INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA VOL. 3

D-EZRIL

D

DABAREH

<dab'-a-re>.

See *DABERATH.*

DABBESHETH

<dab'-e-sheth> ([tvBD″ , *dabbesheth*]; [Δαβασθαί, *Dabasthai*]; the King James Version Dabbasheth, dab'a-sheth): A town on the western boundary of Zebulun (⁰⁶¹⁹¹Joshua 19:11). It is probably identical with the modern *Dabsheh*, a ruined site to the East of Acre.

DABERATH

<dab'-e-rath> ([tr″ bDh″ , *ha-dabherath*], "pasture"; [Δαβειρώθ, *Dabeiroth*]): A city in the territory of Issachar, on the boundary between that tribe and Zebulun (⁰⁶¹⁹²Joshua 19:12). It was assigned to the Gershonite Levites (⁰⁶¹²⁸Joshua 21:28; ¹³⁰⁶²1 Chronicles 6:72). The most probable identification is with *Dabuiriyeh*, a village on the lower western slopes of Tabor.

DABRIA

<da'-bri-a>: One of the five who wrote down the visions of Esdras, described (2 Esdras 14:24) as "ready to write swiftly."

DACUBI; DACOBI

<da-ku'-bi>, <da-ko'-bi>, King James Version: Head of a family of gate-keepers (1 Esdras 5:28).

See *AKKUB; DAKUBI.*

DADDEUS

<da-de'-us>, the Revised Version (British and American); LODDEUS ([Λοδδαῖος, *Loddaios*), which see.

DAGGER

<dag'-er>.

See *ARMOR, ARMS.*

DAGON

<da'-gon> ([ˆ/gD; *daghon*]; apparently derived from [gD; *dagh*], "fish"): Name of the god of the Philistines (according to Jerome on <2340>Isaiah 46:1 of the Philistines generally); in the Bible, Dagon is associated with Gaza (Judges 16) but elsewhere with Ashdod (compare 1 Sa 5 and 1 Macc 10:83 f; 11:4); in <1300>1 Chronicles 10:10 there is probably an error (compare the passage <0810>1 Samuel 31:10). The god had his temple ("the house of Dagon") and his priests. When the ark was captured by the Philistines, it was conducted to Ashdod where it was placed in the house of Dagon by the side of the idol. But on the morrow it was found that the idol lay prostrate before the ark of the Lord. It was restored to its place; but on the following day Dagon again lay on the ground before the ark, this time with the head and both hands severed from the body and lying upon the *miphtan* (the word is commonly interpreted to mean "threshold"; according to Winckler, it means "pedestal"); the body alone remained intact. The Hebrew says: "Dagon alone remained." Whether we resort to an emendation ([/gD; *dagho*], "his fish-part") or not, commentators appear to be right in inferring that the idol was half-man, half-fish. Classic authors give this form to Derceto. The sacred writer adds that from that time on the priests of Dagon and all those that entered the house of Dagon refrained from stepping upon the *miphtan* of Dagon. See <0905>1 Samuel 5:1-5. The prophet Zephaniah (1:9) speaks of an idolatrous practice which consisted in leaping over the *miphtan*. The Septuagint in 1 Samuel indeed adds the clause: "but they were accustomed to leap." Leaping over the threshold was probably a feature of the Philistine ritual which the Hebrews explained in their way. A god Dagon seems to have been worshipped by the Canaanites; *see BETH-DAGON.*

LITERATURE

Commentaries on Judges and 1 Samuel; Winckler, Altoriental. Forschungen, III, 383.

Max L. Margolis

DAILY

<da'-li>: This word, coming as it does from the Hebrew [μ/y, *yom*] "day," and the Greek [ἡμέρα, *hemera*], suggests either day by day (Exodus 5:13), that which is prepared for one daily (Nehemiah 5:18), as e.g. our "daily bread," meaning bread sufficient for that day (Matthew 6:11); or day by day continuously, one day after another in succession, as "the daily burnt offering" (Numbers 29:6 the King James Version), "daily ministration" (Acts 6:1), and "daily in the temple" (Acts 5:42 the King James Version). The meaning of the word "daily" as used in the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:11) seems to indicate sufficient for our need, whether we consider that need as a day at a time, or day after day as we are permitted to live. "Give us bread sufficient for our sustenance."

William E. Vans

DAILY OFFERING OR SACRIFICE

See SACRIFICE.

DAINTIES; DAINTY (MEATS)

<dan'-tis> ([t/M[fìn" , *maT`ammoth*], "things full of taste," [μyM[ìn" , *man`ammim*], [ˆd[ìn" , *ma`adhan*]; [λιπαρός, *liparos*], "fat," "shining"): Jacob is represented as predicting of Asher, "He shall yield royal dainties" (Genesis 49:20; compare parallel clause, "His bread shall be fat," and Deuteronomy 33:24, "Let him dip his foot in oil"). David, praying to be delivered from the ways of "men that work inquiry," cries, "Let me not eat of their dainties" (Psalm 141:4). The man who sitteth "to eat with a ruler" (Proverbs 23:1-3) is counseled, "If thou be a man given to appetite, be not desirous of his dainties; seeing they are deceitful food" (compare John's words in the woes upon Babylon (Revelation 18:14), "All things that were dainties and sumptuous are perished from thee," and Homer's *Iliad* (Pope). xviii.456). "Dainties," then, are luxuries, costly, delicate and rare. This idea is common to all the

words thus rendered; naturally associated with kings' tables, and with the lives of those who are lovers of pleasure and luxury. By their associations and their softening effects they are to be abstained from or indulged in moderately as "deceitful food" by those who would live the simple and righteous life which wisdom sanctions. They are also "offered not from genuine hospitality, but with some by-ends." He should also shun the dainties of the niggard (Proverbs 23:6), who counts the cost (Proverbs 23:7 the Revised Version, margin) of every morsel that his guest eats.

See DELICATE; FOOD, etc.

George B. Eager

DAISAN

<da'-san>, *<da'-i-san>* ([Δαισάν, *Daisan*]): Head of a family of temple servants (1 Esdras 5:3:1) called Rezin in Ezra 2:48; Nehemiah 7:50, the interchange of "D" and "R" in Hebrew being not uncommon.

DAKUBI

<da-ku'-bi>, *<da-koo'-bi>* ([Δακούβ, *Dakoub*], [Δακουβί, *Dakoubi*]; the King James Version Dacobi): Head of a family of gate-keepers (1 Esdras 5:28) called "Akkub" in the canonical lists.

DALAIAH

<da-la'-a>, *<da-la-i'-a>*.

See DELAIAH.

DALAN

<da'-lan> ([Δαλάν, *Dalan*]; the King James Version Ladan): Head of a family that returned to Jerusalem, but which "could shew neither their families, nor their stock, how they were of Israel" (1 Esdras 5:37); corresponds to Delaiah (Ezra 2:60). Another reading is "Asan."

DALE; KING'S

<dal>, [Ël Mh″ qm[`*emeq hamelekh*]) :

(1) "Absalom in his lifetime had taken and reared up for himself the pillar, which is in the king's dale" (2 Samuel 18:18). According to

Josephus (Ant., VII, x, 3) this was a marble pillar, which he calls Absalom's hand" and it wa two furlongs from Jerusalem. Warren suggests that this dale was identical with the KING'S GARDEN (which see), which he places at the open valley formed at the junction of the Tyropoen with the Kidron (*see JERUSALEM*). The so-called Absalom's Pillar, which the Jews still pelt with stones in reprobation of Absalom's disobedience, and which a comparatively recent tradition associates with <01818>2 Samuel 18:18, is a very much later structure, belonging to the Greco-Roman period, but showing Egyptian influence.

(2) King's Vale (<01417>Genesis 14:17; the King James Version dale).

See KING'S VALE; VALE.

E. W. G. Masterman

DALETH

<da'-leth> ([D, ד]): The 4th letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and as such used in Psalm 119 to designate the 4th section; transliterated in this Encyclopedia with the *dagesh* as d, and, without, as dh (= th in "the"). It came also to be used for the number four **(4)**, and with the dieresis for 4,000. With the apostrophe it is sometimes used as abbreviation for the tetragrammaton. For name, etc., *see* ALPHABET.

DALLY

<dal'-i>: Occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 12:26: "But they that would not be reformed by that correction wherein he *dallied* with them" ([παιγνίοις ἐπιτιμήσεως, *paigniois epitimeseos*], "child play of correction"), the reference being to the earlier and lighter plagues of Egypt; Version (British and American) renders "by a mocking correction as of children," "by a correction which was as children's play," Greek (as above). He first tried them by those lighter inflictions before sending on them the heavier. In later usage "daily" implies *delay*.

DALMANUTHA

<dal-ma-nu'-tha>. *See MAGADAN*. Compare <41080>Mark 8:10; <40159>Matthew 15:39.

DALMATIA

<dal-ma'-shi-a> ([Δαλματία, *Dalmatia*], "deceitful"): A district of the Roman empire lying on the eastern shore of the Adriatic. Writing from Rome to Timothy during his second imprisonment (in 66 or 67 AD, according to Ramsay's chronology), Paul records the departure of Titus to Dalmatia (²2 Timothy 4:10). No mention is made of his special mission, and we cannot tell whether his object was to traverse regions hitherto unevangelized or to visit churches already formed. Nor can we determine with certainty the meaning of the word Dalmatia as here used. Originally it denoted the land of the barbarous Dalmatae or Delmatae, a warlike Illyrian tribe subjugated by the Romans after a long and stubborn resistance; it was then applied to the southern portion of the Roman province of Illyricum, lying between the river Titius (modern *Kerka*) and the Macedonian frontier; later the name was extended to the entire province. On the whole it seems most probable that the apostle uses it in this last sense.

***See further under the word** ILLYRICUM.*

Marcus N. Tod

DALPHON

<dal'-fon> ([ˆ/pl Þ″ , *dalphon*], "crafty"): The second of the ten sons of Haman, slain by the Jews (Est 9:7).

DAM

([μαe *'em*], ordinary Hebrew word for "mother"): Hebrew law prohibited the destruction of the "dam" and the young of birds at the same time, commanding that if the young be taken from a nest the dam be allowed to escape (Deuteronomy 22:6,7). In the same spirit it enjoined the taking of an animal for slaughter before it had been seven days with its "dam" (Exodus 22:30; Leviticus 22:27; compare Exodus 23:19).

DAMAGE

<dam'-aj> ([al bj } *chabhala'*]): This word expresses any inflicted loss of value or permanent injury to persons or things. "Why should damage grow to the hurt of the kings?" (Ezra 4:22). In Proverbs 26:6 "damage" means "wrong," "injury" (Hebrew [smj ; *chamac*]). The translation of Est

7:4 is doubtful: "Although the adversary could not have compensated for the king's damage" (the Revised Version, margin "For our affliction is not to be compared with the king's damage" the King James Version "could not countervail the king's damage") but Hebrew [qzn,*nezeq*] (Est 7:4) and Aramaic [qzñ; *naziq*] ([2060]Daniel 6:2) have the meaning of "molestation" or "annoyance" (see Ges.6 Buhl Dict. (15th edition) 489, 806, 908). We therefore ought to read `for that oppression would not have been worthy of the molestation of the king' (Est 7:4) and `that the king should have no molestation' ([2060]Daniel 6:2). The Greek [ζημία, *zemia*], "loss" and [ζημιόω, *zemioo*], "to cause loss"; the Revised Version (British and American) therefore translates [4270]Acts 27:10 "will be with injury and much loss" (the King James Version "damage"), and [4709]2 Corinthians 7:9 "that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing" (the King James Version "damage").

A. L. Breslich

DAMARIS

<dam'-a-ris> ([Δάμαρις, *Damaris*], possibly a corruption of [δάμαλις, *damalis*], "a heifer"): The name of a female Christian of Athens, converted by Paul's preaching ([4734]Acts 17:34). The fact that she is mentioned in this passage together with Dionysius the Areopagite has led some, most probably in error, to regard her as his wife. The singling out of her name with that of Dionysius may indicate some personal or social distinction. Compare [4712]Acts 17:12.

DAMASCENES

<dam-a-senz'>, *<dam'-a-senz>* [τὴν πόλιν Δαμασκηνῶν, *ten polin Damaskenon*], "the city of the Damascenes"): The inhabitants of Damascus under Aretas the Arabian are so called ([4713]2 Corinthians 11:32).

DAMASCUS

<da-mas'-kus>:

1. NAME:

The English name is the same as the Greek [Δαμασκός, *Damaskos*]. The Hebrew name is [qcMd″, *Dammeseq*], but the Aramaic form [qcmrD″, *Darmeseq*], occurs in [13805]1 Chronicles 18:5; [4285]2 Chronicles 28:5. The name appears in Egyptian inscriptions as *Ti-mas-ku* (16th century BC), and

Sa-ra-mas-ki (13th century BC), which W. M. Muller, Asien u. Europa, 227, regards as representing *Ti-ra-mas-ki*, concluding from the "ra" in this form that Damascus had by that time passed under Aramaic influence. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters the forms *Ti-ma-as-gi* and *Di-mas-ka* occur. The Arabic name is *Dimashk esh-Sham* ("Damascus of Syria") usually contrasted to *Esh-Sham* simply. The meaning of the name Damascus is unknown. Esh-Sham (Syria) means "the left," in contrast to the *Yemen* (Arabia) = "the right."

2. SITUATION AND NATURAL FEATURES:

Damascus is situated (33 degrees 30' North latitude, 36 degrees 18' East longitude) in the Northwest corner of the Ghuta, a fertile plain about 2,300 ft. above sea level, West of Mt. Hermon. The part of the Ghuta East of the city is called el-Merj, the "meadow-land" of Damascus. The river Barada (*see ASANA*) flows through Damascus and waters the plain, through which the Nahr el-Awaj (*see PHARPAR*) also flows, a few miles South of the city. Surrounded on three sides by bare hills, and bordered on the East, its open side, by the desert, its well-watered and fertile Ghuta, with its streams and fountains, its fields and orchards, makes a vivid impression on the Arab of the desert. Arabic literature is rich in praises of Damascus, which is described as an earthly paradise. The European or American traveler is apt to feel that these praises are exaggerated, and it is perhaps only in early summer that the beauty of the innumerable fruit trees — apricots, pomegranates, walnuts and many others — justifies enthusiasm. To see Damascus as the Arab sees it, we must approach it, as he does, from the desert. The Barada (Abana) is the life blood of Damascus. Confined in a narrow gorge until close to the city, where it spreads itself in many channels over the plain, only to lose itself a few miles away in the marshes that fringe the desert, its whole strength is expended in making a small area between the hills and the desert really fertile. That is why a city on this site is inevitable and permanent. Damascus, almost defenseless from a military point of view, is the natural mart and factory of inland Syria. In the course of its long history it has more than once enjoyed and lost political supremacy, but in all the vicissitudes of political fortune it has remained the natural harbor of the Syrian desert.

3. THE CITY ITSELF:

Damascus lies along the main stream of the Barada, almost entirely on its south bank. The city is about a mile long (East to West) and about half a mile broad (North to South). On the south side a long suburb, consisting for the most part of a single street, called the Meidan, stretches for a mile beyond the line of the city wall, terminating at the Bawwabet Allah, the "Gate of God," the starting-point of the Haj, the annual pilgrimage to Mecca. The city has thus roughly the shape of a broad-headed spoon, of which the Meidan is the handle. In the Greek period, a long, colonnaded street ran through the city, doubtless the "street which is called Straight" (⁴⁰⁹¹¹Acts 9:11). This street, along the course of which remains of columns have been discovered, runs westward from the Babesh-Sherki, the "East Gate." Part of it is still called Derb el-Mustakim ("Straight Street"), but it is not certain that it has borne the name through all the intervening centuries. It runs between the Jewish and Christian quarters (on the left and right, respectively, going west), and terminates in the Suk el-Midhatiyeh, a bazaar built by Midhat Pasha, on the north of which is the main Moslem quarter, in which are the citadel and the Great Mosque. The houses are flat-roofed, and are usually built round a courtyard, in which is a fountain. The streets, with the exception of Straight Street, are mostly narrow and tortuous, but on the west side of the city there are some good covered bazaars. Damascus is not rich in antiquities. The Omayyad Mosque, or Great Mosque, replaced a Christian church, which in its time had taken the place of a pagan temple. The site was doubtless occupied from time immemorial by the chief religious edifice of the city. A small part of the ancient Christian church is still extant. Part of the city wall has been preserved, with a foundation going back to Roman times, surmounted by Arab work. The traditional site of Paul's escape (⁴⁴⁰⁹²⁵Acts 9:25; ⁴⁷¹¹³³2 Corinthians 11:33) and of the House of Naaman (2 Kings 5) are pointed out to the traveler, but the traditions are valueless. The charm of Damascus lies in the life of the bazaars, in the variety of types which may be seen there — the Druse, the Kurd, the Bedouin and many others — and in its historical associations. It has always been a manufacturing city. Our word "damask" bears witness to the fame of its textile industry, and the "Damascus blades" of the Crusading period were equally famous; and though Timur (Tamerlane) destroyed the trade in arms in 1399 by carrying away the armorers to Samarcand, Damascus is still a city of busy craftsmen in cloth and wood. Its antiquity casts a spell of romance upon it. After a

traceable history of thirty-five centuries it is still a populous and flourishing city, and, in spite of the advent of the railway and even the electric street car, it still preserves the flavor of the East.

4. ITS HISTORY:

(1) The Early Period (to circa 950 BC).

The origin of Damascus is unknown. Mention has already been made (section 1) of the references to the city in Egyptian inscriptions and in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. It appears once — possibly twice — in the history of Abraham. In ⁰¹⁴¹⁵Genesis 14:15 we read that Abraham pursued the four kings as far as Hobah, "which is on the left hand (i.e. the north) of Damascus." But this is simply a geographical note which shows only that Damascus was well known at the time when Genesis 14 was written. Greater interest attaches to ⁰¹⁵⁰²Genesis 15:2, where Abraham complains that he is childless and that his heir is "Dammesek Eliezer" (English Revised Version), for which the Syriac version reads "Eliezer the Damaschul." The clause, however, is hopelessly obscure, and it is doubtful whether it contains any reference to Damascus at all. In the time of David Damascus was an Aramean city, which assisted the neighboring Aramean states in their unsuccessful wars against David (¹⁰⁸⁰⁵2 Samuel 8:5 f). These campaigns resulted indirectly in the establishment of a powerful Aramean kingdom in Damascus. Rezon, son of Eliada, an officer in the army of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, escaped in the hour of defeat, and became a captain of banditti. Later he established himself in Damascus, and became its king (¹¹¹¹²³1 Kings 11:23 ff). He cherished a not unnatural animosity against Israel and the rise of a powerful and hostile kingdom in the Israelite frontier was a constant source of anxiety to Solomon (¹¹¹¹²⁵1 Kings 11:25).

(2) The Aramean Kingdom (circa 950-732 BC).

Whether Rezon was himself the founder of a dynasty is not clear. He has been identified with Hezion, father of Tab-rimmon, and grandfather of Ben-hadad (¹¹¹⁵¹⁸1 Kings 15:18), but the identification, though a natural one, is insecure. Ben-hadad (Biridri) is the first king of Damascus, after Rezon, of whom we have any detailed knowledge. The disruption of the Hebrew kingdom afforded the Arameans an opportunity of playing off the rival Hebrew states against each other, and of bestowing their favors now on one, and now on the other. Benhadad was induced by Asa of Judah to accept a large bribe, or tribute, from the Temple treasures, and relieve Asa

by attacking the Northern Kingdom (⁽¹¹⁵¹⁸⁾1 Kings 15:18 ff). Some years later (circa 880 BC) Ben-hadad (or his successor?) defeated Omri of Israel, annexed several Israelite cities, and secured the right of having Syrian "streets" (i.e. probably a bazaar for Syrian merchants) in Samaria (⁽¹²⁰³⁴⁾1 Kings 20:34). Ben-hadad II (according to Winckler the two Ben-hadads are really identical, but this view, though just possible chronologically, conflicts with ⁽¹²⁰³⁴⁾1 Kings 20:34) was the great antagonist of Ahab. His campaigns against Israel are narrated in ⁽¹²⁰²²⁾1 Kings 20:22. At first successful, he was subsequently twice defeated by Ahab, and after the rout at Aphek was at the mercy of the conqueror, who treated him with generous leniency, claiming only the restoration of the lost Israelite towns, and the right of establishing an Israelite bazaar in Damascus. On the renewal of hostilities three years later Ahab fell before Ramoth-gilead, and his death relieved Ben-hadad of the only neighboring monarch who could ever challenge the superiority of Damascus. Further light is thrown upon the history of Damascus at this time by the Assyrian inscriptions. In 854 BC the Assyrians defeated a coalition of Syrian and Palestine states (including Israel) under the leadership of Ben-hadad at Karqar. In 849 and 846 BC renewed attacks were made upon Damascus by the Assyrians, who, however, did not effect any considerable conquest. From this date until the fall of the city in 732 BC the power of the Aramean kingdom depended upon the activity or quiescence of Assyria. Hazael, who murdered Ben-hadad and usurped his throne circa 844 BC, was attacked in 842 and 839, but during the next thirty years Assyria made no further advance westward. Hazael was able to devote all his energies to his western neighbors, and Israel suffered severely at his hands. In 803 Mari' of Damascus, who is probably identical with the Ben-hadad of ⁽²¹³⁰³⁾2 Kings 13:3, Hazael's son, was made tributary to Ramman-nirari III of Assyria. This blow weakened Aram, and afforded Jeroboam II of Israel an opportunity of avenging the defeats inflicted upon his country by Hazael. In 773 Assyria again invaded the territory of Damascus. Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 BC) pushed vigorously westward, and in 738 Rezin of Damascus paid tribute. A year or two later he revolted, and attempted in concert with Pekah of Israel, to coerce Judah into joining an anti-Assyrian league (⁽²¹⁵³⁷⁾2 Kings 15:37; 16:5; Isaiah 7). His punishment was swift and decisive. In 734 the Assyrians advanced and laid siege to Damascus, which fell in 732. Rezin was executed, his kingdom was overthrown, and the city suffered the fate which a few years later befell Samaria.

(3) The Middle Period (circa 732 BC-650 AD).

