be the vision concerning the continual burnt-offering, and the transgression that maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?” the answer was returned, “Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” (Daniel 8:13,14). Whatever may be the prophetic significance of the passage its astronomical significance is clear: 840,057 days are precisely 2,300 solar years, or 28,447 lunar months, or 30,487 anomalistic months, the anomalistic month being the period in which the moon travels from perigee to perigee. It is the most perfect lunisolar cycle known, and restores the two great lights exactly to their former relationship. This fullest “season” indicated by the sun and moon is given as that for the cleansing of the sanctuary, for the bringing in, as it were, of the full and perfect Jubilee.

It is not possible at present to decide as to whether the Jews had learnt of this cycle and its significance from their astronomical observations. If so, they must have been far in advance in mathematical science of all other nations of antiquity. If not, then it must have been given to them by Divine revelation, and its astronomical significance has been left for modern science to reveal.
6. The Stars:

As with the sun and moon, the stars are regarded under the two aspects of light-givers and time-measurers; or, in other words, as marking the seasons.

(1) Their Number.

But two other ideas are also strongly dwelt upon; the stars and the heaven of which they form the “host” are used to express the superlatives of number and of height. “Look now toward heaven, and number the stars, if thou be able to number them” (Genesis 15:5); “As the host of heaven cannot be numbered” (Jeremiah 33:22) are a few of the passages in which the stars are used for limitless number. Those separately visible to the naked eye at any one time do not exceed 2,000 in number, but it was just as evident to the Hebrews of old, as it was to Ptolemy, the astronomer of Alexandria, that beside the stars separately visible, there is a background, a patterned curtain of light, which indicates by its granular and mottled appearance that it is made up of countless myriads of stars, too faint to be individually detected, too close to be individually defined. The most striking feature of this curtain is the grand stellar stream that we call the Milky Way, but the mind easily recognizes that the minute points of light, composing its pattern, are as really stars as the great leaders of the constellations. Later astronomy has confirmed the testimony of the prophets that the stars are without number. The earliest star catalogue, that of Hipparchus, contained a little over one thousand stars; the great International Photographic Chart will show the images of more than fifty millions, and there are photographs which show more than a hundred thousand stars on a single plate. The limit that has been reached is due only to the limited power of our telescopes or the limited time of exposure of the photographs, not to any limitation in the number of stars. To us today, as to the Psalmist of old, it is a token of the infinite power and knowledge of God that “He telleth the number of the stars; He giveth them all their names” (Psalm 147:4 the King James Version).

(2) Their Distance.

As regards the height, that is to say, the distance of the stars, this is immeasurable except in a very few cases. By using as a base line the enormous diameter of the earth’s orbit — 186,000,000 miles —
astronomers have been able to get a hint as to the distance of some 40 or 50 stars. Of these the nearest, Alpha Centauri, is distant about twenty-five millions of millions of miles; the brighter stars are on the average quite ten times as far; whilst of the distances of the untold millions of stars beyond, we have no gauge. For us, as for King Solomon, the “heaven” of the stars is “for height” (Proverbs 25:3), for a height that is beyond measure, giving us therefore the only fitting image for the immensity of God. So Zophar the Naamathite asked, “Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do?” And Eliphaz the Temanite reiterated the same thought, “Is not God in the height of heaven? And behold the height of the stars, how high they are!” (Job 11:7,8; 22:12). And the height of the heaven, that is to say, the distance of the stars, stands as a symbol, not only of God’s infinitude, but of His faithfulness and of His mercy: “Thus saith Yahweh: If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, then will I also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith Yahweh” (Jeremiah 31:37). And the Psalmist sings, “For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him” (Psalm 103:11 the King James Version).

(3) Their Brightness.

The stars are not all of equal brightness; a fact alluded to by Paul when he wrote that “one star differeth from another star in glory” (1 Corinthians 15:41). The ancient Greek astronomers divided the stars according to their brightness into six classes or magnitudes, to use the modern technical term, the average star in any particular magnitude giving about two and a half times as much light as the average star of the next magnitude.

Just as the number of the stars and their ordered movement led them to be considered as a mighty army, “the host of heaven,” and as a type of that other celestial host, the holy angels, so the individual stars are taken as fitly setting forth, by their brightness and exalted position, spiritual powers and intelligences, whether these are the angels of God, as in Job 38:7, or rulers of churches, as in Revelation 1:20. The same image is naturally applied in a yet higher sense to Christ Himself, who is the “star out of Jacob” (Numbers 24:17), and “the bright, the morning star” (Revelation 22:16; 2 Peter 1:19).
7. Morning Stars:

The Stars as a Dial

In ancient times there were two methods by which the progress of the year could be learned from observation of the heavens. The sun was “for seasons,” and the change in its place of rising or of setting supplied the first method. The second method was supplied by the stars. For as the Hebrew shepherds, such as Jacob, Moses, David and Amos, kept watch over their flocks by night, they saw the silent procession of the stars through the hours of darkness, and knew without clock or timepiece how they were progressing. They noticed what stars were rising in the East, what stars were culminating in the South, what were setting in the West, and how the northern stars, always visible, like a great dial, were turning. But as the eastern horizon began to brighten toward the dawn, they would specially note what stars were the last to rise before their shining was drowned in the growing light of day. These, the last stars to appear in the East before sunrise, were the “morning stars,” the heralds of the sun. As morning followed morning, these morning stars would be seen earlier and earlier, and therefore for a longer time before they disappeared in the dawn, until some morning, other stars, unseen before, would shine out for a few moments, and thus supplant the stars seen earlier as the actual heralds of the sun. Such a first appearance of a star was termed by the Greek astronomers its “heliacal” rising, and the mention in Scripture of “morning stars,” or “stars of the twilight” (Job 38:7; 3:9), shows that the Hebrews like the Greeks were familiar with this feature of the ordinances of heaven, and noted the progress of the year by observation of the apparent changes of the celestial host. One star would herald the beginning of spring, another the coming of winter; the time to plow, the time to sow, the time of the rains would all be indicated by successive “morning stars” as they appeared.

8. Falling Stars:

(1) Meteorites.

Meteors are not stars at all in the popular sense of the word, but are quite small bodies drawn into our atmosphere, and rendered luminous for a few moments by the friction of their rush through it. But as they have been
shown not to be mere distempers of the air, as they were considered at one time, but bodies of a truly planetary nature, traveling round the sun in orbits as defined as that of the earth itself, the epithet is quite appropriate to them. They are astronomical and not merely terrestrial bodies. Meteors are most striking either when they are seen as solitary aerolites or when they fall in some great shower. The most celebrated shower which seemed to radiate from the constellation Leo — and hence called the Leonid — gave for centuries a magnificent spectacle every thirty-three years; the last great occasion having been on November 14, 1866. Those who saw that shower could appreciate the vivid description given by John when he wrote, “The stars of the heaven fell unto the earth, as a fig tree casteth her unripe figs when she is shaken of a great wind” (Revelation 6:13), for the meteors fell like autumn leaves, driven by a great storm, as numerous and as fast. The prophet Isaiah also used a very similar figure (Isaiah 34:4).

(2) The Star “Wormwood.”

Such great meteoric showers are most impressive spectacles, but solitary meteors are sometimes hardly less striking. Bolides or aerolites, as such great solitary meteors are termed, are apparently of great size, and are sometimes so brilliant as to light up the sky even in broad daylight. Such a phenomenon is referred to by John in his description of the star Wormwood: “There fell from heaven a great star, burning as a torch” (Revelation 8:10). Such aerolites are not entirely consumed in their passage through our atmosphere, but portions of them reach the ground, and in some cases large masses have been found intact. These are generally of a stony nature, but others are either almost pure iron or contain much of that metal. Such a meteoric stone was used as the pedestal of the image of the goddess Diana at Ephesus, and the “townclerk” of the city referred to this circumstance when he reminded the Ephesians that their city was “temple-keeper of the great Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter” (Acts 19:35).

9. Wandering Stars:

It has already been noted that the moon may perhaps have received its Hebrew name from the fact of its being a “wanderer” among the stars, but there is no direct and explicit reference in Scripture to other celestial
“wanderers” except in Jude 1:13: “Wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved for ever.” These *asteres planetai* are not our “planets,” but either meteors or comets, more probably the latter, as meteors are more appropriately described as “falling stars.”

(1) Comets as a Spiritual Type.

But as comets and meteors are intimately connected with each other — meteors being in many cases the debris of comets — the simile applies to either. False professors of religion, unstable or apostate teachers, are utterly unlike the stars which shine forth in heaven for ever, but are fitly represented by comets, which are seen only for a few weeks or days, and then are entirely lost to sight, or by meteors, which flash out for a few moments, and are then totally extinguished.

All the great comets, all the comets that have been conspicuous to the naked eye, with the single exception of that named after Halley, have appeared but once within the period of human records and Halley’s Comet only takes 80 days to traverse that part of its orbit which lies within the orbit of the earth; the rest of its period of revolution — 76 years — is passed outside that boundary, and for 38 years at a time it remains outside the orbit of Neptune, more than 2,800,000,000 miles from the sun. The other great comets have only visited our neighborhood once within our experience.

(2) Comets Referred to in Scripture?

The question has been raised whether the appearance of comets is ever referred to in Scripture. Josephus, speaking of the signs which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, says, “Thus there was a star resembling a sword which stood over the city, and a comet that continued a whole year” (BJ, VI, v, 3). The “star resembling a sword” was doubtless the return of Halley’s Comet in 66 AD, and the phrase used by Josephus has suggested that it was a stellar phenomenon that is referred to in Chronicles 21:16: “The angel of Yahweh .... between earth and heaven, having a drawn sword in his hand stretched out over Jerusalem.” But this, and the corresponding suggestion as to the nature of the flaming sword that kept the way of the tree of life (Genesis 3:24), are unsupported conjectures not worthy of attention. The astronomer Pingre thought that
the first vision of Jeremiah of the “rod of an almond tree” and of a “boiling caldron” (Jeremiah 1:11,13) had its physical basis in a return of Halley’s Comet, and other commentators have thought that cometary appearances were described in the “pillars of smoke” of Joel 2:30; but none of these suggestions appear to have plausibility.

2. THE CONSTELLATIONS.

The principal achievement of the science of astronomy in the centuries during which the books of the Old Testament were written was the arrangement and naming of the constellations, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the same system was known to the Hebrews as that which has been handed down to us through the Greek astronomers. Paul certainly knew the Greek constellations, for in his sermon on Mars’ Hill (Acts 17:28) he quoted from that poetical description of them which Aratus the great poet of Cilicia had written about 270 BC. But these constellations have a much greater antiquity than this, and it is probable that they were well known to Abraham before he left Ur of the Chaldees. It has been frequently shown (The Astronomy of the Bible, 158; Astronomy without a Telescope, 5) that these constellations themselves supply evidence that they were designed about 2700 BC. They thus antedated the time of Abraham by some centuries, and since some of their most characteristic forms are found upon old Babylonian “boundary stones,” it is clear that they were known in the country from whence he came out.

1. Nachash, the “Crooked Serpent”:

The direct references to these old constellation-forms in Scripture are not numerous. One of the clearest is in Job 26:13, where “formed the crooked serpent” (the King James Version) is used as the correlative of “garnished the heavens”; the great constellation of the writhing Dragon, placed at the crown of the heavens, being used, metaphorically, as an expression for all the constellations of the sky. For by its folds it encircles both the poles, that of the equator and that of the ecliptic.
2. Leviathan:

The term bariach, rendered “crooked” but better as in the Revised Version, margin as “fleeing,” is applied by Isaiah to “Leviathan” (liwyathan: Isaiah 27:1), properly a “wreathed” or writhing animal, twisted in folds, and hence also called by the prophet `aqallathon, “crooked,” “twisted,” or “winding”; a very appropriate designation for Draco, the great polar Dragon. But the latter was not the only “crooked serpent” in the constellations; there were three others, two of which were placed with an astronomical significance not less precise than the coiling of Draco round the poles. Hydra, the Watersnake, marked out the original celestial equator for about one-third of its circumference, and Serpens, the Adder, lay partly along the celestial equator and then was twisted up the autumnal colure, and reached the zenith with its head.

The arrangement of the twelve signs of the zodiac to mark out the apparent yearly path of the sun, and of these three serpent-forms to hold their respective and significant positions in the heavens, shows that a real progress in astronomy had been made before the constellations were designed, and that their places were allotted to these figures on a definite astronomical plan.

3. The Seed of the Woman:

A further purpose is shown by the relation of the three serpents to the neighboring figures, and it is clear that the history preserved in Genesis 3 was known to the designers of the constellations, and that they wished to perpetuate its memory by means of the stellar frescoes. For the constellations, Scorpio, Ophiuchus and Serpens, show us a man strangling a snake and standing on a scorpion; the head of the latter he crushes with one foot, but his other foot is wounded by its reverted sting. When these three constellations were due South, that is to say, at midnight in spring-time, Hercules and Draco were due north, and presented the picture of a man kneeling on one knee, and pressing down with his other foot the head of the great northern serpent or dragon. During the winter midnight the zodiacal constellation on the meridian was the Virgin, figured as a woman holding an ear of corn in her hand, while beneath her the immense length of Hydra was stretched out upon its belly in the attitude of a snake when fleeing at full speed. These figures are evidently meant to set forth in
picture that which is expressed in word in Genesis 3:14,15, “And Yahweh God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

4. The Bow Set in the Cloud:

Nor is this the only narrative in Genesis which finds a parallel in the constellations. Among the southern groups we find a ship Argo that has grounded on a rock; and close to it stands a figure, Centaurus, who is apparently slaying an animal, Lupus, beside an Altar. The cloud of smoke arising from the Altar is represented by the Milky Way, and in the midst of the cloud there is set the Bow of the Archer, Sagittarius. Here there seems to be pictured the covenant made with Noah after he offered his sacrifice when he left the ark: “I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth” (Genesis 9:13). Thus the constellations, designed several centuries before the time of Abraham, clearly express a knowledge, and appear designed to preserve a remembrance of the two first promises made by God to mankind as recorded in the early chapters of Gen.

There is no need to assume, as some writers have done, that all the 48 primitive constellations were of Divine origin, or even that any of them were. If some of the early astronomers possessed in one form or another the histories that we have in Genesis 3; 8 and 9, it would not be unnatural for them to attempt to preserve a memorial of them in the heavens by associating these figures with the stars.

It does not follow that all the old constellations have an analogous significance, or that if they have, we should now be able to detect it, and a great deal of ingenuity has been wasted in the attempt to convert the old 48 constellations into a sort of gospel in hieroglyphic. Interpretations of this order were current quite early in Christian times, for they are denounced at considerable length and in detail by Hippolytus in his Refutation of All the Heresies, circa 210 AD. Their revival in recent years is chiefly due to Mazzaroth, a series of papers by the late Miss Frances Rolleston in which fanciful etymologies were given to the Arabic names by
which the principal stars are known. These names, for the most part, simply indicate the places which the stars were severally supposed to hold in the figures to which they were assigned, and Miss Rolleston’s derivations for them are quite misleading and unfounded. Nevertheless her results have been blindly accepted by a number of writers.

5. The Dragon of Eclipse:

The peculiar arrangement of the serpent forms in the constellations, and especially the position allotted to Hydra, extended along the equator with its head near the spring equinox and its tail near that of autumn, appears to have given rise to the terms “Dragon’s Head” (omega) and “Dragon’s Tail” (an upside-down omega), for the nodes or points of intersection of the ecliptic (the apparent path of the sun) with the celestial equator, and hence for nodes in general. As eclipses of the sun and moon can only occur when those bodies are near the nodes of the moon’s orbit, that is, near the Dragon’s Head or Tail, the myth seems to have arisen that such eclipses were due to one or other of the two great lights being swallowed by a dragon, and a reference to this myth is found in Job 3:8: “Let them curse it that curse the day, who are ready (the Revised Version, margin: skillful) to rouse up leviathan.” The persons referred to are the magicians who pretended to be able by their incantations to cause an eclipse of the sun by bringing up the mythical dragon that was supposed to devour it. Astronomical nomenclature still retains a trace of these old expressions, for the time taken by the moon to pass from one node to the same node again is still called a “draconic month,” a “month of the dragon.”

6. Joseph’s Dream:

If we realize that the Hebrews were quite familiar with the same constellation figures that we have inherited through the Greeks, several indirect allusions to them gain an added meaning. Thus Joseph dreamed that “the sun and the moon and eleven stars made obeisance” to him (Genesis 37:9). The twelve constellations of the zodiac are the twelve among which the sun and moon move, and thus constitute, as it were, their family. Eleven of them therefore represented eleven sons of Jacob, Joseph himself being of course the twelfth. There is some evidence that the time came when the suggestion of this dream was acted upon to the extent that some of the tribes adopted certain of the constellation figures by way of
crest or armorial bearing. In Numbers 2 it is stated that each of the four camps into which the host of Israel was divided had its own standard:

**7. The Standards of the Tribes:**

“Neither the Mosaic law nor the Old Testament generally gives us any intimation as to the form or character of the standard (deghel). According to rabbinical tradition, the standard of Judah bore the figure of a lion, that of Reuben the likeness of a man, or of a man’s head, that of Ephraim the figure of an ox, and that of Daniel the figure of an eagle; so that the four living creatures united in the cherubic forms described by Ezekiel were represented upon these four standards” (Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Pentateuch, III, 17). A variant of this tradition gives as the standard of Reuben, “unstable as water” (Genesis 49:4 the King James Version), a Man and a River, and of Dan, “Daniel shall be a serpent in the way” (Genesis 49:17), an Eagle and a Serpent. These four forms are also found in the constellations in the four quarters of the heavens. Aquarius, the man with a stream of water, and Leo were the original zodiacal constellations of the two solstices, Taurus was that of the spring equinox, and Aquila and Serpens were close to the autumnal equinox, the latter being actually upon the colure.

**8. The Cherubim:**

This distribution of the four cherubic forms in the four quarters of heaven gives a special significance to the invocation used by Hezekiah and the Psalmist, “Thou that dwellest between the cherubims” (Isaiah 37:16 King James Version: Psalm 80:1 the King James Version). The Shekinah glory rested indeed between the golden cherubim over the ark in the Holy of Holies, but “the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands” (Acts 7:48), and the same cherubic forms were pictured on the curtains of the heavens. “Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee” (1 Kings 8:27); “Thou dwellest between the cherubim,” filling the infinite expanse of the stellar universe.

**9. Balaam’s Prophecy:**

When Balaam saw “Israel dwelling according to their tribes; and the Spirit of God came upon him” (Numbers 24:2), it was not unnatural that he
should allude in his prophecy to the great standards which he would see floating above the camps, and three of the four appear to be indicated: the bull of Joseph — "He hath as it were the strength of the wild-ox"; the lion of Judah — "He lay down as a lion and as a great lion," the King James Version; and Aquarius, the man pouring out a stream of water from a pitcher, the cognizance of Reuben — "Water shall flow from his buckets" (Numbers 24:7,8,9).

In a similar way when the prophets refer to the enemies of Israel under the figure of dragons or reptiles, there seems occasionally an indirect reference to the serpents that represent the powers of evil in the pictures that have been associated with the star groups. Thus in Isaiah 27:1, the English Revised Version, it is prophesied that the Lord “shall punish leviathan the swift serpent, and leviathan the crooked serpent; and He shall slay the dragon that is in the sea”; the first allusion being appropriate to the attitude of Hydra, the second to Draco, the third to Cetus. Whilst the group of constellations, Andromeda, Cetus and Eridanus, the woman persecuted by a dragon that casts a river out of its mouth, a river which flowing down below the horizon appears to be swallowed up by the earth, would seem to have furnished John with some of the material for the imagery of Revelation 12 in his great vision.

Besides references direct or indirect to the familiar constellation figures, four special astronomical terms occur in the Hebrew of the Old Testament which have given rise to much discussion. These are [Kimah], [Kecil], [Mazzaroth] and [`Ayish]. The tradition of their significance had been lost before the Septuagint translation was made, but it may be taken as practically certain that the renderings given in the Revised Version (British and American) are substantially correct.

10. Pleiades:

The word Kimah occurs in three passages, in each case in conjunction with [Kecil] (Amos 5:8; Job 9:9; 38:31). It apparently means a “heap” or “cluster,” and is hence especially applicable to the beautiful little group of the Pleiades, the most conspicuous star cluster visible to the naked eye. There is the less uncertainty about this identification since “kima” is the term generally used in Syriac literature to denote the Pleiades.
Six stars can now easily be seen by any good sight, but very keen-sighted persons can detect more; thus Maestlin, the tutor of Kepler, mapped 11 before the invention of the telescope, and in recent times Carrington and Denning have counted 14 with the naked eye. Still, 6 is the number visible to most persons, though there is a curiously widespread and uniform tradition that they once “were seven who now are six,” and seven is the number almost always assigned to them in literature. Hesiod calls them “the seven sisters, the Virgin stars,” and Milton, “the seven Atlantic sisters,” as representing the daughters of Atlas. Many of the Greek poets, however, regarded them as Peleiades, “rock pigeons,” doves, flying from the hunter Orion; but whether they have been considered as representing doves or maidens, seven has still been their traditional number. Possibly one of the group has declined in brightness in the course of the centuries; Alcyone would seem to have increased in brightness, for though now the brightest, it is not one of the four that figure in Ptolemy’s Catalogue, and if one has increased in brightness, others may have diminished. In the telescope many hundreds of stars are visible. The photographic plate has registered thousands and shows the principal stars as enveloped and threaded together by delicate streams of nebulous matter, the stars shining on these filamentous lines of light like pearls upon a string. This, the appearance of the Pleiades on the best modern photographs, would be strikingly appropriate to the rendering of Job 38:31, which has been adopted in the Revised Version (British and American), “Canst thou bind the cluster (m “chain”) of the Pleiades?” and the question put to Job would be equivalent to asking him if it were his power that had brought together the Pleiades and bound them in so compact a cluster. This rendering which involves the reading “ma`anaddoth” is supported by the Septuagint, and all the early versions, and hence by nearly all Orientalists. The reading in Masoretic Text, “ma`adhannoth,” that is to say, “dainties” or “delights,” and adopted in the King James Version, where the word is paraphrased as “sweet influences,” is however correct, as will be shown below.

The designation of the group as that of the seven stars gives a special significance to one of the details of the vision of John: “I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the candlesticks one like unto a son of man, .... And He had in his right hand seven stars: .... The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks are seven
churches” (Revelation 1:12,13,16,20). The seven stars in a single compact cluster shining as one, furnish an image of the church in its many diversities and its essential unity.

It may be well to correct here a certain widely diffused error. When it was discovered that the sun itself with all its attendant planets was traveling rapidly through space, the German astronomer Madler hazarded the suggestion that the center of the sun’s motion, the attracting body that governed it, might lie in the group of the Pleiades, and this suggestion has been quoted in many popular writings as if it were a demonstrated fact. It soon became evident that there was no sufficient ground for the suggestion, and the idea has been entirely abandoned by astronomers.

11. Orion:

The word [Kecil] as denoting a constellation occurs in the singular number in three passages, and in each it is placed in antithesis to Kimah. In a fourth passage (Isaiah 13:10) it occurs by itself and is in the plural. There is no doubt as to the significance of the word in its common use. In 70 cases it is translated either “fool” or “foolish.” It does not signify a weak-minded person, so much as a violent, impious, self-confident one. As a star name, it is probably rightly considered to refer to the glorious constellation of Orion. According to an old tradition, the name of Nimrod, mentioned in Genesis 10:10, as the founder of Babel, Erech, Accad and Calneh, was given by his courtiers to this most brilliant of all the constellations, one that by its form somewhat suggests a gigantic warrior armed for the fight. Until recently it was not found possible to identify the Nimrod of Scripture with any Babylonian monarch until Dr. T. G. Pinches suggested that “Nimrod” was a deliberate Hebrew transmutation of “Marduk,” the name of the great Babylonian national hero, and chief deity of their pantheon. “The change was brought about by making the root triliteral, and the ending uk (ak) in Merodach-Baladan disappearing first, Marduk appeared as Marad. This was connected with the root maradh, ‘to be rebellious,’ and the word was still further mutilated, or rather deformed, by having a ni attached, assimilating it to a certain extent to the niph’al forms of the Hebrew verbs, and making a change altogether in conformity with the genius of the Hebrew language” (The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia, 129-30). In the very
brief reference to Nimrod in Genesis 10:8,9, he is three times overemphatically termed gibbor, “a mighty (one)” and this has been the name of this constellation among Syrians, Arabs and Jews for many centuries. Indeed the brightest star of the constellation, the one in the left knee, now generally known as Rigel, is still occasionally called Algebar, a corruption of Al Jabbar, though now one of the fainter stars near it more generally bears that name. The word [Kecil] as applied to this constellation would parallel closely the etymology suggested for the name “Merodach,” by its transformation into “Nimrod” as if it were derived from maradh, “to rebel.” He who was to the Babylonians a deified hero, was to the Hebrews a rebel Titan, bound in chains among the stars that all might behold his punishment, and in this aspect the question, “Canst thou .... loose the bands of Orion?” (Job 38:31) would be equivalent to asking “Canst thou bring down out of their places the stars that make up this figure and so, as it were, set the Titan free?”

In Isaiah 13:10, [kecil] occurs in the plural [kecilim], “for the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light”; [kecilim] being translated as “constellations” under the impression that Orion, the brightest of all the constellations, is here put for the constellations in general. This is no doubt correct, but the context shows that the meaning goes farther than this, and that the [kecilim] who were to be darkened were the proud and arrogant tyrants like Nimrod or Merodach who would, if possible, climb up into heaven itself, even as Orion is represented in our star atlases as if trying to climb up into the zodiac — the home of the sun.

12. Mazzaroth, the Constellations of the Zodiac:

A further astronomical term which occurs in Job 38:32 is left untranslated in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), namely, the word Mazzaroth. It occurs only once in the Old Testament, but the similar word mazzaloth, translated “planets” in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), occurs in 2 Kings 23:5. For the latter see ASTROLOGY. In the fifth tablet of the Babylonian Epic of Creation, we read:

1. He (Marduk) made the station for the great gods;

2. The stars, their images, as the stars of the zodiac he fixed.
3. He ordained the year, and into sections (mizrata) he divided it.

4. For the twelve months he fixed three stars.

Here in the third line, mizrata, cognate with the Hebrew [mazzaroth], means the sections or divisions of the year, corresponding to the signs of the zodiac mentioned in the second line.

Yet again when \( \text{Job 9:9} \) is compared with \( \text{Job 38:31,32} \), it is seen that the place of the word mazzaroth in the latter passage is held by the expression “the chambers of the south” (chadhre theman) in the earlier. Mazzaroth therefore is equivalent to “the chambers of the south,” and clearly signifies the twelve constellations of the zodiac through which the sun appears to pass in the course of the year, poetically likened to the “inns,” the “chambers” or “tabernacles” in which the sun successively rests during the several monthly stages of his annual journey. The same idea was employed by the Arabs in their “mansions of the moon,” its “lodging-houses” (menazil), which are 28 in number, since the moon takes 28 days to make the circuit of the heavens, just as the sun takes 12 months.

The word Mazzaroth therefore represents the twelve “signs” or, to speak more correctly, the twelve “constellations” of the zodiac. These two terms are often used indiscriminately, but there is a real difference between their significations. The constellations of the zodiac are the actual groupings of the stars, lying along the ecliptic, and are quite irregular in form and length. The signs have no connection with the actual stars but are imaginary divisions of the ecliptic, all exactly equal in length, and they are reckoned from that point in the heavens where the sun is at the moment that it is crossing the celestial equator in its northward motion in springtime. As this point, known to astronomers as “the first point of Aries,” moves slowly amongst the stars, taking 25,800 years to complete a revolution of the heavens, the signs of the zodiac also move among the stars, and hence, though at one time each sign bore a rough and general correspondence to the constellation of the same name, the signs have gradually drawn away from them. The constellations of the zodiac were designed about 2700 BC, but the signs — the equal divisions of the zodiac named from them — cannot have been adopted earlier than 700 BC, and were probably even later. For since Aries is the first of the signs, it is clear that it was the first
of the constellations at the time when the equal division of the zodiac was
effected, and 700 BC is the very earliest date that the constellation Aries
can have been so regarded. Incidentally it may be remarked that the
mention in the Babylonian story of creation of the allotment of three stars
to each of the sections (Mizrata) of the year, shows that not only had the
division of the zodiac into 12 equal signs been effected, but that a further
step had been taken, namely, the division of each sign into 3 equal parts,
later known amongst the Greeks as its “decans,” corresponding roughly to
the 36 decades of the Egyptian calendar. Whatever, therefore, may have
been the antiquity of the traditions embodied in it, the actual Babylonian
poem quoted above, so far from being an early document, as it was at one
time supposed to be, is probably almost as late as the destruction of
Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

13. “Arcturus”:

There are three constellations, natural groupings of the stars, the Pleiades
and Orion and “Charles’s Wain,” which have always attracted men’s
attention, and we accordingly find them referred to in the earliest poems
extant. Thus they are the three groups of the stars most frequently
mentioned by Homer and Hesiod. The two first groups, the Pleiades and
Orion, are, as we have seen, indicated by [Kimah] and [Kecil]. We should
therefore naturally expect that the third constellation which we find
associated with these in the Book of Job should be none other than the
seven bright stars in the North, the principal part of the Great Bear. The
Hebrew name for this third constellation appears in two slightly different
forms. It is `ash in <200909>Job 9:9, and `ayish in <183832>Job 38:32, and in the latter
case it is connected with its “sons.” The last star of Charles’ Wain or the
Plough, as the group is often called among ourselves, still bears the name
Benetnasch, derived from the Arabic name Benet Na`sh, “the daughters of
the Bier,” by which the Arabs designated the three stars in the Plough-
handle, while they called the four stars in the body of the Plough, Na`sh,
“the bier” or “litter.” Na`sh and its daughters so closely correspond to “
`ayish and its sons,” that there can be no reasonable doubt that the same
seven bright stars are intended; so that the rendering of the Revised
Version (British and American), “Canst thou guide the Bear with her
train?” correctly reproduces the original meaning. The Arcturus of the King
James Version is derived from Vulgate, where it is probably a mistake for Arctos, that is to say, Ursa Major, the Great Bear.

The antithesis which is presented in Job 38:32 now reveals itself. The Mazzaroth are the twelve constellations of the zodiac, and of these each one rules the night for about a month in its turn; they are each “led forth” in its “season.” Each, in its turn, is the “chamber,” “tabernacle” or “resting-place” of the sun, and they are appropriately called “chambers of the south,” since it is especially in the southern sky that each is seen. In contrast to these are the northern constellations, those round the pole, of which the Great Bear or Charles’ Wain is the brightest and best known. At the time of the origin of the constellations, this group was much nearer the pole of the heavens than at present, but now as then these stars are not “led forth,” for they are visible at all hours and during every night; but they are “guided”; they move round the pole of the heavens in an unending circle, as if the wain or chariot were being guided by a skillful driver.

(1) The “Scatterers,” or the North.

There is some probability that in Job 37:9 the same two regions of the heavens are alluded to: “Out of the chamber of the south cometh the storm, and cold out of the north.” It will be observed that the complete expression, “chamber of the south,” is not in the original, the translators having supplied “of the south” from analogy with Job 9:9. The sirocco comes then from the region held by the mazzal, the “chamber,” or constellation of the zodiac, then on the meridian. But the cold, the blizzard, comes from “the scatterers” (Mezarim). Who or what are the scatterers, and why do they represent the north? The late Professor Schiaparelli suggested that by a slight difference in the pointing, the word might be read as mizrayim, “the two winnowing fans,” and that this may well have been a native term for the stars which we now know as the two Bears, Ursa Major and Minor, emphatically the northern constellations; the names being given them from the natural grouping of their chief stars, just as they are known as the two “Dippers” in the United States, or the two “Ladles” in China (Astronomy in the Old Testament,” 67-72).
(2) The Ordinances of Heaven Established on the Earth.

The astronomical antithesis between Mazzaroth, the constellations of the zodiac ("led forth" each "in its season"), and `Ayish, "the Bear with her train" ("guided" in its unceasing revolution round the pole), is so complete and astronomically appropriate, that there is reason to expect an antithesis as clear and as astronomically significant between the two clauses of the preceding verse. But the rendering of the Revised Version (British and American) does not afford anything of the kind: "Canst thou bind the cluster of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?" is simply equivalent to the question as to whether Job could fix these stars in their places in the sky; and for an inquiry so perfectly general, one constellation would be no more appropriate than another. The true rendering must certainly bring out some difference or at least distinction between the two constellations or the use that was made of them.

And in the third passage in which [Kimah] and [Kecil] are mentioned together an important distinction is hinted at. The order in Amos 5:8 suggests that the Pleiades corresponded in some way to daybreak, Orion to nightfall: "That maketh the Pleiades and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night." Sunrise turns "the shadow of death into the morning," and in the progress of the seasons the analogous change on the higher scale is effected when Nature revives from the death of winter in the morning of the year, that is to say, at the return of spring. And at the time of the origin of the constellations the Pleiades were the harbingers of this change at their "cosmical" rising, that is to say, when they rose with the sun at daybreak they brought back the "delights" of springtime.

Similarly sunset makes "the day dark with night," and in the progress of the seasons the analogous change on the higher scale is effected when the long nights and short days of winter set in the evening of the year, and all nature is bound as by iron bands, in cold and frost. And at the time of the origin of the constellations, the "acronychal" rising of Orion, i.e. its rising at nightfall, was the harbinger of this change; the rigor of winter formed "the bands of Orion."

These regular changes in the appearings and positions of the constellations constitute the ordinances of the heavens, ordinances which Job could
neither alter for the worse by holding back the delights of springtime, or for the better by breaking the bonds of winter cold. But these ordinances were not confined in their effects to the heavens; their dominion was established on the earth, which answered by the revival of vegetation when the Pleiades, then nearly in conjunction with the sun, appeared for a short time before sunrise; and by the return of the constraints of cold and frost when Orion, in opposition to the sun, rode the sky the whole night long.

The completeness and beauty of the imagery will now be apparent.

The Pleiades stood for the East, since by their rising just before daybreak, they heralded the morning of the year and the “delights” of springtime.

Orion stood for the West, since his appearing just after nightfall heralded the evening of the year, and the bands of winter cold.

Mazzaroth, the twelve constellations of the zodiac, the “chambers of the south,” each “led forth” from the underworld in its own “season,” stood for the South.

And the “Bear with her train,” “guided” in their unceasing course round the pole, stood for the circumpolar constellations in the North.

And the movements of them all in a perfect obedience to the law of God were the ordinances of heaven; whilst the dominion of them was seen to be established upon the earth in the constant succession of the seasons there in unfailing answer to the changes in the stars above.

These three verses give us a vivid picture of the work of primitive astronomy. The science was then in an early stage of development, but it was a real science, a science of observation, thoroughly sound so far as it had progressed, and showing high intelligence on the part of those who pursued it. We now know that the movement of “the Bear with her train,” that is, the apparent rotation of the heavens round the pole, is due to the real rotation of the earth upon its axis; that the bringing out of “the Mazzaroth in their season,” apparently due to the revolution of the sun round the earth, is due to the real revolution of the earth round the sun. But this knowledge which has enabled us to see where the actual movements lie has not brought us any nearer penetrating the mystery of those movements. What is the ultimate cause of the rotation of this vast
globe, we know no more than the ancients knew what caused the heavens to rotate; what causes it to fly through space 18 miles in every second of time, we know no more than the ancients knew why the sun appeared to move among the stars. To us, as to them, it is the power of God, and the will of God.

14. The Date of the Book of Job:

It has been supposed by some scholars that the Book of Job was written during the Captivity in Babylon, but this supposition is untenable in view of the statement in Job’s Apology that the worship of the heavenly bodies was “an iniquity to be punished by the judges” (Job 31:26-28). This could not have been written by Jews in exile amongst the worshippers of Samas and Sin. But neither can this book have been written after the Return. The meaning of the three terms, [`Ayish], [Kimah] and [Kecil], had been lost before the Septuagint made the rendering of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, for in Amos 5:8 they left [Kimah] and [Kecil] untranslated, and they rendered [`Ayish] and [Kecil] differently in Job 9:9, and 38:31,32. Before the Captivity, [Kimah] and [Kecil] were plainly in common use, since Amos uses them as if they were familiar to his hearers, and as he himself points out, he was not a man of learning but a simple herdsman. The obvious and sufficient explanation of the later ignorance respecting these three terms lies in the catastrophes of the Assyrian and Bah conquests. Not less significant of their complete loss of the old Hebrew astronomy is the alteration which the Septuagint made in the Hebrew text. The “delights of the Pleiades” had evidently no more meaning for them than they have had for the majority of modern Orientalists, and no doubt it seemed a plausible and legitimate emendation to write ma`anaddoth, “chains,” instead of ma`adhannoth, “delights,” so as to bring about a fancied parallelism with moshekhoth, the “bands” of Orion. But the alteration transforms a complete, beautiful and symmetrical figure, an epitome of the astronomical observation of the time, into a bald tautology. Those critics are therefore right who assign the Book of Job and the Isaiah 13 to the period before the Captivities, and the three names come to us as indications, not of a Babylonian science of astronomy, learned by the Jews during their exile, but of a Hebrew astronomy destroyed by the unspeakable disaster of the conquest.
3. PHYSIOGRAPHY.

1. The Circle of the Earth:

It has generally been assumed that the Hebrews considered the earth to be a vast circular plain, arched over by a solid vault — ”the firmament” — above which were stored, as if in cisterns, the “treasuries” (Job 38:22) of the rain, snow and hail, and some writers have even attempted to express this supposed conception in diagrammatic form. One of the best of these attempts, reproduced below, is given by Schiaparelli, in his Astronomy in the Old Testament.

But this assumption is in reality based more upon the ideas prevalent in Europe during the Dark Ages than upon any actual statements in the Old Testament. The same word (chagh) used in the Old Testament to express the roundness of the heavens (Job 22:14) is also used when the circle of the earth is spoken of (Isaiah 40:22), and it is likewise applied to the deep (Proverbs 8:27). Now it is obvious that the heavens are spherical in appearance, and to an attentive observer it is clear that the surface of the sea is also rounded. There is therefore no sufficient warrant for the assumption that the Hebrews must have regarded the earth as flat.

(1) The Earth a Sphere.

Certain astronomical relations were recognized very early. The stars appear as if attached to a globe rotating round the earth once in 24 hours, and this appearance was clearly familiar to the author of the Book of Job, and indeed long before the time of Abraham, since the formation of the constellations could not have been effected without such recognition. But the spherical form of the heavens almost involves a similar form for the earth, and their apparent diurnal rotation certainly means that they are not rigidly connected with the earth, but surround it on all sides at some distance from it. The earth therefore must be freely suspended in space, and so the Book of Job describes it: “He stretcheth out the north over empty space, and hangeth the earth upon nothing” (Job 26:7).

(2) The North Stretched Out over Empty Space.

Here the “north” signifies the northern circumpolar constellations and the writer recognized that they stretch out beyond the utmost confines of the
earth; so that he was not under any impression that the heavens rested upon the earth, or were borne up by mountains. The celestial sphere surrounded the earth entirely, but at a distance from it; between the two there was “empty space.” Some commentators have indeed claimed that Job 26:10, “He hath described a boundary upon the face of the waters, unto the confines of light and darkness” is equivalent to a statement that the circumference of the terrestrial plain extended to the place where sea and sky met. But no man of intelligence can, at any time, have supposed that the sea horizon marked the dividing line between day and night, and the meaning of the passage is correctly given in the King James Version, “until the day and night come to an end”; in other words, the waters of the sea will be confined to their appointed place never again to overflow the earth so long as the succession of day and night shall continue (compare Genesis 8:22; 9:15).

(3) The Corners of the Earth.

See EARTH, CORNERS OF.

2. The Pillars of the Earth:

[erets], “the earth,” is in general the surface of the earth, the dry land inhabited by man and beast. Hence “the pillars” of the earth (Job 9:6) are the rocks that bear up that surface, for as has been shown, it was quite clear to the author of the Book of Job, and to the primitive astronomers, that our world was unsupported in space. For “Vault of the Earth” see EARTH, VAULT OF.

3. The Firmament:

(1) The Hebrew Conception.

Above the, spherical earth was stretched out the “firmament” ([raqia\`]) made on the second day of creation to “divide the waters from the waters” (Genesis 16). To the Hebrews the “firmament” was the apparent void above, in which clouds float and the lights of heaven pursue their appointed paths. The word [raqia\`], by its etymology, suggests an expanse, something stretched, spread or beaten out, as when Isaiah (40:22) says that the Lord “stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in.” But the Greek word stereoma, by which
the Septuagint rendered [raqia`], gives the meaning of a firm and solid structure, and our translators have carried out this same idea in their English rendering of “firmament.”

(2) The Alexandrian Conception.

In this however the Septuagint simply expressed the astronomical science of their day as accepted in Alexandria, where the doctrine of a succession of solid crystalline spheres, each carrying a planet, held currency. But in order to express the Hebrew idea, [raqia`] should be rendered “expanse” or “space”; it corresponds to the “empty space” of Job 26:7. This “expanse” was appointed to divide “the waters which were under the expanse, from the waters which were above the expanse”; and it has been argued from this that the upper waters must have been regarded as being enclosed in a watertight reservoir, furnished with sluices or floodgates, which could be opened to allow the rain to fall.

4. The Windows of Heaven:

Thus in the account of the Flood, “the windows of heaven” are said to have been opened. But, ‘arubbah, “window,” means a network, or lattice, a form which can never have been ascribed to a literal floodgate; and in the other passages where “the windows of heaven” are mentioned the expression is obviously metaphorical (2 Kings 7:2,19; Isaiah 24:18; Malachi 3:10).

5. Rain:

Further the numerous other references to rain connect it with the clouds, as “I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain” (Isaiah 5:6), or in the Song of Deborah, “The clouds dropped water” (Judges 5:4; see also Psalm 77:17; 147:8; Proverbs 16:15; Ecclesiastes 12:2). The fantastic idea of solidly built cisterns in the sky furnished with sluices has no warrant in Scripture. So far from any such crude conception, there is a very clear and complete account of the atmospheric circulation. Elihu describes the process of evaporation, “For he draweth up the drops of water, which distill in rain from his vapor, which the skies pour down and drop upon man abundantly” (Job 36:27,28).
6. Clouds:

Jeremiah and the Psalmist repeat the description, “He causeth the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth; he maketh lightnings for the rain, and bringeth forth the wind out of his treasuries” (<sup>Jeremiah 10:13</sup>). By the foreshortening that clouds undergo in the distance they inevitably appear to form chiefly on the horizon, “at the ends of the earth,” whence they move upward toward the zenith. Thus God “calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth” (Amos 9:6); and thus “All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place whither the rivers go, thither they go again” (<sup>Ecclesiastes 1:7</sup>). Other references to the clouds in the Book of Job reveal not merely observation but acute reflection. “Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of him who is perfect in knowledge?” (<sup>Job 37:16</sup>) indicates a perception that the clouds float, each in its own place, at its own level, each perfectly balanced in the thin air.

7. The Deep:

(1) Meaning of the Word.

Tehom, “the deep,” means moving water, and hence the ocean, which is represented as being essentially one, exactly as we now know it to be by actual exploration — ”Let the waters Under the heavens be gathered together unto one place” (<sup>Genesis 1:9</sup>). And the earth is stretched out “above the waters” (<sup>Psalm 136:6</sup>; <sup>Psalm 24:2</sup>). That is to say that the water surface lies lower than the land surface; and not only so, but, within the substance of the earth itself, there are subterranean waters which form a kind of ocean underground. This also is called in <sup>Ezekiel 31:4</sup> the “deep,” tehom; “The waters nourished it, the deep made it to grow.” But in general tehom denotes the sea, as when Pharaoh’s chosen captains were drowned in the Red Sea, “The deeps cover them” (<sup>Exodus 15:5</sup>). Indeed the word appears to be onomatopoeic derived from the “moaning” or “humming” of the sea; whilst [’erets], the “earth,” seems intended to represent the “rattle” of shingle, “the scream of a madden’d beach dragged down by the wave.”
The Babylonian Dragon of Chaos.

In Genesis 1, tehom denotes the primeval waters, and the resemblance of the word to Tiamat, the name of the Babylonian she-dragon of Chaos, has led some commentators to ascribe a Babylonian origin to this chapter. It need hardly be pointed out that if this resemblance proves any connection between the Hebrew and Babylonian accounts of creation, it proves the Hebrew to be the original. The natural object, tehom, the sea, must have preceded the mythological personification of it.

LITERATURE.


E. W. Maunder

ASTYAGES

<as-ti’-a-jes> ([Ἀστυάγης, Astuages]; or Astyigas (in Ktesias), or Istuvigu, son of Cyaxares. I, king of the Medes 585-550 BC, and predecessor of Cyrus (Bel and the Dragon verse 1)): His wife was the daughter of Alyattes, king of Lydia. The daughter of Astyages (Mandane) married a Persian, Cambyses, and a son was born to them who later became Cyrus the Great. Astyages had given orders to expose the babe; but Harpagus, on whom the task had been imposed, gave the child to a herdsman, with instructions to kill him. When the boy, who had been brought up as his own by the herdsman, arrived at the age of twelve, Astyages discovered that he was the son of Mandane. The king in wrath then had the son of Harpagus killed and served to his father as food. The latter concealed his feelings of hatred and resentment, and bided his time; and when the young Cyrus had grown to manhood, he stirred up the grandson in insurrection against Astyages, who was defeated and taken prisoner (Herodotus i.127-30). When Astyages marched against the Persians, the Medes, under the command of Harpagus, deserted their king, and sided with the disappointed Persians; and Cyrus was crowned king. This account of Herodotus is confirmed by the Annalistic Tablet of Cyrus (RP, series ii, 159). The dethroned monarch was treated with kindness by
his conqueror. According to Ktesias, a home was provided for him by Cyrus in Hyrcania.

Astyages was the last of the kings of the Manda (Media). An exceedingly shrewd man, Deioces by name, had founded the kingdom 150 years before (699-646). Phraortes was the second in line (646-624), and Cyaxares the third (624-584).

J. E. Harry

ASUNDER

<a-sun’-der>: This word occurs 22 times in the King James Version, 13 in Old Testament and 9 in the New Testament. It is found in combination with break (twice), burst, cleave (twice), depart, cut (six times), divide (three times), drive, part, pluck, put (twice), rend, saw. These are the translation of 9 Hebrew, and 4 Greek words.

Break asunder

(1) (ןבֹּרֹּן [parpar]): Job, in reply to Eliphaz, complains about God, “I was at ease, and he brake me asunder” (Job 16:12).

(2) (נֲטֵק [nitteq]): In Psalm 2 the kings and rulers, meditating rebellion against Yahweh and His anointed, say, “Let us break their bonds asunder” (Psalm 2:3).

Burst asunder ([λάσκω, lasko]): This was the fate of Judas (Acts 1:18).

Cleave asunder

(1) (ךְבָּח [nibhqa’]): The same root as of [biq’ah], “a valley.” “The ground clave asunder” and swallowed up Dathan and Abiram with their households (Numbers 16:31).

(2) (לָכַח [pillach]): Job complains of God, “He cleaveth my reins asunder” (Job 16:13).

Cut asunder
1. (קָטַס [qitstsets]): The Lord “cut asunder the cords of the wicked” (Psalm 129:4). The Hebrew word is used of cutting into wires or strips (Exodus 39:3).

2. (גָדָה [gadha']): “to cut off a branch or cut down a tree.” “How is the hammer of the whole earth (Babylon) cut asunder!” (Jeremiah 50:23). Zechariah “cut asunder” the staff “Beauty,” signifying the breach of the covenant between Yahweh and His people, and also the staff “Bands,” signifying the breach of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel (Zechariah 11:10,14).


See PUNISHMENTS.

Depart asunder ([ἀποχωρίζομαι, apochorizomai]): Paul and Barnabas “departed asunder from one another” (Acts 15:39 the King James Version); the Revised Version (British and American) “parted asunder.”

Divide asunder

1. ([חִיתָד [hibhdil]): Usually to separate, to make a division between. Here the reference is to the offering of pigeons or turtledoves (Leviticus 1:17; 5:8).

2. ([μερισμός, merismos]): From merizo, “to divide.” The noun is abstract, “the act of dividing.” The word of God pierces “even to the dividing of soul and spirit” (Hebrews 4:12).

Drive asunder (חַטַּת [hittir]): Lit. “to cause to tremble,” then “to loosen.” God “drove asunder the nations” (Habakkuk 3:6).

Part asunder (חָפָר [hiphridh]): With a preposition ben, “between,” “to separate.” The chariot and horses of fire “parted asunder” Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings 2:11).

Pluck asunder ([διασπάω, diaspa]): To bear asunder, to part forcibly. “Chains had been plucked asunder” by the demoniac of the Gerasenes
Mark 5:4 the King James Version); the Revised Version (British and American) “rent asunder.”

Put asunder ([χορίζω, chorizo]): To sever one from another. See the words of Jesus on divorce (Matthew 19:6; Mark 10:9).

Rend asunder ([נִבְחָצָה, nibhqa‘]): The same Hebrew word as “cleave asunder.”

(1) “And No shall be rent asunder” (Ezekiel 30:16 the King James Version): the Revised Version (British and American) “broken up.”

(2) the Revised Version (British and American) for the King James Version “plucked asunder” (Mark 5:4).

Saw asunder ([πριζῶ, prizo] or [πρίω, prio]): The fate of some on the roll of faith, “They were sawn asunder” (Hebrews 11:37).

See also PUNISHMENTS.

S. F. Hunter

ASUPPIM; HOUSE OF ASUPPIM

<α-συπ’-ίμ>, ([ברית ה-אכופים, beth ha-’acuppim]): King James Version, margin “gatherings”; the Revised Version (British and American) “the storehouses.” In Nehemiah 12:25, the King James Version renders the same word thresholds(King James Version, margin “treasuries, assemblies”). A storehouse most probably at the southern gate of the temple (1 Chronicles 26:15,17; Nehemiah 12:25).

ASUR

<ασ’-υρ> ([‘Ασούρ, Asour]): the Revised Version (British and American) for Assur in 1 Esdras 5:31. Same as Harhur of Ezra 2:51.

ASYLUM

<α-σι’-λυμ>: The custom of fleeing to specially sacred places to obtain the protection of a deity is found all over the world (Post, Grundriss, II, 252 ff). In ancient Israel we meet with it in two forms — the asylum of the
altar and the asylum of the cities of refuge. The altar at the House of God was a place to which persons in danger fled for protection (1 Kings 1:50; 2:28). It had horns and must not be confused with the altars of earth or stone that were used for lay sacrifices. See ALTAR; SANCTUARY. Exodus 21:14 provides that a murderer is to be taken from the altar to be put to death. The law of the cities of refuge proceeds upon a somewhat different principle. Its objects are

(1) to shield a homicide from the avenger of blood until trial, and

(2) to provide a refuge for the manslayer who has not been guilty of murder. There is one reference to the institution in the history of the kingdom (2 Samuel 14:14). For the legal and geographical information, see CITIES OF REFUGE; HOMICIDE.

Harold M. Wiener

ASYNCRITUS

<asyn'-krit-us> ([Ἀσύνκριτος, Asunkritos], “incomparable”): An unknown Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent an affectionate salutation (Romans 16:14).

ATAD

<a'-tad> (אָֽתָּד, “a thorn”).

See ABEL-MIZRAIM.

ATAR

<at'-ar> ([Ατάρ, Atar]; the King James Version Jatal = Ater (Ezra 2:42; Nehemiah 7:45)): The sons of Atar (porters) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:28).

ATARAH

<at’-a-ra>, <a-ta’-ra> (אַתַּרָּה, “crown”): One of Jerahmeel’s wives and mother of Onam (1 Chronicles 2:26).
ATARGATIS

<a-tar'-ga-tis> ([‘Αταργάτις, Atargatis]; the Revised Version (British and American) wrongly ATERGATIS): Is stated in 2 Macc 12:26 to have been worshipped at Karnion, the Ashtaroth-Karnaim of the Old Testament (compare Ant, XII, viii, 4). The name is found on coins of Membij as [‘atar-‘atah], where `Atar (i.e. Ashtoreth) is identified with the goddess `Atah, whose name is sometimes written [‘Ati]. `Atah or `Ati was also worshipped at Palmyra, and (according to Melito) in Adiabene. The compound Atargatis, often corrupted by the Greeks into Derketo, had her chief temples at Membij (Hierapolis) and Ashkelon where she was represented with the body of a woman and the tail of a fish, fish being sacred to her. Herodotus made her the Aphrodite Urania of the Greeks. `Ati may have been originally a Hittite goddess with whom the Assyrian Ishtar (‘Atar) came afterward to be identified.

A. H. Sayce

ATAROTH

<at’-a-roth>, <a-ta’-roth> ([aTaroth], “crowns” or “wreaths”; [‘Αταρώθ, Ataroth]):

(1) A city East of the Jordan, apparently in the territory given to Reuben, but built, or fortified, by the children of Gad (Numbers 32:3,34). It is named along with Dibon, which is identified with Dhiban. Eight miles Northeast by North of Dibon, on the South of Wady Zerqa Ma`in, stands Jebel `Attarus, in which the ancient name is preserved. The city is doubtless represented by Khirbet `Attarus, about 4 miles West of the mountain.

(2) A place on the boundary between Ephraim and Benjamin, toward the West (Joshua 16:2). It seems to be the same as Ataroth-addar of Joshua 16:5 and 18:13. It is probably to be identified with the modern ed-Dariyeh South of nether Bethhoron, and about 12 1/2 miles West of Jerusalem.
A place on the eastern frontier of Ephraim (Joshua 16:7). This town has not been identified. Conder thinks it may be identified with et-Truneh in the Jordan valley, or with Khirbet et-Taiyereh.

W. Ewing

ATAROTH-ADDAR

<at’-a-roth-ad’-ar> (אתרות [‘aTroth ‘addar], “crowns of Addar”).

See ATAROTH (2).

ATER

<a’-ter> (אטר [‘aTer], “bound” (?)):

(1) The ancestor of a family of 98 persons who returned from Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:16; Nehemiah 7:21). The King James Version has “Ater of Hezekiah”; the Revised Version (British and American) of 1 Esdras 5:15 has “Ater of Ezekias,” margin, “Ater of Hezekiah.” The King James Version has “Aterezias.”

(2) The head of a family of porters who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ezra 2:42; Nehemiah 7:45).