Damascus had now lost its political importance, and for more than two centuries we have only one or two inconsiderable references to it. It is mentioned in an inscription of Sargon (722-705 BC) as having taken part in an unsuccessful insurrection along with Hamath and Arpad. There are incidental references to it in [24923]Jeremiah 49:23 ff and [26718]Ezekiel 27:18; 47:16 ff. In the Persian period Damascus, if not politically of great importance, was a prosperous city. The overthrow of the Persian empire by Alexander was soon followed (301 BC) by the establishment of the Seleucid kingdom of Syria, with Antioch as its capital, and Damascus lost its position as the chief city of Syria. The center of gravity was moved toward the sea, and the maritime commerce of the Levant became more important than the trade of Damascus with the interior. In 111 BC the Syrian kingdom was divided, and Antiochus Cyzicenus became king of Coele-Syria, with Damascus as his capital. His successors, Demetrius Eucaerus and Antiochus Dionysus, had troubled careers, being involved in domestic conflicts and in wars with the Parthians, with Alexander Janneus of Judea, and with Aretas the Nabatean, who obtained possession of Damascus in 85 BC. Tigranes, being of Armenia, held Syria for some years after this date, but was defeated by the Romans, and in 64 BC Pompey finally annexed the country. The position of Damascus during the first century and a half of Roman rule in Syria is obscure. For a time it was in Roman hands, and from 31 BC-33 AD its coins bear the names of Augustus or Tiberius. Subsequently it was again in the hands of the Nabateans, and was ruled by an ethnarch, or governor, appointed by Aretas, the Nabatean king. This ethnarch adopted a hostile attitude to Paul ([47132]2 Corinthians 11:32 f) . Later, in the time of Nero, it again became a Roman city. In the early history of Christianity Damascus, as compared with Antioch, played a very minor part. But it is memorable in Christian history on account of its associations with Paul's conversion, and as the scene of his earliest Christian preaching ([44901]Acts 9:1-25). All the New Testament references to the city relate to this event ([44901]Acts 9:1:25; 22:5-11; 26:12,20; [47132]2 Corinthians 11:32 f; [48017]Galatians 1:17). Afterward, under the early Byzantine emperor, Damascus, though important as an outpost of civilization on the edge of the desert, continued to be second to Antioch both politically and ecclesiastically. It was not until the Arabian conquest (634 AD when it passed out of Christian hands, and reverted to the desert, that it once more became a true capital.

(4) Under Islam.

Damascus has now been a Moslem city, or rather a city under Moslem rule, for nearly thirteen centuries. For about a century after 650 AD it was the seat of the Omayyad caliphs, and enjoyed a position of preeminence in the Moslem world. Later it was supplanted by Bagdad, and in the 10th century it came under the rule of the Fatimites of Egypt. Toward the close of the 11th century the Seljuk Turks entered Syria and captured Damascus. In the period of the Crusades the city, though never of decisive importance, played a considerable part, and was for a time the headquarters of Saladin. In 1300 it was plundered by the Tartars, and in 1399 Timur exacted an enormous ransom from it, and carried off its famous armorers, thus robbing it of one of its most important industries. Finally, in 1516 AD, the Osmanli Turks under Sultan Selim conquered Syria, and Damascus became, and still is, the capital of a province of the Ottoman Empire.

C. H. Thomson

DAMMESEK ELIEZER

(<01152>Genesis 15:2 the English Revised Version).
See ELIEZER (1).

DAMN; DAMNATION; DAMNABLE

<dam>, *<dam-na'-shun>*, *<dam'-na-bl>*: These words have undergone a change of meaning since the King James Version was made. They are derived from Latin damnare = "to inflict a loss," "to condemn," and that was their original meaning in English Now they denote exclusively the idea of everlasting punishment in hell. It is often difficult to determine which meaning was intended by the translators in the King James Version. They have been excluded altogether from the Revised Version (British and American). The words for which they stand in the King James Version are:

(1) [ἀπώλεια, *apoleia*], "destruction," translated "damnable" and "damnation" only in 2 Peter 21:3 (the Revised Version (British and American) "destructive," "destruction"). False prophets taught doctrines calculated to destroy others, and themselves incurred the sentence of destruction such as overtook the fallen angels, the world in the Deluge, and the cities of the Plain. *Apoleia* occurs otherwise 16 times in the New Testament, and is always translated in the King James Version and the

Revised Version (British and American) by either "perdition" or "destruction": twice of waste of treasure (Matthew 26:8 = Mark 14:4); twice of the beast that comes out of the abyss and goes into perdition (Revelation 17:8,11). In all other cases, it refers to men, and defines the destiny that befalls them as the result of sin: Judas is the "son of perdition" (John 17:12). Peter consigns Simon Magus and his money to perdition (Acts 8:20). Some men are "vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction" (Romans 9:22), and others, their "end is perdition" (Philippians 3:19). It is the antithesis of salvation (Hebrews 10:39; Philippians 1:28). Of the two ways of life, one leads to destruction (Matthew 7:13). Whether it is utter, final and irretrievable destruction is not stated.

(2) [κρίνω, *krino*], translated "damned" only in the King James Version of 2 Thessalonians 2:12 (the Revised Version (British and American) "judged") means "to judge" in the widest sense, "to form an opinion" (Luke 7:43), and forensically "to test and try" an accused person. It can only acquire the sense of "judging guilty" or "condemning" from the context.

(3) [κατακρίνω, *katakrino*], translated "damned" only in the King James Version of Mark 16:16; Romans 14:23 ("condemned" in the Revised Version (British and American)), means properly "to give judgment against" or "to condemn" and is so translated 17 times in the King James Version and always in the Revised Version (British and American).

(4) [κρίσις, *krisis*], translated "damnation" in the King James Version of Matthew 23:33; Mark 3:29; John 5:29 (the Revised Version (British and American) "judgment," but in Mark 3:29, "sin" for [ἁμάρτημα, *hamartema*]), means

(a) judgment in general like *krino*, and is so used about 17 times, besides 14 times in the phrase "day of judgment";

(b) "condemnation," like *katakrino*, about 14 times.

(5) [κρίμα, *krima*], translated in the King James Version "damnation" 7 times (Matthew 23:14 = Mark 12:40 = Luke 20:47; Romans 3:8; 13:2; 1 Corinthians 11:29; 1 Timothy 5:12), "condemnation" 6 times, "judgment" 13 times, "law" and "avenged" once each; in the Revised Version (British and American) "condemnation" 9 t (Matthew

23:14 only inserted in margin), "judgment" 17 times, and once in margin, "lawsuit" and "sentence" once each. "Judgment" may be neutral, an impartial act of the judge weighing the evidence (so in ⁴⁰⁷⁰Matthew 7:2; ⁴⁴²⁵Acts 24:25; ⁵¹¹³Romans 11:33; ⁵⁰⁶²Hebrews 6:2; ⁶⁰⁴⁷1 Peter 4:17; ⁶²⁰⁴Revelation 20:4) and "lawsuit" (⁴⁶⁰⁷1 Corinthians 6:7); or it may be inferred from the context that judgment is unto condemnation (so in ⁵⁰¹²Romans 2:2,3; 5:16; ⁸⁰⁵⁰Galatians 5:10; ⁶⁰⁰³2 Peter 2:3; ⁶¹⁷⁰Revelation 17:1; 18:20, and the Revised Version (British and American) ⁵¹³²Romans 13:2; ⁴⁶²⁹1 Corinthians 11:29). In places where *krima* and *krisis* are rightly translated "condemnation," and where "judgment" regarded as an accomplished fact involves a sentence of guilt, they together with *katakrino* define the relation of a person to the supreme authority, as that of a criminal, found and held guilty, and liable to punishment. So the Roman empire regarded Jesus Christ, and the thief on the cross (⁴²³⁴Luke 23:40; 24:20). But generally these words refer to man as a sinner against God, judged guilty by Him, and liable to the just penalty of sin. They imply nothing further as to the nature of the penalty or the state of man undergoing it, nor as to its duration. Nor does the word "eternal" ([αἰών, αἰώνιος, *aion, aionios*], often wrongly translated "everlasting" in the King James Version) when added to them, determine the question of duration. Condemnation is an act in the moral universe, which cannot be determined under categories of time.

These terms define the action of God in relation to man's conduct, as that of the Supreme Judge, but they express only one aspect of that relation which is only fully conceived, when coordinated with the more fundamental idea of God's Fatherhood.

See ESCHATOLOGY; JUDGMENT.

LITERATURE.

Salmond, Christian Doctrine of Immortality; Charles, Eschatology.

T. Rees

DAMSEL

<dam'-zel>: A young, unmarried woman; a girl (lass); maiden (compare French *demoiselle*). The Revised Version (British and American) in ⁴⁰⁶⁹Matthew 26:69; ⁴³⁸⁷John 18:17; ⁴⁴²³Acts 12:13; 16:16 gives "maid" for [παιδίσκη, *paidiske*], "a girl," i.e. (spec.) a maidservant or young female

slave (the King James Version "damsel"), and "child" for [παιδίον, *paidion*], "a half-grown boy or girl," in ⁽⁴¹⁰⁵⁹⁾Mark 5:39,40 bis. 41.

DAN (1)

([ˆD; *dan*], "judge"; [Δάν, *Dan*]).

1. NAME:

The fifth of Jacob's sons, the first borne to him by Bilhah, the maid of Rachel, to whom, as the child of her slave, he legally belonged. At his birth Rachel, whose barrenness had been a sore trial to her, exclaimed "God hath judged me .... and hath given me a son," so she called his name Dan, i.e. "judge" (⁽⁰¹³⁰⁶⁾Genesis 30:6). He was full brother of Naphtali. In Jacob's Blessing there is an echo of Rachel's words, "Daniel shall judge his people" (⁽⁰⁴⁹¹⁶⁾Genesis 49:16). Of the patriarch Daniel almost nothing is recorded. Of his sons at the settlement in Egypt only one, Hushim, is mentioned (⁽⁰⁴⁶²³⁾Genesis 46:23). The name in ⁽⁰²⁶²⁾Numbers 26:42 is Shuham.

2. THE TRIBE:

The tribe however stands second in point of numbers on leaving Egypt, furnishing 62,700 men of war (⁽⁰⁰¹³⁹⁾Numbers 1:39); and at the second census they were 64,400 strong (⁽⁰²⁶³⁾Numbers 26:43). The standard of the camp of Daniel in the desert march, with which were Asher and Naphtali, was on the north side of the tabernacle (⁽⁰⁴²²⁵⁾Numbers 2:25; 10:25; compare ⁽⁰⁶⁰⁹⁾Joshua 6:9 the King James Version margin, "gathering host"). The prince of the tribe was Ahiezer (⁽⁰⁰¹¹²⁾Numbers 1:12). Among the spies Daniel was represented by Ammiel the son of Gemalli (⁽⁰⁴³¹²⁾Numbers 13:12). Of the tribe of Daniel was Oholiab (the King James Version "Aholiab") one of the wise-hearted artificers engaged in the construction of the tabernacle (⁽⁰³¹⁰⁶⁾Exodus 31:6). One who was stoned for blasphemy was the son of a Danite woman (⁽⁰³²⁴⁰⁾Leviticus 24:10 f). At the ceremony of blessing and cursing, Daniel and Naphtali stood on Mount Ebal, while the other Rachel tribes were on Gerizim (⁽⁰⁵²⁷¹³⁾Deuteronomy 27:13). The prince of Daniel at the division of the land was Bukki the son of Jogli (⁽⁰³⁴²²⁾Numbers 34:22).

3. TERRITORY:

The portion assigned to Daniel adjoined those of Ephraim, Benjamin and Judah, and lay on the western slopes of the mountain. The reference in

[07057]Judges 5:17: "And Dan, why did he remain in ships?" seems to mean that on the West, Daniel had reached the sea. But the passage is one of difficulty. We are told that the Amorites forced the children of Daniel into the mountain ([07034]Judges 1:34), so they did not enjoy the richest part of their ideal portion, the fertile plain between the mountain and the sea. The strong hand of the house of Joseph kept the Amorites tributary, but did not drive them out. Later we find Daniel oppressed by the Philistines, against whom the heroic exploits of Samson were performed (Judges 14 ff). The expedition of the Danites recorded in Judges 18 is referred to in [06197]Joshua 19:47 ff.

4. THE DANITE RAID:

The story affords a priceless glimpse of the conditions prevailing in those days. Desiring an extension of territory, the Danites sent out spies, who recommended an attack upon Laish, a city at the north end of the Jordan valley. The people, possibly a colony from Sidon, were careless in their fancied security. The land was large, and there was "no want of anything that was in the earth." The expedition of the 600, their dealings with Micah and his priest, their capture of Laish, and their founding of an idol shrine with priestly attendant, illustrate the strange mingling of lawlessness and superstition which was characteristic of the time. The town rebuilt on the site of Laish they called Dan — see following article. Perhaps [14214]2 Chronicles 2:14 may be taken to indicate that the Danites intermarried with the Phoenicians. Divided between its ancient seat in the South and the new territory in the North the tribe retained its place in Israel for a time ([13235]1 Chronicles 12:35; 27:22), but it played no part of importance in the subsequent history. The name disappears from the genealogical lists of Chronicles; and it is not mentioned among the tribes in [66705]Revelation 7:5 ff.

Samson was the one great man produced by Dan, and he seems to have embodied the leading characteristics of the tribe: unsteady, unscrupulous, violent, possessed of a certain grim humor; stealthy in tactics — "a serpent in the way, an adder in the path" ([04917]Genesis 49:17) — but swift and strong in striking — "a lion's whelp, that leapeth forth from Bashan" ([05322]Deuteronomy 33:22). Along with Abel, Daniel ranked as a city in which the true customs of old Israel were preserved ([10018]2 Samuel 20:18 Septuagint).

W. Ewing

DAN (2)

A city familiar as marking the northern limit of the land of Israel in the common phrase "from Daniel even to Beer-sheba" (⟨07200⟩Judges 20:1; ⟨09031⟩1 Samuel 3:20, etc.). Its ancient name was Laish or Leshem (⟨07807⟩Judges 18:7, etc.). It was probably an outlying settlement of Tyre of Sidon. Its inhabitants, pursuing the ends of peaceful traders, were defenseless against the onset of the Danite raiders. Having captured the city the Danites gave it the name of their own tribal ancestor (Judges 18). It lay in the valley near Beth-rehob (⟨07828⟩Judges 18:28). Josephus places it near Mt. Lebanon and the fountain of the lesser Jordan, a day's journey from Sidon (Ant., V, iii, 1; VIII, viii, 4; BJ, IV, i, 1). Eusebius, Onomasticon says it lay 4 Roman miles from Paneas on the way to Tyre, at the source of the Jordan. This points decisively to Tell el-Qady, in the plain West of Banias. The mound of this name — Kady is the exact Arabic equivalent of the Hebrew *Dan* — rises from among the bushes and reeds to a height varying from 40 to 80 ft. The largest of all the springs of the Jordan rises on the west side. The waters join with those of a smaller spring on the other side to form Nahr el-Leddan which flows southward to meet the streams from Banias and Chasbeiyeh. The mound, which is the crater of an extinct volcano, has certain ancient remains on the south side, while the tomb of Sheikh Marzuk is sheltered by two holy trees. The sanctuary and ritual established by the Danites persisted as long as the house of God was in Shiloh, and the priesthood in this idolatrous shrine remained in the family of Jonathan till the conquest of Tiglath-pileser (⟨07830⟩Judges 18:30; ⟨12159⟩2 Kings 15:29). Here Jeroboam I set up the golden calf. The ancient sanctity of the place would tend to promote the success of his scheme (⟨11228⟩1 Kings 12:28 f, etc.). The calf, according to a Jewish tradition, was taken away by Tiglath-pileser. Daniel fell before Benhadad, king of Syria (⟨11150⟩1 Kings 15:20; ⟨44604⟩2 Chronicles 16:4). It was regained by Jeroboam II (⟨12425⟩2 Kings 14:25). It shared the country's fate at th hands of Tiglath-pileser (⟨12159⟩2 Kings 15:29). It was to this district that Abraham pursued the army of Chedorlaomer (⟨01444⟩Genesis 14:14). For Dr. G. A. Smith's suggestion that Daniel may have been at Banias see HGHL1, 473, 480 f.

W. Ewing

DAN (3)

(⟨26719⟩Ezekiel 27:19 the King James Version).

See *VEDAN.*

DANCING

<dan'-sing>.

See *GAMES.*

DANDLE

<dan'-d'-l>. ([[∨″ [∨; *sha`-osha`*], a Pulpal form, from root ([[[∀; *sha`-a`*]) with sense of to "be caressed"). Occurs in ⁻²³⁶⁶²⁻Isaiah 66:12, "shall be dandled upon the knees."

DANGER

<dan'-jer>: Danger does not express a state of reality but a possibility. In ⁻⁴⁰⁵²⁻Matthew 5:21 f, however, and also the King James Version ⁻⁴¹⁰³²⁻Mark 3:29 (the Revised Version (British and American) "but is guilty of an eternal sin") the expression "danger" refers to a certainty, for the danger spoken of is in one case judgment which one brings upon himself, and in the other the committing of an unpardonable sin. Both are the necessary consequences of a man's conduct. The reason for translating the Greek ([ἔνοχος, *enochos*] (literally, "to be held in anything so one cannot escape") by "is in danger," instead of "guilty" or "liable," may be due to the translator's conception of these passages as a warning against such an act rather than as a statement of the judgment which stands pronounced over every man who commits the sin.

A. L. Breslich

DANIEL

<dan'-yel> ([l aYﬤD; *daniye'l*], [l aﬤD; *dani'-el*], "God is my judge"; [Δανιήλ, *Daniel*]):

(1) One of the sons of David (⁻¹³⁰⁰¹⁻1 Chronicles 3:1).
(2) A Levite of the family of Ithamar (⁻¹⁵⁰¹²⁻Ezra 8:2; ⁻¹⁶⁰⁰⁶⁻Nehemiah 10:6).
(3) A prophet of the time of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, the hero and author of the Book of Daniel.

1. EARLY LIFE:

We know nothing of the early life of Daniel, except what is recorded in the book bearing his name. Here it is said that he was one of the youths of royal or noble seed, who were carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar in the third year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah. These youths were without blemish, well-favored, skillful in all wisdom, endued with knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability to stand in the king's palace. The king commanded to teach them the knowledge and tongue of the Chaldeans; and appointed for them a daily portion of the king's food and of the wine which he drank. After having been thus nourished for three years, they were to stand before the king. Ashpenaz, the master or chief of the eunuchs, into whose hands they had been entrusted, following a custom of the time, gave to each of these youths a new and Babylonian name. To Daniel, he gave the name Belteshazzar. In Babylonian this name was probably Belu-lita-sharri-usur, which means "O Bel, protect thou the hostage of the king," a most appropriate name for one in the place which Daniel occupied as a hostage of Jehoiakim at the court of the king of Babylon. The youths were probably from 12 to 15 years of age at the time when they were carried captive. (For changes of names, compare Joseph changed to Zaphenath-paneah (Genesis 41:45); Eliakim, to Jehoiakim (2 Kings 23:34); Mattaniah, to Zedekiah (2 Kings 24:17); and the tw names of the high priest Johanan's brother in the Sachau Papyri, i.e. Ostan and Anani.)

Having purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the food and drink of the king, Daniel requested of Ashpenaz permission to eat vegetables and drink water. Through the favor of God, this request was granted, notwithstanding the fear of Ashpenaz that his head would be endangered to the king on account of the probably resulting poor appearance of the youths living upon this blood-diluting diet, in comparison with the expected healthy appearance of the others of their class. However, ten days' trial having been first granted, and at the end of that time their countenances having been found fairer and their flesh fatter than the other youths', the permission was made permanent; and God gave to Daniel and his companions knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom, and to Daniel understanding in all visions and dreams; so that at the end of the three years when the king communed with them, he found them much superior to all the magicians and enchanters in every matter of wisdom and understanding.

2. DREAM-INTERPRETER:

Daniel's public activities were in harmony with his education. His first appearance was as an interpreter of the dream recorded in Daniel 2. Nebuchadnezzar having seen in his dream a vision of a great image, excellent in brightness and terrible in appearance, its head of fine gold, its breast and its arms of silver, its belly and its thighs of brass, its legs of iron, its feet part of iron and part of clay, beheld a stone cut out without hands smiting the image and breaking it in pieces, until it became like chaff and was carried away by the wind; while the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. When the king awoke from his troubled sleep, he forgot, or reigned that he had forgotten, the dream, and summoned the wise men of Babylon both to tell him the dream and to give the interpretation thereof. The wise men having said that they could not tell the dream, nor interpret it as long as it was untold, the king threatened them with death. Daniel, who seems not to have been present when the other wise men were before the king, when he was informed of the threat of the king, and that preparations were being made to slay all of the wise men of Babylon, himself and his three companions included, boldly went in to the king and requested that he would appoint a time for him to appear to show the interpretation, Then he went to his house, and he and his companions prayed, and the dream and its interpretation were made known unto Daniel. At the appointed time, the dream was explained and the four Hebrews were loaded with wealth and given high positions in the service of the king. In the 4th chapter, we have recorded Daniel's interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar about the great tree that was hewn at the command of an angel, thus prefiguring the insanity of the king.

3. INTERPRETER OF SIGNS:

Daniel's third great appearance in the book is in chapter 5, where he is called upon to explain the extraordinary writing upon the wall of Belshazzar's palace, which foretold the end of the Babylonian empire and the incoming of the Medes and Persians. For this service Daniel was clothed with purple, a chain of gold put around his neck, and he was made the third ruler in the kingdom.

4. SEER OF VISIONS:

Daniel, however, was not merely an interpreter of other men's visions. In the last six chapters we have recorded four or five of his own visions, all of which are taken up with revelations concerning the future history of the great world empires, especially in their relation to the people of God, and predictions of the final triumph of the Messiah's kingdom.