ATEREZAIAS

<a-ter-e-zi’-as> ([Ατήρ τοῦ Ἑζεκία, Ater to Hezekia]): Usually found in the abbreviated form Ater. Head of a Jewish family, which returned with Zerubbabel, under the decree of Cyrus. Mentioned (Ezra 2:16) as sprung from Hezekiah. Their number is given as 98. Mentioned again as found in the register of the genealogies of the first returned exiles by Nehemiah (7:21). Again among those who sealed “the sure covenant” (Nehemiah 10:17). Also found in 1 Esdras 5:15, where the name is given variously as Ater or Aterezaïas. The number of the family, given by Esdras, is 92.
ATERGATIS

<\textit{a-ter'\textquoteright-ga-tis}>.

\textit{See ATARGATIS.}

ATETA

<\textit{a-te'	extquoteright-ta}> (the King James Version Teta; Codex Alexandrinus [\textit{\textalpha\tau\eta\tau\acute{a}}, Ateta], Codex Vaticanus, [om].): Head of a family of Levites; gate keepers who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:28); called Hitita in Ezra 2:42; Nehemiah 7:45.

ATHACH

<\textit{a'thak}> ([\textit{\text vagina}, “lodging-place”]: One of the cities of Judah to which David sent from Ziklag the spoil of the Amalekites (1 Samuel 30:30). Its site is unknown. Driver, Budde, and Wellhausen identify it with Ether (Joshua 15:42).

ATHAIAH

<\textit{a-tha'	extquoteright-ya}> ([\textit{\text vagina} = “Yahweh is helper”; [\textit{\text alpha\theta\epsilon\alpha\acute{a}}, Athea], or [\textit{\text alpha\theta\epsilon\alpha\acute{i}}, Atheai]): He is designated (Nehemiah 11:4) as a descendant of Judah and the son of Uzziah. After the return from Babylon, he dwelt in Jerusalem. In 1 Chronicles 9:4 his name is given as Uthai.

ATHALIAH

<\textit{ath-a-li'	extquoteright-a}> ([\textit{\text vagina}; meaning uncertain, perhaps, “whom Yahweh has afflicted”; 2 Kings 8:26; 11; 2 Chronicles 22; 23):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{1. RELATIONSHIP:}
\end{itemize}

(1) Daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, grand-daughter of Omri, 6th king of Israel. In her childhood the political relations of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel had, after many years of strife, become friendly, and she was married to Jehoram, eldest son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah (2 Kings 8:18). The marriage was one of political expediency, and is a blot on the memory of Jehoshaphat.
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2. ATHALIAH AS QUEEN:

When Jehoram was 32 years of age, he succeeded to the throne, and Athaliah became queen of Judah. She inherited her mother’s strength of will, and like her developed a fanatical devotion to the cult of the Zidonian Baal. Elijah’s blow at the worship of Baal in Samaria shortly before her accession to power did nothing to mitigate her zeal. It probably intensified it. The first recorded act of Jehoram’s reign is the murder of his six younger brothers; some princes of the realm, who were known to be favorable to the ancient faith of the nation, were also destroyed (2 Chronicles 21:4). There can be little doubt that these deeds of blood were supported, and perhaps instigated, by Athaliah, who was a much stronger character than her husband.

3. MURDER OF HER GRANDCHILDREN:

After eight years of royal life, Athaliah became a widow, and her son, Ahaziah, then 22 years of age (2 Kings 8:26; not 42 as in 2 Chronicles 22:2), ascended his father’s throne. As queen-mother, Athaliah was now supreme in the councils of the nation, as well as in the royal palace. Within a single year, the young king fell (see JEHU), and the only persons who stood between Athaliah and the throne were her grandchildren. It is in such moments that ambition, fired by fanaticism, sees its opportunity, and the massacre of the royal seed was determined on. This was carried out: but one of them, Jehoash, a babe, escaped by the intervention of his aunt, Jehosheba (1 Kings 11:2; 2 Chronicles 22:11).

4. HER USURPATION:

The palace being cleared of its royal occupants, Athaliah had herself proclaimed sovereign. No other woman, before or since, sat upon the throne of David, and it is a proof of her energy and ability that, in spite of her sex, she was able to keep it for six years. From 2 Chronicles 24:7 we gather that a portion of the temple of Yahweh was pulled down, and the material used in the structure of a temple of Baal.
5. THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION:

The high priest at this time was Jehoiada, who had married the daughter of Athaliah, Jehosheba (2 Chronicles 22:11). His promotion to the primacy led to the undoing of the usurper, as Jehoiada proved staunchly, if secretly, true to the religion of Yahweh. For six years he and his wife concealed in their apartments, near the temple, the young child of Ahaziah. In the seventh year a counter-revolution was planned. The details are given with unusual fullness in Ki and Chronicles, the writings of which supplement one another. Thus, when the Chronicler wrote, it had become safe to give the names of five captains who led the military rising (2 Chronicles 23:1). With the Book of Ki before him, it was not necessary to do more than extract from the ancient records such particulars as had not hitherto appeared. This it is which has chiefly given rise to the charge of variations in the two narratives.

See JEHOASH.

6. HER DEATH:

At the time of her deposition, Athaliah was resident in the royal palace. When roused to a sense of danger by the acclamations which greeted the coronation ceremony, she made an attempt to stay the revolt by rushing into the temple court, alone; her guards, according to Josephus, having been prevented from following her (Ant., IX, vii, 3). A glance sufficed. It showed her the lad standing on a raised platform before the temple, holding the Book of the Law in his hand, and with the crown upon his brow. Rending her robe and shouting, “Treason! Treason!” she fled. Some were for cutting her down as she did so, but this was objected to as defiling the temple with human blood. She was, therefore, allowed to reach the door of the palace in flight. Here she fell, smitten by the avenging guards.

Athaliah’s usurpation lasted for six years (2 Kings 11:3; 12:1; 2 Chronicles 22:12). Her 1st year synchronizes with the 1st of Jehu in Israel, and may be placed 846 BC (some put later). See CHRONOLOGY OF OLD TESTAMENT. The statement of 2 Kings 12:1 is here understood in the sense that Jehoash began his public reign in the 7th year of Jehu, and that he reigned 40 years counting from the time of his father’s
death. A modern parallel is the dating of all official records and legal documents of the time of Charles II of England from the death of Charles I.

The only other reference to Athaliah is that above alluded to in 2 Chronicles 24:7, where she is spoken of as “that wicked woman.”

(2) A Benjamite who dwelt in Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 8:26,28).

(3) Father of Jeshaiah, who returned with Ezra (8:7); called Gotholias in Apocrypha (1 Esdras 8:33).

W. Shaw Caldecott

ATHANASIAN; CREED

<ath-a-na’-zhan>.

See CREED.

ATHARIAS

<ath-a-ri’-as>.

See ATTHARIAS.

ATHARIM

<ath’-a-rim] (א新媒体 [‘atharim]): the Revised Version (British and American) “The way of Atharim”; the King James Version “The way of the spies.” the Revised Version (British and American) regards Atharim as a place (so Septuagint). the King James Version follows Syriac and Targum, rendering Atharim as if Tarim = spies. Dillmann translates “the caravan path,” connecting it with Arabic athar, “a track or footprint.” Here the king of Arad fought against Israel, taking some captives (Numbers 21:1).

See HORMAH.

ATHEISM

<a’-the-iz’-m> ([ātheós, atheos], “without God” (Ephesians 2:12)): Ordinarily this word is interpreted to mean a denial of the existence of
God, a disbelief in God, the opposite of theism. But it seems better that we should consider it under four heads, in order to obtain a clear idea of the different meanings in which it has been used.

(1) THE CLASSICAL.

In this sense it does not mean a denial of the existence of a Divine Being, but the denial of the existence or reality of the god of a particular nation. Thus the Christians were repeatedly charged with atheism, because of their disbelief in the gods of heathenism. It was not charged that they did not believe in any god, but that they denied the existence and reality of the gods worshipped, and before whom the nation hitherto had bowed. This was considered so great a crime, so dangerous a thing to the nation, that it was felt to be a just cause for most cruel and determined persecutions. Socrates’ teaching cast a shadow on the reality of the existence of the gods, and this charge was brought against him by his contemporaries. Cicero also uses the word in this sense in his charge against Diagoras of Athens. Indeed, such use of it is common in all classical literature.

(2) PHILOSOPHIC.

It is not meant that the various philosophic systems to which this term is applied actually deny the existence of a Divine Being or of a First Cause, but that they are atheistic in their teaching, and tend to unsettle the faith of mankind in the existence of God. There is indeed a belief in a first cause, in force, in motion, in a certain aggregation of materials producing life, but the Divine Being as taught by theism is absolutely denied. This is true of the Idealism of Fichte, of the Ideal Pantheism of Spinoza, the Natural Pantheism of Schelling, and similar forms of thought. In applying the word atheism to the teaching here given, theism does not intend to assail them as wholly without a belief in a Divine Being; but it affirms that God is a person, a self-conscious Being, not merely a first cause or force. To deny this fundamental affirmation of theism is to make the teaching atheistic, a denial of that which is essential to theism (Hebrews 11:3).

(3) DOGMATIC.

It absolutely denies the existence of God. It has often been held that this is, in fact, impossible. Cousin has said, “It is impossible, because the
existence of God is implied in every assertion.” It is true, however, that in all ages there have been persons who declared themselves absolute atheists. Especially is this true of the 18th century a period of widespread skepticism — when not a few, particularly in France, professed themselves atheists. In many cases, however, it resulted from a loose use of the word, careless definition, and sometimes from the spirit of boastfulness.

(4) PRACTICAL ATHEISM.

It has nothing at all to do with belief. Indeed it accepts the affirmations of theism. It has reference wholly to the mode of life. It is to live as though there was no God.

It takes the form often of complete indifference to the claims of the Divine Being or again of outbroken and defiant wickedness (Psalm 14:1). That this form of atheism is widely prevalent is well known. It is accompanied in many cases with some form of unbelief or prejudice or false opinion of the church or Christianity. Dogmatic atheism is no longer a menace or even a hindrance to the progress of Christianity, but practical atheism is widespread in its influence and a dangerous element in our modern life (compare Isaiah 31:1; Jeremiah 2:13,17,18; 18:13-15). Whatever the form, whether it be that of religious agnosticism, denying that we can know that God exists, or critical atheism, denying that the evidence to prove His existence is sufficient, or dogmatic, or practical atheism, it is always a system of negation and as such tears down and destroys. It destroys the faith upon which all human relations are built. Since there is no God, there is no right nor wrong, and human action is neither good nor bad, but convenient or inconvenient. It leaves human society without a basis for order and human government without foundation (Romans 1:10-32). All is hopeless, all is wretchedness, all is tending to the grave and the grave ends all.

Arguments against atheism may be summarized as follows:

(1) It is contrary to reason. History has shown again and again how impossible it is to bring the mind to rest in this doctrine. Although Buddhism is atheistic in its teaching, idolatry is widespread in the lands where it prevails. While the Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte was
based on a denial of the existence of God, his attempt to found the new
religion of humanity with rites and ceremonies of worship reveals how the
longing for worship cannot be suppressed. It is a revelation of the fact so
often seen in the history of human thought, that the mind cannot rest in
the tenets of atheism.

(2) It is contrary to human experience. All history testifies that there are
deep religious instincts within the human breast. To regard these as
deceptive and unreasonable would itself be utterly unreasonable and
unscientific. But the fact of such spiritual longing implies also that there is
a Being who is responsive to and can satisfy the cry of the heart
(Hebrews 11:6). In his Bampton Lectures Reville has said on this
subject: “It would be irrational in the last degree to lay down the existence
of such a need and such a tendency, and yet believe that the need
corresponds to nothing, that the tendency has no goal.”

(3) It fails to account for the evidence of design in the universe.

See COSMOLOGY.

(4) It fails to account for the existence of man and the world in general.
Here is the universe: how did it come to be? Here is man: how is he to be
accounted for? To these and like questions, atheism and atheistic
philosophy have no adequate answer to give.

See also COSMOLOGY; CREATION; GOD.

Jacob W. Kapp

ATHENIANS

<α-θe'-ni-ans> [Ἀθηναῖοι, Athenaioi]: Inhabitants of Athens. Luke has
a remark on their curiosity and their delight in novelty (Acts 17:21).

See ATHENS.

ATHENOBIUS

<ath-e-no'-bi-us> [Ἀθηνόβιος, Athenobios]: A “friend” of Antiochus
VII (Sidetes), who was sent to Jerusalem by the king to protest against the
occupation of Joppa and Gazara, and the citadel Jerusalem. A demand was
made on Simon Maccabeus to give up all the places he had taken or pay 1,000 talents in silver. Simon declined to pay more than 100 talents, and Athenobius returned to Antiochus from his fruitless mission (1 Macc 15:28-36).

**ATHENS**

<ath'-enz> [ Αθηναία, Athenai] In antiquity the celebrated metropolis of Attica, now the capital of Greece. Two long walls, 250 ft. apart, connected the city with the harbor (Peiraeus). In Acts 17 we are told what Paul did during his single sojourn in this famous city. He came up from the sea by the new road (North of the ancient) along which were altars of unknown gods, entered the city from the West, and passed by the Ceramicus (burial-ground), which can be seen to this day, the “Theseum,” the best preserved of all Greek temples, and on to the Agora (Market-Place), just North of the Acropolis, a steep hill, 200 ft. high, in the center of the city. Cimon began and Pericles completed the work of transforming this citadel into a sanctuary for the patron goddess of the city. The magnificent gateway (Propylaea), of which the Athenians were justly proud, was built by Mnesicles (437-432 BC). A monumental bronze statue by Phidias stood on the left, as one emerged on the plateau, and the mighty Parthenon a little further on, to the right. In this temple was the famous gold and ivory statue of Athena. The eastern pediment contained sculptures representing the birth of the goddess (Elgin Marbles, now in the British Museum), the western depicting her contest with Poseidon for supremacy over Attica. This, the most celebrated edifice, architecturally, in all history, was partially destroyed by the Venetians in 1687. Other temples on the Acropolis are the Erechtheum and the “Wingless Victory.” In the city the streets were exceedingly narrow and crooked. The wider avenues were called [πλατεῖα, plateiai], whence English “place,” Spanish “plaza.” The roofs of the houses were flat. In and around the Agora were many porticoes *stoai*. In the Stoa Poecile (“Painted Portico”), whose walls were covered with historical paintings, Paul met with the successors of Zeno, the Stoics, with whom he disputed daily. In this vicinity also was the Senate Chamber for the Council of Five Hundred, and the Court of the Areopagus, whither Socrates came in 399 BC to face his accusers, and where Paul, five centuries later, preached to the Athenians “the unknown
God.” In this neighborhood also were the Tower of the Winds and the water-clock, which must have attracted Paul’s attention, as they attract our attention today.

The apostle disputed in the synagogue with the Jews (Acts 17:17), and a slab found at the foot of Mount Hymettus (a range to the East of the city, 3,000 ft. high), with the inscription [αὕτη ἡ πόλη τοῦ κυρίου, δίκαιοι εἰσελεύσονται ἐν ἁυτῇ, haute he pule tou kuriou, dikaioi eiseleusontai en aute] (Psalm 118:20), was once thought to indicate the site, but is now believed to date from the 3rd or 4th century. Slabs bearing Jewish inscriptions have been found in the city itself.

The population of Athens was at least a quarter of a million. The oldest inhabitants were Pelasgians. Cecrops, the first traditional king, came from Egypt in 1556 BC, and by marrying the daughter of Actaeon, obtained the sovereignty. The first king was Erechtheus. Theseus united the twelve communities of Attica and made Athens the capital. After the death of Codrus in 1068 BC, the governing power was entrusted to an archon who held office for life. In 753 BC the term of office was limited to ten years. In 683 BC nine archons were chosen for a term of one year. Draco’s laws, “written in blood,” were made in 620 BC. Solon was chosen archon in 594 BC and gave the state a constitution. The tyrant Pisistratus was in control permanently from 541 to 527 BC; his son Hipparchus was assassinated in 514. Clisthenes changed the constitution and introduced the practice of ostracism. In 490 BC the Athenians defeated the Persians at Marathon, and again in 480 BC at Salamis. In 476 BC Aristides organized the great Athenian Confederacy. After his death Conon became the leader of the conservative party; and when the general Cimon was killed, Pericles became the leader of the people. In 431 BC the Peloponnesian War broke out and continued till 404 BC, when Athens succumbed to Sparta. An oligarchical government was set up with Critias and Theramenes at the head. War broke out again but peace was restored by the pact of Antalcidas (387 BC). In the Sacred War (357-355 BC) Athens exhausted her strength. When Philip of Macedon began to interfere in Greek affairs, Athens could neither resolve on war measures (to which the oratory of Demosthenes incited her), nor make terms with Philip. Finally, she joined Thebes in making armed resistance, but in spite of her heroic efforts at Chaeronea, she suffered defeat (338 BC). Philip was murdered in 336 BC,
and Alexander the Great became master. After the subjugation of Greece by the Romans, Athens was placed under the supervision of the governor of Macedonia, but was granted local independence in recognition of her great history. As the seat of Greek art and science, Athens played an important role even under Roman sway — she became the university city of the Roman world, and from her radiated spiritual light and intellectual energy to Tarsus, Antioch and Alexandria. Philo, the Jew, declares that the Athenians were [ἐλλήνων ὀξυδερκέστατοι διάνοιαν, Hellenon oxuderkestatoi dianoian] (“keenest in intellect”) and adds that Athens was to Greece what the pupil is to the eye, or reason to the soul. Although the city had lost her real independence, the people retained their old characteristics: they were still interested in art, literature and philosophy. Paul may possibly have attended theater of Dionysus (under the Southeast cliff of the Acropolis) and witnessed a play of the Greek poets, such as Euripides or Menander. Many gifts were received from foreign monarchs by Athens. Attalus I of Pergamum endowed the Academy, Eumenes added a splendid Stoa to theater and Antiochus Epiphanes began the Olympeium (15 columns of which are still standing), the massive sub-basement of which had been constructed by Pisistratus. Athens became a favorite residence for foreign writers who cultivated history, geography and literature. Horace, Brutus and Cassius sojourned in the city for some time. Josephus declares that the Athenians were the most god-fearing of the Greeks [εὐσεβεστάτους τῶν ἑλλήνων, eusebestatos ton Hellenon]. Compare Livy xlv.27.

**LITERATURE.**

See Wordsworth, Athens and Attica; Butler, Story of Athens; Ernest Gardner, Ancient Athens; Tucker, Life in Ancient Athens; A. Mommsen, Athenae Christianae; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Paul, chapter x; Gregorovius, Stadt Athen im Mittelalter; Leake, Grote, Thirlwall, Curtius, Wachsmuth, Holm, and Pausanias’ Attica, recently edited by Carroll (Ginn and Co.), or in the large work of Frazer.

*J. E. Harry*
ATHLAI

<ath’-la-i> יְלִי [‘athlay], “afflicted?”): A Jew, the son of Bebai, who was influenced by Ezra to put away his wife (Ezra 10:28).

ATIPHA

<at’i-fa>.

See HATIPHA.

AT ONE

[εἰς εἰρήνην, eis eirenēn], “at one,” “at peace”): “Set them at one again” (Acts 7:26), the reconciliation of persons at variance. From this adverb we have the words “atone” and “atonement.”

ATONEMENT

<a-ton’-ment>: Translates פָרַה [kaphar]; χατα’ [chaTa’]; ῥατα’ [ratsah], the last employed only of human relations (1 Samuel 29:4); translates the following Greek stems hilas-, simple and compounded with various prepositions; allag- in composition only, but with numerous prepositions and even two at a time, e.g. Matthew 5:24; [lip-] rarely (Daniel 9:24).

I. TERMS EMPLOYED.

1. Hebrew and Greek Words:

The root meanings of the Hebrew words, taking them in the order cited above, are, to “cover,” hence expiate, condone, cancel, placate; to “offer,” or “receive a sin offering,” hence, make atonement, appease, propitiate; “effect reconciliation,” i.e. by some conduct, or course of action. Of the Greek words the meanings, in order, are “to be,” or “cause to be, friendly”; “to render other,” hence to restore; “to leave” and with preposition to leave off, i.e. enmity, or evil, etc.; “to render holy,” “to set apart for”; hence, of the Deity, to appropriate or accept for Himself.
2. The English Word:

It is obvious that the English word “atonement” does not correspond etymologically with any Hebrew or Greek word which it translates. Furthermore, the Greek words in both Septuagint and New Testament do not correspond exactly to the Hebrew words; especially is it true that the root idea of the most frequently employed Hebrew word, “cover,” is not found in any of the Greek words employed. These remarks apply to both verbs and substantives. The English word is derived from the phrase “at one,” and signifies, etymologically, harmony of relationship or unity of life, etc. It is a rare instance of an AS theological term; and, like all purely English terms employed in theology, takes its meaning, not from its origin, but from theological content of the thinking of the Continental and Latin-speaking Schoolmen who employed such English terms as seemed most nearly to convey to the hearers and readers their ideas. Not only was no effort made to convey the original Hebrew and Greek meanings by means of English words, but no effort was made toward uniformity in translating of Hebrew and Greek words by their English equivalents.

3. Not to Be Settled by Lexicon Merely:

It is at once clear that no mere word-study can determine the Bible teaching concerning atonement. Even when first employed for expressing Hebrew and Christian thought, these terms, like all other religious terms, already had a content that had grown up with their use, and it is by no means easy to tell how far heathen conceptions might be imported into our theology by a rigidly etymological study of terms employed. In any case such a study could only yield a dictionary of terms, whereas what we seek is a body of teaching, a circle of ideas, whatever words and phrases, or combinations of words and phrases, have been employed to express the teaching.

4. Not Chiefly a Study in Theology:

There is even greater danger of making the study of the Atonement a study in dogmatic theology. The frequent employment of the expression “the Atonement” shows this tendency. The work of Christ in reconciling the world to God has occupied so central a place in Christian dogmatics that the very term atonement has come to have a theological rather than a
practical atmosphere, and it is by no means easy for the student, or even for the seeker after the saving relation with God, to pass beyond the accumulated interpretation of the Atonement and learn of atonement.

5. Notes on Use of Terms:

The history of the explanation of the Atonement and the terms of preaching atonement cannot, of course, be ignored. Nor can the original meaning of the terms employed and the manner of their use be neglected. There are significant features in the use of terms, and we have to take account of the history of interpretation. Only we must not bind ourselves nor the word of God in such forms.

(1) The most frequently employed Hebrew word, [kaphar], is found in the Prophets only in the priestly section (Ezekiel 45:15,20; Daniel 9:24) where English Versions of the Bible have “make reconciliation,” margin, “purge away.” Furthermore, it is not found in Deuteronomy, which is the prophetic book of the Pentateuch (Hexateuch). This indicates that it is an essentially priestly conception. The same term is frequently translated by “reconcile,” construed as equivalent to “make atonement” (Leviticus 6:30; 16:20; 1 Samuel 29:4; Ezekiel 45:15,20; Daniel 9:24). In this latter sense it connects itself with [chaTa’]. In 2 Chronicles 29:24 both words are used: the priests make a sin offering [chaTa’] to effect an atonement [kaphar]. But the first word is frequently used by metonymy to include, at least suggestively, the end in view, the reconciliation; and, on the other hand, the latter word is so used as to involve, also, doing that by which atonement is realized.

(2) Of the Greek words employed hilaskesthai means “to make propitious” (Hebrews 2:17; Leviticus 6:30; 16:20; Ezekiel 45:20); allattein, used however only in composition with prepositions, means “to render other,” “to restore” to another (former?) condition of harmony (compare Matthew 5:24 = “to be reconciled” to a fellow-man as a condition of making an acceptable sacrifice to God).

(3) In the English New Testament the word “atonement” is found only at Romans 5:11 and the American Standard Revised Version changes this to “reconciliation.” While in strict etymology this word need signify only the active or conscious exercise of unity of life or harmony of relations, the
causative idea probably belongs to the original use of the term, as it certainly is present in all current Christian use of the term. As employed in Christian theology, both practical and technical, the term includes with more or less distinctness:

(a) the fact of union with God, and this always looked upon as

(b) a broken union to be restored or an ideal union to be realized,

(c) the procuring cause of atonement, variously defined,

(d) the crucial act wherein the union is effected, the work of God and the response of the soul in which the union becomes actual.

Inasmuch as the reconciliation between man and God is always conceived of as effected through Jesus Christ (2 Corinthians 5:18-21) the expression, “the Atonement of Christ,” is one of the most frequent in Christian theology. Questions and controversies have turned mainly on the procuring cause of atonement, (c) above, and at this point have arisen the various “theories of the Atonement.”

2. BIBLE TEACHING CONCERNING ATONEMENT IN GENERAL:

The Atonement of Christ must be interpreted in connection with the conception of atonement in general in the Scriptures. This idea of atonement is, moreover, part of the general circle of fundamental ideas of the religion of Yahweh and Jesus. Theories of the Atonement root themselves in conceptions of the nature and character of God, His holiness, love, grace, mercy, etc.; of man, his nature, disposition and capacities; of sin and guilt.

1. Primary Assumption of Unity of God and Man:

The basal conception for the Bible doctrine of atonement is the assumption that God and man are ideally one in life and interests, so far as man’s true life and interest may be conceived as corresponding with those of God. Hence, it is everywhere assumed that God and man should be in all respects in harmonious relations, “at-one.” Such is the ideal picture of Adam and Eve in Eden. Such is the assumption in the parable of the Prodigal Son; man ought to be at home with God, at peace in the Father’s
house (Luke 15). Such also is the ideal of Jesus as seen especially in John 14 through 17; compare particularly 17:21ff; compare also Ephesians 2:11-22; 1 Corinthians 15:28. This is quite possibly the underlying idea of all those offerings in which the priests — God’s representatives—and the people joined in eating at a common meal parts of what had been presented to God. The prohibition of the use of blood in food or drink is grounded on the statement that the life is in the blood (Leviticus 17:10 f) or is the blood (Genesis 9:4; Deuteronomy 12:23). Blood was used in the consecration of tabernacle, temple, vessels, altars, priests; all things and persons set apart for Yahweh. Then blood was required in offerings made to atone for sin and uncleanness. The reason for all this is not easy to see; but if we seek an explanation that will account for all the facts on a single principle, shall we not find it in the idea that in the life-principle of the blood God’s own life was present? Through this life from God all living beings shared God’s life. The blood passing out of any living being must therefore return to God and not be consumed. In sprinkling blood, the life-element, or certainly the life-symbol, over persons and things set apart for God they were, so to say, visibly taken up into the life of God, and His life extending over them made them essentially of His own person. Finally the blood of sacrifices was the returning to God of the life of the man for whom the beasts stood. And this blood was not burned with the dead sacrifice but poured out beside the holy altar. The now dead sin offering was burned, but the blood, the life, returned to God. In peace-offerings of various sorts there was the common meal in which the common life was typified.

In the claim of the first-fruits of all crops, of all flocks and of all increase, God emphasized the common life in production; asserted His claim to the total life of His people and their products. God claimed the lives of all as belonging essentially to Himself and a man must recognize this by paying a ransom price (Exodus 30:12). This did not purchase for the man a right to his own life in separation from God, for it was in no sense an equivalent in value to the man’s time. It the rather committed the man to living the common life with God, without which recognition the man was not fit to live at all. And the use of this recognition-money by the priests in the temple was regarded as placing the man who paid his money in a sort of
continuous worshipful service in the tabernacle (or temple) itself (Exodus 30:11-16).

2. The Breach in the Unity:

In both Old Testament and New Testament the assumption of unity between God and man stands over against the contrasted fact that there is a radical breach in this unity. This breach is recognized in all God’s relations to men; and even when healed it is always subject to new failures which must be provided for, by the daily oblations in the Old Testament, by the continuous intercession of the Christ (Hebrews 7:25; 9:24) in the New Testament. Even when there is no conscious breach, man is taught to recognize that it may exist and he must avail himself of the appointed means for its healing, e.g. daily sacrifices. This breach is universally attributed to some behavior on man’s part. This may be moral or ceremonial uncleanness on man’s part. He may have broken with God fundamentally in character or conduct and so by committing sin have incurred guilt; or he may have neglected the fitting recognition that his life is in common with God and so by his disregard have incurred uncleanness. After the first breach between God and man it is always necessary that man shall approach God on the assumption that this breach needs healing, and so always come with an offering. In human nature the sin breach is rooted and universal (Romans 3:9-19; 5:12-14).

3. Means for Expressing, Restoring and Maintaining:

Numerous and various means were employed for expressing this essential unity of life, for restoring it since it was broken off in sin, and for maintaining it. These means were primarily spiritual and ethical but made extensive use of material substances, physical acts and symbolical ceremonials; and these tended always to obscure and supplant the spiritual and ethical qualities which it was their function to exhibit. The prophet came to the rescue of the spiritual and ethical and reached his highest insight and function in the doctrine of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh through whom God was to be united with a redeemed race (compare among many passages, Isaiah 49:1-7; 66:18 ff; Psalm 22:27 ff).

Atonement is conceived in both Old Testament and New Testament as partly personal and partly social, extending to the universal conception.
The acts and attitudes by which it is procured, restored and maintained are partly those of the individual alone (Psalm 51), partly those in which the individual secures the assistance of the priest or the priestly body, and partly such as the priest performs for the whole people on his own account. This involves the distinction that in Israel atonement was both personal and social, as also were both sin and uncleanness. Atonement was made for the group by the priest without specific participation by the people although they were, originally at least, to take cognizance of the fact and at the time. At all the great feasts, especially upon the **DAY OF ATONEMENT** (which see) the whole group was receptively to take conscious part in the work of atonement (Numbers 29:7-11).

The various sacrifices and offerings by means of which atonement was effected in the life and worship of Israel will be found to be discussed under the proper words and are to be spoken of here only summarily. The series of offerings, guilt-offerings, burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, peace-offerings, reveal a sense of the breach with God, a conviction of the sin making the breach and an ethical appreciation of the holiness of God entirely unique among religions of ancient or modern times, and this fact must never be overlooked in interpreting the New Testament Christian doctrine of the Atonement. In the Old Testament there are sins and sinful circumstances for which no atonement is possible. Many passages, indeed, almost seem to provide against atonement for any voluntary wrongdoing (e.g. Leviticus 4:2,13,22,27; 5:14 ff). This is, no doubt, an extreme interpretation, out of harmony with the general spirit of the Old Testament, but it does show how seriously sin ought to be taken under the Old Testament regime. No atonement for murder could make possible the residence of the murderer again in that section of the land where the murder was done (Numbers 35:33), although the land was not by the murder rendered unfit for occupation by others. When Israel sinned in making the golden calf, God refused to accept any atonement (Exodus 32:20 ff) until there had been a great loss of life from among the sinners. No repentance could find atonement for the refusal to follow Yahweh’s lead at Kadesh-barnea (Numbers 14:20-25), and complete atonement was effected only when all the unbelieving generation had died in the wilderness (Numbers 26:65; 32:10 ff); i.e. no atonement was possible, but the
people died in that sin, outside the Land of Promise, although the sin was not allowed to cut off finally from Yahweh (Numbers 14:29 f).

Permanent uncleanness or confirmed disease of an unclean sort caused permanent separation from the temple and the people of Yahweh (e.g. Leviticus 7:20 f), and every uncleanness must be properly removed (Leviticus 5:2b; 17:15; 22:2-8; Deuteronomy 23:10 f). A house in which an unclean disease was found must be cleansed — have atonement made for it (Leviticus 14:53), and in extreme cases must be utterly destroyed (Leviticus 14:43 ff).

After childbirth (Leviticus 12:7 f) and in all cases of hemorrhage (compare Leviticus 15:30) atonement must be effected by prescribed offerings, a loss, diminution, or pollution of blood, wherein is the life, having been suffered. All this elaborate application of the principle of atonement shows the comprehensiveness with which it was sought by the religious teachers to impress the people with the unity of all life in the perfectly holy and majestic God whom they were called upon to serve. Not only must the priests be clean who bear the vessels of the Lord (Isaiah 52:11), but all the people must be clean also from all defilement of flesh and spirit, seeking perfect holiness in the fear of their God (compare 2 Corinthians 7:1).

3. THE ATONEMENT OF JESUS CHRIST

1. Preparation for New Testament Doctrine:

All the symbols, doctrine and examples of atonement in the Old Testament among the Hebrews find their counterpart, fulfillment and complete explanation in the new covenant in the blood of Jesus Christ (Matthew 26:28; Hebrews 12:24). By interpreting the inner spirit of the sacrificial system, by insisting on the unity and holiness of God, by passionate pleas for purity in the people, and especially by teaching the principle of vicarious suffering for sin, the Prophets laid the foundation in thought-forms and in religious atmosphere for such a doctrine of atonement as is presented in the life and teaching of Jesus and as is unfolded in the teaching of His apostles.
The personal, parabolic sufferings of Hosea, the remarkable elaboration of the redemption of spiritual Israel through a Suffering Servant of Yahweh and the extension of that redemption to all mankind as presented in Isaiah 40 through 66, and the same element in such psalms as Psalm 22, constitute a key to the understanding of the work of the Christ that unifies the entire revelation of God’s righteousness in passing over human sins (Romans 3:24 f). Yet it is remarkable that such a conception of the way of atonement was as far as possible from the general and average Jewish mind when Jesus came. In no sense can the New Testament doctrine of the Atonement be said to be the product of the thought and spirit of the times.

2. The One Clear Fact:

However much theologians may disagree as to the rationale of the Atonement, there is, as there can be, no question that Jesus and all His interpreters in the New Testament represent the Atonement between God and men as somehow accomplished through Jesus Christ. It is also an agreed fact in exegesis that Jesus and His apostles understood His death to be radically connected with this Atonement.

(1) Jesus Himself teaches that He has come to reveal the Father (John 14:9), to recover the lost (Luke 19:10), to give life to men (John 6:33; 10:10), to disclose and establish the kingdom of heaven (or of God), gathering a few faithful followers through whom His work will be perpetuated (John 17:2 ff; Matthew 16:13 ff); that salvation, personal and social, is dependent upon His person (John 6:53 ff; 14:6). He cannot give full teaching concerning His death but He does clearly connect His sufferings with the salvation He seeks to give. He shows in Luke 4:16 ff and 22:37 that He understands Isaiah 52 through 53 as realized in Himself; He is giving Himself (and His blood) a ransom for men (Matthew 20:28; 26:26 ff; compare I Corinthians 11:23 ff). He was not a mere martyr but gave Himself up willingly, and voluntarily (John 10:17 f; Galatians 2:20), in accordance with the purpose of God (Acts 2:23), as the Redeemer of the world, and expected that by His lifting up all men would be drawn to Him (John 12:31-33). It is possible to explain the attention which the Evangelists give to the death of Jesus only by supposing that they are reflecting the importance which they recall Jesus Himself to have attached to His death.
All the New Testament writers agree in making Jesus the center of their idea of the way of salvation and that His death is an essential element in His saving power. This they do by combining Old Testament teaching with the facts of the life and death of the Lord, confirming their conclusion by appeal to the Resurrection. Paul represents himself as holding the common doctrine of Christianity at the time, and from the beginning, when in 1 Corinthians 15:3 f he sums up his teaching that salvation is secured through the death and resurrection of Jesus according to the Scriptures. Elsewhere (Ephesians 2:16,18; 1 Timothy 2:5; compare Acts 4:12) in all his writings he emphasizes his belief that Jesus Christ is the one Mediator between God and man, by the blood of His cross (Colossians 1:20; 1 Corinthians 2:2), removing the sin barrier between God and men. Peter, during the life of Jesus so full of the current Jewish notion that God accepted the Jews de facto, in his later ministry makes Jesus in His death the one way to God (Acts 4:12; 1 Peter 1:2,18,19; 2:21,24; 3:18).

John has this element so prominent in his Gospel that radical critical opinion questions its authorship partly on that account, while the epistles of John and the Revelation are, on the same ground, attributed to later Greek thought (compare 1 John 1:7; 2:2; 3:5; 4:10; Revelation 1:5; 5:9). The Epistle to the Hebrews finds in Jesus the fulfillment and extension of all the sacrificial system of Judaism and holds that the shedding of blood seems essential to the very idea of remission of sins (9:22; compare 2:17; 7:26 f; 9:24-28).

3. How Shall We Understand the Atonement?

When we come to systematize the teaching concerning the Atonement we find, as in all doctrine, that definite system is not offered us in the New Testament, but all system, if it is to have any value for Christianity, must find its materials and principles in the New Testament. Proceeding in this way some features may be stated positively and finally, while others must be presented interrogatively, recognizing that interpretations may differ.

An initial consideration is that the Atonement originates with God who “was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself” (2 Corinthians 5:19), and whose love gave Jesus to redeem sinful men (John 3:16;
Romans 5:8, etc.). In all atonement in Old Testament and New Testament the initiative is of God who not only devises and reveals the way to reconciliation, but by means of angels, prophets, priests and ultimately His only begotten Son applies the means of atonement and persuades men to accept the proffered reconciliation. Nothing in the speculation concerning the Atonement can be more false to its true nature than making a breach between God and His Christ in their attitude toward sinful men.

(2) It follows that atonement is fundamental in the nature of God in His relations to men, and that redemption is in the heart of God’s dealing in history. The “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (Revelation 13:8 the King James Version and the English Revised Version; compare Revelation 5:5-7) is the interpreter of the seven-sealed book of God’s providence in history. In Jesus we behold the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world (John 1:29).

(3) The question will arise in the analysis of the doctrine: How does the death of Christ save us? No specific answer has ever been generally satisfactory. We have numerous theories of the Atonement. We have already intimated that the answer to this question will depend upon our idea of the nature of God, the nature of sin, the content of salvation, the nature of man, and our idea of Satan and evil spirits. We ought at once to dismiss all merely quantitative and commercial conceptions of exchange of merit. There is no longer any question that the doctrines of imputation, both of Adam’s sin and of Christ’s righteousness, were overwrought and applied by the early theologians with a fatal exclusiveness, without warrant in the Word of God. On the other hand no theory can hold much weight that presupposes that sin is a thing of light consequence in the nature of man and in the economy of God. Unless one is prepared to resist unto blood striving against sin (Hebrews 12:2-4), he cannot know the meaning of the Christ. Again, it may be said that the notion that the death of Christ is to be considered apart from His life, eternal and incarnate life, as the atoning work, is far too narrow to express the teaching of the Bible and far too shallow to meet the demands of an ethical conscience.

It would serve clearness if we reminded ourselves that the question of how in the Atonement may involve various elements. We may inquire:
(a) for the ground on which God may righteously receive the sinner;
(b) for the means by which God places the restoration within the reach of the sinner;
(c) for the influence by which the sinner is persuaded to accept the reconciliation;
(d) for the attitude or exercise of the sinner toward God in Christ wherein he actually enters the state of restored union with God.

The various theories have seemed to be exclusive, or at least mutually antagonistic, largely because they have taken partial views of the whole subject and have emphasized some one feature of the whole content. All serious theories partly express the truth and all together are inadequate fully to declare how the Daystar from on high doth guide our feet into the way of peace (Luke 1:79).

(4) Another question over which theologians have sorely vexed themselves and each other concerns the extent of the Atonement, whether it is available for all men or only for certain particular, elect ones. That controversy may now be passed by. It is no longer possible to read the Bible and suppose that God relates himself sympathetically with only a part of the race. All segregated passages of Scripture formerly employed in support of such a view have now taken their place in the progressive self-interpretation of God to men through Christ who is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2). No man cometh unto the Father but by Him (John 14:6): but whosoever does thus call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved (Joel 2:32; Acts 2:21).

See also ATONEMENT, DAY OF; PROPITIATION; RECONCILIATION; SACRIFICE.
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ATONEMENT, DAY OF

1. THE LEGAL ENACTMENTS.

1. Named:

In addition to the chief passage, Leviticus 16, which is treated under a separate head, we have the following:

In Exodus 30:10 it is mentioned in the directions that are given for the construction of the altar of incense that Aaron, once a year, is to make an atonement on the horns of the altar, with the blood of the sin offering, which is used for the purpose of an atonement for sin.

In Leviticus 23:26-32 mention is made in the list of festivals of the Day of Atonement, on the 10th day of the 7th month. It is ordered that for this day there shall be a holy convocation at the sanctuary, a fast, an offering by fire, and rest from labor from the 9th day of the 7th month in the evening.

According to Leviticus 25:9 the year of jubilee begins with the Day of Atonement.

Numbers 18 speaks of the duties and the rights of the priests and the Levites. In contrast with the latter, according to 18:7, Aaron and his sons are to perform the duties of the priesthood in all matters pertaining to the
altar and of the service within the veil and shall render this service. We have here doubtless a comprehensive law for the entire priestly order, so that from this alone it cannot be determined that the service within the veil, by which reference is made to the ceremony of the Day of Atonement, has been reserved for the high priest alone, just as in Deuteronomy 10:8; 33:8 ff, everything that pertains to the whole tribe of Levi is found combined, without thereby the division into high priest, priests and Levites, being regarded as excluded (compare Ezekiel, II, 2, (1), c).

Numbers 29:7-11 contains in connection with the laws treating of sacrifices also the enactment, that on the 10th day of the 7th month there shall take place a holy convocation at the sanctuary, fasting and rest from labor. In addition to the sin offering, which is brought for the purpose of atonement for sin, and in addition to the regular burnt offerings and the accompanying meal offerings and drink offerings, burnt offerings also are to be brought, namely, one young bullock, one young ram, seven lambs of the first year (all without blemish); then meal offerings, namely, three-tenths (compare Numbers 28:12-14) of fine flour mingled with oil for each bullock; two-tenths for each ram; one-tenth for each lamb; then a sin offering, namely, one he-goat.

Ezekiel in his vision of the new temple, of the holy city and the holy country (chapters 40 through 48), in 45:18 ff, gives a series of enactments for the festivals and the sacrifices. According to these, on the 1st day of the 1st month and on the 7th day of the 1st month (on the 1st day of the 7th month according to the Septuagint), the sanctuary is to be cleansed through a young bullock without blemish, the priest taking some of the blood of the sin offering and putting it on the posts of the temple, on the four corners of the altar and on the posts of the gate of the inner court; and this is to be done for the sake of those who perhaps have sinned through error or ignorance. Further, that sacrifice which is to be brought on the Passover by the princes for themselves and all the people of the land (compare 45:22) appears to present a clear analogy to Leviticus 16. As for the rest, Ezekiel 40 through 48 cannot without further consideration be put on the same level with the other legal enactments, but are to be regarded as an ideal scheme, the realization of which is conditioned on the entrance of the wonderful future (compare Ezekiel).
(1) Contents, Structure and Position.

Leviticus 16:1-28 contains instructions given by Yahweh to Moses for his brother Aaron (16:1,2).

(a) Leviticus 16:1-10.

Leviticus 16:1-10 contain presuppositions, preparations and summary statements of the ceremonies on the Day of Atonement. According to 16:1,2, Aaron is not allowed to enter the holy place at any time whatever, lest he may die as did his sons with their unseemly fire offering (compare Leviticus 10:1 ff); 16:3-5 tell what is necessary for the ceremony: For himself four things: a young bullock as a sin offering (compare 16:6,11,14,15,27); a ram for burnt offering (compare 16:24); sacred garments, namely, a linen coat, linen breeches, linen girdle, linen mitre (compare 16:23,32); a bath. For the congregation: two he-goats as a sin offering (compare 16:7 ff,15-22,25,27,28,32,33), a ram as a burnt offering (compare 16:24). The passages in parentheses show how closely the succeeding parts of this account are connected with this introductory part, 16:1-10. In other parts of Leviticus also it is often found that the materials used for the sacrifices are mentioned first, before anything is said in detail of what is to be done with this material. Compare 8:1,2 with 8:6,7 ff,10,14,18,22,26 and 9:2-4 with 9:7,8 ff,12 ff,15-18. In 16:6 Aaron’s sin-offering bullock is to be used as an atonement for himself; 16:7-10 refer to the two goats: they are to be placed at the door of the tent of meeting (16:7); lots are to be cast upon them for Yahweh and Azazel (16:8); the first to be prepared as a sin offering for Yahweh (16:9); the second, in accordance with the law, to be sent into the desert (16:10).

(b) Leviticus 16:11-24.

Leviticus 16:11-24 describe the ceremony itself and give fuller directions as to how the different sacrificial materials mentioned under (a) are to be used by Aaron: 16:11-14 speak of the atonement for Aaron and his house; 16:11, of his sin-offering bullock to be killed; 16:12, of burning coal from the altar and two handfuls of sweet incense beaten small to be placed behind the veil; 16:13, of the cloud of incense to be made in the Holy of
Holies, so that the top covering is hidden and Aaron is protected from the danger of death; 16:14, of some of the blood to be sprinkled once on the front of the top covering and seven times in front of it. Leviticus 16:15-19 prescribe the ceremony with the first sin-offering goat for the congregation: in 16:15,16a, the ceremony described in 16:14 is directed also to be carried out with the goat, as an atonement for the inner sanctuary, cleansing it from blemishes; in 16:16b the same thing is directed to be done in regard to the tabernacle of revelation, i.e. the holy place, in 16:17, no one is permitted to be present even in the holy place when these ceremonies take place; in 16:18,19, the altar too is directed to be cleansed by an atonement, some of the blood of both sin-offering animals being smeared on the horns and sprinkled seven times on the ground. Leviticus 16:20-22 prescribe the ceremony with the second sin-offering goat for the congregation: 16:20 directs it to be brought there; in 16:21 there takes place the transfer of guilt; Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the goat; shall confess all guilt over him; shall lay them upon the head of the goat; shall through a man send him into the desert; in 16:22a, the goat carries the guilt into an uninhabited land; in 16:22b, he is not to be let go until he is in the desert. Leviticus 16:23,24, the concluding act: in 16:23a, Aaron takes off his linen garments in the tent of meeting, and in 16:23b puts them down there; in 16:24a, he bathes in the holy place and again puts on his usual clothing; in 16:24b he brings the burnt offering for himself and his people. (The statement `for himself and his people’ at this place concludes the ritual as such.)

(c) Leviticus 16:25-28.

Leviticus 16:25-28 are explanatory, with three additional directions. In 16:25, the fat of the sin offering is directed to be consumed into smoke on the altar; 16:26, he who has taken away the second goat must wash his clothes and bathe himself, and only then is he permitted to enter the camp; 16:27, the fat, flesh and dung of the sin-offering animal, and then the blood that was brought into the (inner) sanctuary, are to be burned outside of the camp; 16:28, he who has burned these must wash his clothes, and must bathe, and only after this can he enter the camp. (In this case 16:25 and 27 correspond, and also 16:26 and 28; and in addition 16:26,27,28 are united by their reference to the camp.)
Leviticus 16:29-34: Over against these sections (a) — (c) (16:1-28), which contain the instructions for the high priest, we have a fourth (16:29-34), which already through the address in the second person plural and also by its contents is intended for the congregation. In 16:29-31, the demand is made of the congregation. As in Leviticus 23:26 ff; Numbers 29:7 ff, a fast and absolute rest are prescribed for the 10th day of the 7th month as the Day of Atonement; in Leviticus 16:32-34, a number of directions are given in a summary to the congregation on the basis of 16:1 ff, namely, 16:32, how the atonement is to take place: the priest who is anointed; he shall be consecrated; that he perform the service in his father’s place; in his linen garments; 16:33 prescribes when and for whom the atonement is to take place: for the holy of holies; for the holy place; for the altar; for the order of priests and all the people; in 16:34, the one Day of Atonement in the year for all sins is declared to be an everlasting statute. The statement that Aaron (16:2), according to Yahweh’s command, did as Moses directed aptly closes the whole chapter.

**Use of Number Four**

The number four appears to occupy a predominating place in this chapter, as the bird’s-eye view above already shows, and as this can be traced still further in the details of the accounts. But even if this significance of the number four in the division of the chapter is accidental, although this number appears almost as a matter of course, and in Exodus 35:4 through 40:38, in Genesis 12 through 25, in the story of Abraham, Leviticus 11 through 15, and Deuteronomy 12 through 26 naturally fall into four pericopes with four subdivisions, yet this chapter is, as far as contents are concerned, so closely connected, and so well organized as a whole, that all attempts to ascribe it to different sources, concerning which we shall speak immediately, must come to naught in view of this fact.

**Place in Leviticus**

At this point we first of all draw attention to the fact that Leviticus 16 has its well-established place in the whole of the Book of Leviticus (compare LEVITICUS). The whole book has as its purpose to regulate the dealings
of the Israelites with their God, and it does this in such a way that the first part (Leviticus 1 through 17) removes the hindrances that have been caused by sin. In this the ordinances with reference to the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16), and with reference to the significance of the blood (Leviticus 17), constitute a natural acme and excellent conclusion, while this prepares for the positive sanctification, which is discussed in Leviticus 18 ff. In 15:31 we find in addition a clear transition to the thoughts of Leviticus 16, for in this passage mention is made of the uncleanness of the Israelites, which contaminates the dwelling-place of Yahweh that is in their midst.

(2) Modern Attempts to Disprove Unity of Chapter.

A large number of attempts have been made to destroy the unity of this chapter, which has been demonstrated in division (1) above. Thus Stade separates Leviticus 16:3-10 as the original kernel from the explanatory and changing details that were added in 16:11-28. But we have already seen that 16:3-10 are the preparation for all that follows, so that these verses demand 16:11 ff as a necessary complement. Again Oort separates 16:1-4, 11b, 14, 16, 18a, 19, 23, 24a, 25a, 29a from the rest, by using the purification of the sanctuary and the atonement of the people as the measure for this separation; but above all it is proved by Ezekiel 45:18-20 that just these two thoughts are inseparably united. In recent times it has become the custom, following the leadership of Benzinger, to divide the text into three parts. Baentsch divides as follows:

(a) Leviticus 16:1-4, 6, 12 f, 34b contain a single pericope, which on the basis of the fate of the sons of Aaron, described in Leviticus 10, determines under what circumstances Aaron alone is permitted to enter the Holy of Holies;

(b) Leviticus 16:29-34a contain “an older, relatively simpler law in reference to the yearly day of penitence and atonement”;

(c) 16:5, 7-10, 11, 14-28 are a “later enlargement of this ritual, with a more complicated blood rite,” and above all with “the rite of the sin goat.”

Of these three pieces only
(a) is thought to belong to the original Priest Codex, as proved especially by its reference back to Leviticus 10;

(b) is regarded as belonging to the secondary parts, because the day of repentance is not yet mentioned in Nehemiah 8 ff; compare III, 1; at any rate the anointing of all the priests is there not yet presupposed (compare LEVITICUS);

(c), however, is declared to be very late and its separate parts are regarded as having originated only after the others (thus recently also Bertholet).

It is impossible here to enter into all the minor parts eliminated by the exegetes; and in the same way we do not intend in our examination to enter into all the incorrect views found in these criticisms. We confine ourselves to the chief matter. The very foundation of the criticism is wrong. What Aaron’s sons experienced according to Leviticus 10 could very easily have furnished a connecting link for that ritual which is introduced in Leviticus 16:2 ff, but could never have furnished the occasion for the composition of the pericope described above (a); for Nadab and Abihu had not entered into the Holy of Holies at all. Just as little justifiable is the conclusion drawn from chapter 10, that chapter 16 originally followed immediately on chapter 10. For who could possibly have conceived the thought of inserting chapters 11 through 15 in an altogether unsuitable place between chapters 10 and 16 and thus have split asunder a connection so transparent? In general, the different attempts to break the unity of this chapter show how subjective and arbitrary these attempts are. They are a characteristic example of the manner in which the Priest Codex is now being further divided (compare LEVITICUS). In general, sufficient material for the positive refutation of such attempts has been given above.

2. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

1. The Significance for Israel:

The significance of the day is expressed in the name “Day of Atonement” [Yom ha-kippurim]: Leviticus 23:27 f; 25:9) in the same manner as it is in the fast which was enjoined on the congregation as a sign of sorrow for their sins (this fasting being the only one enjoined by the law: Leviticus
16:29,31; 23:26 ff; Numbers 29:7 ff), as also finally and chiefly in the entire ritual (Exodus 30:10; Leviticus 23:28; Numbers 29:11; Leviticus 16; compare also Ezekiel 18:20,22). Then, too, the atonement takes place for the sanctuary which has been defiled by the contamination of the Israelites (Exodus 30:10; Leviticus 16:16-20,33; compare also Ezekiel 45:18-20). In particular, mention is made of the Holy of Holies (Leviticus 16:33, called [Miqdash ha-qodhesh]; otherwise in Leviticus regularly [ha-qodhesh]), then of the holy place (16:16b,20,33), and then of the altar (16:18,20,33). In the last-mentioned case it is a matter of discussion whether the altar of incense is meant, as is claimed by Jewish tradition, on the basis of Exodus 30:10, or the altar of burnt offerings, for which reference could be made to the additional statements in Leviticus 16:18, to those of 16:16, and to the conclusion in 16:17. The altar of incense (Exodus 30:10) would then be included in the atonement of the tent of meeting. The somewhat remarkable position of 16:17b would then at the same time find its motive in this, that, while 16:6 and 11b mention an atonement only for Aaron and his house, the atonement of the Holy of Holies and of the holy place in 16:17 is for Aaron, his house, and the whole congregation, while the atonement of the burnt-offering altar in the forecourt (16:18) would be intended only for the sins of the congregation. The atonement, however, takes place for all the transgressions of the congregation since the last Day of Atonement (compare 16:21 f,30,34). In reference to the significance of what is done with the second goat of sin offering, compare 16:8 ff,20 ff, and AZAZEL, II, 1. In this way Delitzsch has correctly called the Day of Atonement “the Good Friday of the Old Testament.” How deeply the consciousness of sin must have been awakened, if the many otherwise commanded private and congregational sacrifices did not make such an institution superfluous, and if even the high priest himself stood before God as a sinner (16:6,11 ff). On this day, with the exception of the mitre, he does not wear the insignia of his high-priestly office, but wears white garments, which in their simplicity correspond to the earnestness of the situation. The repetition of the bath, both in his case and in that of the other persons engaged in the ceremony (16:4,24,26,28), was necessary, because the mere washing of the hands and feet (Exodus 30:19 f) would not suffice on this occasion (compare Numbers 19:7 ff,19,21). The flesh of the sin-offering animals was not permitted to be eaten but had to be burned (16:27) because it was
sacrificed also for Aaron’s sin, and its blood was carried not only into the holy place but also into the Holy of Holies (compare 16:27 with Leviticus 6:23; 4:11 f,21; Exodus 29:14; Leviticus 8:17; 9:11; 10:19). And in comparison with the consciousness of sin that had been aroused, how great must on the other hand God’s grace appear, when once in each year a general remission of all the sins that had been forgiven was guaranteed.