5. OFFICIAL OF THE KINGS:

In addition to his duties as seer and as interpreter of signs and dreams, Daniel also stood high in the governmental service of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede, and perhaps also of Cyrus. The Book of Dnl, our only reliable source of information on this subject, does not tell us much about his civil duties and performances. It does say, however, that he was chief of the wise men, that he was in the gate of the king, and that he was governor over the whole province of Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar; that Belshazzar made him the third ruler in his kingdom; and that Darius made him one of the three presidents to whom his hundred and twenty satraps were to give account; and that he even thought to set him over his whole kingdom. In all of these positions he seems to have conducted himself with faithfulness and judgment. While in the service of Darius the Mede, he aroused the antipathy of the other presidents and of the satraps. Unable to find any fault with his official acts, they induced the king to make a decree, apparently general in form and purpose, but really aimed at Daniel alone. They saw that they could find no valid accusation against him, unless they found it in connection with something concerning the law of his God. They therefore caused the king to make a decree that no one should make a request of anyone for the space of thirty days, save of the king. Daniel, having publicly prayed three times a day as he was in the habit of doing, was caught in the act, accused, and on account of the irrevocability of a law of the Medes and Persians, was condemned in accordance with the decree to be cast into a den of lions. The king was much troubled at this, but was unable to withhold the punishment. However, he expressed to Daniel his belief that his God in whom he trusted continually would deliver him; and so indeed it came to pass. For in the morning, when the king drew near to the mouth of the den, and called to him, Daniel said that God had sent His angel and shut the mouths of the lions. So Daniel was taken up unharmed, and at the command of the king

his accusers, having been cast into tile den, were destroyed before they reached the bottom.

LITERATURE.

Besides the commentaries and other works mentioned in the article on the Book of Daniel, valuable information may be found in Josephus and in Payne Smith's Lectures on Daniel.

R. Dick Wilson

DANIEL, BOOK OF

<dan'-yel>:

I. NAME.

The Book of Daniel is rightly so called, whether we consider Daniel as the author of it, or as the principal person mentioned in it.

II. PLACE IN THE CANON.

In the English Bible, Daniel is placed among the Major Prophets, immediately after Ezk, thus following the order of the Septuagint and of the Latin Vulgate (Jerome's Bible, 390-405 A.D.) In the Hebrew Bible, however, it is placed in the third division of the Canon, called the Kethuvim or writings, by the Hebrews, and the hagiographa, or holy writings, by the Seventy. It has been claimed, that Daniel was placed by the Jews in the third part of the Canon, either because they thought the inspiration of its author to be of a lower kind than was that of the other prophets, or because the book was written after the second or prophetical part of the Canon had been closed. It is more probable, that the book was placed in this part of the Hebrew Canon, because Daniel is not called a *nabhi'* ("prophet"), but was rather a *chozeh* ("seer") and a *chakham* ("wise man"). None but the works of the *nebhi'im* were put in the second part of the Jewish Canon, the third being reserved for the heterogeneous works of seers, wise men, and priests, or for those that do not mention the name or work of a prophet, or that are poetical in form. A confusion has arisen, because the Greek word prophet is used to render the two Hebrew words *nabhi'* and *chozeh*. In the Scriptures, God is said to speak to the former, whereas the latter see visions and dream dreams. Some have attempted to explain the position of Daniel by assuming that he had the prophetic gift

without holding the prophetic office. It must be kept in mind that all reasons given to account for the order and place of many of the books in the Canon are purely conjectural, since we have no historical evidence bearing upon the subject earlier than the time of Jesus ben Sirach, who wrote probably about 180 BC.

III. DIVISIONS OF THE BOOK.

According to its subject-matter, the book falls naturally into two great divisions, each consisting of six chapters, the first portion containing the historical sections, and the second the apocalyptic, or predictive, portions; though the former is not devoid of predictions, nor the latter of historical statements. More specifically, the first chapter is introductory to the whole book; Daniel 2 through 6 describe some marvelous events in the history of Daniel and his three companions in their relations with the rulers of Babylon; and chapters 7 through 12 narrate some visions of Daniel concerning the great world-empires, especially in relation to the kingdom of God.

According to the languages in which the book is written, it may be divided into the Aramaic portion, extending from Daniel 2:4b to the end of chapter 7, and a Hebrew portion embracing the rest of the book.

IV. LANGUAGES.

The language of the book is partly Hebrew and partly a dialect of Aramaic, which has been called Chaldee, or Biblical Aramaic This Aramaic is almost exactly the same as that which is found in portions of Ezra. On account of the large number of Babylonian and Persian words characteristic of this Aramaic and of that of the papyri recently found in Egypt, as well as on account of the general similarity of the nominal, verbal and other forms, and of the syntactical construction, the Aramaic of this period might properly be called the Babylonian-Persian Aramaic With the exception of the sign used to denote the sound "dh," and of the use of *qoph* in a few cases where Daniel has `ayin, the spelling in the papyri is the same in general as that in the Biblical books. Whether the change of spelling was made at a later time in the manuscripts of Daniel, or whether it was a peculiarity of the Babylonian Aramaic as distinguished from the Egyptian or whether it was due to the unifying, scientific genius of Daniel himself, we have no means at present to determine. In view of the fact that the Elephantine Papyri frequently employ the "d" sign to express the "dh"

sound, and that it is always employed in Ezra to express it; in view further of the fact that the "z" sign is found as late as the earliest Nabatean inscription, that of 70 BC (see Euting, 349: 1, 2, 4) to express the "dh" sound, it seems fatuous to insist on the ground of the writing of these two sounds in the Book of Daniel, that it cannot have been written in the Persian period. As to the use of *qoph* and `ayin for the Aramaic sound which corresponds to the Hebrew *tsadhe* when equivalent to an Arabic dad, any hasty conclusion is debarred by the fact that the Aramaic papyri of the 5th century BC, the manuscripts of the Samaritan Targum and the Mandaic manuscripts written from 600 to 900 AD all employ the two letters to express the one sound. The writing of 'aleph and he without any proper discrimination occurs in the papyri as well as in Daniel. The only serious objection to the early date of upon the ground of its spelling is that which is based upon the use of a final "n" in the pronominal suffix of the second and third persons masculine plural instead of the margin of the Aramaic papyri and of the Zakir and Sendschirli inscriptions. It is possible that was influenced in this by the corresponding forms of the Babylonian language. The Syriac and Mandaic dialects of the Aramaic agree with the Babylonian in the formation of the pronominal suffixes of the second and third persons masculine plural, as against the Hebrew, Arabic, Minaean, Sabean and Ethiopic. It is possible that the occurrence of "m" in some west Aramaic documents may have arisen through the influence of the Hebrew and Phoenician, and that pure Aramaic always had "n" just as we find it in Assyrian and Babylonian, and in all east Aramaic documents thus far discovered.

The supposition that the use of "y" in Daniel as a preformative of the third person masculine of the imperfect proves a Palestinian provenience has been shown to be untenable by the discovery that the earliest east Syriac also used "y". (See M. Pognon, Inscriptions semitiques, premiere partie, 17.)

This inscription is dated 73 AD. This proof that in the earlier stages of its history the east Aramaic was in this respect the same as that found in Daniel is confirmed by the fact that the forms of the 3rd person of the imperfect found in the proper names on the Aramaic dockets of the Assyrian inscriptions also have the preformative y. (See Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, II, 47.)

V. PURPOSE OF THE BOOK.

The book is not intended to give an account of the life of Daniel. It gives neither his lineage, nor his age, and recounts but a few of the events of his long career. Nor is it meant to give a record of the history of Israel during the exile, nor even of the captivity in Babylon. Its purpose is to show how by His providential guidance, His miraculous interventions, His foreknowledge and almighty power, the God of heaven controls and directs the forces of Nature and the history of nations, the lives of Hebrew captives and of the mightiest of the kings of the earth, for the accomplishment of His Divine and beneficent plans for His servants and people.

VI. UNITY.

The unity of the book was first denied by Spinoza, who suggested that the first part was taken from the chronological works of the Chaldeans, basing his supposition upon the difference of language between the former and latter parts. Newton followed Spinoza in suggesting two parts, but began his second division with Daniel 7, where the narrative passes over from the 3rd to the 1st person. Kohler follows Newton, claiming, however, that the visions were written by the Daniel of the exile, but that the first 6 chapters were composed by a later writer who also redacted the whole work. Von Orelli holds that certain prophecies of Daniel were enlarged and interpolated by a Jew living in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in order to show his contemporaries the bearing of the predictions of the book upon those times of oppression. Zockler and Lange hold to the unity of the book in general; but the former thought that [27105]Daniel 11:5-45 is an interpolation; and the latter, that 10:1 through 11:44 and 12:5-13 have been inserted in the original work. Meinhold holds that the Aramaic portions existed as early as the times of Alexander the Great — a view to which Strack also inclines. Eichhorn held that the book consisted of ten different original sections, which are bound together merely by the circumstance that they are all concerned with Daniel and his three friends. Finally, Deuteronomy Lagarde, believing that the fourth kingdom was the Roman, held that Daniel 7 was written about 69 AD. (For the best discussion of the controversies about the unity of Daniel, see Eichhorn, Einleitung, sections 612-19, and Buhl in See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche, IV, 449-51.)

VII. GENUINENESS.

With the exception of the neo-Platonist Porphyry, a Greek non-Christian philosopher of the 3rd century AD, the genuineness of the Book of was denied by no one until the rise of the deistic movement in the 17th century. The attacks upon the genuineness of the book have been based upon:

(1) the predictions,

(2) the miracles,

(3) the text,

(4) the language,

(5) the historical statements.

1. The Predictions:

The assailants of the genuineness of Daniel on the ground of the predictions found therein, may be divided into two classes — those who deny prediction in general, and those who claim that the apocalyptic character of the predictions of Daniel is a sufficient proof of their lack of genuineness. The first of these two classes includes properly those only who deny not merely Christianity, but theism; and the answering of them may safely be left to those who defend the doctrines of theism, and particularly of revelation. The second class of assailants is, however, of a different character, since it consists of those who are sincere believers in Christianity and predictive prophecy. They claim, however, that certain characteristics of definiteness and detail, distinguishing the predictive portions of the Book of Daniel from other predictions of the Old Testament, bring the genuineness of Daniel into question.

The kind of prediction found here, ordinarily called apocalyptic, is said to have arisen first in the 2nd century BC, when parts of the Book of Enoch and of the Sibylline Oracles were written; and a main characteristic of an apocalypse is said to be that it records past events as if they were still future, throwing the speaker back into some distant past time, for the purpose of producing on the reader the impression that the book contains real predictions, thus gaining credence for the statements of the writer and giving consolation to those who are thus led to believe in the providential foresight of God for those who trust in Him.

Since those who believe that God has spoken unto man by His Son and through the prophets will not be able to set limits to the extent and definiteness of the revelations which He may have seen fit to make through them, nor to prescribe the method, style, time and character of the revelations, this attack on the genuineness of Daniel may safely be left to the defenders of the possibility and the fact of a revelation. One who believes in these may logically believe in the genuineness of Daniel, as far as this objection goes. That there are spurious apocalypses no more proves that all are spurious than that there are spurious gospels or epistles proves that there are no genuine ones. The spurious epistles of Philaris do not prove that Cicero's Letters are not genuine; nor do the false statements of 2 Macc, nor the many spurious Acts of the Apostles, prove that 1 Macc or Luke's Acts of the Apostles is not genuine. Nor does the fact that the oldest portions of the spurious apocalypses which have been preserved to our time are thought to have been written in the 2nd century BC, prove that no apocalypses, either genuine or spurious, were written before that time. There must have been a beginning, a first apocalypse, at some time, if ever. Besides, if we admit that the earliest parts of the Book of Enoch and of the Sibylline Oracles were written about the middle of the 2nd century BC, whereas the Book of Esdras was written about 300 AD, 450 years later, we can see no good literary reason wh Daniel may not have antedated Enoch by 350 years. The period between 500 BC and 150 BC is so almost entirely devoid of all known Hebrew literary productions as to render it exceedingly precarious for anyone to express an opinion as to what works may have characterized that long space of time.

2. The Miracles:

Secondly, as to the objections made against the Book of Daniel on the ground of the number or character of the miracles recorded, we shall only say that they affect the whole Christian system, which is full of the miraculous from beginning to end. If we begin to reject the books of the Bible because miraculous events are recorded in them, where indeed shall we stop?

3. The Text:

Thirdly, a more serious objection, as far as Daniel itself is concerned, is the claim of Eichhorn that the original text of the Aramaic portion has been so thoroughly tampered with and changed, that we can no longer get at the

genuine original composition. We ourselves can see no objection to the belief that these Aramaic portions were written first of all in Hebrew, or even, if you will, in Babylonian; nor to the supposition that some Greek translators modified the meaning in their version either intentionally, or through a misunderstanding of the original. We claim, however, that the composite Aramaic of Daniel agrees in almost every particular of orthography, etymology and syntax, with the Aramaic of the North Semitic inscriptions of the 9th, 8th and 7th centuries BC and of the Egyptian papyri of the 5th century BC, and that the vocabulary of Daniel has an admixture of Hebrew, Babylonian and Persian words similar to that of the papyri of the 5th century BC; whereas, it differs in composition from the Aramaic of the Nabateans, which is devoid of Persian, Hebrew, and Babylonian words, and is full of Arabisms, and also from that of the Palmyrenes, which is full of Greek words, while having but one or two Persian words, and no Hebrew or Babylonian.

As to different recensions, we meet with a similar difficulty in Jeremiah without anyone's impugning on that account the genuineness of the work as a whole. As to interpolations of verses or sections, they are found in the Samaritan recension of the Hebrew text and in the Samaritan and other Targums, as also in certain places in the text of the New Testament, Josephus and many other ancient literary works, without causing us to disbelieve in the genuineness of the rest of their works, or of the works as a whole.

4. The Language:

Fourthly, the objections to the genuineness of Daniel based on the presence in it of three Greek names of musical instruments and of a number of Persian words do not seem nearly as weighty today as they did a hundred years ago. The Greek inscriptions at Abu Simbal in Upper Egypt dating from the time of Psamtek II in the early part of the 6th century BC, the discovery of the Minoan inscriptions and ruins in Crete, the revelations of the wide commercial relations of the Phoenicians in the early part of the 1st millennium BC, the lately published inscriptions of Sennacherib about his campaigns in Cilicia against the Greek seafarers to which Alexander Poly-histor and Abydenus had referred, telling about his having carried many Greeks captive to Nineveh about 700 BC, the confirmation of the wealth and expensive ceremonies of Nebuchadnezzar made by his own building and other inscriptions, all assure us of the possibility of the use of Greek

musical instruments at Babylon in the 6th century BC. This, taken along with the well-known fact that names of articles of commerce and especially of musical instruments go with the thing, leave no room to doubt that a writer of the 6th century BC may have known and used borrowed Greek terms. The Arameans being the great commercial middlemen between Egypt and Greece on the one hand and Babylon and the Orient on the other, and being in addition a subject people, would naturally adopt many foreign words into their vocabulary.

As to the presence of the so-called Persian words in Daniel, it must be remembered that many words which were formerly considered to be such have been found to be Babylonian. As to the others, perhaps all of them may be Median rather than Persian; and if so, the children of Israel who were carried captive to the cities of the Medes in the middle of the 8th century BC, and the, Arameans, many of whom were subject to the Medes, at least from the time of the fall of Nineveh about 607 BC, may well have adopted many words into their vocabulary from the language of their rulers. Daniel was not writing merely for the Jews who had been carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar, but for all Israelites throughout the world. Hence, he would properly use a language which his scattered readers would understand rather than the purer idiom of Judea. Most of his foreign terms are names of officials, legal terms, and articles of clothing, for which there were no suitable terms existing in the earlier Hebrew or Aramaic There was nothing for a writer to do but to invent new terms, or to transfer the current foreign words into his native language. The latter was the preferable method and the one which he adopted.

5. The Historical Statements:

Fifthly, objections to the genuineness of the Book of Daniel are made on the ground of the historical misstatements which are said to be found in it. These may be classed as:

(1) chronological,

(2) geographical, and

(3) various.

(1) **Chronological Objections.**

The first chronological objection is derived from [2000]Daniel 1:1, where it is

said that Nebuchadnezzar made an expedition against Jerusalem in the 3rd year of Jehoiakim, whereas Jeremiah seems to imply that the expedition was made in the 4th year of that king. As Daniel was writing primarily for the Jews of Babylon, he would naturally use the system of dating that was employed there; and this system differed in its method of denoting the 1st year of a reign from that used by the Egyptians and by the Jews of Jerusalem for whom Jeremiah wrote.

The second objection is derived from the fact that Daniel is said ([2021]Daniel 1:21) to have lived unto the 1st year of Cyrus the king, whereas in [7100]Daniel 10:1 he is said to have seen a vision in the 3rd year of Cyrus, king of Persia. These statements are easily reconciled by supposing that in the former case it is the 1st year of Cyrus as king of Babylon, and in the second, the 3rd year of Cyrus as king of Persia.

The third chronological objection is based on [7068]Daniel 6:28, where it is said that Daniel prospered in the kingdom of Darius and in the kingdom of Cyrus the Persian. This statement is harmonized with the facts revealed by the monuments and with the statements of the book itself by supposing that Darius reigned synchronously with Cyrus, but as sub-king under him.

The fourth objection is based on [7080]Daniel 8:1, where Daniel is said to have seen a vision in the third year of Belshazzar the king. If we suppose that Belshazzar was king of the Chaldeans while his father was king of Babylon, just as Cambyses was king of Babylon while his father, Cyrus, was king of the lands, or as Nabonidus II seems to have been king of Harran while his father, Nabonidus I, was king of Babylon, this statement will harmonize with the other statements made with regard to Belshazzar.

(2) **Geographical Objections.**

As to the geographical objections, three only need be considered as important. The first is, that Shushan seems to be spoken of in [2001]Daniel 7:2 as subject to Babylon, whereas it is supposed by some to have been at that time subject to Media. Here we can safely rest upon the opinion of Winckler, that at the division of the Assyrian dominions among the allied Medes and Babylonians, Elam became subject to Babylon rather than to Media. If, however, this opinion could be shown not to be true, we must remember that Daniel is said to have been at ShuShan in a vision.

The second geographical objection is based on the supposition that Nebuchadnezzar would not have gone against Jerusalem, leaving an Egyptian garrison at Carchemish in his rear, thus endangering his line of communication and a possible retreat to Babylon. This objection has no

weight, now that the position of Carchemish has been shown to be, not at Ciressium, as formerly conjectured, but at Jirabis, 150 miles farther up the Euphrates. Carchemish would have cut off a retreat to Nineveh, but was far removed from the direct line of communication with Babylon.

The third geographical objection is derived from the statement that Darius placed 120 satraps in, or over, all his kingdom. The objection rests upon a false conception of the meaning of satrap and of the extent of a satrapy, there being no reason why a sub-king under Darius may not have had as many satraps under him as Sargon of Assyria had governors and deputies under him; and the latter king mentions 117 peoples and countries over which he appointed his deputies to rule in his place.

(3) **Other Objections.**

Various other objections to the genuineness of Daniel have been made, the principal being those derived from the supposed non-existence of Kings Darius the Mede and Belshazzar the Chaldean, from the use of the word Chaldean to denote the wise men of Babylon, and from the silence of other historical sources as to many of the events recorded in Daniel. The discussion of the existence of Belshazzar and Darius the Mede will be found under *BELSHAZZAR* and *DARIUS*. As to the argument from silence in general, it may be said that it reduces itself in fact to the absence of all reference to Daniel on the monuments, in the Book of Ecclus, and in the post-exilic literature. As to the latter books it proves too much; for Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, as well as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, refer to so few of the older canonical books and earlier historical persons and events, that it is not fair to expect them to refer to Daniel — at least, to use their not referring to him or his book as an argument against the existence of either before the time when they were written. As to Ecclesiasticus, we might have expected him to mention Daniel or the Song of Three Children; but who knows what reasons Ben Sira may have had for not placing them in his list of Hebrew heroes? Perhaps, since he held the views which later characterized the Sadducees, he may have passed Daniel by because of his views on the resurrection and on angels. Perhaps he failed to mention any of the four companions because none of their deeds had been wrought in Palestine; or because their deeds exalted too highly the heathen monarchies to which the Jews were subject. Or, more likely, the book may have been unknown to him, since very few copies at best of the whole Old Testament can have existed in his time, and the Book of Daniel may not have gained

general currency in Palestine before it was made so preeminent by the fulfillment of its predictions in the Maccabean times.

It is not satisfactory to say that Ben Sira did not mention Daniel and his companions, because the stories concerning them had not yet been imbedded in a canonical book, inasmuch as he does place Simon, the high priest, among the greatest of Israel's great men, although he is not mentioned in any canonical book. In conclusion, it may be said, that while it is impossible for us to determine why Ben Sira does not mention Daniel and his three companions among his worthies, if their deeds were known to him, it is even more impossible to understand how these stories concerning them cannot merely have arisen but have been accepted as true, between 180 BC, when Ecclesiasticus is thought to have been written, and 169 BC, when, according to 1 Maccabees, Matthias, the first of the Asmoneans, exhorted his brethren to follow the example of the fortitude of Ananias and his friends.

As to the absence of all mention of Daniel on the contemporary historical documents of Babylon and Persia, such mention is not to be expected, inasmuch as those documents give the names of none who occupied positions such as, or similar to, those which Daniel is said to have filled.

VIII. INTERPRETATION.

Questions of the interpretation of particular passages may be looked for in the commentaries and special works. As to the general question of the kind of prophecy found in the Book of Daniel, it has already been discussed above under the caption of "Genuineness." As to the interpretation of the world monarchies which precede the monarchy of the Messiah Prince, it may be said, however, that the latest discoveries, ruling out as they do a separate Median empire that included Babylon, support the view that the four monarchies are the Babylonian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman. According to this view, Darius the Mede was only a sub-king under Cyrus the Persian. Other interpretations have been made by selecting the four empires from those of Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Medo-Persia, Alexander, the Seleucids, the Romans, and the Mohammedans. The first and the last of these have generally been excluded from serious consideration. The main dispute is as to whether the 4th empire was that of the Seleucids, or that of the Romans, the former view being held commonly by those who hold to the composition of in the 2nd century BC,

and the latter by those who hold to the traditional view that it was written in the 6th century BC.

IX. DOCTRINES.

It is universally admitted that the teachings of Daniel with regard to angels and the resurrection are more explicit than those found elsewhere in the Old Testament. As to angels, Daniel attributes to them names, ranks, and functions not mentioned by others. It has become common in certain quarters to assert that these peculiarities of Daniel are due to Persian influences. The Babylonian monuments, however, have revealed the fact that the Babylonians believed in both good and evil spirits with names, ranks, and different functions. These spirits correspond in several respects to the Hebrew angels, and may well have afforded Daniel the background for his visions. Yet, in all such matters, it must be remembered that Daniel purports to give us a vision, or revelation; and a revelation cannot be bound by the ordinary laws of time and human influence.

As to the doctrine of the resurrection, it is generally admitted that Daniel adds some new and distinct features to that which is taught in the other canonical books of the Old Testament. But it will be noted that he does not dwell upon this doctrine, since he mentions it only in [27102]Daniel 12:2. The materials for his doctrine are to be found in [23614]Isaiah 26:14,21 and 66:24; [26701]Ezekiel 37:1-14, and in [18142]Job 14:12; 19:25; [28062]Hosea 6:2; 1 Kings 17; 2 Kings 4, and 8:1-5, as well as in the use of the words for sleep and awakening from sleep, or from the dust, for everlasting life or everlasting contempt in [23619]Isaiah 26:19; [19766]Psalm 76:6; 13:3; 127:2; [05116]Deuteronomy 31:16; [10712]2 Samuel 7:12; [11021]1 Kings 1:21; [18072]Job 7:21, and [24201]Jeremiah 20:11; 23:40. The essential ideas and phraseology of Daniel's teachings are found in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. The first two parts of the books of Enoch and 2 Maccabees make much of the resurrection; but on the other hand, Ecclesiastes seems to believe not even in the immortality of the soul, and Wisdom and 1 Maccabees do not mention a resurrection of the body. That the post-exilic prophets do not mention a resurrection does not prove that they knew nothing about Daniel any more than it proves that they knew nothing about Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

There are resemblances, it is true, between the teachings of Daniel with regard to the resurrection and those of the Avesta. But so are there between his doctrines and the ideas of the Egyptians, which had existed for

millenniums before his time. Besides there is no proof of any derivation of doctrines from the Persians by the writers of the canonical books of the Jews; and, as we have seen above, both the ideas and verbiage of Daniel are to be found in the generally accepted early Hebrew literature. And finally, this attempt to find a natural origin for all Biblical ideas leaves out of sight the fact that the Scriptures contain revelations from God, which transcend the ordinary course of human development. To a Christian, therefore, there can be no reason for believing that the doctrines of Daniel may not have been promulgated in the 6th century BC.

Commentaries and Introductions:

The best commentaries on Daniel from a conservative point of view are those by Calvin, Moses Stuart, Keil, Zockler, Strong in Lange's Bibelwerk, Fuller in the Speaker's Commentary, Thomson in the Pulpit Commentary, and Wright, Daniel and His Critics. The best defenses of Daniel's authenticity and genuineness are Hengstenberg, Authenticity of the Book of Daniel, Tregelles, Defense of the Authenticity, Auberlen, The Prophecies of Daniel, Fuller, Essay on the Authenticity of Daniel, Pusey, Daniel the Prophet (still the best of all), C. H. H. Wright, Daniel and His Critics, Kennedy, The Book of Daniel from the Christian Standpoint, Joseph Wilson, Daniel, and Sir Robert Anderson, Daniel in the Critics' Den. One should consult also Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia, Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, and Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament. For English readers, the radical school is best represented by Driver in his Literature of the Old Testament and in his Daniel; by Bevan, The Book of Daniel; by Prince, Commentary on Daniel, and by Cornill in his Introduction to the Old Testament.

X. APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS.

In the Greek translations of Daniel three or four pieces are added which are not found in the original Hebrew or Aramaic text as it has come down to us. These are The Prayer of Azarias, The Song of the Three Children, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon. These additions have all been rejected from the Canon by the Protestant churches because they are not contained in the Hebrew Canon. In the Church of England they are "read for example of life and instruction of manners." The Song of Three Children was "ordered in the rubric of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (AD 1549) to

be used in Lent as a responsory to the Old Testament Lesson at the Morning Prayer." It contains the Prayer of Azarias from the midst of the fiery furnace, and the song of praise by the three children for their deliverance; the latter being couched largely in phrases borrowed from Psalm 148. Susanna presents to us the story of a virtuous woman who resisted the seductive attempts of two judges of the elders of the people, whose machinations were exposed through the wisdom of Daniel who convicted them of false witness by the evidence of their own mouth, so that they were put to death according to the law of Moses; and from that day forth Daniel was held in great reputation in the sight of the people. Bel and the Dragon contains three stories. The first relates how Daniel destroyed the image of Bel which Nebuchadnezzar worshipped, by showing by means of ashes strewn on the floor of the temple that the offerings to Bel were devoured by the priests who came secretly into the temple by night. The second tells how Daniel killed the Dragon by throwing lumps of mingled pitch, fat and hair into his mouth, so causing the Dragon to burst asunder. The third gives a detailed account of the lions' den, stating that there were seven lions and that Daniel lived in the den six days, being sustained by broken bread and pottage which a prophet named Habakkuk brought to him through the air, an angel of the Lord having taken him by the arm and borne him by the hair of his head and through the vehemency of his spirit set him in Babylon over the den, into which he dropped the food for Daniel's use.

LITERATURE.

For commentaries on the additions to the Book of Daniel, see the works on Daniel cited above, and also The Apocrypha by Churton and others; the volume on the Apocrypha in Lange's Commentary by Bissell; "The Apocrypha" by Wace in the Speaker's Commentary, and Schurer, History of the Jewish People.

R. Dick Wilson

DANITES

<dan'-its> ([ynDh″ , *ha-dani*]): Occurs as describing those belonging to Daniel in <07133>Judges 13:2; 18:1,11; <13125>1 Chronicles 12:35.

DAN-JAAN

<dan-ja'-an> ([ˆ[ǰ″ ˆD; *dan ya`-an*]; B, [Δὰν Εἰδὰν καὶ Οὐδάν, *Daniel Eidan kai Oudan*]): A place visited by Joab and his officers when taking the census (<10406>2 Samuel 24:6). It is mentioned between Gilead and Sidon. Some would identify it with *Khan Danian*, a ruined site North of Achzib. The text is probably corrupt. Klostermann would read "toward Daniel and Ijon" (compare <11520>1 Kings 15:20).

DANNAH

<dan'-a> ([hND″ , *dannah*]): One of the cities in the hill country of Judah (<06549>Joshua 15:49) between Socoh and Kiriath-sannah (Debir), probably Idhna — the Iedna of the *Onom* — 8 miles W. of Hebron. See PEF, III, 305, 330.

DAPHNE

<daf'-ne> ([Δάφνη, *Daphne*], "bay-tree"): A suburb of Antioch on the Orontes, according to Strabo and the Jerusalem itinerary, about 40 furlongs, or 5 miles distant. It is identified with *Beit el-Ma'* on the left bank of the river, to the Southwest of the city. Here were the famous grove and sanctuary of Apollo. The grove and shrine owed their origin to Seleucus Nicator. It was a place of great natural beauty, and the Seleucid kings spared no outlay in adding to its attractions. The precincts enjoyed the right of asylum. Hither fled Onias the high priest (171 BC) from the wrath of Menelaus whom he had offended by plain speech. To the disgust and indignation of Jew and Gentile alike, he was lured from the sanctuary by Andronicus and basely put to death (2 Macc 4:33-38). It sheltered fugitives dyed with villainy of every shade. It was the great pleasure resort of the citizens of Antioch; and it gained an evil repute for immorality, as witnessed by the proverbial *Daphnici mores. In Tiberim defluxit Orontes*, says Juvenal (iii.62), indicating one main source of the corruption that demoralized the imperial city. The decline of Daphne dates from the days of Christian ascendancy in the reign of Julian. The place is still musical with fountains and luxuriant with wild vegetation; but nothing now remains to suggest its former splendor. *See* ANTIOCH; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chapter xxiii.

W. Ewing

DARA

<dar'-a> ([[ר " D; *dara`*]).

See DARDA.

DARDA

<dar'-da> ([[D " r Ɖ " , *darda`*], "pearl of wisdom"): One of the wise men to whom Solomon is compared (<1063>1 Kings 4:31). He was either a son of Mahol (ibid.) or a son of Zerah, son of Judah (<1306>1 Chronicles 2:6, where the corresponding name in the same list is given as DARA). In rabbinic lore the name has been interpreted as *dor dea*, "the generation of knowledge" — the generation of the wilderness.

DARE

<dar>: The expression "to dare" in the Scriptures never has the meaning of "to defy," "to challenge," or "to terrify." It is always found as the translation of [τολμάω, *tolmao*], "to manifest courage." This is particularly evident from <4702>2 Corinthians 10:12, "for we are not bold to number or compare ourselves" (the King James Version "for we dare not make ourselves of the number").

DARIC

<dar'-ik> ([ˆ/mKⱵƉ" , *darkemon*], and [ˆ/KrƉ" a" , *'adharkon*]; [δαρεικός, *dareikos*]): A Persian gold coin about a guinea or five dollars in value. The first form of the word occurs in <1390>1 Chronicles 29:7; <5069>Ezra 2:69, and <1670>Nehemiah 7:70-72; the second in <5027>Ezra 8:27 and is rendered, "dram" in the King James Version and "daric" in the Revised Version (British and American). In the passage in Chronicles, it must refer to a weight, since at the time of David there were no coins, but in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah the Persian darics were current.

See MONEY.

DARIUS

<da-ri'-us>: The name of three or four kings mentioned in the Old Testament. In the original Persian it is spelled "Darayavaush"; in Babylonian, usually "Dariamush"; in Susian(?), "Tariyamaush"; in Egyptian

"Antaryuash"; on Aramaic inscriptions, [vwhyrd] or [vwhwyrD]; in Hebrew, [vwyrD; *dareyawesh*]; in Greek, [Δαρεῖος, *Dareios*]; in Latin, "Darius." In meaning it is probably connected with the new Persian word Dara, "king." Herodotus says it means in Greek, [Ἐρξείης, *Erxeies*], *coercitor*, "restrainer," "compeller," "commander."

(1) Darius the Mede (Daniel 6:1; 11:1) was the son of Ahasuerus (Xerxes) of the seed of the Medes (Daniel 9:1). He received the government of Belshazzar the Chaldean upon the death of that prince (Daniel 5:30,31; 6:1), and was made king over the kingdom of the Chaldeans.

From Daniel 6:28 we may infer that Darius was king contemporaneously with Cyrus. Outside of the Book of Daniel there is no mention of Darius the Mede by name, though there are good reasons for identifying him with Gubaru, or Ugbaru, the governor of Gutium, who is said in the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle to have been appointed by Cyrus as his governor of Babylon after its capture from the Chaldeans. Some reasons for this identification are as follows:

(a) Gubaru is possibly a translation of Darius. The same radical letters in Arabic mean "king," "compeller," "restrainer." In Hebrew, derivations of the root mean "lord," "mistress," "queen"; in Aramaic, "mighty," "almighty."

(b) Gutium was the designation of the country North of Babylon and was in all possibility in the time of Cyrus a part of the province of Media.

(c) But even if Gutium were not a part of Media at that time, it was the custom of Persian kings to appoint Medes as well as Persians to satrapies and to the command of armies. Hence, Darius-Gubaru may have been a Mede, even if Gutium were not a part of Media proper.

(d) Since Daniel never calls Darius the Mede king of Media, or king of Persia, it is immaterial what his title or position may have been before he was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans. Since the realm of the Chaldeans never included either Media or Persia, there is absolutely no evidence in the Book of Daniel that its author ever meant to imply that Darius the Mede ever ruled over either Media or Persia.

(e) That Gubaru is called governor (pihatu), and Darius the Mede, king, is no objection to this identification; for in ancient as well as modern oriental

empires the governors of provinces and cities were often called kings. Moreover, in the Aramaic language, no more appropriate word than "king" can be found to designate the ruler of a sub-kingdom, or province of the empire.

(f) That Darius is said to have had 120 satraps under him does not conflict with this; for the Persian word "satrap" is indefinite as to the extent of his rule, just like the English word "governor." Besides, Gubaru is said to have appointed pihatus under himself. If the kingdom of the Chaldeans which he received was as large as that of Sargon he may easily have appointed 120 of these sub-rulers; for Sargon names 117 subject cities and countries over which he appointed his prefects and governors.

(g) The peoples, nations and tongues of chapter 6 are no objection to this identification; for Babylonia itself at this time was inhabited by Babylonians, Chaldeans, Arabians, Arameans and Jews, and the kingdom of the Chaldeans embraced also Assyrians, Elamites, Phoenicians and others within its limits.

(h) This identification is supported further by the fact that there is no other person known to history that can well be meant. Some, indeed, have thought that Darius the Mede was a reflection into the past of Darius Hystaspis; but this is rendered impossible inasmuch as the character, deeds and empire of Darius Hystaspis, which are well known to us from his own monuments and from the Greek historians, do not resemble what Daniel says of Darius the Mede.

(2) Darius, the fourth king of Persia, called Hystaspes because he was the son of a Persian king named Hystaspis, is mentioned in Ezra (4:5, et al.), Haggai (1:1) and Zechariah (1:1). Upon the death of Cambyses, son and successor to Cyrus, Smerdis the Magian usurped the kingdom and was dethroned by seven Persian nobles from among whom Darius was selected to be king. After many rebellions and wars he succeeded in establishing himself firmly upon the throne (Ant., XI, i). He reorganized and enlarged the Persian empire. He is best known to general history from his conflict with Greece culminating at Marathon, and for his re-digging of the Suez Canal. In sacred history he stands forth as the king who enabled the Jews under Jeshua and Zerubbabel to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem.

(3) Darius, called by the Greeks Nothus, was called Ochus before he

became king. He reigned from 424 to 404 BC. In the Scriptures he is mentioned only in ⁴⁶²²²Nehemiah 12:22, where he is called Darius the Persian, probably to distinguish him from Darius the Mede. It is not necessary to suppose that
Darius Codomannus who reigned from 336 to 330 BC, is meant by the author of Nehemiah 12, because he mentions Jaddua; for

(a) Johanan, the father of this Jaddua, was high priest about 408 BC, as is clear from the Aramaic papyrus from Elephantine lately published by Professor Sachau of Berlin, and Jaddua may well have succeeded him in those troubled times before the death of Darius Nothus in 404 BC. And

(b) that a high priest named Jaddua met Alexander in 332 BC, is attested only by Josephus (Ant., XI, viii, 5). It is not fair to take the testimony of Josephus as to Jaddua without taking his testimony as to the meeting with Alexander and as to the appeal of Jaddua to the predictions of the Book of Daniel. But even if Josephus be right, there may have been two Jadduas, one high priest in 404 BC, and the other in 332 BC; or the one who was alive and exercising his functions in 404 BC may still have been high priest in 332 BC. He need not have exceeded 90 years of age. According to the Eshki Harran inscription, which purports to have been written by himself, the priest of the temple in that city had served for 104 years. In our own time how many men have been vigorous in mind and body at the age of 90, or thereabouts; Bismarck and Gladstone, for example?

R. Dick Wilson

DARK; DARKNESS

<dark>, *<dark'-nes>* ([Ë∨j , *choshekh*]; [σκότος, *skotos*]):

1. DARKNESS AND LIGHT IN PALESTINE:

The day and night, light and darkness, are notable antitheses in Palestine. There the day does not slowly fade away into the night after a period of twilight, but before sunset there is the brightness of day, and when the sun has disappeared everything has changed and night is at hand. From sunset until the darkness of night is less than an hour.

2. SYMBOLIC USES:

In the Bible the main use of darkness is in contrast to light. Light is the symbol of God's purity, wisdom and glory. Darkness is the opposite. Miraculous occurrence of darkness in the land of Egypt for three days is recorded in ⁽¹²¹⁰²¹⁾Exodus 10:21,22, and at the death of Christ (⁽⁴¹⁷⁴⁵⁾Matthew 27:45).

See PLAGUES; ECLIPSE.

The figurative uses of darkness are many and various. It is used as a symbol

(a) of moral depravity and its punishment. The wicked walk and work in darkness (⁽¹⁹⁸²⁵⁾Psalm 82:5; ⁽²⁰²¹³⁾Proverbs 2:13; ⁽⁴³⁸¹⁹⁾John 3:19; ⁽⁴⁵¹³¹²⁾Romans 13:12), and their reward is to "sit in darkness" (⁽¹⁹ᴬ⁷¹⁰⁾Psalm 107:10) or to be "cast forth into the outer darkness" (⁽⁴⁰⁸¹²⁾Matthew 8:12);
(b) of things mysterious or inexplicable (⁽¹¹⁰⁸¹²⁾1 Kings 8:12; ⁽¹⁹⁹⁷⁰²⁾Psalm 97:2);
(c) of trouble and affliction (⁽¹⁰²²²⁹⁾2 Samuel 22:29; ⁽¹⁸⁰⁵¹⁴⁾Job 5:14; ⁽²⁰²⁰²⁰⁾Proverbs 20:20; ⁽²³⁹⁰²⁾Isaiah 9:2; compare ⁽⁰¹¹⁵¹²⁾Genesis 15:12);
(d) of punishment (⁽²⁵⁰³²⁾Lamentations 3:2; ⁽²⁶³²⁰⁸⁾Ezekiel 32:8; ⁽³⁶⁰¹¹⁵⁾Zephaniah 1:15);
(e) of death (⁽⁰⁹⁰²⁹⁾1 Samuel 2:9; ⁽¹⁸¹⁰²¹⁾Job 10:21 f; ⁽²¹¹¹⁰⁸⁾Ecclesiastes 11:8);
(f) of nothingness (⁽¹⁸⁰³⁰⁴⁾Job 3:4-6);
(g) of human ignorance (⁽¹⁸⁹⁰⁸⁾Job 19:8; ⁽⁶²⁰²¹¹⁾1 John 2:11).
"A dark (the Revised Version, margin "squalid") place" (⁽⁶¹⁰¹⁹⁾2 Peter 1:19) refers especially to the state of things described in 2 Peter 2.

Alfred H. Joy

DARKLY

<*dark'-li*>: The word occurs in ⁽⁴⁶¹³¹²⁾1 Corinthians 13:12, "For now we see in a mirror, darkly," in translation of the words [ἐν αἰνίγματι, *en ainigmati*], the Revised Version, margin "in a riddle." The contrast is with the "face to face" vision of Divine things in eternity. Earth's best knowledge is partial, obscure, enigmatic, a broken reflection of the complete truth ("broken lights of Thee").

DARKON

<*dar'-kon*> ([ˆ/qrD″ , *darqon*], "carrier"): Ancestor of a subdivision of "Solomon's servants," so called, in post-exilic times (⟨15026⟩Ezra 2:56; ⟨16758⟩Nehemiah 7:58; Lozon, 1 Esdras 5:33).

DARK SAYINGS

(⟨20016⟩Proverbs 1:6; ⟨19782⟩Psalm 78:2; singular, ⟨19404⟩Psalm 49:4**(5)**; [t/dyj i *chidhoth*], singular [hdyj i *chidhah*], elsewhere rendered "riddle," "proverb"): In the heading to the canonical Book of Proverbs, the general term "proverbs" is made to include "a proverb [l vm; *mashal*], and a figure (or, an interpretation, [hxyl m] *melitsah*]), the words (singular [rbD; *dabhar*]) of the wise, and their dark sayings (or, riddles)." The "proverb" is either a saying current among the people (compare ⟨09102⟩1 Samuel 10:12; "the proverb of the ancients" 24:13 **(14)**), or a sentence of ethical wisdom composed by the order of wise men ([µymkj } *chakhamim*]). Of the latter kind are the sententious maxims of the Wisdom literature (chiefly Proverbs, but also Job, Ecclesiastes, and among the uncanonical writings, Ecclesiasticus). They are characterized by a secular touch; wisdom, moreover, flourished among the neighbors of Israel as well; so in Edom and elsewhere. Whatever the date of the collection known as the "Proverbs of Solomon," the wise men existed in Israel at a very early period; the prophets allude to them. But the Hebrew *mashal* is sometimes of a more elaborate character corresponding to our "parables"; frequently a vein of taunt runs through them, and they played an important part in compositions directed against other nations (compare ⟨02127⟩Numbers 21:27). The prophets are fond of employing this genre of literary production; in their hands the *mashal* becomes a figurative or allegorical discourse (compare ⟨26105⟩Ezekiel 21:5 ff (8 ff)). The *mashal* in the sense of a didactic poem occurs also in the Psalms (Pss 49 and 78). Hence, it is that "proverb" and "figure," or "proverb" and "dark saying" are interchangeable terms. The "dark saying" is the popular "riddle" (compare Judges 14) raised to the dignity of elaborate production. It is in short an allegorical sentence requiring interpretation. Both prophets and psalmists avail themselves thereof. The word of God comes to the prophet in the form of a vision (compare the visions of Amos or Jeremiah), i.e. the truth presents itself to them in the form of a simile. To the perfect prophet of the type of Moses the revelation comes direct in the shape of the naked truth without the mediation of

figures of speech or obscure utterances requiring elucidation (compare Numbers 12). In the same way Paul (1 Corinthians 13) distinguishes between the childish manner of speaking of things spiritual and the manner of a man: "For now we see in a mirror, darkly (Greek "in a riddle"); but then face to face." The rabbis say that, whereas all the other prophets saw God and things Divine in a dim mirror, Moses saw them in a polished, clear mirror. Both Paul and the rabbis feel the difference between mediate and immediate vision, the revelation which requires dark figurative language as a vehicle and the clear perception which is the direct truth.

Max L. Margolis

DARLING

<dar'-ling> ([דיחי; *yachidh*], "only," the King James Version margin, "only one"; the American Revised Version, margin, "*dear* life"): Used poetically for the life or soul (Psalm 22:20; 35:17).

DART

<dart> ([חץ *chets*]; [βέλος, *belos*]): A pointed missile weapon, as an arrow or light spear (2 Samuel 18:14; Job 41:26).
   See ARMOR; ARMS, III, 4; ARROW.

Figurative:

(1) Of the penalty of sin (Proverbs 7:23 the King James Version);
   (2) of strong suggestions and fierce temptations to evil (Ephesians 6:16; compare 1 Macc 5:51).

DART-SNAKE

<dart'-snake> (Isaiah 34:15).
   See ARROWSNAKE.