2. Significance from a Christian Standpoint:

“The Day of Atonement, the good Friday of the Old Testament” — these words express not only the highest significance of the day but also its limitations. As the tabernacle, the sacrificial system, the entire law, thus too the Day of Atonement in particular contained only the shadow of future good things, but not these things themselves (Hebrews 10:1), and is “like in pattern to the true” (Hebrews 9:24). Christ Himself entered into the holy place, which was not made with hands, namely, into heaven itself, and has now appeared before God, by once for all giving Himself as a sacrifice for the removal of sin (Hebrews 9:23 ff). By this act the purpose of the Old Testament sacrificial cult and its highest development, namely, the Day of Atonement, understood in its typical significance, has been fulfilled, and at the same time surpassed and thereby abrogated (compare Leviticus). Accordingly, our hope, too, like an anchor — (Hebrews 6:19), penetrates to the inner part of the veil in the higher sense of the term, i.e. to heaven.

3. ON THE HISTORY OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

1. The Long Silence of History:

(1) The Facts and the False Conclusions.

The Day of Atonement is stated to have been instituted in the times of Moses (Leviticus 16:1); the ceremony takes place in the tabernacle (tent of meeting); the people are presupposed to be in the camp (Leviticus 16:26 ff); Aaron is still the high priest. Very remarkably there is but little evidence of the observance of this prominent day in the later history of Israel. Down to the time of the Exile there is found a deep silence on this subject. The days of atonement in Ezekiel 45:18 ff (compare under I, 1)
differ in number and observance from that in Leviticus 16. According to Zechariah 3:9, God in the Messianic future will take away the guilt of the land in a single day; but this too presents no more than an analogy to the results of the Day of Atonement. On the other hand, there is no reference made to the day where we could expect it. Not only in connection with the consecration of Solomon’s temple, and Ezra 3:1-6, in the account of the reintroduction of the sacrificial services after the return from the Exile, are silent on the subject, which fact could possibly be explained in an easy manner; but also Nehemiah 8 f. According to 8:2 f, Ezra begins on the 1st day of the 7th month in the year 444 BC to read from the law; on the 2nd day of the 7th month remembrance is made of the ordinance treating of the feast of tabernacles, and on the 22nd day of the 7th month (Nehemiah 8:13 ff), this festival is observed; on the 24th day of the 7th month a day of penance is observed (Nehemiah 9:1); but of the Day of Atonement coming in between Nehemiah 8:1 and chapter 9:1, namely, on the 10th day of the 7th month, which would seem to make the day of penance superfluous, nothing is said. From these facts the Wellhausen school has drawn the conclusion, in accordance with its principles elsewhere observed, that all those legal enactments that have not in the history a sufficient evidence of having been observed, did not exist until the time when they have such historical evidence; that therefore the Day of Atonement did not originate until after the year 444 BC. It is claimed that the day originated in the two days of atonement mentioned in Ezekiel 45:18-20 (compare under I, 1); in the four national fast days of Zechariah 7:5, and 8:19, and in the day of penance of 444 BC, just mentioned, on the 24th day of the 7th month, which is said to have been repeated on the following New Year’s day, the 10th day of the 7th month; and that by the sacred character of its observance it soon crowded the New Year day upon the 1st day of the 7th month (compare Leviticus 23:23 ff; Numbers 29:1 ff; contrary to Leviticus 25:9 and Ezekiel 40:1). In this way it is thought that Leviticus 16:29 ff first originated, and that at a still later time the complicated blood ritual had been added (compare under I, 1, 2). But it is to be observed that in still later times there is found no more frequent mention of the Day of Atonement than in the earlier, although it is the custom of modern criticism to place a much larger bulk of Biblical literature into this later period. It is only when we come to Jesus Sirach (Ecclesiasticus 50:5 ff) that the high priest Simon is praised, when
he came forth from behind the veil; and this is certainly a reference to the Day of Atonement, although no further mention is made at this place of the ceremony as such. Then there is a further silence on the subject down to Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews (6:19; 9:7,13 ff; 10:1 ff; compare under II, 2). It is probable too that the fasting mentioned in Acts 27:9 is based on the Day of Atonement. We have in this manner a characteristic example to show how carefully we must handle the argument from silence, if we do not want to arrive at uncomfortable results.

(2) The Historicity of the Day of Atonement.

Since Leviticus 16 constitutes only one part of the Levitical legislation, the question as to the original and historical character of the day cannot be fully discussed at this place (see LEVITICUS). At so late a period, naturally all the data that would lead to an explanation of the origin of such a fundamental institution as the Day of Atonement are lacking. It is all the more impossible to separate Leviticus 16 from the other priestly ordinances, because the name of the lid of the ark of covenant [hakapporeth]: Exodus 25:17 ff; 26:34) stands in the clearest relation to the ceremony that takes place with this ark on the Day of Atonement. The impossibility of splitting up Leviticus 16 as is the manner of critics, or even as much as separating it from Leviticus 11 through 15, has been sufficiently demonstrated above (compare under I). Against the view which forces the Priest Codex down at least to the Exile and to claim the tabernacle as the product of imagination and as a copy of the temple of Solomon (see EXODUS), we have still the following to add: If the ark of the covenant was no longer in existence after the Exile and if, according to Jeremiah 3:16, the Israelites no longer expected its restoration, then it would have been absolutely impossible in the ritual of the Day of Atonement to connect the most important ceremony of this ritual with this ark and on this to base the atonement. In the second temple, as is well known, the incense pan was placed on the “foundation stone” in the Holy of Holies, because there was no tabernacle. Against these facts the counter-arguments mentioned above cannot stand. Even those who deny the existence of the Day of Atonement do not lay much stress on 2 Chronicles 7:1-9 and Ezra 3:1-6; but Nehemiah 8 ff also does not deserve mention, since in this place the emphasis lies on the purpose of showing how the congregation was to declare its adherence to the law, and
how the Day of Repentance, which had been observed since the beginning of the history of Israel, was instituted to be observed on the 24th day of the 7th month for all sins (9:1 ff), and was not made superfluous by the celebration of the Day of Atonement on the 10th day of the 7th month, on which day only the sins of the last year were taken into consideration. But Ezekiel changed or ignored also other pre-exilic arrangements (compare Ezekiel), so that he is no authority in deciding the question as to the earlier existence of the Day of Atonement. Finally, attention must be drawn to the fact that the Passover festival is mentioned in prophetic literature, in addition to the mere reference in Isaiah 30:29, only in Ezekiel 45:21; the ark of the covenant only in Jeremiah 3:16; the Feast of Tabernacles only in Hosea 12:9; Ezekiel 45:25; and that in its historical connection the Feast of Weeks is mentioned incidentally only in 2 Chronicles 8:13, and possibly in 1 Kings 9:25, and is not at all found in Ezekiel (compare 45:18 ff), although the existence of these institutions has for a very long time been called into question.

2. Further Development:

The Day of Atonement, in accordance with its purpose in later times, came more and more into the foreground and was called “the great fast” or “the great day,” or merely “the day.” Its ritual was further enlarged and the special parts mentioned in the law were fully explained, fixed and specialized. Compare especially the tract “Yoma” in the Mish; and for the further elaborations and stories in poetry and prose on the basis of the Talmud, see, e.g. Delitzsch’s translation from Maim, [Ha-yadh ha-chazaqah], in the supplement to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1857. According to these accounts, e.g. the high priest had to be a married man. Already seven days before the beginning of the Day of Atonement he was ordered to leave his house and had to submit to a series of purifications and had to practice for the performance of the different purification ceremonies, some of which were difficult. The last night he was not allowed to sleep and had to spend his time in studying the sacred writings. On the Day of Atonement he took five baths and ten washings. Four times he enters the Holy of Holies (with the incense), with the blood of both sin offerings, and when he brings out the utensils used with the incense he makes three confessions of sins (for himself, for himself and his house, for Israel); 10 times in all he utters the name of Yahweh; 43 times
he sprinkles; in addition he must read certain sections of the Scriptures or repeat them from memory (compare also *AZAZEL*). When he returns home he celebrates a festival of rejoicing, because he has without harm been able to leave the sanctuary. In addition, he had performed severe physical work, and especially difficult was the manipulation of the incense. The modern estimate put on the Day of Atonement appears from the following citation of Wellhausen: “The rite and the sacrifice through the unfavorable circumstances of the times have disappeared; but it has retained the same sacred character. He who has not yet entirely broken with Judaism observes this day, no matter how indifferent he may be otherwise to old customs and festivals.”

*Wilhelm Moller*

**ATROTH-BETH-JOAB**


**ATROTH-SHOPHAN**

<at’-roth-sho’fan> בְּתֶרֶח שוֹפָן [כ’Troth shophan]; Septuagint [γῆν σωφάν, gen sophan]: A town built or fortified by the children of Gad East of the Jordan (<Numbers 32:35>), named next to Aroer. If it had been at Khirbet `Attarus or Jebel `Attarus (HDB and EB, under the word) Aroer would hardly have been named between them. The King James Version reads Atroth, Shophah, understanding that two places are named. No identification is yet possible.

**ATTAI**

<at’-ta-i> <at’-i> יָתָי [כ’attay], “timely?”):

(1) A son of Jarha, the Egyptian, by a daughter of Sheshan (<1 Chronicles 2:35 f>).

(2) A Gadite soldier who joined David’s army at Ziklag (<1 Chronicles 12:11>).
(3) A son of Rehoboam and grandson of Solomon (2 Chronicles 11:20).

**ATTAIN**

<a-tan’>: The rendering of נָכָה [qanah] = “buy,” “get” (Proverbs 1:5); נָסָח [nasagh]= “reach,” “a meal-offering .... according as he is able” (Ezekiel 46:7 margin), “not attained unto the days” (Genesis 47:9); יָכֹּל [yakhol] or יָכֹהֶל [yakhowl] = “be able,” “overcome,” “attain to innocency” (Hosea 8:5); בּוֹ [bo’] = “come,” “follow” (2 Samuel 23:19,23; 1 Chronicles 11:21,25); καταντάω, katantao=“arrive at” (Acts 27:12 the King James Version; Philippians 3:11); καταλαμβάνω, katalambano] =“take eagerly,” “seize,” “apprehend,” “attained to righteousness” (Romans 9:30); φθάνω, phthano] =“have arrived at” (Romans 9:31 the King James Version; Philippians 3:16); λαμβάνω, lambano] -“take,” “get a hold of,” “catch,” the Revised Version (British and American) “already obtained” (Philippians 3:12); παρακολουθέω, parakoloutheo] = “follow,” “trace out,” “conform to” (1 Timothy 4:6). Here the Revised Version (British and American) corrects the King James Version.

Frank E. Hirsch

**ATTALIA**

<at-a-li’-a> [’Ατταλία, Attalia]: A city on the southern coast of Asia Minor in ancient Pamphylia which, according to Acts 14:25, was visited by Paul and Barnabas on the way to Antioch during their first missionary journey. The city was founded by Attalus II Philadelphus (159-138 BC), hence, its name Attalia, which during the Middle Ages was corrupted to Satalia; its modern name is Adalia. Attalia stood on a flat terrace of limestone, about 120 ft. high, near the point where the Catarrhactes River flowed into the sea. The river now, however, has practically disappeared, for the greater part of its water is turned into the fields for irrigation purposes. The early city did not enjoy the ecclesiastical importance of the neighboring city of Perga; but in 1084 when Perga declined, Attalia became a metropolis. In 1148 the troops of Louis IV sailed from there to Syria; in 1214 the Seljuks restored the city walls, and erected several public
buildings. The city continued to be the chief port for ships from Syria and Egypt, and the point of entry to the interior until modern times, when the harbor at Mersine was reopened; it has now become a place of little importance.

The town possesses considerable which is of archaeological interest. The outer harbor was protected by ancient walls and towers now in ruins; its entrance was closed with a chain. The inner harbor was but a recess in the cliff. The city was surrounded by two walls which were constructed at various times from material taken from the ruins of the ancient city; the outer wall was protected by a moat. The modern town, lying partly within and partly without the walls is thus divided into quarters. In the southern quarter live the Christians; in the northern the Moslems. Among other objects of archaeological interest still to be seen may be mentioned the inscribed arched gateway of Hadrian and the aqueduct. Rich gardens now surround the town; the chief exports are grain, cotton, licorice root and valonia or acorn-cups.

E. J. Banks

ATTALUS

<at’-a-lus>: King of Pergamum, mentioned in 1 Macc 15:22 among the kings to whom was sent an edict (Ant., XIV, viii, 5) from Rome forbidding the persecution of the Jews.

See ATTALIA.

ATTEND; ATTENDANCE

<a-tend’>; <a-tend’-ans>:

(1) “To incline,” “listen,” “regard” בקשת [qashabha]; ℊ Psalm 17:1 etc.); then, in the King James Version, “observe,” but in the Revised Version (British and American), more frequently, “give heed” προσέχειν νοῦν, prosechein noun, as in ℊ 1 Timothy 4:13.

(2) “To be with,” “take care of,” “wait upon” (Est 4:5; הָעִדָּה Hebrews 7:13; Romans 13:6); literally, “give unremitting care to,” as in ℊ 1
Corinthians 7:35 (Luther: “serve the Lord constantly and without hindrance”).

**ATTENT; ATTENTIVE**

*a-tent’* (archaic; *2* Chronicles 6:40); *a-tent’-iv*: Expresses the direction of thought and interest toward some one point. Same Hebrew word as “attend,” and is used particularly in prayers (*Psalm* 130:2; *Nehemiah* 1:6). “Very attentive” (*Luke* 19:48) is a paraphrase for what is literally rendered in the Revised Version (British and American), “the people all hung upon him, listening” [*exekremeto*].

**ATTHARATES**

*a-thar’-a-tez*: A title assigned to Nehemiah, probably by a later editor (*Nehemiah* 8:9). The Septuagint omits the title; the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) gives “Atharsatha”; the King James Version reads “Nehemiah, which is the Tirshatha.” Tirshatha is the Persian title for a local or provincial governor (*Nehemiah* 8:9 = 1 Esdras 9:49).

*See TIRSHATHA.*

**ATTHARIAS; ATHARIAS**

*a-tha-ri’as*: 1 Esdras 5:40 = *Ezra* 2:63.

*See TIRSHATHA.*

**ATTIRE; DYED ATTIRE**

*a-tir’*: “Can a virgin forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire?” asks the prophet Jeremiah in hot remonstrance against Israel’s unfaithfulness. “Yet,” saith Yahweh, “my people have forgotten me” (2:32). “And I saw that she was defiled,” cries Ezekiel against Jerusalem; “she saw men ... girded with girdles upon their loins, with flowing turbans [AV exceeding in dyed attire] upon their heads, ..... after the likeness of the Babylonians in Chaldea, ..... and ..... she doted upon them ..... (“Ezekiel 23:13-16). “And, behold, there met him,” says the author of Proverbs (*Proverbs* 7:10) in his description of the “strange woman,” that “lieth in wait at every street corner,” “a woman with the attire of a harlot, and wily of heart,” whose
“house is the way to Sheol” (Proverbs 7:27). These passages show how diversely and elastically the term “attire” was used among the Hebrews. The numerous synonyms for “dress,” “attire,” “apparel,” “clothes,” “raiment,” “garment,” etc., found in English Versions of the Bible, reflect a similar wealth of nomenclature in the original Hebrew and Greek; but the lack of exactness and consistency in the renderings of translators makes the identification of the various articles of dress referred to very difficult, sometimes impossible.

*See DRESS.*

George B. Eager

**ATTITUDES**

<at’-i-tuds>: Customs change slowly in Bible lands. This becomes clear by a comparison of the many references found in the Bible and other literatures of the Orient with existing circumstances and conditions. The same fact is attested by the pictures illustrating daily life upon the monuments of Assyria, Babylonia and Egypt in the countries between the Nile and the Tigris. Many of these, dating back to the second or third millennium before our era, prove conclusively that the same practices and usages as are now common among the inhabitants of those lands were in vogue in the days of Hammurabi and the early rulers of Egypt. This is especially true of matters pertaining to the worship of the gods, and of the attitudes or positions assumed in homage and respect to monarchs and those in authority.

The many references found in the Bible to these same usages prove that the Hebrews too had much in common with the nations around them, not only in creed, but also in the mode of worship, as well as in general everyday etiquette. This is not strange, at least among the Semitic peoples, for there is more or less agreement, even among all nations, ancient and modern, in the attitude of the worshipper in temple and high place.

The outward tokens of respect and honor shown by Orientals to their superiors, above all to monarchs, may seem exaggerated. But when we consider that the king was God’s vicegerent upon the earth or over a certain country, and in some sense Divine, worthy even of adoration, it is
not strange that almost equal homage should be paid him as the gods themselves. The higher the person was in power, the greater the honor and respect shown him. It is natural, therefore, that God, the Lord of Lords, and the King of Kings should be the recipient of the highest reverence and adoration.

There are several Hebrew words used to describe the various attitudes assumed by those who worshipped Yahweh and heathen gods; these same words are constantly employed in speaking of the homage or respect paid to rulers and persons in authority. The most common terms are those rendered “to stand,” “to bow,” “to kneel” and “prostrate oneself” or “fall on the face.” It is not always easy to differentiate between them, for often one passes imperceptibly into the other. No doubt several attitudes were assumed by the worshipper or suppliant while offering a prayer or petition. The intensity, the ardor or earnestness with which such a petition or prayer was presented would naturally have much to do with the words and posture of the petitioner, though the same expression might be employed to designate his posture or attitude. Thus “to fall on the face” might be done in many different ways. The Moslems observe a regular course of nine or more different postures in their worship. These are more or less faithfully observed by the faithful everywhere. It is almost certain that the Hebrews in common with other Orientals observed and went through almost every one of these attitudes as they presented themselves in prayer to Yahweh. We shall call attention to just four postures:

1. **STANDING:**

   This was one of the very common postures in prayer to God, especially in public worship. It is still customary to stand either erect or with slightly bowed head while offering the public prayers in the synagogue. This is likewise the common practice of a large number of Christians in this and other lands, and no doubt such a posture is sanctioned by the example of
the early church and primitive Christians, who, in turn, adopted the usages of the Jewish church. The same practice was in vogue among the Persians, Egyptians and Babylonians and other ancient people as is evidenced by their sculptures and paintings. The famous stela of Hammurabi shows this great king in a standing position as he receives the famous Code from the sun-god. There are numerous Babylonian and Assyrian seals on which are pictured a priest in a standing position before the throne of Sin or Shamash. In this attitude with uplifted hands, he is sometimes accompanied by the person in whose behalf prayers are made. A beautiful rock sculpture at Ibriz, Southeast of Eregli in Lycaonia, shows us a king or satrap in a standing position, worshipping a local Baal. E. J. Davies, the discoverer of this Hittite monument, in describing it, makes this remark, which we cannot refrain from inserting, inasmuch as it gives another proof of the unchangeable East. He says: “He (the god) wears boots turned up in front, and bound round the leg above the ankle by thongs and a piece of leather reaching half-way up the shin, exactly as it is worn to this day by the peasants of the plain of Cilicia round Adana.” King Solomon, during at least a portion of his prayer at the dedication of the temple, stood before the altar with his hands stretched out toward heaven (1 Kings 8:22). Numerous allusions to prayer in the New Testament prove that standing was the common posture (Matthew 6:5; Mark 11:25; Luke 18:11).

What has been said about standing while praying to God is true also of the attitude of the petitioner when paying homage or making an entreaty to man. The Assyrian and Babylonian monuments are full of evidence on this point; we shall give only one illustration: One of the sculptures describing the siege of Lachish by Sennacherib represents the monarch as seated upon his throne while the conquered stand or kneel before him. Joseph stood before Pharaoh (Genesis 41:46). Solomon’s advisers stood before him (2 Chronicles 10:6) and so did those of Rehoboam (2 Chronicles 10:8). The same attitude was assumed by suppliants in the Persian court (Est 5:2; 8:4). The same is true of Babylonia (Daniel 1:19; 2:2).

2. KNEELING:

Though standing seems to have been the usual attitude, it is quite certain that kneeling was common at all times. The monuments afford abundant proof for this statement; so too the many references in the Bible. Solomon
not only stood before the altar on the occasion of dedicating his famous temple, but he also knelt (1 Kings 8:54; 2 Chronicles 6:13). Josephus, describing this ceremony, says that the king at the conclusion of his prayer prostrated himself on the ground and in this posture continued worshipping for a long time. Ezra fell upon his knees as he addressed Yahweh in prayer (Ezra 9:5). Daniel, too, knelt upon his knees and prayed three times a day (Daniel 6:10). The same practice was observed by the apostles and the early church; for we read that Stephen (Acts 7:60), Peter (Acts 9:40), Paul (Acts 20:36) and others (Acts 21:5) assumed this posture as they prayed.

3. BOWING:

As already stated, it is not always easy to determine the exact posture of those described as kneeling or bowing, for this varied with the temperament of the suppliant and the intensity of his prayer or supplication. Eleazer when sent to select a wife for his master, Isaac, bowed before Yahweh (Genesis 24:26). The Hebrews on leaving Egypt were commanded to bow to Yahweh (Exodus 11:8; 12:27,28). The injunction of the Psalmist shows the prevalence of this posture in prayer: “O come, let us worship and bow down” (Psalm 95:6). Isaiah refers to the same when he says: “Every knee shall bow” to God (Isaiah 45:23). Paul also bowed his knees to the Father (Ephesians 3:14). The same practice obtained among the heathen nations as they worshipped their gods or idols. Naaman bowed before Rimmon, his god. The numerous prohibitions in the Hebrew Scriptures against bowing down at the shrines of the nations around Israel prove the prevalence of this method of adoration. Indeed, one of the ten commandments is directed explicitly against bowing to or worshipping idols (Exodus 20:5). The same prohibition was often repeated, as by Joshua (23:7) and the author of 2 Kings (17:35). Unfortunately, Israel did transgress in this very thing, for while still in the Wilderness they bowed down to the gods of Moab (Numbers 25:2) and again after their settlement in Canaan (Judges 2:12). Amaziah bowed down to the gods of Edom (2 Chronicles 25:14).

Like deference was also shown to angels or supernatural beings. Thus, Abraham bows to the three angels as they appear to him at Mamre (Genesis 18:2). And so did Lot at Sodom (Genesis 19:1). Joshua fell
on his face before the prince of the host of Yahweh (Joshua 5:14). This attitude was a common one to Ezekiel as he saw his wonderful visions (Ezekiel 1:28; 3:23, and often). Daniel when he saw Gabriel in a vision was afraid and fell upon his face (Daniel 8:17). The three disciples had the same experience on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matthew 17:6).

Monarchs and persons of superior rank were the recipients of like honors and marks of respect. Joseph’s brothers bowed as they came into his presence, thinking that he was an Egyptian of high rank (Genesis 43:28). Bathsheba bowed to King David when she entered his presence in the interest of their son Solomon (1 Kings 1:16,31). But such deference was not shown to monarchs only, for Jacob and his household bowed down seven times to the irate Esau (Genesis 33:3 ff). Abigail fell on her face before David as he was marching to avenge himself upon Nabal, her husband (1 Samuel 25:23). David too when he went to meet Jonathan fell on his face to the ground and bowed himself three times (1 Samuel 20:41). The Shunammite woman, as she came to entreat Elisha for the life of her boy, bowed before the prophet (2 Kings 4:37). The same custom prevailed not only among the Persians, as is evident from the Book of Esther and the monuments at Persepolis, but also in Babylonia, Assyria and other countries.

4. PROSTRATION:

This was but a more intense way of showing one’s regard or of emphasizing a petition. It was the token of abject subjection or the deepest reverence. Abraham, when Yahweh appeared to him and promised him a son, with profoundest gratitude and greatest joy fell prostrate on his face (Genesis 17:3). Moses and Aaron were often found in this posture (Numbers 14:5; 16:4,45; 20:6). Elijah, eccentric in many ways, cast himself upon the earth and placed his face between his knees (1 Kings 18:42). Job fell on the ground and worshipped Yahweh (Job 1:20). Such homage was often shown to our Saviour (Mark 5:22; John 11:32), not because men realized that He was God in the flesh, but simply as a mark of respect for a great teacher and miracle-worker. It is to be noticed that our Saviour never refused such homage, but accepted it as pertinent and proper. Did He not realize that honor and worship Divine belonged to Him, He would have refused them just as Peter did when
Cornelius fell down at his feet and worshipped him (Acts 10:25) or as the angel in Revelation 19:10, who said to John, prostrate at his feet, “See thou do it not: I am a fellow servant,” etc.

See ADORATION, III.

W.W. Davies

ATTUS

<at'-us> (1 Esdras 8:29 = Ezra 8:2).

See HATTUSH.

AUDIENCE


AUGIA

<o’-ji-a> [Aυγία, Augia]: The wife of Jaddus, whose sons were removed from priesthood because their names were not found in the register, their ancestors having “usurped the office of the priesthood” (1 Esdras 5:38). Omitted in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7.

AUGURS’ OAK

<o’-gurs’ ok>: If we translated the Hebrew verb ['onen], “to practice augury” (see AUGURY) we should in Judges 9:37 for “the oak of
Meonemmm” render “the augurs’ oak” as in the Revised Version, margin, for the last word is simply the part of the same verb and means “one who practices augury,” though there is some doubt as to the exact connotation of the word. See under *DIVINATION*. The English Versions of the Bible make this noun the name of a place; but no such place is known and the derivation and form of the word are clear and certain. We have a similar phrase similarly misunderstood by our translators in Genesis 12:6 where the “oak of Moreh” should be “the oak” (or “terebinth?”) “of the diviner” or “augur,” for [moreh] is also a part. = “one who teaches” or “directs.” Probably the same tree is meant, since in each case the neighborhood is that of Shechem. The worship of trees, or rather the deity supposed to make them his home, has prevailed very widely. See W. R. Smith, Rel. Semitic.(2), 195; compare Judges 4:5; 2 Samuel 5:24 and “the oak of Zeus at Dodona. “ In Judges 9:6 we read of a “[matstsebhah], oak tree”: the tree with an altar on which sacrifices were offered. The oak trees of Genesis 12:6 and of Judges 9:37, if two distinct trees are meant, would be trees which the Canaanites had been in the habit of consulting: hence, the name.

T. Witton Davies

**AUGURY**

<o’-gu-ri> <o’-gur-i>: This word occurs in the Revised Version (British and American) in Leviticus 19:26, Deuteronomy 18:10,14; 2 Kings 21:6, and the parallel in 2 Chronicles 33:6. In all these cases the verb “practice augury” is in the King James Version “to observe times.” The verb thus translated is לֹאָדָה [‘onen], which means probably to utter a low croaking sound as was done in divining.

See *DIVINATION*.

**I. DEFINITION.**

The derivation of “augur” is doubtful, but that it means strictly to divine from the flight of birds is suggested by its likeliest etymology (avis, gur) and especially from the fact that in early Latin the augur was called auspex (= avi spex). But both words came to be applied to all forms of divining from omens.
2. AUGURY AMONG THE ROMANS.

The Roman augur was a government official, paid to guide the councils of the nation in times of peace and of war. The principal signs from which these augurs deduced their omens were these:

(1) celestial signs, chiefly lightning and thunder, the direction of the former (right to left a good sign, and vice versa);

(2) signs from the flight, cries and feeding of birds;

(3) signs from the movements and audible sounds of animals, including serpents;

(4) signs from the examination of the entrails of animals;

(5) belomancy, or divination by arrows;

(6) sortilege, or divination by lot. Among the Romans as among other nations (Babylonians, etc.), a sacrifice was offered before omens were taken, so as to propitiate the gods.