DASH

The idea of "to throw violently" or "to strike" with purpose of causing destruction is usually connected with the word "to dash." There is perhaps but one exception to this: Psalm 91:12 and the quotations of this passage in the New Testament (Matthew 4:6; Luke 4:11, [προσκόπτω, *proskopto*]), have the meaning "to strike against accidentally" and not intentionally. Nahum 2:1, "he that dasheth in

pieces" is doubtful. "He that scatters" would be in better harmony with the Hebrew [6ypmemephits], and the following description of destruction. In all other cases "to dash" is connected with the idea of destruction, especially the infliction of punishment which is usually expressed by [vf" r; raTash], "to dash to the ground" ([12082]2 Kings 8:12; [23136]Isaiah 13:16 ff, et al., "to dash in pieces," the King James Version simply "to dash"), but also by [6p" n; naphats], "to break to pieces" ([19009]Psalm 2:9; 137:9, et al.).

See also *PUNISHMENTS.*

A. L. Breslich

DATES

<dats> ([vb" r; debhash]): Arabic, *dibbs* ([44305]2 Chronicles 31:5, King James Version margin); English Versions of the Bible HONEY (which see).

See also *PALM TREE.*

DATHAN

<da'-than> ([ˆtD] *dathan*], meaning and derivation unknown, though the name is found in Assyrian, in the records of Shalmaneser II): The son of Eliab the son of Pallu the son of Reuben ([0205]Numbers 26:5 ff; [05106]Deuteronomy 11:6; [19A67]Psalm 106:17). He and his brother Abiram, with others, followed Korah the Levite in disputing the authority of Moses and Aaron in the wilderness (Numbers 16-17; 26; [05106]Deuteronomy 11:6; [19A67]Psalm 106:17). Other followers of Korah perished by fire before the tent of meeting, but Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by the earth, with their families and their goods, at their tents.

See *KORAH.*

Willis J. Beecher

DATHEMA

<dath'-e-ma> ([ˆtD; *Dathema*): A stronghold (1 Macc 5:29) in Gilead to which the Jews fled for refuge from the heathen (1 Macc 5:9). They were delivered by Judas and Jonathan his brother. It was within a night's march from Bosora. It may possibly be identical with `*Athaman* which lies East of *el-Muzerib*.

DAUB

<*dob*>: "To daub" always has the meaning "to cover," "to smear with" in the Scriptures. Ezekiel compares the flatteries of the false prophets to a slight wall covered with whitewash (literally, "spittle"). See [26310]Ezekiel 13:10 ff; 22:28. In [00018]Exodus 2:3 "daubed it with slime and with pitch" (Hebrew [הרמ]]″ w″ , *wattachmerah*], denominative of [רמד*echemar*], "bitumen" or "asphalt"), "to daub" has the same meaning as in the Ezekiel passage.

DAUGHTER

<*do'-ter*> ([tB″ , *bath*]; [θυγάτηρ, thugater]): Used in Scriptures in several more or less distinct senses:

(a) for daughter in the ordinary, literal sense ([01425]Genesis 46:25; [02016]Exodus 1:16);

(b) daughter-in-law ([08012]Ruth 2:2);

(c) grand-daughter or other female descendant (Exodus 21; [42005]Luke 1:5; 13:16);

(d) the women of a country, or of a place, taken collectively ([42328]Luke 23:28), of a particular religion ([39211]Malachi 2:11);

(e) all the population of a place, taken collectively, especially in Prophets and poetic books ([19094]Psalm 9:14; [23310]Isaiah 23:10; [24624]Jeremiah 46:24; [42105]Matthew 21:5);

(f) used in familiar address, "Daughter, be of good comfort" ([40922]Matthew 9:22 the King James Version; [41534]Mark 5:34; [42848]Luke 8:48);

(g) women in general ([20829]Proverbs 31:29);

(h) the personification of towns or cities, as of the female sex ([23470]Isaiah 47:1; [26164]Ezekiel 16:44,46; compare [34304]Nahum 3:4,7), especially of dependent towns and villages ([19481]Psalm 48:11; [04225]Numbers 21:25 margin; [07027]Judges 1:27 margin);

(i) in Hebrew idiom for person or thing belonging to or having the characteristics of that with which it is joined, as "daughter of ninety years," of Sarah, ninety years old ([01717]Genesis 17:17); "daughters of music," singing birds, or singing women ([21204]Ecclesiastes 12:4); daughters of a tree,

i.e. branches; daughter of the eye, i.e. the pupil.

Daughters were not so highly prized as sons, not being usually mentioned by name. A father might sometimes sell his daughter as bondwoman (⟨02107⟩Exodus 21:7); though not to a foreigner (⟨02108⟩Exodus 21:8); daughters might sometimes inherit as did sons, but could not take the inheritance outside of the tribe (⟨04301⟩Numbers 36:1-12).

<div align="right">

Edward Bagby Pollard

</div>

DAUGHTER-IN-LAW

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

DAVID

<*da'-vid*> ([dwD; *dawidh*], or [dywD; *dawidh*], "beloved"; [Δαυείδ, *Daueid*], also in New Testament, *Dauid*, *Dabid*; see Thayer's Lexicon):

I. NAME AND GENEALOGY.

This name, which is written "defectively" in the older books, such as those of Samuel, but fully with the yodh in Chronicles and the later books, is derived, like the similar name Jedidish (⟨01025⟩2 Samuel 12:25), from a root meaning "to love." The only person who bears this name in the Bible is the son of Jesse, the second king of Israel. His genealogy is given in the table appended to the Book of Ruth (4:18-22). Here the following points are to be noted: David belonged to the tribe of Judah: his ancestor Nahshon was chieftain of the whole tribe (⟨04107⟩Numbers 1:7; 2:3; ⟨13210⟩1 Chronicles 2:10) and brother-in-law of Aaron the high priest (⟨02063⟩Exodus 6:23). As no other descendants of Nahshon are mentioned, his authority probably descended to Jesse by right of primogeniture. This supposition is countenanced by the fact that Salma (Salmon), the name of the son of Nahshon and father of Boaz, is also the name of a grandson of Caleb who became "father" of Bethlehem, the home of Jesse (⟨13051⟩1 Chronicles 2:51). David was closely connected with the tribe of Moab, the mother of his grandfather Obed being Ruth the Moabitess. Of the wife or wives of Jesse we know nothing, and consequently are without information upon a most interesting point — the personality of the mother of David; but that she too may have been of the tribe of Moab is rendered probable by the fact that, when hard pressed, David placed his parents under the protection of the king of that country (⟨09203⟩1 Samuel 22:3,1).

II. EARLY YEARS.

The home of David when he comes upon the stage of history was the picturesque town of Bethlehem.

1. Shepherd:

There his family had been settled for generations, indeed ever since the Israelite nation had overrun the land of Canaan. His father was apparently not only the chief man of the place, but he seems to have been chieftain of the whole clan to which he belonged — the clan of Judah. Although the country round Bethlehem is more fertile than that in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, the inhabitants joined to the cultivation of the soil the breeding of cattle (Luke 2:8). David's father, not only cultivated his ancestral fields, but kept flocks of sheep and goats as well. The flocks were sent out every day to pasture in the neighboring valleys attended by the herdsmen armed so as to defend themselves and their charge, not only against marauders from the surrounding deserts, but also from the lions and bears with which the country was then infested. David seems to have been in the habit of accompanying his father's servants in their task (1 Samuel 17:20,22), and on occasion would be left in full charge by himself. Nor was his post at such times a sinecure. He had not only to keep a sharp lookout for thieves, but on more than one occasion had with no other weapon than his shepherd's club or staff to rescue a lamb from the clutches of a lion or a bear (1 Samuel 17:34 ff). Such adventures, however, must have been rare, and David must often have watched eagerly the lengthening of the shadow which told of the approach of sunset, when he could drive his charge into the zariba for the night and return home. There is, indeed, no life more monotonous and enervating than that of an eastern shepherd, but David must have made good use of his idle time. He seems, in fact, to have made such good use of it as to have neglected his handful of sheep. The incidents of which he boasted to Saul would not have occurred, had his proper occupation taken up all his thoughts; but, like King Alfred, his head seems to have been filled with ideas far removed from his humble task.

2. Slinger:

David, like Nelson, does not seem to have known what it was to be afraid, and it was not to be expected that he could be satisfied with the lot of the youngest of eight sons of the now aged chief (1 Samuel 17:12; 1 Chronicles 2:13 ff). In the East every man is a soldier, and David's bent

was in that direction. The tribesmen of Benjamin near whose border his home was situated were famed through all Israel as slingers, some of whom could sling at a hair and not miss (^{07:16}Judges 20:16). Taught, perhaps, by one of these, but certainly by dint of constant practice, David acquired an accuracy of aim which reminds one of the tales of William Tell or Robin Hood (^{09:17:49}1 Samuel 17:49).

3. Harpist:

Another of the pastimes in the pursuit of which David spent many an hour of his youthful days was music. The instrument which he used was the "harp" (Hebrew [*kinnor*]). This instrument had many forms, which may be seen on the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments; but the kind used by David was probably like the modern Arabic, rubaba, having only one or two strings, played not with a plectrum (Ant., VII, xii, 3) but by the hand (compare ^{09:16:23}1 Samuel 16:23, etc., which do not exclude a quill). Whatever the nature of the instrument was, David acquired such proficiency in playing it that his fame as a musician soon spread throughout the countryside (^{09:16:18}1 Samuel 16:18). With the passing of time he becomes the Hebrew Orpheus, in whose music birds and mountains joined (compare Koran, chapter 21).

4. Poet:

To the accompaniment of his lyre David no doubt sang words, either of popular songs or of lyrics of his own composition, in that wailing eastern key which seems to be an imitation of the bleating of flocks. The verses he sang would recount his own adventures or the heroic prowess of the warrior of his clan, or celebrate the loveliness of some maiden of the tribe, or consist of elegies upon those slain in battle. That the name of David was long connected with music the reverse of sacred appears from the fact that Amos denounces the people of luxury of his time for improvising to the sound of the viol, inventing instruments of music, like David (6:5). (It is not clear to which clause "like David" belongs, probably to both.) The only remains of the secular poetry of David which have come down to us are his elegies on Saul and Jonathan and on Abner (^{10:01:19}2 Samuel 1:19-27; 3:33,14), which show him to have been a true poet.

5. Psalmist:

Did David also compose religious verses? Was he "the sweet psalmist of

Israel" (◁1020▷2 Samuel 23:1)? In the oldest account which we have, contained in the books of Samuel, David appears as a musician and as a secular poet only, for it is obvious the poetical passages, ◁1020▷2 Samuel 22:1-23:7, do not belong to the original form of that book but are thrust in in the middle of a long list of names of David's soldiers. The position is the same in ◁3065▷Amos 6:5. It is in the later books and passages that sacred music and psalms begin to be ascribed to him. Perhaps the earliest instance is the passage just cited containing the "last words" of David (◁1020▷2 Samuel 23:1-7). The Chronicler (about 300 BC) seems to put parts of Psalms 105; 96, and 106 into the mouth of David (◁13607▷1 Chronicles 16:7 ff), and ◁16236▷Nehemiah 12:36 regards him apparently as the inventor of the instruments used in the Temple service (◁13205▷1 Chronicles 23:5), or as a player of sacred music. So too in the Septuagint psalter (Psalm 151:2) we read, "My hands made an organ, my fingers fashioned a psaltery"; and gradually the whole of the Psalms came to be ascribed to David as author. In regard to this question it must be remembered that in the East at any rate there is no such distinction as that of sacred and secular. By sacred poetry we mean poetry which mentions the name of God or quotes Scripture, but the Hebrew or Arab poet will use the name of God as an accompaniment to a dance, and will freely sprinkle even comic poetry with citations from his sacred book. David must have composed sacred poems if he composed at all, and he would use his musical gift for the purposes of religion as readily as for those of amusement and pleasure (◁10614▷2 Samuel 6:14,15). Whether any of our psalms was composed by David is another question. The titles cannot be considered as conclusive evidence, and internal proofs of his authorship are wanting. Indeed the only psalm which claims to have been written by David is the 18th (= 2 Samuel 22). One cannot help wishing that the 23rd Psalm had been sung by the little herd lad as he watched his father's flocks and guarded them from danger.

6. Tribesman:

There are sayings of Mohammed that the happiest life is that of the shepherd, and that no one became a prophet who had not at one time tended a flock of sheep. What Mohammed meant was that the shepherd enjoys leisure and solitude for reflection and for plunging into those day dreams out of which prophets are made. If David, like the Arab poet Tarafa, indulged in sport, in music and in poetry, even to the neglect of his charge, he must have sought out themes on which to exercise his muse; and it must have been with no little chagrin that he learnt that whereas the

tribes of Ephraim, Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Issachar, Zebulun, Levi, Dan, and even the non-Israelite tribes of Kenaz and the debatable land of Gilead could boast of having held the hegemony of Israel and led the nation in battle, his own tribe of Judah had played a quite subordinate part, and was not even mentioned in the national war song of Deborah. As contrasted with the poets of these tribes he could boast in his verses only of Ibzan who belonged to his own town of Bethlehem (⁰⁷¹²⁸Judges 12:8). The Jerahmeelites were no doubt a powerful clan, but neither they nor any other of the subdivisions of Judah had ever done anything for the common good. Indeed, when the twelve pathfinders had been sent in advance into Canaan, Judah had been represented by Caleb, a member of the Uitlander tribe of Kenaz (⁰⁴³⁰⁶Numbers 13:6). He became apparently the adopted son of Hezron and so David might claim kinship with him, and through him with Othniel the first of the judges (⁰⁷⁰¹³Judges 1:13). David thus belonged to the least efficient of all the Israelite tribes except one, and one which, considering its size and wealth, had till now failed to play a worthy part in the confederacy. It is difficult to believe that the young David never dreamed of a day when his own tribe should take its true place among its fellows, and when the deliverer of Israel from its oppressors should belong for once to the tribe of Judah.

III. IN THE SERVICE OF SAUL.

The earliest events in the career of David are involved in some obscurity.

1. David First Meets Saul:

This is due mainly to what appears to be an insoluble difficulty in 1 Samuel 16 and 17. In chapter 16, David is engaged to play before Saul in order to dispel is melancholy, and becomes his squire or armor-bearer (16:21), whereas in the following chapter he is unknown to Saul, who, after the death of Goliath, asks Abner who he is, and Abner replies that he does not know (17:55). This apparent contradiction may be accounted for by the following considerations:

(a) 16:14-23 may be inserted out of its chronological order for the sake of the contrast with the section immediately preceding — "the spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon David from that day forward .... the spirit of Yahweh departed from Saul" (16:13,14);

(b) the fact of David becoming Saul's squire does not imply constant personal attendance upon him; the text says David became an (not his) armor-bearer to Saul. The king would have many such squires: Joab, though only commander-in-chief, had, it seems, eighteen (⟨10237⟩2 Samuel 23:37 reads "armor-bearers");

(c) David would not play before Saul every day: his presence might not be required for a space of weeks or months;

(d) Saul's failure to recognize David may have been a result of the `evil spirit from Yahweh' and Abner's denial of knowledge may have been feigned out of jealousy. If we accept all the statements of the dramatis personae in these narratives we shall not get very far.

2. His First Exploit:

The facts seem to have been somewhat as follows: It had become evident that Saul was not equal to the task to which he had been set — the task of breaking the Philistine power, and it became the duty of Samuel, as the vicar of Yahweh and as still holding very large powers, to look about for a successor. He turned to the tribe of Judah (the full brother of his own ancestor Levi), a tribe which was fast becoming the most powerful member of the federation. The headman of this clan was Jesse of Bethlehem. His name was well known in the country — Saul does not require to be told who he is (⟨09168⟩1 Samuel 16:18; 17:58) — but he was by this time advanced in years (⟨09172⟩1 Samuel 17:12). He had, however, many sons. Old men in the East often foretell a great future for a young boy (compare ⟨42034⟩Luke 2:34). Samuel saw that David was formed of other clay than his brothers, and he anointed him as he had done Saul (⟨09101⟩1 Samuel 10:1). But whereas the anointing of Saul was done surreptitiously and for a definite purpose which was explained at the time (⟨09101⟩1 Samuel 10:1), that of David was performed before his whole family, but with what object he was not told (⟨09163⟩1 Samuel 16:13). His brothers do not seem to have thought the matter of much consequence (compare ⟨09178⟩1 Samuel 17:28), and all David could conclude from it was that he was destined to some high office — perhaps that of Samuel's successor (compare ⟨11195⟩1 Kings 19:15,16). It would have the effect of nerving him for any adventure and raising his hopes high and steeling his courage. Whether by accident or by contrivance he became attached to Saul as minstrel (compare ⟨12080⟩2 Kings 3:15) and subsequently as one of his armor-bearers. He would probably be at this time about

twenty years of age. It must have been after an interval of some months that an event happened which made it impossible for Saul ever again to forget the existence of David. This was the famous duel between David and the Philistine Goliath, which saved the situation for Saul for the time (1 Samuel 17). In regard to this narrative it must be noted that ⁽⁰⁹¹⁷¹²⁾1 Samuel 17:12-31,41,50,55-58 and 18:1-5 are lacking in the best manuscript of the Septuagint, that is, the sending of David from Bethlehem and his fresh introduction to Saul and Saul's failure to recognize him are left out. With the omission of these verses all the difficulties of the narrative vanish. For the reason why David could not wear the armor offered him was not because he was still a child, which is absurd in view of the fact that Saul was exceptionally tall (⁽⁰⁹⁰²⁾1 Samuel 9:2), but because he had had no practice with it (⁽⁰⁹¹⁷³⁹⁾1 Samuel 17:39). It is ridiculous to suppose that David was not at this time full-grown, and that two armies stood by while a child advanced to engage a giant. The event gained for David the reputation won in modern times at the cannon's mouth, but also the devoted friendship of Jonathan and the enmity of Saul (⁽⁰⁹¹⁸⁰¹⁾1 Samuel 18:1-9).
The next years of David's life were spent in the service of Saul in his wars with the Philistines. David's success where Saul had failed, however, instead of gratifying only inflamed the jealousy of the latter, and he determined to put David out of the way. More than once he attempted to do so with his own hand (⁽⁰⁹¹⁸¹¹⁾1 Samuel 18:11; 19:10), but he also employed stratagem. It came to his ears that his daughter Michal, as well as his son Jonathan, loved David, and Saul undertook to give her to David on the condition of his killing one hundred Philistines.

3. Envy of Saul and Flight of David:

The gruesome dowry was paid, and David became Saul's son-in-law. The Hebrew text states that Saul first offered his elder daughter to David, and then failed to implement his promise (⁽⁰⁹¹⁸¹⁷⁾1 Samuel 18:17-19,21b), but this passage is not found in the Greek. David's relation to Saul did not mitigate the hatred of the latter; indeed his enmity became so bitter that David determined upon flight. With the help of stratagem on the part of Michal, this was effected and David went to Samuel at Ramah for counsel and advice (⁽⁰⁹¹⁹¹⁸⁾1 Samuel 19:18). There Saul pursued him, but when he came into the presence of the prophet, his courage failed and he was overcome by the contagion of the prophetic ecstasy (⁽⁰⁹¹⁹²⁴⁾1 Samuel 19:24) as he had been on a previous occasion (⁽⁰⁹¹⁰¹¹⁾1 Samuel 10:11). David returned to Gibeah, while the coast was clear, to meet Jonathan, but Saul also returned

immediately, his hatred more intense than before. David then continued his flight and came to Ahimelech, the priest at Nob (⊲0210⊳1 Samuel 21:1). It is sometimes supposed that we have here two inconsistent accounts of David's flight, according to one of which he fled to Samuel at Ramah, and according to the other to Ahimelech at Nob; but there is no necessity for such a supposition, and even if it were correct, it would not clear up all the difficulties of the narrative. There is evidently much in these narratives that is left untold and our business should be to fill up the gaps in a way consistent with what we are given. That Saul made sure that David would not return is shown by the fact that he gave his daughter Michal to a man of the tribe of Benjamin as wife (⊲0254⊳1 Samuel 25:44).

4. Jonathan and David:

The relation existing between Jonathan and David was one of pure friendship. There was no reason why it should not be so. A hereditary monarchy did not yet exist in Israel. The only previous attempt to establish such an institution — that of Gideon's family (Judges 9) — though not of Gideon himself (⊲0002⊳1 Samuel 8:23) — had ended in failure. The principle followed hitherto had been that of election by the sheikhs or caids of the clans. To this Saul owed his position, for the lot was a kind of ballot. Moreover, behind all national movements there lay the power of the prophets, the representatives of Yahweh. Saul was indebted for his election to Samuel, just as Barak was to Deborah (⊲0006⊳Judges 4:6). Like the judges who preceded him he had been put forward to meet a definite crisis in the national affairs — the rise of the Philistine power (⊲0916⊳1 Samuel 9:16). Had he succeeded in crushing these invaders, the newly-established kingdom would in the absence of this bond of union have dissolved again into its elements, as had happened on every similar occasion before. He was the only judge who had failed to accomplish the task for which he was appointed, and he was the only one who had been appointed on the understanding that his son should succeed him, for this constitutes the distinction between king and judge. Moreover, not only was Saul aware that he had failed, but he saw before him the man who was ready to step into his place and succeed. His rival had, besides, the backing of the mass of the people and of Samuel who was still virtual head of the state and last court of appeal. It is not to be wondered at that Saul was hostile to David. Jonathan, on the other hand, acquiesced in the turn things had taken and bowed to what he believed to be the inevitable. Such was his love for David that he asked only to be his [*wazeer*] (vizier) when David came to

the throne (⁰⁹²³⁷1 Samuel 23:17). David's position was perhaps the most difficult imaginable. He had to fight the battles of a king whose one idea was to bring about his ruin. He was the bosom friend of a prince whom he proposed to supplant in his inheritance. His hope of salvation lay in the death of his king, the father of his wife and of his best friend. The situation would in ordinary circumstances be intolerable, and it would have been impossible but for the fact that those concerned were obsessed by a profound belief in Fate. Jonathan bore no grudge against David for aiming at the throne, because to the throne he was destined by the will of Yahweh. To David it would never occur that he had the choice of declining the high destiny in store for him. Had he had the power to refuse what he believed to be the decree of Fate, he would hardly escape censure for his ambition and disloyalty.