3. AUGURY AMONG THE GREEKS.

Almost the only kind of divination practiced or even known among the Romans was that by signs or omens, though Cicero (de Div. i.1 f) notices another kind which may be called divining by direct inspiration from the gods. It is this higher and more spiritual mode of divining that obtained most largely among the Greeks, whose chief word for diviner implies this. Yet the lower kind of divination known as augury was to some extent practiced among the Greeks.

4. AUGURY AMONG THE HEBREWS.

In general it may be said that the religion of Israel set itself steadfastly and consistently against augury; a very remarkable fact when one remembers how rife it was among the surrounding peoples — Arabs, Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, etc. Surely there is in this evidence of special Divine guidance, for those ancient Hebrews are not fit to be compared with the Babylonians or Egyptians or Romans for achievements in art and general secular literature. For the attitude of the Old Testament toward
augury see the passages enumerated in the opening of this article. Several kinds of augury are mentioned in the Old Testament, and in some cases without explicit condemnation.

1. Belomancy:
Belomancy was a method of divination by arrows, a number of which were marked in certain ways, then mixed and drawn at random. We have a reference to this in Hosea 4:12: ‘My people ask counsel from their wood [literally, “tree”] and their staff [i.e. “arrow”] tells them (their oracles)’; and also in Ezekiel 21:21: ‘For the king of Babylon .... used divination, shaking the arrows to and fro.’ The first passage shows that belomancy was practiced by Israelites though the prophet condemned it. The second is interesting as showing how the Babylonian used his arrows. It is to be noticed that the prophet Ezekiel records the incident without making any comment on it, favorable or otherwise. He would, however, had he spoken, almost certainly have condemned it. Mohammed forbade this use of arrows as “an abomination of Satan’s work” (Koran, Sur. 5 92).

2. Hydromancy:
Hydromancy, or divination by water, was practiced by Joseph (Genesis 44:3-5) without any censure on the part of the writer. There were among the Romans and other ancient nations, as among modern Arabs, etc., many modes of divining by means of water. Generally a piece of silver or gold or a precious stone was thrown into a vessel containing water: the resulting movements of the water and the figures formed were interpreted according to certain fixed signs. See August., de Civ. Dei, vii.31; Strabo xvi.11.39; Iamblichus, de Myst., iii.4.

3. Sortliege:
Of sortliege, or divination by lot, we have instances in Leviticus 16:8; Matthew 27:35; 1 Chronicles 25:8; Jonah 1:2 ff; Acts 1:26, etc. The Urim and Thummim was simply a case of sortliege, though in this case, as in the cases enumerated above, God was supposed to control the result. A proper translation of 1 Samuel 14:41 f, based on a text corrected according to the Septuagint of Lucian, is the following: “And Saul said, O Lord the God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy
servant this day? If the iniquity be in me or in Jonathan my son, give Urim; and if thou sayest thus, The ......” It iniquity is in the people, give Thummim. seems almost certain that these words refer to two balls put into the high priest’s ephod and drawn by him at random, the one divining one answer, and the other the contrary.

4. Other Methods:

We meet with several other signs. The prophet Elisha directs King Joash to throw two arrows through the window in order to find out whether the king will be victorious or not (2 Kings 13:14-19). If Gideon’s fleece were wet and the ground dry this was to be a sign of coming victory over the Midianites. There is nothing in the narrative disapproving of the course taken (Judges 6:36-40). In 1 Samuel 14:8 ff Jonathan is represented as deciding whether or not he is to attack the Philistines by the words he will hear them speak. See further Genesis 24:12-19; 2 Kings 20:9.

5. Dreams:

Dreams are very commonly mentioned in the Bible as a means of forecasting the future. See Genesis 20:3, 6 f (Abimelech); 31:10-13 (Jacob); 37:5; 40:3 ff (Joseph), and also Judges 7:13; 1 Kings 3:5 f; Matthew 1:20; 2:12 ff; 27:19, etc. The part of the Pentateuch ascribed by Wellhausen, etc., to Elohist abounds with accounts of such significant dreams.

6. Astrology:

That omens were taken from the heavenly bodies by the Babylonians, and other ancient nations is matter of definite knowledge, but it is never countenanced in the Old Testament. Indeed the only explicit reference to it in the Hebrew Scriptures occurs in Isaiah 47:13 where the Exilic author mockingly urges Babylon to turn to her astrologers that they may save her from her threatened doom.

Several cuneiform inscriptions give lists of celestial omens by which Babylonian augurs prognosticated the future. In Matthew 2 the wise men received their first intimation of the birth of the child Jesus from a bright star which they saw in the East.
5. HIGHER CHARACTER OF HEBREW PROPHECY.

Though Old Testament prophecy in its lowest forms has features in common with heathen divination, it stands on an infinitely higher level. The prophet speaks under a strong impulse and from a sense of duty. The heathen diviner plied his calling for money. The Greek *mantis* worked himself into a state of frenzy, thought to imply inspiration, by music and certain drugs. The prophet believed himself directly guided by God.

*See ASTROLOGY, 1; DIVINATION.*

**LITERATURE.**

T. Witton Davies, Magic. Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews, 1898, 72 ff; articles on “Divination” in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) (Jevons); Encyclopedia Biblica (T. Witton Davies), and on “Augury” in Jewish Encyclopedia (Blau), valuable as giving the rabbinical side as well.

*T. Witton Davies*

**AUGUSTAN; AUGUSTUS’ BAND.**

<o-gus’-tan> <o-gus’-tus-izs>

*See ARMY, ROMAN.*

**AUGUSTUS**

<o-gus’-tus> [Αὐγοῦστος, Augoustos]:

(1) The first Roman emperor, and noteworthy in Bible history as the emperor in whose reign the Incarnation took place (<sup>Luke 2:1</sup>). His original name was Caius Octavius Caepias and he was born in 63 BC, the year of Cicero’s consulship. He was the grand-nephew of Julius Caesar, his mother Atia having been the daughter of Julia, Caesar’s younger sister. He was only 19 years of age when Caesar was murdered in the Senate house (44 BC), but with a true instinct of statesmanship he steered his course through the intrigues and dangers of the closing years of the republic, and after the battle of Actium was left without a rival. Some difficulty was experienced in finding a name that would exactly define the
position of the new ruler of the state. He himself declined the names of rex and dictator, and in 27 BC he was by the decree of the Senate styled Augustus. The epithet implied respect and veneration beyond what is bestowed on human things:

“Sancta vocant augusta patres: Augusta vocantur Tempa sacerdotum rite dicata manu.”
— Ovid Fasti. 609; compare Dion Cass., 5316

The Greeks rendered the word by [Σεβαστός, Sebastos], literally, “reverend” (Acts 25:21,25). The name was connected by the Romans with augur — “one consecrated by religion” — and also with the verb augere. In this way it came to form one of the German imperial titles “Mehrer des Reichs” (extender of the empire). The length of the reign of Augustus, extending as it did over 44 years from the battle of Actium (31 BC) to his death (14 AD), doubtless contributed much to the settlement and consolidation of the new regime after the troubled times of the civil wars.

It is chiefly through the connection of Judea and Palestine with the Roman Empire that Augustus comes in contact with early Christianity, or rather with the political and religious life of the Jewish people at the time of the birth of Christ: “Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled” (Luke 2:1). During the reign of Herod the Great the government of Palestine was conducted practically without interference from Rome except, of course, as regarded the exaction of the tribute; but on the death of that astute and capable ruler (4 BC) none of his three sons among whom his kingdom was divided showed the capacity of their father. In the year 6 AD the intervention of Augustus was invited by the Jews themselves to provide a remedy for the incapacity of their ruler, Archelaus, who was deposed by the emperor from the rule of Judea; at the same time, while Caesarea was still the center of the Roman administration, a small Roman garrison was stationed permanently in Jerusalem. The city, however, was left to the control of the Jewish Sanhedrin with complete judicial and executive authority except that the death sentence required confirmation by the Roman procurator. There is no reason to believe that Augustus entertained any specially favorable appreciation of Judaism, but from policy he showed himself favorable to the Jews in Palestine and did
everything to keep them from feeling the pressure of the Roman yoke. To the Jews of the eastern Diaspora he allowed great privileges. It has even been held that his aim was to render them pro-Rom, as a counterpoise in some degree to the pronounced Hellenism of the East; but in the West autonomous bodies of Jews were never allowed (see Mommsen, Provinces of the Roman Empire, chapter 11).

(2) For Augustus in Acts 25:21,25 the King James Version, see EMPEROR.

J. Hutchison

AUL

See AWL.

AUNT

[dodhah, “loving”]: A father’s sister (Exodus 6:20); an uncle’s wife (Leviticus 18:14; 20:20).

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

AUTRANITIS

: Used by Josephus for HAURAN (which see).

AUSTERE

[αὐστηρός, austeros], “harsh,” “rough”): Twice used by Christ in the parable of the Pounds (Luke 19:21,22), and of special significance as illustrating the false conception of God cherished by the sinful and disobedient. The fear resident in a guilty conscience sees only sternness and severity in God’s perfect righteousness. The word may be made an eminent study in the psychology of an evil heart. Wrongdoing eclipses the soul’s vision of God’s love and pictures His righteousness as harsh, unfeeling, partial, unjust, forbidding. The awfulness of sin may thus be seen in its power so to pervert the soul as to make goodness seem evil, justice unjust, and even love unlovely. Compare “hard” [σκληρός,
skleros], “dried up,” “harsh”) in the parable of the Talents (Matthew 25:24).

Dwight M. Pratt

AUTHOR

<o'-ther>: This word is used to translate two Greek words:

(1) [αἴτιος, aitios], literally, “cause,” hence, “author.” Hebrews 5:9, He “became the author of eternal salvation.”

(2) [ἀρχηγός, archegos] = literally, “chief leader,” “prince,” “captain”; then author, originator. It is rendered “author” in the following passages:

(a) Hebrews 12:2, “looking unto Jesus, the author [King James Version, Revised Version] and finisher [Revised Version, “perfecter”] of our faith.” But here it seems better to take archegos in its primary sense, “leader” (Revised Version margin “captain”), rather than in its secondary sense “author.” The meaning is, not that He is the originator of faith in us, but that He Himself is the pioneer in the life of faith. He is first in the company of the faithful (compare references to His “faithfulness,” Hebrews 2:17; 3:2,5,6), far surpassing in His fidelity even the Old Testament saints mentioned in chapter 11; and therefore we are to look to Him as our perfect pattern of faith. Faith has not only Christ for its object, but Christ for its supreme example. So Bengel, Bleek, B. Weiss, Alford, A. B. Davidson, Grimm-Thayer. Others, however, take the word in the sense of “author.”

(b) Hebrews 2:10, “to make the author [King James Version, “captain”] of their salvation perfect through sufferings.” Here the idea of Christ as originator or author of our salvation is present (compare the passage Hebrews 5:9, where however a different word is used; see above). But here again the original meaning of “leader” is not to be lost sight of. He, being the first possessor of salvation, becomes the author of it for others. “The idea that the Son goes before the saved in the same path ought perhaps to be retained” (Davidson). Compare Hebrews 6:20, where Jesus is said to be our “forerunner.”
Acts 3:15, King James Version margin and the Revised Version margin have “author,” where text has “prince.” Here again it is possible that the two ideas are present.
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AUTHORITY IN GENERAL

<o-thor’-i-ti>.

See AUTHORITY IN RELIGION, I.

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

<o-thor’-i-ti> ἐξουσία [rabhah]; ἐξουσία [toqeph]; ἐξουσία, exousia; ἐξουσίαζω, exousiazō; κατεξουσίαζω, katexousiazō; ἐπιταγή, epitage; ὑπεροχή, huperoche; ἀρχηγεῖν, authenteo; δυνάστης, dunastes

1. GENERAL IDEA.

1. Of Two Kinds:

The term is of manifold and ambiguous meaning. The various ideas of authority fall into two main classes: as external or public tribunal or standard, which therefore in the nature of the case can only apply to the outward expressions of religion; and as immanent principle which governs the most secret movements of the soul’s life.

(1) External.

A characteristic instance of the former idea of authority is found in A. J. Balfour’s Foundations of Belief: “Authority as I have been using the term is in all cases contrasted with reason, and stands for that group of non-rational causes, moral, social and educational, which produces its results by psychic processes other than reasoning” (p. 232, 8th edition). The bulk of men’s important beliefs are produced and authorized by “custom, education, public opinion, the contagious convictions of countrymen, family, party or church” (p. 226). Authority and reason are “rival claimants” (p. 243). “Authority as such is, from the nature of the case, dumb in the presence of argument” (p. 234). Newman makes a kindred
distinction between authority in revealed religion and conscience in natural religion, although he does not assign as wide a sphere to authority, and he allows to conscience a kind of authority. “The supremacy of conscience is the essence of natural religion, the supremacy of apostle or pope or church or bishop is the essence of revealed; and when such external authority is taken away, the mind falls back again of necessity upon that inward guide which it possessed even before revelation was vouchsafed” (Development of Doctrine, 86, edition 1878). From a very different standpoint the same antithesis appears in the very title of Sabatier’s book, The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit. He knows both kinds of authority. “The authority of material force, of custom, tradition, the code, more and more yields place to the inward authority of conscience and reason, and in the same measure becomes transformed for the subject into a true autonomy” (p. xxxiii, English Translation).

(2) Internal.

Martineau distinguishes the two types of authority to reject the former and accept the latter. “The mere resort to testimony for information beyond our province does not fill the meaning of `authority’; which we never acknowledge till that which speaks to us from another and a higher strikes home and wakes the echoes in ourselves, and is thereby instantly transferred from external attestation to self-evidence. And this response it is which makes the moral intuitions, started by outward appeal, reflected back by inward veneration, more than egoistic phenomena, and turning them into corresponsendency between the universal and the individual mind, invests them with true authority” (Seat of Authority, Preface, edition 1890).

Confusion would disappear if the fact were recognized that for different persons, and even for the same persons at different times, authority means different things. For a child his father’s or his teacher’s word is a decree of absolute authority. He accepts its truth and recognizes his obligation to allow it to determine his conduct. But when reason awakes in him, he may doubt their knowledge or wisdom, and he will seek other guides or authorities. So it is in religious development. Some repudiate authorities that others acknowledge. But no one has a monopoly of the term or
concept, and no one may justly say to Dr. Martineau or anybody else that “he has no right to speak of `authority’ at all.”

2. **Universal Need of Authority:**

All religion involves a certain attitude of thought and will toward God and the Universe. The feeling element is also present, but that is ignored in theories of external authority. All religion then involves certain ideas or beliefs about God, and conduct corresponding to them, but ideas may be true or false, and conduct right or wrong. Men need to know what is true, that they may do that which is right. They need some test or standard or court of appeal which distinguishes and enforces the truth; forbids the wrong and commands the right. As in all government there is a legislative and an executive function, the one issuing out of the other, so in every kind of religious authority recognized as such, men require that it should tell them what ideas they ought to believe and what deeds to perform.

In this general sense authority is recognized in every realm of life, even beyond that which is usually called religious life. Science builds up its system in conformity with natural phenomena. Art has its ideals of beauty. Politics seeks to realize some idea of the state. Metaphysics reconstructs the universe in conformity with some principle of truth or reality.

3. **Necessity for Infallible Criterion of Truth:**

“If we are ....to attach any definite intelligible meaning to the distinction between things as they really are, and things as they merely appear to be, we must clearly have some universal criterion or test by which the distinction may be made. This criterion must be in the first place infallible; that is, must be such that we cannot doubt its validity without falling into a contradiction in our thought ..... Freedom from contradiction is a characteristic that belongs to everything that is real .... and we may therefore use it as a test or criterion of reality “(Taylor, Elements of Metaphysics, 18-19). A more skeptical philosopher writes: “That the truth itself is one and whole and complete, and that all thinking and all experience moves within its recognition, and subject to its manifest authority, this I have never doubted” (Joachim, The Nature of Truth, 178). It is only a thoroughgoing skeptic that could dispense with authority, a
“Pyrrho,” who holds suspense of judgment to be the only right attitude of mind, and he, to be logical, must also suspend all action and cease to be. There can be no question, therefore, except in total nescience, as to the fact of authority in general; and the problem to decide is, “What is the authority in religion?”

4. Ultimate Nature of Authority:

It is a problem involved in the difficulties of all ultimate problems, and all argument about it is apt to move in a circle. For the ultimate must bear witness of its own ultimacy, the absolute of its own absoluteness, and authority of its own sovereignty. If there were a court of appeal or a standard of reference to which anything called ultimate, absolute and supreme, could apply for its credentials, it would therefore become relative and subordinate to that other criterion. There is a sense in which Mr. Balfour’s saying is true, “that authority is dumb in the presence of argument.” No process of mediate reasoning can establish it, for no premise can be found from which it issues as a conclusion. It judges all things, but is judged of none. It is its own witness and judge. All that reason can say about it is the dictum of Paxmenides: “it is.”

5. It Is God:

In this sense, there can be no question again among religious people, that the authority is God. The one idea involves the other. He alone is self-existent and supreme, who is what He is of His own right. If God exists, He is the ultimate criterion and power of truth and reality. All truth inheres in Him and issues from Him. The problem of authority thus becomes one with the proof and definition of God. These questions lie beyond the purpose of the present article; (see GOD). Their solution is assumed in this discussion of authority, although different theories of authority no doubt involve different ideas of God.

6. Different Ideas of God and Different Views of Authority:

External theories generally involve what is called a deistic conception of God. Spiritualistic theories of authority correspond to theistic views of God. If He is immanent as well as transcendent, He speaks directly to men, and has no need of intermediaries. Pantheism results in a naturalistic
theory of truth. The mind of God is the law of Nature. But pantheism in
practice tends to become polytheism, and then to issue in a crude anarchy
which is the denial of all authority and truth. But within Christendom the
problem of authority lies between those who agree in believing in one God,
who is personal, transcendent and to some extent immanent. The
differences on these points are really consequences of differences of views
as to His mode of self-communication.

7. A Problem of Knowledge For Christians:
It is, therefore, a problem of epistemology rather than of ontology. The
question is, in what way does God make known Himself, His mind and
His authority to men generally? The purpose of this article is the
exposition of the Biblical teaching of authority, with some attempt to
place it in its true position in the life of the church.

2. THE BIBLICAL REFERENCES.

1. In the Old Testament:

Only for

(1) [rabhah] (Proverbs 29:2): “to be great” or “many.” “When the
righteous are in authority, the people rejoice.” So the King James
Version and the Revised Version, margin, but the Revised Version
(British and American) “When the righteous are increased” (so BDB).
Toy in the place cited remarks, “The Hebrew has: `When the righteous
increase,’ the suggestion being that they then have control of affairs;
the change of a letter gives the reading `rule’ which is required by the
‘govern’ of the second line.”

(2) [toqeph] (Est 9:29): “Esther the queen .... wrote with all authority
to confirm this second letter of Purim” (Revised Version margin
“strength” [so BDB]).

2. In the New Testament:

(1) Most frequently for exousia, exousiazo; and kateexousiazo:
(a) of God’s authority (Acts 1:7): as the potter’s over clay (Romans 9:21, right”; Jude 1:25, “power”; Revelation 9, “power”);

(b) of Christ’s teaching and works (Matthew 7:29; 21:23,24,27 = Mark 1:22,27; Mark 11:28,29,33 = Luke 4:36; 20:2,8; John 5:27, authority to execute judgment. The same Greek word, translated “power” in the King James Version but generally “authority” in the Revised Version (British and American) or the Revised Version, margin, appears also in Matthew 9:6,8, to forgive sins: 28:18; Mark 2:10; Luke 4:32; 5:24; John 10:18; 17:2; Revelation 12:10);

(c) of the disciples, as Christ’s representatives and witnesses (Luke 9:1, the twelve; 2 Corinthians 10:8, Paul); also of their rights and privileges; (the same Greek word in Matthew 10:1; Mark 3:15; 6:7; Luke 10:19 = the Revised Version (British and American) “authority”; John 1:12; Acts 8:19; 2 Corinthians 13:10; 2 Thessalonians 3:9; Hebrews 13:10; Revelation 2:26; 22:14 = the Revised Version (British and American) “right”);

(d) of subordinate heavenly authorities or powers (1 Corinthians 15:24; 1 Peter 3:22; and the same Greek word in Ephesians 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Colossians 1:16; 2:10,15; Revelation 11:6; 14:18; 18:1);

(e) of civil authority, as of king, magistrate or steward (Luke 7:8 = Matthew 8:9 [centurion]; Mark 13:34; Luke 19:17; 20:20; 22:25 = Matthew 20:25 = Mark 10:42; and Acts 9:14; 26:10,12 [of Saul]; and the same Greek word in Luke 12:11; 23:7; John 19:10,11; Acts 5:4; Romans 13:1,2,3; Titus 3:1; Revelation 17:12,13);

(g) of man’s inward power of self-control (the same Greek word in 1 Corinthians 7:37; 8:9, “liberty”; 6:12; 7:4; 9:4,5,6,12,18, the Revised Version (British and American) “right”; 11:10).

(2) For *epitage*: commandment, authority to exhort and reprove the church (Titus 2:15).

(3) For *huperoche*: “for kings and all that are in high place” (Revised Version (British and American) 1 Timothy 2:2).

(4) For *authenteo*: “I permit not a woman .... to have dominion over a man” (Revised Version, 1 Timothy 2:12).


3. Common Elements in Their Meaning:

Of the words translated “authority,” *exousia*, alone expresses the idea of religious authority, whether of God, of Christ or of man. The other uses of this word are here instructive in as bringing out the common element in secular and religious authority. The control of the state over its subjects, whether as supreme in the person of emperor or king, or as delegated to and exercised by proconsul, magistrate or soldier, and the control of a householder over his family and servants and property, exercised directly or indirectly through stewards, have some characteristics which also pertain to religious authority; and the differences, essential though they are, must be derived from the context and the circumstances of the case. In one passage indeed the civil type of authority is mentioned to be repudiated as something that should not obtain within the religious community (Matthew 20:25-27 = Mark 10:42-44 = Luke 22:25,26). But although its principle and power are so entirely different in different realms, the fact of authority as determining religious thought, conduct and relations permeates the whole Bible, and is expressed by many terms and phrases besides those translated “authority.”

3. BIBLICAL TEACHING.

A summary of the Biblical account of authority is given in Hebrews 1:1; “God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days
spoken unto us in a Son [RVm].” Behind all persons and institutions stands God, who reveals His mind and exercises His sovereignty in many ways, through many persons and institutions, piecemeal and progressively, until His final revelation of His mind and will culminates in Jesus Christ.

1. Old Testament Teaching:

(1) Earliest Form Patriarchal

The earliest form of authority is patriarchal. The father of the family is at once its prophet, priest and king. The consciousness of individuality was as yet weak. The unit of life was the family, and the father sums up the family in himself before God and stands to it as God. Such is the earliest picture of religious life found in the Bible. For whatever view may be taken of the historicity of Gen, there can be little doubt that the stories of the patriarchs represent an early stage of religious life, before the national or even the tribal consciousness had developed.

(2) Tribal and Personal Authority

When the tribal consciousness emerges, it is clad in a network of customs and traditions which had grown with it, and which governed the greater part of the life of the tribe. The father had now become the elder and judge who exercised authority over the larger family, the tribe. But also, men of commanding personality and influence appear, who change and refashion the tribal customs. They may be men of practical wisdom like Jethro, great warriors like Joshua, or emergency men like the judges. Moses stands apart, a prophet and reformer who knew that he bore a message from God to reform his people’s religion, and gave Israel a knowledge of God and a covenant with God which set them forever apart from all other peoples. Other tribes might have a Jethro, a Joshua and a Jephthah, but Israel alone had its Moses. His authority has remained a large factor in the life of Israel to the present day and should hereafter be assumed as existing side by side with other authorities mentioned.

(3) Seers and Priests

In our earliest glimpses of Hebrew life in Canaan we find bands of seers or prophets associated with religion in Israel, as well as a disorganized
priesthood which conducted the public worship of Yahweh. These features were probably common to Israel and neighboring Semitic tribes. Here again the individual person emerges who rises above custom and tradition, and exercises an individual authority direct from God over the lives of the people. Samuel, too, was a prophet, priest and king, but he regarded his function as so entirely ministerial, that God might be said to govern His people directly and personally, though He made known His will through the prophet.

(4) Kings and Established Religion

In the period of the kingship, religious authority became more organized, institutional and external. The occasional cooperation of the tribes developed into nationality, and the sporadic leadership of emergency chieftains gave way to the permanent rule of the king. Priests and prophets became organized and recognized guilds which acted together under the protection and influence of the king, along the lines of traditional morality and religion. The Hebrew church in its middle ages was an established church and thoroughly “Erastian.” We know very little of the details of its organization, but it is clear that the religious orders as a rule offered little resistance to the corrupting influences of the court and of the surrounding heathenism.

(5) The Great Prophets

Opposition to corruption and advance to higher levels of religious life invariably originated outside the recognized religious authorities. God raised for Himself prophets such as Elijah, Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah, who spoke out of the consciousness of an immediate vision or message or command from God. In turn they influenced the established religious authorities, as may be seen in the reformations of Hezekiah and Josiah. All that is distinctive in the religion of Israel, all revelation of God in the Old Testament, proceeded from the inner experiences of the irregular prophets.

(6) The Canon and Rabbinical Tradition

In the Judaism of the post-exilic period, the disappearance of the kingship, and the cessation of prophecy produced new conditions which demanded a readaptation of religious authorities. The relative position of the
priesthood was greatly enhanced. Its chiefs became princes of Jerusalem, and exercised all the powers of theocracy that remained under foreign rule. And new developments emerged. The formation of the canon of the Old Testament set up a body of writings which stood as a permanent and external standard of doctrine and worship. But the necessity was felt to interpret the Scriptures and to apply them to existing conditions. The place of the old prophetic guilds was taken by the new order of rabbis and scribes. Gradually they secured a share with the priests in the administration of the law. “In the last two pre-Christian centuries and throughout the Talmudic times, the scribes [tsopherim], also called the wise [chakhamim], who claimed to have received the true interpretation of the Law as ‘the tradition of the Elders and Fathers’ in direct line from Moses, the prophets, and the men of the great synagogue, .... included people from all classes. They formed the court of justice in every town as well as the high court of justice, the Sanhedrin in Jerus” (Kohler in Jew Encyclopedia, II, 337). In the time of Christ, these courts were the recognized authorities in all matters of religion.

2. New Testament Teaching:

(1) Jesus Christ’s Authority.

When He began to teach in Palestine, all knowledge of God, and all exercise of His authority were mediated through the priests and scribes, who however claimed the Old Testament as their source. Christ was neither the destroyer nor the creator of institutions. He never discussed the abstract right or capacity of the Jewish orders to be religious teachers. He enjoined obedience to their teaching (Matthew 23:2,3). Still less did He question the authority of the Old Testament. He came not to destroy, but to fulfill the law and the prophets (Matthew 5:17). But He did two things which involved the assertion of a new and superior authority in Himself. He repudiated the scribes’ interpretation of the law (Matthew 23:13-16), and He declared that certain of the provisions of the Mosaic law itself were temporary and tentative, and to be replaced or supplemented by His own more adequate teaching (Matthew 5:32,34,39,44; 19:8,9). In doing this, He was really fulfilling a line of thought which permeates the entire Old Testament. All its writers disclaim finality and look forward to a fuller revelation of the mind of God in a day of Yahweh or a new covenant or a
Messiah. Jesus Christ regarded these expectations as being realized in Himself, and claimed to complete and fulfill the development which had run through the Old Testament. As such, He claims finality in His teaching of the will of God, and absolute authority in the realm of religion and morals.

(a) His Teaching

His teaching is with authority. His hearers contrast it with that of the scribes, who, with all the prestige of tradition and establishment, in comparison with Him, entirely lacked authority (Matthew 7:29; Mark 1:22; Luke 4:32; John 7:46).

(b) His Works

His authority as a teacher is closely associated with His works, especially as these revealed His authority over that world of evil spirits whose influence was felt in the mental disorders that afflicted people (Mark 1:27; Luke 4:36).

(c) Forgiving and Judging

In His claim to forgive sins, sanctioned by works of healing, He seemed to exercise a Divine prerogative (Matthew 9:6,8; Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24). It implied an infallible moral judgment, a power to dispense with the recognized laws of retribution and to remove guilt, which could only inhere in God. All these powers are asserted in another form in the statement that He is the final judge (John 5:27).

(d) Life and Salvation

He therefore possesses authority over life and salvation. The Father gave Him authority over all flesh, “that whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life” (John 17:2 the American Revised Version, margin). This authority begins in His power over His own life to give it in sacrifice for men (John 10:18). By faith in Him and obedience to Him, men obtain salvation (Matthew 10:32; 11:28-30). Their relation to Him determines their relation to God and to the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 10:40; Luke 12:8).

(e) Derived from His Sonship
When challenged by the chief priests and elders, the established religious authorities, to state by what authority He taught, He gives no categorical reply, but tells them the parable of the Vineyard. All the prophets and teachers that had come from God before Him were servants, but He is the Son (Matthew 21:23-27,37; Mark 11:28-33; 12:6; Luke 20:2,8,13). The Fourth Gospel definitely founds His authority upon His sonship (John 5:19-27). Paul deduces it from His self-sacrifice (Philippians 2:5-11).

(f) In His Ascended State

In His ascended state, all authority in heaven and on earth is given unto Him (Matthew 28:18). It is not only authority in the church, and in the moral kingdom, but in the universe. God has set Him “far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come” (Ephesians 1:21; compare Colossians 2:10; 1 Peter 3:22; 1 Corinthians 15:24; Revelation 12:10).

(g) Christ and the Paraclete

His authority in the church as revealer of truth and Lord of spirits is not limited or completed within His earthly life. By His resurrection and exaltation He lives on in the church. “Where two or three are gathered .... in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matthew 18:20). “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world” (Matthew 28:20). Greater works than He did in the flesh will be done in the church, because of His exaltation: (John 14:12); and by His sending the Paraclete, “Comforter” (American Revised Version) (John 14:16). The Paraclete, which is the Holy Spirit, will teach the disciples all things, and bring to their remembrance all that He said unto them (John 14:26). He has many things to tell them which in the days of His flesh they cannot receive, but the Spirit of truth shall guide them into all truth (John 16:12,13). And the Paraclete is neither separated nor distinct from Him in His exalted and permanent life (John 14:18,28). Herein is the authority of Christ made complete and permanent. His teaching, works and character, as facts outside of men, even while He lived, and still more when He was dead, could only partially and imperfectly rule their spirits. “Have I been so long
time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip?” In the day of the
Spirit’s revelation “ye shall know that I am in my Father” (John
14:9,20). Nor, again, did or could He define the truth as it applied to every
contingency throughout all time, while He lived under the limitations of
time and place. Such a revelation, if it could have been given, would have
been quite useless, for men can only apprehend the truth progressively
and in relation to the position they occupy in time and place. But by His
permanent spiritual presence in the church, He enters into, inhabits and
governs its whole life and determines for it what is true and right at every
stage of its development. (See Forrest, Authority of Christ, 202-3.) To ask
whence Christ derives or how He possesses the authority above described,
is to raise the whole question of His metaphysical existence. Empirically,
we see it issuing from two facts which are essentially one — His filial
consciousness and His moral perfection. These chiefly are the empirical
facts which the church has sought to interpret and express in the
metaphysical doctrine of the Incarnation. (See Forrest, op. cit.)

(2) The Disciples’ Authority.

The first disciples acknowledged Christ in all things as their Lord and
Master; not the teaching they had heard, nor the example they had
witnessed, but Christ in His permanent, living presence. They pray to
Him to fill Judas’ place among the Twelve (Acts 1:24,25). He gave the
Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2:33). In His name they perform their miracles
(Acts 3:6; 9:34). With Him Saul meets on the way to Damascus (Acts
9:5; Galatians 1:12). From Him they receive the teaching and commands
which they deliver to the churches (1 Corinthians 11:23).

But they too exercised an authority which is derivative, secondary, and
dependent upon Him.

(a) Derived from Christ

While Jesus Christ yet lived He gave the Twelve, and again the Seventy,
authority to cast out unclean spirits and to heal all manner of diseases,
while they went about preaching (Matthew 10:1; Mark 3:15; 6:7;
Luke 9:1; 10:19). After His resurrection He gave them commission to
bear witness for Him, to baptize and to teach all nations (Matthew
28:18-20; Luke 24:48,49). Paul also traced his authority to preach
directly to Jesus Christ (Galatians 1:1,12). From Him they received their endowment with the Holy Spirit for the work (Acts 1:5; 2:33).

(b) Paul’s Authority

Paul claimed for himself, and by inference, for the other apostles, authority to exercise discipline in the churches, “which the Lord gave for building you up” (2 Corinthians 10:8; 13:10). All the church’s ministers exercise oversight and admonition over the churches (1 Thessalonians 5:12; 2 Timothy 4:2; 2:2).

(c) Authority of All Believers

The authority of sonship, and of participation in the tree of life belongs to all believers (John 1:12; Revelation 22:14).

(d) Authority over the Nations

And in virtue of their faith they have authority over the nations (Revelation 2:26; 20:4). Christ makes them to be kings (Revised Version (British and American) a kingdom) and priests (Revelation 1:6), a royal priesthood (1 Peter 2:9).

In all this we are to see the authority of faith, of character, of men who are messengers of Christ because they are in living union with Him. It pertains to no office or institution, and exists only where Christ reigns in men, and therefore, through them.

(3) Church’s Authority Moral and Personal.

It is moral and personal and more concerned with life than with doctrine. Paul was the greatest teacher of the early church, but he claims no infallibility, promulgates no dogma, imposes no standard of orthodoxy beyond faith in Christ. He reasons, argues and persuades men to accept the gospel he had received of the Lord, but he knows no other authority than the truth as it is a living fact in Jesus Christ.

In the Pastoral Epistles we certainly read of a “sound doctrine” which should be taught and believed, but it has not crystallized into a creed, and the only condition of salvation laid down is living faith in Jesus Christ.

See DOCTRINE.
The authority of the apostolic church, then, is in the first place that of individual men in whom Jesus Christ lives, a direct personal and individual authority. It is true that the individual can only live the Christian life, and therefore know the Christian truth, in a society, but that does not impair the individual and personal character of his witness. Yet as the church lives a collective life, there is a sense in which it may be said to bear a collective witness. Men are naturally more readily impressed by an idea held by the many. That is right in so far as the probability of the truth of a doctrine increases with the number of minds which approve it. That is the element of truth in the Catholic dictum quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est (“what is believed everywhere, always, and by all”). But the assent of the many does not constitute the truth of an idea or fact, nor enhance its authority. And there are levels of truth to which only few minds can attain, so that the assent of the many may be a presumption against the truth of an idea. And in the last resort, men do not accept ideas with mind and heart, because many believe them, but because of their inherent truth, their power to govern their minds. And the essential truth of a doctrine is no greater, whether one or a million accept it.

The apostolic church recognized this principle, for it never claimed for itself greater authority than that of a tutor to bring men to Christ, the one Lord. Peter, Paul, John, each knew Christ in a degree, and each spoke of Him as well as he could, but none of them claims to say all, or demands that his own teaching should absolutely rule men’s minds; and the collective authority of the church can never rise higher than that of its best spirits.

(4) Authority of the Bible.

And the authority of the Bible as a whole is of the same nature as that of the church. It is a record of the experiences of men who knew God in various ways and degrees, but among them all there is only one Master. ‘No one knows the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.’ In varying degrees obedience should be rendered to many men in the church and outside of it, as they satisfy the demands of reason and conscience, but in the last resort every soul by itself must find, choose and obey its own King. For Christians Christ alone is King, as He revealed Himself in His human personality, in the experience and history
of the church, and ultimately in the personal experience of every believer. (For a different view see J. H. Leckie, Authority in Religion.)

4. OUTLINE HISTORY OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCTRINE OF AUTHORITY.

1. Appeal to Reason as Logos:

Different ideas, drawn from many sources, soon replaced New Testament principles of authority in the life and thought of the church. The Greek apologists and Fathers were generally dominated by the Platonic doctrine of the Logos, and thought of God as dwelling in man and communicating His mind to him by giving him a share of His own mind and reason. While they accepted the Scriptures and the traditions of the church as Divine teaching, they did not regard them as external and sovereign authorities, but rather as copies of the Divine reason which dwelt in every man, but in complete and perfect manner only in Jesus Christ.

2. Orthodox Dogma:

Neo-Platonism followed, and it underlies much of the church teaching from Origen to Augustine. God as pure being could not make known His essence to men, and His Logos in all the forms of its manifestation tended to become a spoken word which God had sent forth from Himself, rather than the living indwelling of God with men. When the Logos ceased to be living, it tended to become external and stereotyped, and upon this basis grew up Greek orthodoxy. Men who knew but little of the living personal Word felt the need of defining and establishing the central truths of Christianity in fixed and permanent forms which should become the standard of all thinking. The inward witness of the Logos disappears, and the external authority of tradition and dogma as defined by the councils took its place. The bishops preserved the tradition and constituted the councils and thus became the organs of authority. The Scriptures were still venerated in words, but in fact subordinated to the episcopacy.

3. Scholasticism:

Aristotle’s philosophy dominated the Middle Ages, or rather the pale ghost of Aristotle’s system, the formal logic only. The forms of thought were mistaken for its essence. Truth consisted in logical consistency and
systematic coherence. The dogmas of earlier ages were assumed as premises from which to deduce, by syllogistic inference, the whole structure of the church and its organs and sacraments, as the infallible representatives of God on earth.

4. *Ecclesiastical Absolutism*:

Nominalism emptied the forms of thought of all reality and reared the ecclesiastical system upon negation. All the more necessary was it to affirm the absolute and unquestioned authority of the church, since it rested upon no reason or reality to which appeal could be made to justify its position and teaching. Thus, the growth of absolutism in the church went pari passu with the disappearance of idealism, of any contact of the mind with reality, truth and God. Another way of saying this truth is that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of the living Christ suffered a total eclipse during the Middle Ages, while the authority of the church as the organ of revelation became absolute.

5. *Reformation Principles*:

The Reformation was not consciously based upon any philosophic principles. It was the product of practical necessities. Men’s spiritual needs drove them back to God, and they found Him in two sources, in the Bible, which was the record of His self-revelation through prophet, psalmist, apostle and preeminently through Jesus Christ, and in the accordant testimony of the Holy Spirit in their own hearts. But the underlying principles of this teaching were not articulated in a philosophy of knowledge and revelation for two centuries.

6. *New Scholasticism*:

Therefore the second and third generations of Reformers, no longer possessed by the visions and convictions of Luther and Calvin, were thrown back upon the old scholastic philosophy which recognized no kinship of mind between God and man, and knew no direct communication between them. Hence, it was necessary to find a new external authority, and this they discovered in the Bible which they made into a law of truth, as defined anew by ecclesiastical councils.
7. The Inner Light:

But the mystical side of the Reformers’ teaching was not altogether lost, and a few obscure bodies of Christians continued to hold the doctrine of the inner light. Yet as the scholastic Protestants took only half — the objective half of the Reformers’ teaching — the mystics only took the subjective half, and every man’s imagination tended to become a law unto himself.

8. Back to Experience:

Kant did for philosophy what Luther had done for religion. He rejected its dogmas and external authorities in order to come back to its realities. He was the first philosopher of the Protestant principle. He sought to discover a direct relation between man’s mind and reality. He did not fully succeed. The old dogma of the *noumenon* as something that lay completely beyond man’s ken clung to him, and vitiated his system. But through man’s moral nature, he found a way to the heart of reality and to God. His idealistic principles were developed by his successors into the modern idealism, upon which it has been possible to erect a theory of knowledge that brings man’s mind into direct contact with God, and therefore, a theory of authority which represents God as directly the sovereign of the soul.

9. Distrust of Reason:

But the other side of Kant’s philosophy, too, was developed into a theory of religious skepticism and external authority. Man’s reason, he had taught, could not come into contact with reality, with the thing-in-itself, and therefore it could know nothing of God. This distrust of reason was made the basis of two different systems of external authority by Dean Mansol and Cardinal Newman. The skeptical element really descended from Locke and Hume, but men who would have disdained to learn their theology from Hume accepted Hume’s principles from Kant, and built upon them, as a house upon sand, one, the authority of Anglicanism, and the other, the authority of Romanism.
10. Christian Skepticism:

Kant’s skepticism also allied itself with elements of Luther’s teaching and traveled a middle course in the school of Ritschl. While holding that man may have knowledge and experience of Divine things in Jesus Christ, who is of the practical value of God for religious experience, the Ritschlians scruple to affirm that it is a direct and actual knowledge of God as He is essentially. This they will neither deny nor affirm, but the refusal to affirm has for many minds the effect of denial, and it leads to a subjectivism which is not far removed from skepticism and the denial of all authority.

5. CLASSIFICATION OF THEORIES:

The various theories of authority may be now classed as follows:

1. External:

(1) Incipient Catholicism

Incipient Catholicism in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. — All ideas of a living and profeftit revelation were suppressed as in the case of Montanism. Three more or less coordinate authorities were set up which determined for individual Christians what was Christian truth and conduct. The canon of the New Testament was gradually formed to define what writings, in addition to the Old Testament taken over from the Jewish church, were inspired by the Holy Spirit and of Divine authority. The outline of a common creed or rule of faith grew up as the standard interpretation of Scripture. Above all was the episcopacy, which was supposed to preserve in unbroken tradition the unwritten teaching of the apostles. As the only living factor in this system of authority the last easily secured the predominant place. (See Harnack, History of Dogma, II, chapter ii, English translation.)

(2) General Councils.

The authority of the episcopacy was organized into a permanent and general form in the councils, to whose decision obedience was demanded on pain of excommunication. The councils professed and believed that they were only defining the teaching that had always obtained in the
church, and therefore invested themselves and their decisions with the authority of Christ.

(3) Romanism.

During the Middle Ages, the church of Rome concentrated in itself, that is, in its episcopacy, all the authority of tradition, bishops, councils and whatever else had held sway over the mind of the church. Scripture was ignored and the Bishop of Rome exercised the plenary authority of God over men’s minds and lives. “Boniface VIII accepted in the Bull Unam sanctam (ecclesiam) of November 18, 1302, the Thomist doctrine of the papacy: ‘We declare, say, define and pronounce that it is essential to salvation that every human creature should subject himself to the Roman Pontiff’“ (Loofs, Dogmengeschichte, 307).

(4) Papal Infallibility.

This theory culminated in 1870 in the formal declaration of the infallibility of the pope. “The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra .... has that infallibility, with which the Divine Redeemer endowed His church, in defining a doctrine of faith or morals” (Vatican Council, 1870, Session 4, cap. 4). This authority of the pope extends over all questions of knowledge and conduct, of discipline and government in the whole church. The theory is based upon the doctrine of tradition, as laid down in the Council of Chalcedon. “The doctrine of Catholic teaching is, that the body of publicly revealed doctrine has received no objective increase since the days of the apostles,” and “it is no change of doctrine when that which has always been held implicitly becomes the subject of an explicit declaration” (Hunter, Outlines of Dogmatic Theology, I, 159, 164). Newman and recent modernists, however, concede a development in the doctrines of the church, but on the basis of the traditional teaching derived from the apostles. But once a development is conceded, questions arise as to its principles and conditions, and the whole authority that rests upon them falls to the ground by the mere fact of an appeal from it to the principles that govern its development. The attempt to evade criticism by positing the miraculous preservation of the tradition from error involves a further appeal from the supposed authority to a hypothetical miracle for which there is no tittle of evidence. All the evidence is against it. The history of
the church shows that it has been as liable to error, and as readily influenced by natural conditions, as any other human institution.

(5) Inerrancy of Scripture.

When Protestants sought an external authority, they posited the inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible, and the whole Christian faith was founded upon that dogma. “Holy Scripture is the judge, or rather the voice of the supreme and infallible judge, the Holy Spirit, and the norm to which an inferior judge should refer in deciding controversies of faith, and according to which alone he should give sentence” (Quenstedt, quoted in Hutter's Redivivus, 119, 10th edition). Protestants found it necessary to interpret Scripture, and to define doctrines in synods and councils, but their decisions had authority only because they were supposed to be expositions of Scripture, and in that sense, the expression of God’s mind. They differed from the “Catholic” councils in that they claimed no authority of their own and repudiated any authority that might be derived from tradition or the ministerial office.

(6) Anglican Appeal to Antiquity.

In the Anglican church too, the Scriptures as infallible were the ultimate authority, but some kind of a coordinate authority was claimed for the priesthood as standing in the succession of the apostles, and for the church Fathers and councils of the first six centuries. And the tendency has been to lay increasing emphasis on the latter factors, as criticism has undermined the literal and external authority of Scripture.

(7) Limitations of External Authority.

All the above-mentioned theories contain an element of truth, and the authorities they posit have in their turns ruled the minds and lives of men; but none of them can be regarded as adequate and final expressions of the mind of God to man.

(a) Not Infallible

It is superfluous to demonstrate that they are not infallible; in spite of that they might still be all the authority that man can have or need.

(b) Rests on Personal Authority
They all rest on the assumption that God’s self-revelation came to an end with the apostolic age. The Biblical theory admittedly does, and the tradition theories strictly interpreted are in exactly the same case. An authority resting upon a traditional teaching handed down faithfully from the apostles would differ in no essential respect from one resting upon the written words of the apostles. They would be equally limited, literal, external and mechanical. But problems of mind and conduct have arisen, which the apostles never contemplated, and which their teaching (whether preserved in written or oral tradition matters nothing) could not solve.

(c) No Apostolical Tradition Extant

As a matter of fact no traditional teaching of the apostles supplementing their writings has ever been discovered or can be discovered. What has been put forward as such is in manifest contradiction to their writings.

(d) No Consensus of Fathers

The idea that there is a consensus of opinion among church Fathers is equally illusory. If there were, it would need to be proved that such opinion could have any binding authority in religion.

(e) Bible Needs Interpretation

The Bible is not one body of truth all standing at the same level, and whatever view of its inspiration may be held, some further authority will be needed to discriminate between the lower and the higher in its teaching.

(f) Authority Necessarily Spiritual

Above all, an authority which is merely external and objective is no authority at all to the mature religious life. Blind submission to any external authority, creed, church or book, is the condition of a slave, and in such case “our spiritual intelligence is not quickened and developed by communion with the infinite wisdom, but arrested and quelled. Only then, on the other hand, are we spiritually enfranchised when we receive a revelation as from God, not because we are awed or terrified or allured by our selfish interests into reception of it, but because our own minds and hearts respond to it, because we see and know it to be true” (J. Caird, University Sermons (1898), 204-5).
Theories of internal authority are in the nature of the case not so easily classified or defined as those of external; nor have they as yet filled so large a place in the public life of the church. But it would be a serious error to suppose that all the men who gave their adherence to systems of external authority lived in mere subjection to them. The history of mysticism in the church is the history of independent thought resting in a direct knowledge of God that transcended all external authority. Montanism and Gnosticism each in its own way appealed to an inner criterion of truth. All heresies involved some independent judgment, and appealed to authorities that were neither objective nor established. The Protestant Reformation was an open revolt against external authority, and although it resulted for a time in the substitution of another external authority, neither its original motive, nor its permanent force had any kinship with it. Luther’s free criticism of the Bible, and Calvin’s appeal to the testimony of the Holy Spirit as the final principle of its interpretation, are well known. No body of Protestants at present founds its faith on the mere letter of Scripture or creed. Inward authority has been conceived in many ways and expressed by many terms, such as the Logos (Greek apologists); the Paraclete (Montanus); ecstasy (Mystics); knowledge as opposed to faith or creed (Gnostics); the personal experience of faith (Luther); the testimony of the Holy Spirit (Calvin); the inner light (Quakers); individual experience (Pietists); practical reason (Kant); religious feeling (Schleiermacher); the historical Christ (Ritschl); conscience (Martineau); the living Christ (R. W. Dale); the consciousness of Christ (A.M. Fairbairn); the Christ of history and of experience (D. W. Forest) and many more. The variety suggests at first the denial rather than the affirmation of authority, but it is only in such a variety that the principles of an adequate authority can be recognized.

The ultimate authority in religion is God as He reigns in men’s hearts. But both the experience itself and the expression and interpretation of it vary with each individual. A religious authority to be real and effective must win the response of the human spirit, and in that personal relation of Spirit with spirit lie the conditions of variation. Yet human reason and conscience everywhere tend to acknowledge one standard, to recognize one ideal and to obey one Lord. Nothing can force such a uniformity but the inward
fitness of one supreme revelation to the common demands of humanity. No agreement yet exists as to the possibility or reality of such a revelation. But wherever men lend themselves to the spiritual contact of Jesus Christ with their souls, without the intervention of human creeds or institutions, their conscience and reason approve His moral supremacy and their spirits recognize His intimate knowledge of the Father.

**LITERATURE:**
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*T. Rees*

**AUTHORIZED VERSION**

<o’-thor-iz’d>.

*See ENGLISH VERSIONS.*

**AVA**

<a’-va.>

*See AVVA.*

**AVAIL**

<a-val’> πλησ [shawah], “to be equal,” hence “to be enough,” “to avail”): Used in the sense of “satisfy” (Est 5:13). Queen Esther’s exceptional favor availed not to satisfy Haman, because of his insane jealousy of his rival Mordecai. [ ἰσχύω, ischuo], “to be strong..,” translated also “prevail” (Revelation 12:8); with a negative signifies incompetence, e.g. the impossibility of redemptive merit or power in an outward ceremony or act
Galatians 5:6; 6:15 the King James Version): “neither circumcision availcth anything,” contrasted with the efficacy of faith “in Christ Jesus.” Used also to express the efficacy of prayer (James 5:16).

**AVARAN**

<av’-a-ran>: A surname of Eleazar, the third son of Mattathias (1 Macc 2:5). It is doubtfully conjectured that Eleazar received this surname from the episode related in 1 Macc 6:43-46; the word may mean “the piercer,” referring to his stabbing of the elephant. Some connect it with חור [chur], “to be white,” and connect it with Eleazar’s white complexion. The Syriac reads “Chavran” and the Vulgate’s “Abaron”; the Septuagint in 1 Macc 6:43 gives Sauaran which is an error for Eleazaros auran; Septuagint’s Codex Venetus corrects to auran.

**AVEN**

<a’-ven> אֶבֶן [’awen] “emptiness,” “vanity”: Used in Ezekiel 30:17 for On or Heliopolis, in Egypt. See ON. As a term of contempt Hosea calls Beth-el “Beth-aven” (4:15; 10:5). So Amos speaks of some valley near Damascus as “the valley of Aven” (that is, of the idol, 1:5), in which Baalbek (Heliopolis) was situated. The word is rendered “idol” in Isaiah 66:3.

**AVENGE; AVENGER**

<a-venj’> <a-venj’-er>: Avenge. — The general idea connected with this word is that of inflicting punishment upon the wrongdoer. Since emphasis may be placed upon the deed itself, the wrongdoer, or the injured party, the verb is found an intransitive (only Leviticus 19:18; see below), transitive (2 Samuel 4:8 et al.); and also active (Deuteronomy 32:43), passive (Jeremiah 5:9) and reflexive (Est 8:13). In 1 Samuel 25:26 ff avenge is translated from יָשָׁה [yasha`], “to save” (Revised Version margin, “thine own hand saving thee”), in Hosea 1:4 from פָּקַד [paqadh], “to visit,” and in 2 Samuel 18:19 ff from שָׁפָט [shaphaT], “to judge,” but the usual Hebrew word is נָקָם [naqam], or derivatives, “to avenge.” The translation in the Revised Version (British and American)
differs in some places from King James Version: Numbers 31:3 (Revised Version (British and American) “execute Yahweh’s vengeance”; compare 2 Samuel 22:48, Psalm 18:47, Leviticus 26:25; Leviticus 19:18 (Revised Version (British and American) “tak vengeance”); Judges 5:2 (Revised Version (British and American) “for that the leaders took the lead in Israel” from [para`], “to be free, to lead”). In the New Testament avenge is translated from the Greek [ekdikeo], “to do justice,” “to protect” (Luke 18:3 ff et al.) and the King James Version Revelation 18:20, [krino], “to judge” (Revised Version (British and American) “God hath judged your judgment”).

Avenger. — That is, the person who inflicts punishment upon the evil-doer for a wrong experienced by himself (from [naqam], “to avenge”; Psalm 8:2 et al.) or by someone else from [ga’al], “to redeem”; Numbers 35:12 ff et al.). In the New Testament avenger occurs only once; “the Lord is an avenger in all things” (1 Thessalonians 4:6). It was the duty of the nearest relative to execute vengeance upon the murderer of his kin: he became the [go’el]. With reference to the protective legislation and custom, see GOEL. Compare BLOOD; REVENGE, REVENGER.

A. L. Breslich

**AVERSE**

< a-vurs’ > בָּשַׁב [shabh], “to turn back,” “retreat’): Quiet, peaceful wanderers (Micah 2:8).

**AVIM**

< av’-im >.

See AVVIM.

**AVIMS**

< av’-imz > (Deuteronomy 2:23).

See AVVIM.
**AVITES**

\(<a'-vits>\).

See AVVIM.

**AVITH**

\(<a'-vith>\) ἀνθίνα [‘awith]: The royal city of Hadad king of Edom (Genesis 36:35; 1 Chronicles 1:46). The Septuagint reads [Γετθαίμ, Getthaim]. There is no clue to its identification.

**AVOID**

\(<a-void>\): Archaic use in 1 Samuel 18:11 for “escaped.” In the Revised Version (British and American) of New Testament only in 2 Corinthians 8:20 [στελλόμενοι, stellomenoi] with negative), literally, “arranging that not,” etc., i.e. by anticipation providing that something should not occur. In the King James Version for “turn away from,” [ἐκκλίνετε, ekklinete]: Romans 16:17; 1 Timothy 6:20; “refuse,” [παραίτοῦ, paraitou], 2 Timothy 2:23; [περιίστασο, periiastaso], Titus 3:9.

**AVOUCH**

\(<a-vouch’>\): In English Versions of the Bible only in Deuteronomy 26:17,18, in the sense of “to confess,” “avow,” “publicly and solemnly declare.” The Hebrew form is likewise unique (Hiph. of [’amar]).