IV. DAVID IN EXILE.

1. David as Outlaw:

From the moment of his flight David became an outlaw and remained so until the death of Saul. This period of his career is full of stirring adventures which remind us of Robert Bruce or William Wallace of Scotland. Like King Arthur and other heroes he carried a famous sword — the sword of Goliath (⁰⁹²¹⁹1 Samuel 21:9). Having obtained it of Ahimelech, he for the first time left Israelite territory and went to the Philistine city of Gath (⁰⁹²¹¹⁰1 Samuel 21:10). Not feeling safe here he left and took up his abode in the cave of Adullam (⁰⁹²²¹1 Samuel 22:1) in the country of Judah, almost within sight of his native Bethlehem. This cave was admirably suited to the outlaw's purpose and no doubt David had many a time explored its recesses when a boy. Here he was joined by his parents and brothers, with their servants, as well as by all sorts of persons who were at war with the government, debtors, fugitives from justice, and discontented persons generally. David thus became the chief of a band of outlaws who numbered about 400. Of such stuff some of his bravest soldiers were made (¹⁰²³¹³2 Samuel 23:13 ff). He had an augur, too, to direct his actions, and, after the massacre of the priests at Nob, a priest, Abiathar, carrying an ephod with which to cast lots (⁰⁹²²⁵1 Samuel 22:5; 23:6). During this period he supported himself and his men by making raids on the Philistine outposts and levying blackmail on his own countrymen (⁰⁹²⁵²1 Samuel 25:2 ff) in return for giving them his protection from the Philistines (⁰⁹²³¹1 Samuel 23:1 ff). Hard pressed both by Saul and the Philistines (who had

established themselves even in Bethlehem) he committed his parents to the keeping of the king of Moab, and began to rove as a freebooter through the country (⟨0235⟩1 Samuel 23:5,15,25,29). On two occasions David had Saul in his power, but refused to seize the opportunity of taking his life (1 Samuel 24-26). Here again there are no adequate grounds for supposing we have two accounts of one and the same incident. During his wandering David's followers increased in numbers (compare ⟨0222⟩1 Samuel 22:2; 23:13; 25:13). His chief lieutenant was his nephew Abishai, the son of his sister Zeruiah, but his brothers, Joab and Asahel, do not seem to have joined David yet. Another of his nephews, Jonathan the son of Shimei (Shammah), is mentioned (⟨1022⟩2 Samuel 21:21; compare ⟨0169⟩1 Samuel 16:9) and the Chronicler thinks many other knights joined him during this period (⟨13110⟩1 Chronicles 11:10 ff). The position of David at this time was very similar to that of the brigand Raisuli of late in Morocco. That there was some stability in it is shown by his taking two wives at this time — Ahinoam and Abigail (⟨0254⟩1 Samuel 25:42,43).

2. David Joins the Philistines:

David now, abandoning all hope of ever conciliating the king (⟨0270⟩1 Samuel 27:1), made a move which shows at once his reckless daring and consummate genius. He offered the services of himself and his little army of 600 men to the enemies of his country. The town of Gath appears to have been an asylum for fugitive Israelites (⟨11029⟩1 Kings 2:39). David's first impulse on his flight from Saul had been to seek safety there (⟨0210⟩1 Samuel 21:10-15). Then, however, he was the hero of Israel, whose assassination would be the highest gain to the Philistines; now he was the embittered antagonist of Saul, and was welcomed accordingly. Achish placed at his disposal the fortified town of Ziklag in the territory of the now extinct tribe of Simeon, and there he and his followers, each of whom had his family with him, took up their quarters for sixteen months (⟨0206⟩1 Samuel 27:6,7). The advantages to David were many. He was safe at last from the persecution of Saul (⟨0204⟩1 Samuel 27:4); he could secure ample supplies by making raids upon the Amalekites and other tribes hostile to Israel toward the South (⟨0208⟩1 Samuel 27:8); and if the opportunity presented itself he could deal a serious blow at the Philistine arms. The position was no doubt a precarious one. It could last just as long as David could hoodwink Achish by persuading him that his raids were directed against his own tribe (⟨0270⟩1 Samuel 27:10). This he succeeded in doing so completely that Achish would have taken him with him on the campaign which ended in the

decisive battle of Gilboa, but the other chiefs, fearing treachery, refused to allow him to do so. David was forced to return with his followers to Ziklag, only to find that town razed to the ground and all the women and children carried off by his old enemies the Amalekites ([0801]1 Samuel 30:1,2). By the time he had recovered the spoil and returned in triumph to Ziklag the battle of Gilboa had been fought and Saul was slain. The conduct of David in his relations with the Philistines was not more reprehensible than that of the Cid who allied himself with Al-Mu'taman of Saragossa, or of Coriolanus who went over to the Volsci. David composed upon the death of Saul and Jonathan an elegy every sentence of which has become classic.

V. DAVID AS KING.

1. Civil War:

David immediately removed from Ziklag and took up his quarters at Hebron, where he was at once anointed king over his own tribe of Judah. Thus began the cleavage between Judah and Israel. Here he was joined, apparently for the first time, by his nephew Joab. Abner, however, loyal to his former master, had Esh-baal ([13083]1 Chronicles 8:33), son of Saul, anointed king over the remaining tribes at Mahanaim, a fortified town East of the Jordan. War continued between David and Abner for several years, fortune always favoring David. Seeing things were going against him Abner forced Esh-baal into a personal quarrel with himself and then transferred his allegiance and persuaded his side to transfer theirs to David ([10821]2 Samuel 3:21). He did not reap the fruit of his defection, as he was immediately after assassinated by Joab in revenge for the death of Asahel whom Abner had killed in self-defence ([10827]2 Samuel 3:27). Deprived of his chief support Esh-baal also fell a victim to assassination ([10842]2 Samuel 4:2 ff). David denounced both crimes with apparent sincerity. He composed an elegy and fasted for Abner ([10833]2 Samuel 3:33 ff) and avenged the death of Esh-baal ([10849]2 Samuel 4:9 ff). Yet these acts of violence laid the sovereignty of all Israel at his feet. Of the male heirs of Saul there remained only a son of Jonathan, Merib-baal ([13084]1 Chronicles 8:34) who was a crippled child of 7. David was therefore elected king over the nation ([10501]2 Samuel 5:1 ff). His sovereignty of Judah is said to have lasted 7 1/2 years and that over the undivided people 33, making a reign of 40 years, beginning from David's 30th year ([10855]2 Samuel 5:5; [13004]1 Chronicles 3:4; in [10210]2 Samuel 2:10 the text is probably corrupt). These are round

2. Conquests Abroad:

King of all the Israelite tribes, David found his hands free to expel the foreigners who had invaded the sacred territory. His first step was to move his headquarters from the Southern Hebron, which he had been compelled at first to make his capital, to the more central Jerusalem. The fort here, which was still held by the aboriginal Jebusites, was stormed by Joab, David's nephew, who also superintended the rebuilding for David. He was in consequence appointed commander-in-chief (1 Chronicles 11:6,8), a post which he held as long as David lived. The materials and the skilled workmen for the erection of the palace were supplied by Hiram of Tyre (2 Samuel 5:11). David now turned his attention to the surrounding tribes and peoples. The most formidable enemy, the Philistines, were worsted in several campaigns, and their power crippled (2 Samuel 5:17 ff; 8:1). In one of these David so nearly came by his death, that his people would not afterward permit him to take part in the fighting (2 Samuel 21:16,17). One of the first countries against which David turned his arms was the land of Moab, which he treated with a severity which would suggest that the Moabite king had ill-treated David's father and mother, who had taken refuge with him (2 Samuel 8:2). Yet his conduct toward the sons of Ammon was even more cruel (2 Samuel 12:31), and for less cause (10:1 ff). The king of Zobah (Chalkis) was defeated (2 Samuel 8:3), and Israelite garrisons were placed in Syria of Damascus (2 Samuel 8:6) and Edom (2 Samuel 8:14). The sons of Ammon formed a league with the Syrian kingdoms to the North and East of Palestine (2 Samuel 10:6,16), but these also had no success. All these people became tributary to the kingdom of Israel under David (2 Samuel 10:18,19) except the sons of Ammon who were practically exterminated for the time being (2 Samuel 12:31). Thus, Israel became one of the "great powers" of the world during the reign of David and his immediate successor.

3. Political Situation:

There is no doubt that the expansion of the boundaries of Israel at this period almost to their ideal limits (Deuteronomy 11:24, etc.) was largely due to the fact that the two great empires of Egypt and Assyria were at the moment passing through a period of weakness and decay. The Assyrian monarchy was in a decadent state from about the year 1050 BC, and the 22nd Dynasty — to which Shishak belonged (1 Kings 14:25) — had not yet arisen. David, therefore, had a free hand when his time came

and found no more formidable opposition than that of the petty states bordering upon Palestine. Against the combined forces of all the Israelite tribes these had never been able to effect much.

4. The Ark:

It had been the custom of the Israelites on setting out upon expeditions in which the nation as a whole took part to carry with them the sacred box or "ark" which contained the two stone tables (Joshua 4:7, etc.). When David had secured the fortress of Jebus for his metropolis one of his first thoughts was to bring into it this emblem of victory. It was then lying at Kiriath-jearim, possibly Abu Gosh about 8 miles Northwest of Jerusalem (compare Psalm 132). Owing to the sudden death of one of the drivers, which he interpreted as indicative of anger on the part of Yahweh, David left the ark at the house of a Philistine which happened to be near at hand. Since no misfortune befell this person, but on the contrary much prosperity, David took courage after three months to bring the sacred chest and its contents into his royal city. The ceremony was conducted with military honors in 2 Samuel 6:1 and with religious dancing and music (6:5,14) and festivity (6:18,19). A tent was pitched for it, in which it remained (7:2), except when it was sent with the army to the seat of war (11:11; 15:24). David, however, had already built for himself a stone palace, and he wished now to add to it a chapel royal in the shape of a small temple, such as the neighboring kings had. He was the more anxious to so do since he had much of the material ready at hand in the precious metals which formed the most valuable part of the plunder of the conquered races, such as bronze from Chalkis (8:8), gold and silver (8:11) and the vessels which he had received as a present from the king of Hamath (8:10). He was persuaded, however, by the prophet Nathan to forego that task, on the ground of his having shed much human blood, and to leave it to his successor (1 Chronicles 22:8; 28:3).

VI. DOMESTIC LIFE.

1. His Wives and Children:

In accordance with the practice of the kings of his time, David had several wives. His first wife was Michal, the younger daughter of Saul. When David fled from Saul she was given to Phaltiel, but was restored to David after Saul's death. She does not appear to have borne any children. In 2 Samuel 21:8 "Michal" should be Merab (1 Samuel 18:19). During the

period of separation from Michal, David took to wife Ahinoam of Jezreel and Abigail the wife of Nabal (⟨0258⟩1 Samuel 25:43,12), who accompanied him to Ziklag (⟨0270B⟩1 Samuel 27:3 ff), when they were among those captured by the Amalekites (⟨0305⟩1 Samuel 30:5). A fourth wife was the daughter of Talmai of Geshur, Maacah, whom he had captured in war (⟨0270B⟩1 Samuel 27:8; ⟨1030B⟩2 Samuel 3:3). When he removed to Hebron Ahinoam bore him his oldest son Amnon, and Abigail his second son Chileab or Daniel (⟨1032⟩2 Samuel 3:2,3; ⟨3301⟩1 Chronicles 3:1); his third son was Absalom, whose mother was Maacah, and his fourth Adonijah. His mother's name was Haggith; nothing is known about her. Two other sons, Shephatiah and Ithream were also born in Hebron (⟨1032⟩2 Samuel 3:2-5; ⟨3301⟩1 Chronicles 3:1-4). When David added the kingdom of Israel to that of Judah, he, in accordance with custom, took more wives with a view to increase his state and dignity. One of these was Bathsheba, who became the mother of Solomon (⟨10513⟩2 Samuel 5:13 ff; ⟨3305⟩1 Chronicles 3:5 ff; 14:3 ff). David's sons discharged priestly functions (⟨1088⟩2 Samuel 8:18; compare Nathan in ⟨3812⟩Zechariah 12:12).

2. *Domestic Troubles:*

It was perhaps inevitable that in so large a household the usual dissensions and crimes of the harem should have sprung up in plenty. A most unvarnished account of these is given in 2 Samuel 11 through 20 — it has been suggested by Abiathar the priest in order to avenge himself on Solomon for his disgrace (⟨1026⟩1 Kings 2:26,27), Solomon's mother being Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11; 12). 1 Chronicles 13 recounts the wrong done to Tamar, the daughter of David and Maacah, and sister of Absalom, and how the last named, having avenged his sister's honor by killing Amnon, his oldest brother, fled for asylum to his mother's father, the king of-Geshur. Thence after two years he returned (chapter 14), only to foment rebellion against his father (chapter 15), leading to civil war between David and Judah on the one side and Absalom and Israel on the other (chapters 16; 17), and ending in the death of himself (chapter 18) and of Amasa, David's nephew, at the hands of his cousins Joab and Abishai (20:7 ff), as well as nearly precipitating the disruption of the newly founded kingdom (19:43). The rebellion of Absalom was probably due to the fact of Solomon having been designated David's successor (compare 12:24; ⟨3320⟩1 Chronicles 22:9), for Absalom had the best claim, Amnon being dead and Chileab apparently of no account.

VII. HIS OFFICIALS.

As David's circumstances improved he required assistance in the management of his affairs.

1. Prophets:

The beginning of his good fortune had been the friendship of the prophet Samuel (1 Samuel 16:13; 19:18). The prophet or seer was keeper of the king's conscience and was not appointed by him, but claimed divine authority (2 Samuel 7:3,1 ff; 12:1 ff; 24:11 ff). Among the persons who discharged this duty for David were Gad the seer (1 Samuel 22:5) and Nathan the prophet (1 Kings 1:11 ff). All these are said to have written memoirs of their times (1 Chronicles 29:29; 2 Chronicles 9:29).

2. Priests:

Next to the prophet came the priest. The *kohen* (priest) was, as the name indicates, a soothsayer or diviner. The duty of Abiathar, David's first priest (1 Samuel 22:20 ff), was to carry the ephod — an object used for casting lots (1 Samuel 23:6 ff), in order to decide what to do in cases where there was no other way of making up one's mind (1 Samuel 30:7). It is not to be confused with the dress of the same name (1 Samuel 2:18). Later, at Hebron, Abiathar was given a colleague, Zadok (1 Chronicles 12:28), and it became their duty to carry the ark in expeditions (2 Samuel 15:24). Shortly after the death of David, Abiathar was deposed by Solomon for his part in Adonijah's attempt to seize the throne (1 Kings 2:26,27), and Zadok remained sole priest to the king (1 Kings 2:35). David's sons also acted in the same capacity (2 Samuel 8:18). An extra private priest is mentioned in 2 Samuel 20:26 (compare 23:26,38).

3. Military Officers:

When still an outlaw David required the services of a henchman to take command of his men in his absence. This post was held at first by different persons according to circumstances, but generally, it seems, by his nephew Abishai (1 Samuel 26:6). It was only after the death of Saul that his brother Joab threw in his lot with David. His great military talents at once gave him a leading place, and as a reward for the capture of Jebus he was given the chief command, which he held against all rivals (2 Samuel 3:27; 20:10) during the whole reign. David's special body-guard of Philistine troops — the Cherethites and Pelethites — were commanded by

Benaiah, who in the following reign, succeeded Joab (⁽¹⁰²⁵⁾1 Kings 2:35).

<div align="center">

4. Other Officials:

</div>

The office of recorder or magister memoriae was held during this reign and in the following by Jehoshaphat (⁽¹⁰⁸¹⁶⁾2 Samuel 8:16); and that of secretary by Seraiah (⁽¹⁰⁸¹⁷⁾2 Samuel 8:17), also called Shavsha (⁽¹³¹⁸¹⁶⁾1 Chronicles 18:16) or Shisha (⁽¹⁰⁴³⁾1 Kings 4:3). There were also the counselors, men noted for their great acumen and knowledge of human nature, such as Ahithophel and Hushai.

<div align="center">

5. Mutual Rivalry:

</div>

It was natural that there should be much mutual jealousy and rivalry among these officials, and that some of them should attach themselves to one of David's many sons, others to another. Thus, Amnon is the special patron of David's nephew Jonadab (⁽¹⁰³³⁸⁾2 Samuel 13:3; compare 21:21), and Absalom is backed by Amasa (⁽¹⁰⁷²⁵⁾2 Samuel 17:25). The claim of Adonijah to the throne is supported by Joab and Abiathar (⁽¹¹⁰¹⁰⁷⁾1 Kings 1:7), as against that of Solomon who is backed by Nathan, Benaiah, Zadok (⁽¹¹⁰¹⁰⁸⁾1 Kings 1:8) and Hushai (compare Ant, VII, xiv, 4). Ahithophel sides with Absalom; Hushai with David (⁽¹⁰⁵¹²⁾2 Samuel 15:12,32).

<div align="center">

VIII. PERSONAL CHARACTER OF DAVID.

1. Chronicles:

</div>

We would obtain a very different idea of the personal character of David if we drew our conclusions from the books of Samuel and Kings or from the books of Chronicles. There is no doubt whatever that the former books are much truer to fact, and any estimate or appreciation of David or of any of the other characters described must be based upon them. The Chronicler, on the other hand, is biased by the religious ideas of his own time and is prejudiced in favor of some of those whose biographies he writes and against others. He accordingly suppresses the dark passages of David's life, e.g. the murder of Uriah (1 Chronicles 20), or sets them in a favorable light, e.g. by laying the blame of the census upon Satan (⁽¹³²¹⁰⁾1 Chronicles 21:1). David's success, especially as against Saul's misfortune, is greatly exaggerated in ⁽¹³¹²²²⁾1 Chronicles 12:2,22. Ceremonial functions are greatly elaborated (chapter 16; compare 2 Samuel 6). The various orders of priests and singers in the second temple have their origin traced back to David (16:4 ff,37 ff; 1 Chronicles 23 through 27), and the temple of Solomon itself is to all intents and purposes built by him (chapters 22; 28). At the

same time there may be much material in the shape of names and isolated statements not found in the older books, which so long as they are not tinged with the Chronicler's pragmatism or "tendency," may possibly be authentic records preserved within the circle of the priestly caste, e.g. we are told that Saul's skull was fastened in the temple of Dagon (⁽¹³⁰¹⁰⁾1 Chronicles 10:10). There is no doubt that the true names of Ish-bosheth, Mephibosheth and Eliada (⁽¹⁰²⁰⁸⁾2 Samuel 2:8; 4:4; 5:16) were Ish-baal (Esh-baal), Merib-baal and Beeliada (⁽¹³⁰⁸³⁾1 Chronicles 8:33; 9:39; 8:34; 9:40; 14:7); that the old name of Jerusalem was Jebus (11:4,5; compare ⁽⁰⁷⁹¹⁰⁾Judges 19:10,11); perhaps a son of David called Nogah has to be added to ⁽¹⁰⁵¹⁵⁾2 Samuel 5:15 from ⁽¹³⁰⁰⁷⁾1 Chronicles 3:7; 14:6; in ⁽¹⁰⁸⁰⁸⁾2 Samuel 8:8 and 21:18, for Betah and Gob read Tebah (Tibhath) and Gezer (⁽¹³¹⁸⁰⁸⁾1 Chronicles 18:8; ⁽⁰¹²²⁴⁾Genesis 22:24; ⁽¹³¹⁰⁴⁾1 Chronicles 20:4). The incident recounted in ⁽¹⁰²⁰⁹⁾2 Samuel 23:9 ff happened at Pasdammim (⁽¹³¹¹¹³⁾1 Chronicles 11:13). Shammah the Harodite was the son of Elika (⁽¹⁰²³²⁵⁾2 Samuel 23:25; compare ⁽¹³¹¹²⁷⁾1 Chronicles 11:27), and other names in this list have to be corrected after the readings of the Chronicler. Three (not seven) years of famine was the alternative offered to David (⁽¹⁰²⁴¹³⁾2 Samuel 24:13; compare ⁽¹³²¹¹²⁾1 Chronicles 21:12).

2. Psalms:

If we could believe that the Book of Psalms was in whole or in part the work of David, it would throw a flood of light upon the religious side of his nature. Indeed, we should know as much about his religious life as can well be known about anyone. Unfortunately the date and authorship of the Psalms are questions regarding which the most divergent opinions are held. In the early Christian centuries all the Psalms were ascribed to David and, where necessary, explained as prophecies. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Book of Psalms simply as "David" (⁽⁵⁹⁰⁴⁷⁾Hebrews 4:7). The Greek text, however, of that book ascribes only some 87 of the poems to David, and the Hebrew only 73. Some of these are not David's, and in the whole book there is only one which professes from its contents to be his, namely, Psalm 18 (= 2 Samuel 22). The occasion on which a psalm was composed is stated only in the case of thirteen psalms, all of which are ascribed to David. Each of these is referred to some incident recorded in the books of Samuel, although sometimes the citation is erroneous (*see* PSALMS). The Septuagint supplies occasions to two or three more psalms; but all such statements are merely the conjectures of readers and scribes and are of no historical value.

3. Complex Character:

To form a correct opinion of anyone is much more difficult than to state the facts of his life; to form an opinion which will be generally accepted is impossible. Of David's character the most opposite estimates have been formed. On one hand he is extolled as a saint, and yet few men have committed worse crimes. The character of David must remain, like that of everyone, an insoluble enigma. A person is to be judged by his motives rather than by his actions, and one's true motives are unknown even to oneself (Jeremiah 17:9). There are several sides of David's nature in regard to which there cannot be two opinions.

4. Physical Courage:

Perhaps the feature of his character which stands out most prominently in his earlier years, at any rate, is his boundless physical courage. He never shirked danger (1 Samuel 17:28,34 ff) and delighted in hairbreadth escapes in 1 Samuel 26:6. Like most Semites he was fond of gambling and liked to take risks (18:26; compare 23:9; 30:7), even when modesty would have led him to decline them (17:32; compare Judges 8:20). A native indifference to the shedding of blood grew into a liking for it, giving rise to acts of gross cruelty (1 Samuel 27:9; 2 Samuel 8:2; 16:7, etc.). He had need, indeed, to be a brave man, considering the character of the men whom he ruled (1 Samuel 22:2). Yet he could rule them by gentleness as well as by force (30:23). All classes had unbounded confidence in his personal courage and soldierly qualities (2 Samuel 18:3), and were themselves driven to restrain his military ardor (2 Samuel 21:17).