**AVVA**

\(<av’-a>\) אֲוָא [‘awwa’]; the King James Version Ava, \(<a’-va>\): A province, the people of which Shalmaneser king of Assyria placed in the cities of Samaria in the room of the children of Israel taken into exile by him (2 Kings 17:24). It is probably the same as Ivva (2 Kings 18:34; 19:13; Isaiah 37:13), a province conquered by Assyria.
AVVIM; AVITES

<av'-im> <a'-vits> וַיִּבְדַּל [awwim]; [ ἐναυίοι, Heuaioi], also unaspirated; also used to represent the name of the Hivites): The early inhabitants of the southern extremity of Canaan afterward occupied by the Philistines (Deuteronomy 2:23; compare Joshua 13:3,4, the King James Version “Avim,” <a’-vim>). The Avvim of Joshua 18:23 was a town of Benjamin, not a people. Gesenius supposes the name to mean “dwellers in the desert,” but it was more probably the name of some pre-Sem tribe. The Avvim are described as living in [Chatserim] or “encampments” and extending as far as the outskirts of Gaza.

AWAIT

<a-wat’>: Only in Acts 9:24 the King James Version, in its now obsolete sense as a noun, “ambush”: “their laying await was known of Saul.” the Revised Version (British and American) “their plot.”

AWAKE

<a-wak’> יָקָץ [yaqats], “to waken”; וָרָא [‘ur], “to rouse up” from sleep; [ἐγείρω, egeiro], “to arouse from sleep”): The ordinary terms for awaking from natural slumber: as of Jacob at Bethel (Genesis 28:16); of Solomon at Gibeon (1 Kings 3:15); of Jesus in the storm-tossed boat (Luke 8:24). Used figure with striking effect of awaking from mental, moral and spiritual sleep: as when Deborah calls upon herself to awake to the fervor and eloquence of poetry (Judges 5:12); of Zion’s awaking to moral vigor and beauty (Isaiah 52:1); of waking from spiritual death (Ephesians 5:14); from the grave in resurrection (Daniel 12:2). Poetically used of the rising north wind (Song 4:16); of music (Psalm 108:2); of the sword in battle (Zechariah 13:7); of a lover’s affection (Song 2:7); of God Himself responding to prayer (Psalm 59:4). Also used of moral awaking, as from drunkenness: [ἐκνηφῶ, eknepho], “to become sober” (compare Joel 1:5).

Dwight M. Pratt
AWAY WITH

(1) “To endure,” “to bear with” (Isaiah 1:13), “I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting,” i.e. endure the combination of wickedness and worship. In the Hebrew merely, “I am unable iniquity and the solemn meeting.”

(2) To destroy [ἀἴρεω, airo]. Found in such expressions as Acts 22:22, “Away with such a fellow from the earth.”

AWE

<o>: Fear mingled with reverence and wonder, a state of mind inspired by something terrible or sublime. In the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) it occurs in Psalm 4:4: “Stand in awe, and sin not” (where the Revised Version, margin has, “Be ye angry,” so Septuagint; compare Ephesians 4:26); Psalm 33:8; 119:161. In the following passages the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes “stand in awe for the King James Version “fear”: Psalm 22:23 phoboumenoi; Isaiah 29:23; I Samuel 18:15; Malachi 2:5; and in Hebrews 12:28 it substitutes “awe” for the King James Version “reverence” (deos here only in New Testament). In all these passages, except I Samuel 18:15 (eulabeito, where it describes Saul’s feeling toward David), the word stands for man’s attitude of reverential fear toward God. This is the characteristic attitude of the pious soul toward God in the Scriptures, especially in the Old Testament. It arises from a consciousness of the infinite power, sublimity and holiness of God, which fills the mind with the “fear of the Lord,” and a dread of violating His law.

See FEAR.

D. Miall Edwards

AWL

<ol> מַרְסָאָה [martsea`:] “Bore his ear through with an awl” (Exodus 21:6; Deuteronomy 15:17). The ear was pierced as being the organ of hearing, thus signifying the servant’s promise of obedience.

See BORE.
AX (AXE); AX-HEAD

<aks>; <aks’hed>: Nine different Hebrew words have been rendered “ax”:

(1) גֶזֶנֶן [garzen]. This unquestionably was one of the larger chopping instruments, as the uses to which it was put would imply (Deuteronomy 19:5; 20:19; Kings 6:7; Isaiah 10:15). The modern ax used by the woodchoppers in Syria has a shape much like the ancient stone and bronze axes, with the exception that it is fastened to the handle by passing the latter through a hole in the ax-head, whereas the Egyptian sculptures show that their ax-heads were held to the handles by means of thongs. The so-called battle-ax found at Tell el-Chesy was probably fastened in this way. Syrian peasants are frequently seen carrying in their belts small hatchets the heads of which are shaped like a battle-ax and which are bound to the handles by thongs.

(2) מָאָטָסָר [ma`atsar], is used in Isaiah 44:12 (King James Version renders “tongs”) and in Jeremiah 10:3.

(3) קָרֹד [qardom], is used in Judges 9:48; 1 Samuel 13:20,21; Psalm 74:5; Jeremiah 46:22. The present Arabic word, [qudum], which is the name for the native adze, is from the same origin. The adze is the only chopping instrument of the Syrian carpenter. He uses it for many purposes, where a foreigner would use a saw or chisel or plane, and with a skill which the foreigner envies. Many students of Syrian life believe that the adze is a tool which has survived from the early Hebrew times.

(4) בַרְזֶל [barzel] (Deuteronomy 19:5; 2 Kings 6:5): The interest associated with this word is that it literally means “iron,” although the context indicates that it means “ax.” If the word iron was not used here to mean “metal,” then iron axes were used by the children of Israel. If iron axes existed, however, they have long since disappeared as the result of corrosion, since the only ones discovered have been of stone, copper or bronze.

See BRONZE.
(5) מָגְזִירָה [maghzirah] (2 Samuel 12:31) is literally, “a cutting instrument,” and might be rendered, “a blade” or sickle.

(6) מֵגֶרֶה [megherah] (1 Chronicles 20:2), translated in this one passage as axes, but better translated “saws.”

(7) חֶרֶב [cherebh] (Ezekiel 26:9), rendered ax in this passage only. It is usually translated sword. It could also mean pick-axe.

(8) כַּשִּׁיל [kashil] (Psalm 74:6 the King James Version), literally, “a feller,” hence, an axe.


James A. Patch

AXLE-TREE

<ak'-sil-tre>.

See SEA, THE MOLTEN.

AYIN

<a'-yen> שׁ [ayin], “eye” or “fountain”: The 16th letter of the Hebrew alphabet, so named, probably, because the original form resembled the eye. [Ayin] (א) is usually neglected in pronunciation, and inverted comma (‘) is the sign most commonly employed to represent it in transliteration. The same sound is found in the Arabic and other Semitic languages. The Arabs have two pronunciations, one a very strong guttural formed at the back of the palate, something like a rattled “r” or “rg,” the other similar in quality, only less harsh and guttural. The Septuagint reproduced the `ayin (’) in some cases by the Greek letter gamma (g).”The numerical value of this letter is 70. An `ayin (’) begins each verse of the 16th section of Psalm 119 in the Hebrew.

W.W. Davies
AZAEL

<az’-a-el> [ʾĄẓ́āḥlōq, Azaelos]; compare Asahel [Ezra 10:15]): Father of Jonathan, one of two chief investigators of foreign marriages (1 Esdras 9:14).

AZAELUS

<az-a-e’-lus> (B, [ʾĄẓ́āḥlōq, Azaelos]; A, [ʾĄẓ́ahł, Azael]; omitted in Ezra 10): Azaelus, son of Ezora, put away his “strange wife” (1 Esdras 9:34).

AZAL

<a’-zal>.

See AZEL.

AZALIAH

<az-a-li’-a> [atsalyahu, “Yahweh has set aside”): A son of Meshullam and father of Shaphan the scribe, famous in connection with the discovery of the law in the reign of King Josiah (2 Kings 22:3).

AZANIAH

<az-a-ni’-a> [ʾazanyah, “Yahweh has given ear”): A son of Jeshua, a Levite who signed the covenant (Nehemiah 10:9).

AZAPHION

<a-za’-fi-on>.

See ASSAPHIOTH.

AZARA

<az’-a-ra>.

See ASARA.
AZARIEL

<az-a’-ra-el>.

See AZAREL.

AZARAIAS

<az-a-ra’-yas> (B, [‘ Açαραίας, Azaraias]; A, [Σαραίας, Saraias]; the King James Version Saraias); compare Seraiah (Ezra 7:1): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:1).

AZAREEL

<a-zar’e-el>.

See AZAREL.

AZAREL

<az’a-rel> [azarel], “God is helper”; the King James Version reads Azareel in numbers 1-5, Azarael in number 6):

(1) A Korahite who entered the army of David at Ziklag (1 Chronicles 12:6).

(2) A musician in the temple appointed by lot; son of Heman (1 Chronicles 25:18; compare Uzziel, 25:4).

(3) A captain of the tribe of Daniel in the service of David (1 Chronicles 27:22).

(4) One of those who had “strange wives,” a son of Bani (Ezra 10:41).

(5) The father of Amashai, a priest who dwelt in Jerusalem after the Exile (Nehemiah 11:13).

(6) A priest’s son who played the trumpet in the procession when the wall was dedicated (Nehemiah 12:36).

A. L. Breslich
AZARIAH

<az-a-ri’-a> [‘azaryahu] and  הָזָרֹיאָה [‘azaryah], “Yahweh has helped”:

(1) King of Judah.

See UZZIAH.

(2) A Judahite of the house of Ethan the Wise (1 Chronicles 2:8).

(3) The son of Jehu, descended from an Egyptian through the daughter of Sheshan (1 Chronicles 2:38).

(4) A son of Ahimaaz and grandson of Zadok (1 Chronicles 6:9).

(5) A son of Zadok the high priest and an official of Solomon (1 Kings 4:2).

(6) A high priest and son of Johanan (1 Chronicles 6:10).

(7) A Levite, ancestor of Samuel, and Heman the singer (1 Chronicles 6:36).

(8) A son of Nathan and captain of Solomon’s tax collectors (1 Kings 4:5).

(9) A prophet in the reign of King Asa; his father’s name was Oded (2 Chronicles 15:1-8).

(10 and 11) Two sons of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah (2 Chronicles 21:2).


(13) A son of Jeroham, who helped to overthrow Athaliah, and place Joash on the throne (2 Chronicles 23:1).

(14) A son of Johanan and a leading man of Ephraim, mentioned in connection with the emancipated captives taken by Pekah (2 Chronicles 28:12).
(15) A Levite of the family of Merari, who took part in cleansing the temple in the days of Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 29:12).

(16) A high priest who rebuked King Uzziah for arrogating to himself priestly functions (2 Chronicles 26:16-20).

(17) The father of Seraiah and son of Hilkiah (1 Chronicles 6:13 f).

(18) A son of Hoshai, and a bitter enemy of Jeremiah (Jeremiah 43:2 ff).

(19) One of the royal captives taken to Babylon, whose name was changed to Abed-nego (Daniel 1:7).

(20) The son of Maaseiah, who helped repair the walls of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 3:23 f).

(21) A Levite who assisted Ezra to expound the Law (Nehemiah 8:7).

(22) A priest who sealed the covenant (Nehemiah 10:2).

(23) A prince of Judah mentioned in connection with the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 12:32 f).

W. W. Davies

AZARIAS

<az-a-ri’as> [ ‘Αζαριας, Azarias] and [ ‘Αζαριας, Azareias]:

(1) Azarias, who put away his “strange wife” (1 Esdras 9:21); compare Uzziah (Ezra 10:21).

(2) Azarias, who stood at the right side of Ezra when the law was read to the people (1 Esdras 9:43); omitted in Ezra 8:4.

(3) Azarias, who interpreted the law to the people (1 Esdras 9:48); compare Azariah (Nehemiah 8:7).

(4) Azarias, a name assumed by the angel Raphael (Tobit 5:12; 6:6,13; 7:8; 9:2).

See RAPHAEL.
(5) Azarias, a general in the service of Judas Maccabee (1 Macc 5:18,56,60).

(6) Azarias, one of the three men thrown into the fiery furnace (The Song of the Three Children (Azariah) verses 2,66); compare Azariah (<sup>270106</sup> Daniel 1:6 ff; 2:17), Abed-nego (<sup>270107</sup> Daniel 1:7; 2:49; 3:12 ff).

A. L. Breslich

AZARU

<az’a-ru> (B, [ ’Άξαρού, Azarou]; A, [ ’Άξουρού, Azourou]; the King James Version Azuran): The descendants of Azaru returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:15); omitted in Ezra and Neh; compare however Azzur (<sup>161017</sup> Nehemiah 10:17).

AZAZ

<a’-zaz> [‘azaz], “powerful”): A descendant of Reuben (<sup>130508</sup> 1 Chronicles 5:8).

AZAZEL

<az’a’zel> [’aza’zel] [ἀποπομπαίος, apopomaios]; the King James Version Scapegoat, the Revised Version, margin “removal”):  

1. THE MEANING OF THE WORD

1. The Passages to Be Considered:

This word is found in connection with the ceremony of the Day of Atonement (which see). According to <sup>031608</sup> Leviticus 16:8, Aaron is to cast lots upon the two goats which on the part of the congregation are to serve as a sin offering (16:5), “one lot for Yahweh, and the other lot for Azazel.” In 16:10, after the first goat has been set apart as a sin offering for Yahweh, we read: “But the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be set alive before Yahweh, to make atonement for him, to send him away for Azazel into the wilderness.” In 16:26 we read: “And he that letteth go the goat for Azazel shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water.” Before this, in 16:21 f mention had been made of what should be done with
the goat. After the purification of the (inner) sanctuary, of the tent of meeting, and of the altar, the living goat is to be brought, “and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all .... their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.” But in this last mentioned and most important passage the term under consideration is not found.

2. The Proposed Interpretations:

(1) The Etymology.

Some have derived the word from [\`az plus `azal] (fortis abiens, “passing away in his strength” or from an intentional alteration of [\`el plus `azaz], robur Dei, “strength of God”; compare below the angel of the Book of Enoch); while others have regarded the word as a broken plural of a substantive in the Arabic `azala, and translated it as “lonesomeness,” “desert.” Now there is an inclination to regard it as a reduplication from `azalzel, derived from the root `azal. If we accept this view, although it is without certainty and an exact analogue cannot be found, we could conclude from the way in which this noun has been formed that we have before us not an abstract term (remotio, “removal,” or abitus, “departure”), but a concrete noun, or an adjective, longe remotus (“far removed”) or porro abiens (“going far away”).

(2) The Explanation.

In Leviticus 16:10,22,26, we would have an acceptable sense, if we regarded this word as expressive of a distinct locality in the wilderness (compare JEWISH TRADITION, II, 2). But this interpretation is impossible, since the law in Leviticus 16 was given during the wanderings in the wilderness and accordingly presupposed a constant change in the encampment, even if this should be regarded only as the historical background. By the use of the same preposition [le-] in connection with Yahweh and Azazel, it seems natural to regard the expressions as entirely II and to think of some personal being. Some interpret this word as referring to a demon of the wilderness (compare Psalm 106:37;
and explain the term as “one who has separated himself from God,” or “he who has separated himself,” or “he who misleads others.” But a demon of this kind could not possibly be placed in contrast to Yahweh in this way; and as in the Book of Enoch 6:6; 8:1 ff; 9:6; 10:4 ff; 13:1 ff; 69:2 one of the most prominent of the fallen angels who taught mankind the arts of war and luxury, revealed secrets to them, and is now bound in the wilderness, and is there preserved for the final judgment, because he was mainly responsible for the presence of evil in the world, is called Azael (also Azazel, or Azalzel), it is highly probable that this name was taken from Leviticus 16. In later times the word Azazel was by many Jews and also by Christian theologians, such as Origen, regarded as that Satan himself who had fallen away from God. In this interpretation the contrast found in 16:8, in case it is to be regarded as a full parallelism, would be perfectly correct. But it must be acknowledged that in Holy Scripture, Satan is nowhere called by the name of Azazel, and just as little is the wilderness regarded as his permanent place of abode. Against these last two interpretations we must also recall that in the most significant passage, namely, 16:20 ff, the term Azazel is not found at all. The same is true in the case of the ceremony in connection with the purification of leprous people and houses (Leviticus 14:7 ff,49 ff), which throughout suggests Leviticus 16. In this place we have also the sevenfold sprinkling (compare 14:16 with Leviticus 16:14 f); and in addition two animals, in this case birds, are used, of which the one is to be slain for the purpose of sprinkling the blood, but the other, after it has been dipped into the blood of the one that has been slain, is to be allowed to fly away. In this way the essential thought in Leviticus 16 as also in Leviticus 14 seems to be the removal of the animal in either case, and it is accordingly advisable to interpret Azazel adjectively, i.e. to forego finding a complete parallelism in Leviticus 16:8, and to regard the preposition in connection with Yahweh as used differently from its use with Azazel, and to translate as follows: “And Aaron shall cast lots over both goats, the one lot [i.e. for the one goat] for Yahweh, and one lot for the goat that is destined to go far away.” On the preposition [le-] used with the second Azazel in 16:10, compare Exodus 21:2. With this interpretation a certain hardness yet remains for our linguistic sense, because we cannot find a good translation for the adjective.
But in favor of this interpretation and against the personal interpretation we can appeal also to the feeling of the Septuagint translators who translate *apopompaios, diestalmenos,* and also to that of Aquilos, who translates *tragos apoluomenos, apolelumenos, kekralaiomenos,* and of Symmachus who translates *aperchomenos, aphiemenos.* (The general idea expressed by all these words is “removal,” “sending away,” “releasing” or “dismissal.”) It is true that the Septuagint in one place translates *eis ten apopompen,* which however could be also an abstract circumlocution for a conception that, though used elsewhere, is yet awkward. In the Vulgate, we have *caper emissarius* and Luther says “der ledige Bock,” which are probably based on a wrong etymology, since [ez] signifies only a goat or perhaps this word “Bock” is here only supplied from the connection, and that quite correctly, so that Luther and the Vulgate can also be cited in favor of our interpretation.

2. WHAT IS DONE IN CONNECTION WITH AZAZEL.

1. The Significance of This Action:

Both goats, according to Leviticus 16:5, are to be regarded as a single sin-sacrifice, even should we interpret Azazel as demon or Satan, and we are accordingly not at all to understand that a sacrifice was brought to these beings. This too is made impossible by the whole tenor of the Old Testament in general, as of Leviticus 16 in particular, so that in 16:8 the two members introduced by the preposition [le-] would not at all be beings of exactly the same importance. Both goats, so to say, represent two sides of the same thing. The second is necessary to make clear what the first one, which has been slain, can no longer represent, namely, the removal of the sin, and accordingly has quite often aptly been called the hircus redivivus. But what is to be represented finds its expression in the ceremony described in 16:20 f. Whatever may be the significance of the laying on of hands in other connections, whether the emphasis is placed more on the disposal or on the appropriation of the property, at this place it certainly is only a symbol of the transfer of guilt, which is confessed over the goat and is then carried into the wilderness by the goat upon which it has been laid. In order to make this transfer all the more impressive, both the hands are here brought into action, while e.g. in Leviticus 1:4 only one hand is used. The fact that the goat is
accompanied by somebody and that it is to be taken to an uninhabited place is to indicate the absolute impossibility of its return, i.e. the guilt has been absolutely forgiven and erased, a deep thought made objectively evident in a transparent manner and independently of the explanation of Azazel, which is even yet not altogether certain. In the personal interpretation, we could have, in addition to the idea of the removal of the guilt, also a second idea, namely, that Azazel can do no harm to Israel, but must be content with his claim to a goat which takes Israel’s place.

2. The Jewish Liturgy:

The actions in connection with Azazel, as was also the case with the Day of Atonement, were interpreted more fully by the Talmud and the traditions based on it (compare *ATONEMENT, DAY OF*, III, 2). The lots could be made of different materials; in later times they were made of gold. The manner of casting the lots was described in full. The goat that was to be sent into the wilderness was designated by a black mark on the head, the other by one on the neck. On the way from Jerusalem to the wilderness, huts were erected. From a distance it was possible to see how the goat was hurled backward from a certain cliff, called Beth-Hadudu ([Beth-chadedun], 12 miles East of Jerusalem). By means of signals made with garments, news was at once sent to Jerusalem when the wilderness had been reached.

*Wilhelm Moller*

**AZAZIAH**

<az-a-zi’-a> עזזיה [‘azazyahu], “Yahweh is strong,” or “strengthens”):

(1) A Levite musician who participated in the services held on the return of the ark to Jerusalem (<131521>1 Chronicles 15:21). His name is omitted from the list in <131518>1 Chronicles 15:18.

(2) Father of Hoshea, who was the leader of Ephraim at the time that David enumerated the people (<132720>1 Chronicles 27:20).

(3) A Levite who had charge of the offerings brought to the temple in the days of Hezekiah (<143113>2 Chronicles 31:13).
AZBASARETH

<az-bas'-a-reth>: The name of an Assyrian king. The King James Version form “Azbasareth” comes from the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

See ASBASARETH.

AZBUK

<az’-buk> [azbuk]: The father of a certain Nehemiah — not the great governor of the same name, though a contemporary (Nehemiah 3:16).

AZEKAH

<a-ze’-ka> [azekah]: A town of some importance in the Shephelah of Judah mentioned (Joshua 15:35) next to Socoh. In Joshua 10:10 the defeated kings of the Arnorites are described as flying before Joshua “by the way of the ascent of Beth-horon .... to Azekah, and unto Makkedah” and (verse 11) as the host fled “Yahweh cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died.” In Samuel 17:1 it is recorded that before David’s combat with Goliath, the Philistines “gathered together at Socoh, which belongeth to Judah, and encamped between Socoh and Azekah, in Ephes-dammin.” In 2 Chronicles 11:9 it is mentioned as one of the frontier cities which Rehoboam fortified and in Jeremiah 34:7 it is one of the two fortified cities remaining to Judah in the Shephelah which Nebuchadnezzar was besieging. “Azekah and the towns (margin, “daughters”) thereof” is mentioned among the cities reoccupied by Jews returning after the Exile (Nehemiah 11:30). In all the three last references the place is mentioned along with Lachish.

All the data suit Tell Zaqareyeh on the North side of the Vale of Elah (Wady es-Sunt) and some 3 miles Northwest of Socoh (Kh. Shuweikeh). This site, which was partially excavated by the Palestine Exploration Fund, is one of great natural strength. “The hill stands almost isolated, rising abruptly for almost 350 ft. above the Vale of Elah; .... to the West the fall is also very great, while to the South the tell is joined by a neck of
land (about 100 ft. below the summit) to a hill behind.” The summit is about 350 yds. by 150 yds., and is much larger than Tell el-Chesy (Lachish) (Bliss). Excavations showed that it was a very ancient site which had been powerfully fortified, and the rock under the city was excavated in a series of very extraordinary underground chambers which could be used as places of refuge. The site suits the narrative of Joshua’s battle every well, as there is a long-used high route running North to South from the neighborhood of Ajalon. Its position as a frontier fortress is comparable with that of Lachish: the name Zakareyeh, seems to be a survival of Azekah. See PEFS, 1899, 10 ff; PEF, III, 441.

E. W. G. Masterman

AZEL

<a’-zel> [’atsel], “noble”:

(1) A descendant of King Saul, through Jonathan (1 Chronicles 8:37 f; 9:43 f).

(2) Azel, <a’-zel>, the King James Version Azal [’atsel]; [ ‘Ａσαήλ, Asael; Zechariah 14:5): A place not far from Jerusalem. There may be an echo of the name in that of Wady Yasal, to the right of `Ain el-Loz, in Wady en-Nar.

AZEM

<a’-zem>: the King James Version form for Ezem (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Joshua 15:29; 19:3).

AZEPHURITH

<az-e-fu’-rith>.

See ARSIPHURITH.
AZETAS

<\textit{a-ze’-tas}> [ Ἄζητας, Azetas]: The head of a family accompanying Zerubbabel out of captivity (1 Esdras 5:15). Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah gives this name in his list.

AZGAD

<\textit{az’-gad}> הָשָׁג [azgadh], “strong is Gad”: In the list of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel are mentioned “the children of Azgad” (1,222, Ezra 2:12; 2,322, Nehemiah 7:17). 110 males with their chief returned with Ezra (Ezra 8:12). Azgad was among the leaders who signed the Covenant after Nehemiah (Nehemiah 10:15).

AZIEI

<\textit{a-zi’-e-i}>: An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2). Compare Azariah (Ezra 7:3) and Ozias (1 Esdras 8:2; the King James Version Ezias).

AZIEL

<\textit{a’-zi-el}> הָיָשֶׁל [aziel], “God is power”; compare Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 210, 309): A Levite singer who played the psalteries (1 Chronicles 15:20); compare Jaaziel (1 Chronicles 15:18).

AZIZA

<\textit{a-zi’-za}> הָזִז [aziza’] “the powerful”): Aziza had taken a foreign wife (Ezra 10:27): compare Zardeus (1 Esdras 9:28 the Revised Version (British and American)).

AZMAVETH (1)

<\textit{az-ma’-veth}> [azmaweth]:

(1) One of David’s 30 mighty men (2 Samuel 23:31; 1 Chronicles 11:33).

(2) A descendant of Jonathan, the son of Saul (1 Chronicles 8:36; 9:42).
Father of two warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chronicles 12:3).

The name of one set over David’s treasures (1 Chronicles 27:25). Some identify him with (1) and (3).

AZMAVETH (2)

AZMON

AZNOTH-TABOR

azor

AZOTUS

AZRIEL
(1) One of the leading men of the half-tribe of Manasseh, East of the Jordan, who with others of his tribe was carried captive by the king of Assyria (1 Chronicles 5:24 ff).

(2) The father of Jerimoth of the tribe of Naphtali in the reign of King David (1 Chronicles 27:19).

(3) The father of Seraiah, one of the officers sent by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch (Jeremiah 36:26).

AZRIKAM

<az-ri’-kam> יָדֹרֶקם [azriqam], “my help has arisen”:

(1) A descendant of King David through Zerubbabel (1 Chronicles 3:23).

(2) A prince of Judah in the time of Ahaz. He was slain by Zichri, an Ephraimite soldier (2 Chronicles 28:7).

(3) One of Azel’s sons, a Benjamite, descended from King Saul (1 Chronicles 8:38; 9:44).

(4) A Levite of the house of Merari and a resident of Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 9:14; Nehemiah 11:15).

AZUBAH

<a-zu’-ba> יָדֹבוּחַ [azubah], “desolation”:

(1) A wife of Caleb, by whom she had three sons (1 Chronicles 2:18 f).

(2) The daughter of Shilhi and mother of King Jehoshaphat (1 Kings 22:42; 2 Chronicles 20:31).

AZUR

<a’-zur>.

See AZZUR.
AZURAN

<az’-u-ran>, <a-zu’-ran.>

See AZARU.

AZZAH

<az’-a> אזר [‘azzah], “strong”: the King James Version form
(Deuteronomy 2:23; 1 Kings 4:24; Jeremiah 25:20) for the Revised
Version (British and American) “Gaza.”

AZZAN

<az’-an> אזן [‘azzan], “strong” or “thorn”: Father of Paltiel of the tribe
of Issachar. One of the commissioners selected to divide the land between
the tribes (Numbers 34:26).

AZZUR

<az’-ur> אזור [‘azzur], “helpful”:

(1) The father of Hananiah, a false prophet of Gibeon in the days of
Zedekiah (Jeremiah 28:1 ff).

(2) One of those who, with Nehemiah, sealed the covenant on the return
from Babylon (Nehemiah 10:17).

(3) The father of Jaazaniah, “one of” the princes of the people who gave
wicked counsel to the city of Jerusalem (Ezekiel 11:1 f). the King James
Version has “Azur” for

(1) and (3), but the Hebrew form of

(3) is אזר [‘azur].
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