5. Moral Courage:

Whether David possessed moral courage to an equal degree is another matter. Had he done so he would hardly have permitted the execution of seven sons of Saul (2 Samuel 21:1 ff), and that, too, at the cost of breaking his plighted word (1 Samuel 24:21); he would not have stood in awe of the sons of his sister Zeruiah (2 Samuel 3:39), and would have punished Joab instead of weakly invoking an imprecation on his head (2 Samuel 3:29), however much he might have felt the loss of his services. But in many matters his natural sense of justice was blunted by the superstitions of the age in which he lived.

6. Prudence:

But David was even more prudent than courageous. He is so described by the person who recommended him (somewhat eulogistically) to Saul ([09618]1 Samuel 16:18). Prudence or wisdom was indeed what his biographer most remarks in him ([09805]1 Samuel 18:5,30), and situated as he was he could not have too much of it. It shows itself in the fact that he consistently made as many friends and as few enemies as was possible. His wonderful foresight is shown in such acts as his conciliating the Judean chiefs with gifts taken from his spoil ([08305]1 Samuel 30:26 ff), in his commendation of the men of Ja-besh-gilead ([10015]2 Samuel 2:5-7), and in his reception of Abner ([10320]2 Samuel 3:20). Yet it must be confessed that this constant looking forward to the future takes away from the spontaneity of his virtue. His gratitude is often a keen sense of favors to come. His kindness to Merib-baal did him no harm and some advantage (2 Samuel 9; 19:24 ff), and his clemency to Shimei helped to win him the tribe of Benjamin ([10916]2 Samuel 19:16 ff). Even in his earliest youth he seems to have preferred to attain his ends by roundabout ways. The means by which he obtained introduction or reintroduction to Saul ([09726]1 Samuel 17:26 ff) afford some justification for the opinon which his oldest brother held of him ([09728]1 Samuel 17:28). Perhaps nothing proves the genius of David better than his choice of Jebus as the capital of the country — which it still continues to be after a lapse of three thousand years.

7. Strategy:

Yet it must be confessed that David's prudence often degenerates into cunning. With true oriental subtlety he believed firmly in keeping one's secret to oneself at all costs ([09202]1 Samuel 21:2). The manner in which he got himself out of Gath after this first visit there ([09213]1 Samuel 21:13) and the fact that he hoodwinked Achish during sixteen months (1 Samuel 27; 28:1; 29) may excite our admiration but not our respect. The Oriental, however, delights in a display of cunning and makes use of it without shame ([10534]2 Samuel 15:34), just as the European does in secret. There is something curiously modern in the diplomacy which David employed to ensure his own return in due state ([10911]2 Samuel 19:11 ff). We must remember, however, that David lived among persons hardly one of whom he could trust. Joab accuses Abner of deceit, while he himself was faithful to none except David ([10325]2 Samuel 3:25). Ziba accuses Merib-baal of treachery, and Merib-baal accuses Ziba of falsehood, and David cannot tell which is speaking the truth ([10601]2 Samuel 16:1 ff; 19:24 ff). David himself

is out-witted by Joab, though with a friendly purpose (⁐2 Samuel 14:1 ff). The wonder, therefore, is, not that David was guilty of occasional obliquity, but that he remained as straightforward and simple as he was.

8. Nobility:

David was, indeed, a man very much ahead of the times in which he lived. His fine elegies upon the death of Saul and Jonathan, Abner and Absalom show that his nature was untainted with malice. It was no superstitious fear but a high sense of honor which kept him back from putting out of his way his arch-enemy when he had him in his power (1 Samuel 24-26). He even attempts to find an excuse for him (⁐1 Samuel 26:19), while depreciating himself (⁐1 Samuel 24:14; 26:20) in phrases which are more than a mere oriental metonymy (⁐2 Samuel 9:8). It was the ambition of his life to be the founder of a permanent dynasty (⁐2 Samuel 7:29), yet he was willing that his house should be sacrificed to save his nation from destruction (⁐2 Samuel 24:17). Like most Orientals he was endowed with a refinement of feeling unknown in the West. His refusal to drink of water obtained at the cost of bloodshed has become classic (⁐2 Samuel 23:17). And he seems to have been gifted with the saving sense of humor (⁐1 Samuel 26:15). That he was a religious person goes without saying (2 Samuel 7; 8:11). He probably did not believe that outside the land of Israel Yahweh ceased to rule: the expression used in ⁐1 Samuel 26:19 is not a term of dogmatic theology. Like other Hebrews David had no theology. He believed in Yahweh alone as the ruler, if not of the universe, at any rate of all the world known to him. He certainly did not believe in Chemosh or Milcom, whether in the lands of Moab and Ammon or out of them (⁐2 Samuel 12:30; for "their king" read Malcam (Milcom)).

9. David in Relation to His Family:

David discharged, as most Orientals do, his duty toward his parents (⁐1 Samuel 22:3). To Michal, his first wife, his love was constant (⁐2 Samuel 3:13), although she did not bear him any children. In accordance with the custom of the times, as his estate improved, he took other wives and slave-girls. The favorite wife of his latter days was Bathsheba. His court made some show of splendor as contrasted with the dwellings of the peasantry and the farmer class (⁐2 Samuel 19:28,35), but his palace was always small and plain, so that it could be left to the keeping of ten women when he removed from it (⁐2 Samuel 15:16). David and Michal seem to have lived on terms of perfect equality (⁐2 Samuel 6:20 ff). In this he contrasts somewhat with Ahab (⁐1 Kings 21:5 ff). David's chief

weakness in regard to his family was his indulgence of some of his sons and favoring some above others, and want of firmness in regard to them. He could refuse them nothing (⁽¹⁰¹³²⁾2 Samuel 13:27). His first favorite was his oldest son Amnon (⁽¹⁰¹³²⁾2 Samuel 13:21, Septuagint). After the death of Amnon, Absalom became the favorite (⁽¹⁰¹³³⁾2 Samuel 18:33), and after the death of Absalom, Adonijah (⁽¹¹⁰⁰⁶⁾1 Kings 1:6). Yet David lived for two whole years in Jerusalem along with Absalom without seeing him (⁽¹⁰⁴²⁸⁾2 Samuel 14:28), and he was succeeded not by Adonijah, but by Solomon, whose mother was the favorite wife of his later years.

10. David in Relation to His Friends:

Not only did David know the value of having many friends, but he was capable of sincere attachment. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of his love for Jonathan, although it is not so completely cut off from all suspicion of self-interest as is that of Jonathan for him. David, indeed, had the faculty of winning the confidence and love of all sorts and conditions of people, not only of Jonathan (⁽⁰⁹¹⁸⁰⁾1 Samuel 18:1 ff; 20; 23:16 ff), but of Jonathan's sister Michal (⁽⁰⁹¹⁸⁰⁾1 Samuel 18:20), of the whole people (⁽⁰⁹¹⁸⁸⁾1 Samuel 18:28 Septuagint; ⁽¹⁰⁰⁹⁴⁾2 Samuel 19:14), and even of his people's enemies (⁽¹⁰⁷⁷⁷⁾2 Samuel 17:27 ff). His friendship lasted as long as the object of it lived (⁽¹⁰⁰¹⁷⁾2 Samuel 1:17 ff; 10:1 f). In the case of his officers this was partly due to his faculty for choosing good men (⁽¹⁰⁸¹⁶⁾2 Samuel 8:16 ff), so that the same persons often held the same offices during David's life (⁽¹⁰¹²³⁾2 Samuel 20:23 ff). Yet the services of one of them at least were retained more by compulsion than by choice (⁽¹⁰⁰³⁹⁾2 Samuel 3:39). He seems, indeed, to have continued Joab in his post because he felt he could not do without him. Joab was devoted to David with the devotion of Caleb Balderstone to his master, and he was as utterly unscrupulous. He did not hesitate to commit any crime that would benefit David. The latter dared not perpetrate these atrocities himself, but he did not mind taking advantage of such a useful instrument, and never punished Joab for them, save with an impotent curse (⁽¹⁰⁰³⁹⁾2 Samuel 3:29). He dealt otherwise with malefactors who could be better spared (⁽¹⁰⁰¹⁴⁾2 Samuel 1:14 ff; 4:9 ff). Indeed, a suspicious juryman might find that David put both Abner and Amasa, in the way of Joab (⁽¹⁰⁰²³⁾2 Samuel 3:23 ff; 19:13; 4 ff). It does not say much for David that he fell so low as to fear losing the good opinion even of Joab, this ready instrument of his worst crime (⁽¹⁰¹²⁵⁾2 Samuel 11:25).

11. His Success:

One reason for the high position David held in the popular estimation was

no doubt his almost uninterrupted success. He was regarded as the chosen of Heaven, by friend and foe alike (⟨02317⟩1 Samuel 23:17). Fortune seemed to favor him. Nothing could have been more timely than the death of Saul and Jonathan, of Ishbaal and Abner, of Absalom and Amasa, and he did not raise his hand against one of them. As a guerrilla chief with his 600 bandits he could keep at bay. Saul with his 3,000 picked men (⟨02402⟩1 Samuel 24:2; 26:2), but he was not a great general. Most of the old judges of Israel did in one pitched battle what David effected in a campaign (⟨09180⟩1 Samuel 18:30; 19:8; 23:1 ff; ⟨10517⟩2 Samuel 5:17 ff; 21:15 ff). Most of his conquests were won for him by Joab (⟨13106⟩1 Chronicles 11:6; ⟨10101⟩2 Samuel 11:1), who willingly accorded David the credit of what he himself had done (⟨10227⟩2 Samuel 12:27,28; compare ⟨10813⟩2 Samuel 8:13; ⟨13181⟩1 Chronicles 18:11 with the title of Psalm 60). And to crown all, when he came to turn his arms east and west, he found his two most formidable opponents in these directions crippled and harmless. That he ever survived Saul he owed to a timely incursion of the Philistines (⟨02324⟩1 Samuel 23:24 ff), and his whole career is largely to be explained by the fact that, at the moment, the tribe of Judah as a whole was passing from insignificance to supremacy.

12. *His Foreign Friends:*

In the prosecution of his military achievements David employed everyone who came to his hand as an instrument without any question of nationality. This is not to impugn his patriotism. Eastern peoples are united not by the ties of country but of religion. Still it does seem strange that two of David's best friends were two enemies of his nation — Nahash, king of the sons of Ammon (⟨09101⟩1 Samuel 11:1; ⟨10001⟩2 Samuel 10:1 ff) and Achish, lord of Gath (⟨02110⟩1 Samuel 21:10; 27; 28:1 ff; 29). He appears to have found the Philistines more reliable and trustworthy than the Hebrews. When he became king, his personal body-guard was composed of mercenaries of that nation — the Cherethites and Pelethites — with whom he had become acquainted when at Ziklag (⟨09014⟩1 Samuel 30:14; ⟨10818⟩2 Samuel 8:18; 20:23). It was to a native of Gath that he committed the care of the sacred ark on its passage from Kiriath-jearim to Jerusalem (⟨10610⟩2 Samuel 6:10,11). When the rebellion broke out under Absalom, he committed one-third of his forces to a banished soldier of the same town, who had come to him a little while before with a band of followers (⟨10519⟩2 Samuel 15:19 ff; 18:2). Some of the soldiers in whom he placed the greatest confidence were Hittites (⟨09606⟩1 Samuel 26:6; ⟨10106⟩2 Samuel 11:6), and his commissariat was furnished by persons outside of Israel (⟨10727⟩2 Samuel 17:27; the Machir tribe were half

Syrian; Gilead is the son of Machir, [13714]1 Chronicles 7:14). The threshing-floor of a Jebusite became the site of the temple of Solomon ([10248]2 Samuel 24:18 ff).

13. Nemesis:

David was a strong believer in the power of Nemesis, and that daughter of Night played a considerable part in his life. He felt a peculiar satisfaction in being undeservedly cursed by Shimei, from a conviction that poetic justice would in the end prevail ([10162]2 Samuel 16:12). He must have felt that the same unseen power was at work when his own oldest son was guilty of a crime such as his father had committed before him (2 Samuel 13 and 11), and when the grandfather of the wife of Uriah the Hittite became the enemy whom he had most to fear ([10103]2 Samuel 11:3; 23:34; compare [19402]Psalm 41:9; 55:12 f). And David's own last hours, instead of being spent in repose and peace following upon a strenuous and successful life, were passed in meting out vengeance to those who had incurred his displeasure as well as commending those who had done him service ([11025]1 Kings 2:5 ff).

14. References in the New Testament:

Even as early as Ezekiel, David became the ruler who was to govern the restored people of Israel (34:23,14; 37:24). If there were to be a ruling house, it must be the Davidic dynasty; it did not occur to the Jews to think of any other solution ([30091]Amos 9:11; [28015]Hosea 3:5; [24009]Jeremiah 30:9; [38128]Zechariah 12:8). That Jesus was descended from David ([40927]Matthew 9:27, etc.) is proved by the fact that his enemies did not deny that he was so ([42241]Matthew 22:41 ff). In the New Testament, David is regarded as the author of the Psalms ([44025]Acts 4:25; [45046]Romans 4:6; [58047]Hebrews 4:7). He is also one of the Old Testament saints ([58132]Hebrews 11:32) whose actions (unless otherwise stated) are to be imitated ([40128]Matthew 12:3); but yet not to be compared with the Messiah ([44229]Acts 2:29 ff; 13:36) who has power over the life to come ([66037]Revelation 3:7) and who is "the Root of David" ([66055]Revelation 5:5; 22:16).

LITERATURE.

See the commentaries on the books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Psalms, and histories of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, especially Wellhausen and Kittel. A sketch of the life and historical position of David from the modern Continental point of view will be found in G. Beer, Saul, David, Salomo, published by Mohr, Tubingen, 1906.

Thomas Hunter Weir

DAVID, CITY OF

See ZION.

DAVID, ROOT OF

<root> ([ἡ ῥίζα Δαυείδ, *he rhiza Daueid*], Revelation 5:5; 22:16): Root here means stock, family, descendant, hence, "the Root of David" is that which descended from David, not that from which David descended. Jesus Christ in His human nature and family connections was a descendant of David, a member of his family.

DAVID, TOWER OF

<tou'-er>.

See JERUSALEM.

DAWN; DAWNING

<don>: The word means the approach of the morning light, the breaking of the day. There are several words in the Bible that indicate this. [נֶשֶׁף, *nesheph*], "twilight" of the morning (Job 7:4; Psalm 119:147). The same word is used for evening twilight (1 Samuel 30:17; 2 Kings 7:5,7); [פְּנוֹת הַבֹּקֶר *penoth ha-boqer*], "the turning" of the morning, the change from darkness to light, approach of the morning (Judges 19:26); [עַפְעַפֵּי־שָׁחַר *aph`-appe shachar*], "the eyelids" of the morning (Job 3:9; 41:18 **(10)**); [עֲלוֹת הַשָּׁחַר *aloth ha-shachar*], "the ascent" or "rise" of the morning (Joshua 6:15); [ἐπιφώσκω, *epiphosko*], "to grow light," the approach of the dawn (Matthew 28:1; Luke 23:54 margin); [διαυγάζω, *diaugazo*], "to grow bright, "lustrous" (2 Peter 1:19), "until the day dawn"; figurative of the Second Coming of Christ (compare 1:16).

H. Porter

DAY

<da> ([יוֹם, *yom*]; [ἡμέρα, *hemera*]): This common word has caused some trouble to plain readers, because they have not noticed that the word is used in several different senses in the English Bible. When the different

uses of the word are understood the difficulty of interpretation vanishes. We note several different uses of the word:

(1) It sometimes means the time from daylight till dark. This popular meaning is easily discovered by the context, e.g. Genesis 1:5; 8:22, etc. The marked periods of this daytime were morning, noon and night, as with us. See Psalm 55:17. The early hours were sometimes called "the cool of the day" (Genesis 3:8). After the exile the day. or daytime was divided into twelve hours and the night into twelve (see Matthew 20:1-12; John 11:9; Acts 23:23); 6 a.m. would correspond to the first hour, 9 a.m. to the third; 12 noon to the sixth, etc. The hours were longer during the longer days and shorter during the shorter days, since they always counted 12 hours between sunrise and sunset.
(2) Day also means a period of 24 hours, or the time from sunset to sunset. In Bible usage the day begins with sunset (see Leviticus 23:32; Exodus 12:15-20; 2 Corinthians 11:25, where night is put before day).

See DAY AND NIGHT.

(3) The word "day" is also used of an indefinite period, e.g "the day" or "day that" means in general "that time" (see Genesis 2:4; Leviticus 14:2); "day of trouble" (Psalm 20:1); "day of his wrath" (Job 20:28); "day of Yahweh" (Isaiah 2:12); "day of the Lord" (1 Corinthians 5:5; 1 Thessalonians 5:2; 2 Peter 3:10); "day of salvation" (2 Corinthians 6:2);. "day of Jesus Christ" (Philippians 1:6).
(4) It is used figuratively also in John 9:4, where "while it is day" means "while I have opportunity to work, as daytime is the time for work." In 1 Thessalonians 5:5,8, "sons of the day" means spiritually enlightened ones.
(5) We must also bear in mind that with God time is not reckoned as with us (see Psalm 90:4; 2 Peter 3:8).
(6) The apocalyptic use of the word "day" in Daniel 12:11; Revelation 2:10, etc., is difficult to define. It evidently does not mean a natural day.

See APOCALYPSE.

(7) On the meaning of "day" in the story of Creation we note

(a) the word "day" is used of the whole period of creation (Genesis 2:4);

(b) these days are days of God, with whom one day is as a thousand years; the whole age or period of salvation is called "the day of salvation"; see above. So we believe that in harmony with Bible usage we may understand the creative days as creative periods.

See also ASTRONOMY; CREATION; EVOLUTION.

G. H. Gerberding

Figurative: The word "day" is used figuratively in many senses, some of which are here given.

(1) The span of human life. — [01604]Genesis 5:4: "And the days of Adam .... were eight hundred years." "And if thou wilt walk .... then I will lengthen thy days" ([11614]1 Kings 3:14; compare [19012]Psalm 90:12; [23805]Isaiah 38:5).

(2) An indefinite time. — Existence in general: [01314]Genesis 3:14: "All the days of thy life" (compare [01234]Genesis 21:34; [04919]Numbers 9:19; [06213]Joshua 22:3; [42124]Luke 1:24; [44210]Acts 21:10).

(3) A set time. — [01524]Genesis 25:24: "And when her days .... were fulfilled"; [27213]Daniel 12:13: "Thou shalt stand in thy lot, at the end of the days" (compare [03206]Leviticus 12:6; [27244]Daniel 2:44).

(4) A historic period. — [01604]Genesis 6:4: "The Nephilim were in the earth in those days"; [07706]Judges 17:6: "In those days there was no king in Israel" (compare [09301]1 Samuel 3:1; [13517]1 Chronicles 5:17; [28213]Hosea 2:13).

(5) Past time. — [19188]Psalm 18:18: "the day of my calamity"; [19705]Psalm 77:5: "I have considered the days of old" (of [33720]Micah 7:20; [39307]Malachi 3:7; [42330]Matthew 23:30).

(6) Future time. — [05114]Deuteronomy 31:14: "Thy days approach that thou must die"; [19707]Psalm 72:7: "In his days shall ...." (compare [26214]Ezekiel 22:14; [29029]Joel 2:29; [42419]Matthew 24:19; [61003]2 Peter 3:3; [66906]Revelation 9:6).

(7) The eternal. — In [27009]Daniel 7:9,13, where God is called "the ancient of days."

(8) A season of opportunity. — [43904]John 9:4: "We must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work" (compare [45132]Romans 13:12,13; [52505]1 Thessalonians 5:5-8).

See DAY (4), above.

(9) Time of salvation. — Specially referring to the hopes and prospects of the parousia (*see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*). [45132]Romans 13:12: "The night is far spent, and the day is at hand."

Henry E. Dosker

DAY AND NIGHT

"Day," [μ/y, *yom*]; ordinarily, the Hebrew "day" lasted from dawn to the coming forth of the starts (⁴⁶⁰²¹Nehemiah 4:21). The context usually makes it clear whether the term "day" refers to the period of twenty-four hours or to daytime; when there was a possibility of confusion, the term [hl y] ″, *laylah*], "night," was added (⁰¹⁰⁷⁴Genesis 7:4,12; 31:39). The "day" is reckoned from evening to evening, in accordance with the order noted in the account of Creation, namely, "And there was evening and there was morning, one day" (⁰¹⁰⁰⁵Genesis 1:5); ⁰⁸³³²Leviticus 23:32 and ²⁷⁰⁸¹⁴Daniel 8:14 reflect the same mode of reckoning the day. The phrase [rqBdbr[, `*erebh boker*], "evening-morning," used in this last passage, is simply a variation of *yom* and *laylah*, "day" and "night"; it is the equivalent of the Greek [νυχθήμερον, *nuchthemeron*] (⁴⁷¹²⁵2 Corinthians 11:25). That the custom of reckoning the day as beginning in the evening and lasting until the following evening was probably of late origin is shown by the phrase "tarry all night" (⁰⁷¹⁹⁰⁶Judges 19:6-9); the context shows that the day is regarded as beginning in the morning; in the evening the day "declined," and until the new day (morning) arrived it was necessary to "tarry all night" (compare also ⁰⁴¹¹³²Numbers 11:32).

The transition of day to night begins before sunset and lasts till after sunset; the change of night to day begins before sunrise and continues until after sunrise. In both cases, neither `*erebh*, "evening," nor *boqer*, "morning," indicate an exact space of time (compare ⁰¹⁰⁸¹Genesis 8:11; ⁰²¹⁰¹³Exodus 10:13; ⁰⁵¹⁶⁰⁶Deuteronomy 16:6). The term [tvn, *nesheph*], is used for both evening twilight and morning dawn (compare ⁰⁹³⁰¹⁷1 Samuel 30:17; ¹²⁰⁷⁰⁵2 Kings 7:5,7; ¹⁸⁰⁷⁰⁴Job 7:4). Since there were no definite measurements of the time of day, the various periods were indicated by the natural changes of the day; thus "midday" was the time of the day when the sun mounted its highest ([μyrhx; *cohorayim*]); afternoon was that part of the day when the sun declined ([μ/Yh″ t/fn] *neToth ha-yom*]); and evening was the time of the going down of the sun ([br[, `*erebh*]). "Between the evenings" ([μyB″ r[b̂ʾ, *ben ha-`arbayim*) was the interval between sunset and darkness. The day was not divided into hours until a late period. [h[v; *sha`ah*] = Aramaic (²⁰⁸⁰⁶Daniel 3:6), is common in Syriac and in later Hebrew; it denoted, originally, any short space of time, and only later came

to be equivalent to our "hour" (Driver). The threefold division of the day into watches continued into post-exilic Roman times; but the Roman method of four divisions was also known ([41335]Mark 13:35), where all four divisions are referred to: "at even" ([ὀψέ, *opse*]), "midnight" ([μεσονύκτιον, *mesonuktion*]), "at cock crowing" ([ἀλεκτοροφωνία, *alektorophonia*]), "in the morning" ([πρωΐ, *proi*]). These last extended from six to six o'clock (of also [0425]Matthew 14:25; [41335]Mark 13:35). [41204]Acts 12:4 speaks of four parties of four Roman soldiers (quaternions), each of whom had to keep guard during one watch of the night. In *Berakhoth* 3b, Rabbi Nathan (2nd century) knows of only three night-watches; but the patriarch, Rabbi Judah, knows four.

See also DAY.

Horace J. Wolf

DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH

([ἡ παρασκευή, *he paraskeue*], "preparation"): Considered as a day of preparation, in accordance with [02623]Exodus 16:23, both before the regular Sabbath and before a feast Sabbath ([40762]Matthew 27:62; [41542]Mark 15:42; [42354]Luke 23:54; [43914]John 19:14,31,42). At 3 p.m., the Hebrews began to prepare their food for the next day, and to perform all labors which were forbidden to be done on the Sabbath and yet must be done. They bathed and purified themselves, dressed in festive apparel, set their tables, and lighted their lamps. On the day before Easter, the Hebrews of the later period made it their chief business to remove all leaven from the house ([46057]1 Corinthians 5:7). This custom of converting at least a portion of the day before the Sabbath into a holy day was recognized by the Romans to such an extent that, according to a rescript of Augustus, Jews need not appear in court after 3 p.m. on such days. Criminal cases were not brought before court on this day, and journeys exceeding 12 Roman miles were prohibited. The signal for the preparations was given by the priests by means of trumpets blown six times at intervals.

Frank E. Hirsch

DAY, BREAK OF

See BREAK OF DAY.

DAY, JOSHUA'S LONG

See BETH-HORON, BATTLE OF.

DAY, LAST

([ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα, *he eschate hemera*]): Repeatedly used by Jesus in John (6:39,40,44,54; 11:24; 12:48) for the day of resurrection and judgment (*see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*). Compare the usage in the Old Testament (Isaiah 2:2; Micah 4:1) and the New Testament (Acts 2:17; 2 Timothy 3:1; 2 Peter 3:3; 1 John 2:18; Jude 1:18) of "last days" and "last time" to denote the Messianic age.

See LATTER DAYS; LAST DAYS; LAST TIME.

In John 7:37, "the last day, the great day of the feast" refers to the eighth day of the feast of Tabernacles. This closing day was observed as a Sabbath (Leviticus 23:36). On it the libation of water made on other days was not made; hence, the allusion of Jesus to Himself as the Giver of the living water.

James Orr

DAY, LORD'S

See LORD'S DAY.

DAY OF ATONEMENT

See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

DAY OF CHRIST

See DAY OF THE LORD.

DAY OF YAHWEH

See DAY OF THE LORD.

DAY OF JUDGMENT

See JUDGEMENT, LAST.

DAY OF THE LORD (YAHWEH)

([h/hy]μ/y, *yom Yahweh*]; [ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου, *he hemera tou Kuriou*]): The idea is a common Old Testament one. It denotes the consummation of the kingdom of God and the absolute cessation of all attacks upon it (Isaiah 2:12; 13:6,9; 34:8; Ezekiel 13:5; 30:3; Joel 1:15; 2:11; Amos 5:18; Zephaniah 1:14; Zechariah 14:1) It is a "day of visitation" (Isaiah 10:3), a day "of the wrath of Yahweh" (Ezekiel 7:19), a "great day of Yahweh" (Zephaniah 1:14). The entire conception in the Old Testament is dark and foreboding.

On the other hand the New Testament idea is pervaded with the elements of hope and joy and victory. In the New Testament it is eminently the day of Christ, the day of His coming in the glory of His father. The very conception of Him as the "Son of Man" points to this day (E. Kuehl, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 68). John 5:27: "And he gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is a son of man" (compare Matthew 24:27,30; Luke 12:8). It is true in the New Testament there is a dark background to the bright picture, for it still remains a "day of wrath". (Romans 2:5,6), a "great day" (Revelation 6:17; Jude 1:6), a "day of God" (2 Peter 3:12), a "day of judgment" (Matthew 10:15; 2 Peter 3:7; Romans 2:16). Sometimes it is called "that day" (Matthew 7:22; 1 Thessalonians 5:4; 2 Timothy 4:8), and again it is called "the day" without any qualification whatever, as if it were the only day worth counting in all the history of the world and of the race (1 Corinthians 3:13). To the unbeliever, the New Testament depicts it as a day of terror; to the believer, as a day of joy. For on that day Christ will raise the dead, especially His own dead, the bodies of those that believed in Him — "that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day" (John 6:39). In that day He comes to His own (Matthew 16:27), and therefore it is called "the day of our Lord Jesus" (2 Corinthians 1:14),"the day of Jesus Christ" or "of Christ" (Philippians 1:6,10), the day when there "shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven" (Matthew 24:30). All Paulinic literature is especially suffused with this longing for the "parousia," the day of Christ's glorious manifestation. The entire conception of that day centers therefore in Christ and points to the everlasting establishment of the kingdom of heaven, from which sin will be forever eliminated, and in which the antithesis between Nature and grace will be changed into an everlasting synthesis.

See also ESCHATOLOGY (OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT).

Henry E. Dosker

DAY'S JOURNEY

<jur'-ni> ([μ/y ЁrD, *derekh yom*], [0186]Genesis 30:36; [0103]Numbers 10:33; 11:31; [ἡμέρας ὁδός, *hemeras hodos*], [0244]Luke 2:44): The common way of estimating distances in the East is by hours and days. This is natural in a country where roads are mere bridle paths or non-existent, as in the desert. The distance traveled must of course differ largely according to the difficulties of the way, and it is more important to know where night will overtake the traveler than the actual distance accomplished. A day's journey is now commonly reckoned at about 3 miles per hour, the distance usually covered by a loaded mule, the number of hours being about 8. Hence, a day's journey is about 24 miles, and this may be taken as a fair estimate for Bible times.

H. Porter

DAYS, LAST

See LAST DAYS.

DAYSMAN

<daz'-man> ([j k″ y; *yakhach*], "to argue, decide, convince," the Revised Version (British and American) UMPIRE): The use of this word appears to have been more common in the 16th century than at the later date of the translation of the King James Version, when its adoption was infrequent. The oldest instance of the term given in the Oxford English Dictionary is Plumpton Corresp. (1489), p. 82: "Sir, the dayesmen cannot agre us." It appears also in the 1551 edition of the Old Testament in [0025]1 Samuel 2:25, where the English Versions of the Bible "judge" is translated "dayes-man." Tyndale's translation has for [0202]Exodus 21:22, "He shall paye as the dayesmen appoynte him" (EV as the "judges determine"). See also Edmund Spenser's Faerie Queene, ii, c. 8, published in 1590. As used in the King James Version ([1093]Job 9:33) the word means an arbitrator, umpire, referee; one who stands in a judicial capacity between two parties, and decides upon the merits of their arguments or case at law. "Neither is there-any daysman (the Revised Version (British and American) "umpire")

betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both" (compare ⟨01317⟩Genesis 31:37). It was the eastern custom for a judge to lay his hands upon the heads of the two parties in disagreement, thus emphasizing his adjudicatory capacity and his desire to render an unbiased verdict. Job might consider a human judge as capable of acting as an umpire upon his own claims, but no man was worthy to question the purposes of Yahweh, or metaphorically, to "lay his hands upon" Him.

In the New Testament (⟨4008⟩1 Corinthians 4:3, [ἀνθρωπίνη, *anthropine*], [ἡμέρα, *hemera*]) "man's judgment" is literally, "man's day," in the sense of a day fixed for the trial of a case. Both Tyndale and Coverdale so translate. See also ⟨5405⟩1 Timothy 2:5, where the Saviour is termed the "one mediator .... between God and men." Here the word understands a pleader, an advocate before an umpire, rather than the adjudicator himself (see ⟨18925⟩Job 19:25-27).

Arthur Walwyn Evans

DAYSPRING

<da'-spring>: This beautiful English word, in current use in the time of the King James Version, is found in the Old Testament as the translation of [רגְ " ﬠ" , *shachar*], "Hast thou .... caused the dayspring to know his place?" (⟨8882⟩Job 38:12 the King James Version). This is no doubt intended literally for the dawn. The "place" of the dayspring is the particular point of the horizon at which the sun comes up on any given day. This slowly changes day by day through the year, moving northward from midwinter till midsummer, and back again southward from midsummer to midwinter. *See ASTRONOMY*, I, 2. Also once in the New Testament for [ἀνατολή, *anatole*], "a rising." "The dayspring from on high hath visited us" (the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "shall visit us," ⟨4078⟩Luke 1:78). Also in Apocrypha, "At the dayspring pray unto thee" (AV; the Revised Version (British and American) "plead with thee at the dawning of the light," The Wisdom of Solomon 16:28). Both the Hebrew and Greek words, however, are of frequent occurrence, but variously rendered "dawn," "break of day," "morning," "sunrise," "east." Note especially "the spring of the day" (⟨09026⟩1 Samuel 9:26), "the day began to spring" (⟨07925⟩Judges 19:25). Used with heliou, "sun," for rising of the sun (⟨6012⟩Revelation 7:2; 16:12). In the Septuagint the same Greek word is used for Hebrew [tsemach], "branch," to designate the Messiah (⟨22205⟩Jeremiah 23:5; ⟨38062⟩Zechariah 6:12. But this sense of the word is wholly unknown in

profane Greek The word is also employed in Septuagint to express the rising of a heavenly body, as the moon (⟨2609⟩Isaiah 60:19). This is good Greek See the kindred verb *anatello*, "to rise" (the Septuagint, ⟨2601⟩Isaiah 60:1; ⟨3042⟩Malachi 4:2).

What is the meaning of *anatole* in ⟨4078⟩Luke 1:78? Certainly not branch; that does not fit any of the facts, unless it be rendered "branch of light" (see Reynolds, John the Baptist, 115). It occurs in Zacharias' hymn over the birth of his son. The ode consists of two parts, "The glory and security of the Messiah's kingdom," and "The glory of the Forerunner." The expression before us is in the latter part. It naturally refers, therefore, not to the Messiah himself, but to John. He is the dayspring from on high who hath visited the people who sat in darkness and the shadow of death. With Godet we believe that the picture is borrowed from the caravan which has missed its way in the desert. The unfortunate pilgrims, overtaken by the night, are sitting down expecting death, when suddenly a star brightly beams above them. They take courage at the sight. The whole caravan leaps to its feet. It is the herald of the coming day and soon they see the great orb himself filling the east with orient pearl and gold. Is not one tempted to go a little farther and see here the morning star, herald of the coming sun to be obliterated by his rising? `He must wax, but I must wane' (⟨4030⟩John 3:30). What was John's work but, by his own testimony, to guide the benighted pilgrims into the way of peace, that is, to Him who was the Prince of Peace? If, however, as by most commentators, it be taken to refer to the Messiah, it probably implies prophetic knowledge that the conception of Jesus had already taken place, and that the Messianic era was at hand, when the Jewish world should be filled with spiritual splendor.

See DAY-STAR.

G. H. Trever

DAY-STAR

([rj ″ v″ AˆB,I I ghe*helel ben-shachar*], ⟨3442⟩Isaiah 14:12; [φωσφόρος, *phosphoros*], ⟨6019⟩2 Peter 1:19): The Old Testament passage is rendered in the King James Version "Lucifer, son of the morning," in the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) "day-star," i.e. the morning star. The reference is to the king of Babylon (⟨3404⟩Isaiah 14:4). In ⟨6019⟩2 Peter 1:19, "Until .... the daystar arise in your hearts," the word is literally, "light-bringer." It is applicable, therefore, not

only to the planet Venus, seen as a morning star, herald of the dawn, but to the sun itself, and is used here as a title of our Lord.

See ASTRONOMY, I, 6.

DAY, THAT (THE)

See DAY OF THE LORD.

DEACON; DEACONESS

<de'-k'-n>, *<de'-k'-n-es>*: The term [διάκονος, *diakonos*], and its cognates occur many times in the New Testament, as do its synonyms [ὑπηρέτης, *huperetes*], and [δοῦλος, *doulos*], with their respective cognates. It may be said in general that the terms denote the service or ministration of the bondservant (*doulos*), underling (*huperetes*) or helper (*diakonos*), in all shades and gradations of meaning both literal and metaphorical. It would serve no useful purpose to list and discuss all the passages in detail. Christianity has from the beginning stood for filial service to God and His kingdom and for brotherly helpfulness to man, and hence, terms expressive of these functions abound in the New Testament. It behooves us to inquire whether and where they occur in a technical sense sufficiently defined to denote the institution of a special ecclesiastical office, from which the historical diaconate may confidently be said to be derived.

Many have sought the origin of the diaconate in the institution of the Seven at Jerusalem (Acts 6), and this view was countenanced by many of the church Fathers. The Seven were appointed to "serve tables" (*diakonein trapezais*), in order to permit the Twelve to "continue stedfastly in prayer, and in the ministry (*diakonia*) of the word." They are not called deacons (*diakonoi*), and the qualifications required are not the same as those prescribed by Paul in ⁵⁰⁰⁸1 Timothy 3:8-12; furthermore, Stephen appears in Acts preeminently as a preacher, and Philip as an evangelist. Paul clearly recognizes women as deaconesses, but will not permit a woman to teach (⁵⁰²¹²1 Timothy 2:12). The obvious conclusion is that the Seven may be called the first deacons only in the sense that they were the earliest recorded helpers of the Twelve as directors of the church, and that they served in the capacity, among others, of specially appointed ministrants to the poor.

Paul says, "I commend unto you Phoebe our sister, who is a servant (the

Revised Version, margin "or, deaconess") of the church that is at Cenchrea" (⁴⁵⁶⁰¹Romans 16:1). This is by many taken as referring to an officially appointed deaconess; but the fact that there is in the earlier group of Paul's epistles no clear evidence of the institution of the diaconate, makes against this interpretation. Phoebe was clearly an honored helper in the church closely associated with that at Corinth, where likewise evidence of special ecclesiastical organization is wanting.

In ⁵⁰¹⁰¹Philippians 1:1 Paul and Timothy send greetings "to all the saints .... at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Here then we find mention of "deacons" in a way to suggest a formal diaconate; but the want of definition as to their qualifications and duties renders it impossible to affirm with certainty the existence of the office.

In ⁵⁴⁰⁸⁸1 Timothy 3:8-12, after prescribing the qualifications and the method of appointment of a bishop or overseer, Paul continues: "Deacons in like manner must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them serve as deacons, if they be blameless. Women in like manner must be grave, not slanderers, temperate, faithful in all things. Let deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Deacons and deaconesses are here provided for, and the character of their qualifications makes it clear that they were to be appointed as dispensers of alms, who should come into close personal relations with the poor.

We conclude, therefore, that the Seven and Phoebe did not exercise the diaconate in a technical sense, which appears first certainly in 1 Timothy 3, although it is not improbably recognized in ⁵⁰¹⁰¹Philippians 1:1, and was foreshadowed in the various agencies for the dispensing of alms and the care of the poor of the church instituted in various churches at an earlier date.

See also BISHOP; CHURCH; CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

William Arthur Heidel

DEAD

<ded> ([tWm, *muth*]; [νεκρός, *nekros*]): Used in several senses:

> **(1)** as a substantive, denoting the body deprived of life, as when Abraham speaks of burying his dead (Genesis 23);

(2) as a collective noun including all those that have passed away from life (as ⁗Revelation 20:12). In several passages dead in this sense is used in contrast to the quick or living (as ⁗Numbers 16:48). This collective mode of expression is used when resurrection is described as "rising from the dead";

(3) as an adjective, coupled with body, carcass or man, as ⁗Deuteronomy 14:8 the King James Version;

(4) most frequently it is used as a complement of the verb "to be," referring to the condition of being deceased or the period of death, e.g. ⁗2 Samuel 12:19; ⁗Mark 5:35;

(5) in the sense of being liable to death it occurs in ⁗Genesis 20:3; ⁗Exodus 12:33; ⁗2 Samuel 16:9;

(6) as an intensive adjective it is used in the phrase "dead sleep," to mean profound sleep simulating death (⁗Psalm 76:6);

(7) figuratively "dead" is used to express the spiritual condition of those who are unable to attain to the life of faith. They are dead in trespasses, as in ⁗Ephesians 2:1, or conversely, those who by the New Birth are delivered from sin, are said to be dead to the Law (as ⁗Colossians 2:20, etc.). A faith which does not show its life in the practical virtues of Christianity is called dead (⁗James 2:17);

(8) in ⁗Romans 4:19; ⁗Hebrews 11:12, "dead" signifies the senile condition of loss of vigor and virility.

The passage in Job (26:5), wherein in the King James Version "dead things" seem to mean things that never had life, is more accurately translated in the Revised Version (British and American) as "they that are deceased," i.e. the shades of the dead.

There are few references to the physical accompaniments of the act of dying. Deborah has a poetical account of the death of Sisera (⁗Judges 5:24 ff), and in Ecclesiastes 12, where the failure of the bodily faculties in old age culminates in death, it is pictorially compared to the breaking of a lamp extinguishing the flame ("golden" being probably used of "oil," as it is in ⁗Zechariah 4:12), and the loosing of the silver [chebhel] or chain by which the lamp is suspended in the tent of the Arabic

The dead body defiled those who touched it (⁗Leviticus 11:31) and therefore sepulture took place speedily, as in the case of Lazarus (⁗John 11:17-39) and Ananias and Sapphira (⁗Acts 5:6-10). This practice is still

followed by the
The uselessness of the dead is the subject of proverb (Ecclesiastes 9:4)

utterly worthless (1 Samuel 24:14; 2 Samuel 9:8; 16:9).

Macalister

See

DEAD BODY

CORPSE.

< >
"mortal (Hebrew , "hateful," "foul") enemy" (Psalm 17:9), and

general panic (Hebrew , "death," 1 Samuel 5:11).
<6618>
"deadly wound" (Greek), better "death-stroke," as in the Revised

(*ti* <41618> *meste*
thanatephorou <5088>
words convey the idea of "causing or bringing death" and occur in classical

reptiles, deadly potions, mortal wounds and fatal contagion.

Luering

The name given by Greek and Latin writers to the remarkable inland lake
ARABAH
In the Bible it is called the Salt Sea (Genesis 14:3; Deuteronomy
`). (Joshua 3:16); and the (East)
<26718> <29020>
called Lut (Sea of Lot). By the time of
Asphaltires (Ant., I, ix) from the quantities of bitumen or asphalt

wadies.

I. PRESENT AREA.

The length of the lake from North to South is 47 miles; its greatest width is 10 miles narrowing down to less than 2 miles opposite Point Molyneux on el-Lisan. Its area is approximately 300 square miles. From various levelings its surface is found to be 1,292 ft. below that of the Mediterranean, while its greatest depth, near the eastern shore 10 miles South of the mouth of the Jordan is 1,278 ft. But the level varies from 10 to 15 ft. semiannually, and more at longer intervals; and we are not sure from which one of these levels the above figures have been derived. Throughout the northern half of the lake on the East side the descent to the extreme depth is very rapid; while from the western side the depth increases more gradually, especially at the extreme northern end, where the lake has been filled in by the delta of the Jordan.

About two-thirds of the distance to the southern end, the peninsula, el-Lisan ("the Tongue"), projects from the East more than half-way across the lake, being in the shape, however, of a boot rather than a tongue, with the toe to the North, forming a bay between it and the eastern mainland. The head of this bay has been largely filled in by the debris brought down by Wady Kerak, and Wady Ben Hamid, and shoals very gradually down to the greatest depths to the North. The toe of this peninsula is named Point Costigan, and the heel, Point Molyneux, after two travelers who lost their lives about the middle of the 19th century in pioneer attempts to explore the lake. Over the entire area South of Point Molyneux, the water is shallow, being nowhere more than 15 ft. deep, and for the most part not over 10 ft., and in some places less than 6 ft. In high water, the lake extends a mile or more beyond low-water mark, over the Mud Flat (Sebkah) at the south end.

From the history of the crossing of the Jordan by Joshua and the expedition of Chedorlaomer when Lot was captured, it is evident that the outlines of the sea were essentially the same 3,500 years ago as they are now, showing that there has been no radical change in climatic conditions since then.

II. FORMER ENLARGEMENT.

But if we go back a few thousand years into prehistoric times the evidence is abundant that the valley has witnessed remarkable climatic changes (*see ARABAH*). At Ain Abu Werideh, about 40 miles beyond the south end of the lake, Hull in 1883 discovered deposits of an abandoned shore line

1,400 ft. above its level (*see*   ). A pronounced abandoned shore
line at the 650 ft. level had been observed first by
afterward by many travelers. But from the more detailed examination made
by Professor   Huntington in 1909 (see Palestine and Its
Transformation) five abandoned shore lines of marked size have been

above the present level of the lake: 1,430, 640, 430, 300 and 250 ft. He
writes that "at its greatest extent the sea stretched at least 30 miles south of

Galilee and the Waters of Merom, and sent an arm into the Vale of
.... Lacustrine deposits exist in the Jordan valley shortly south of the Sea of
                    Jisr el-Mujamiyeh, as the modern railroad bridge is
                              lacustrine, lies under some
untilted whitish clays, also apparently
about 840 ft. below that of the Mediterranean Sea, or 450 above the Dead
Sea. .... So far as can be detected by the aneroid the highest deposits

There are also numerous minor strands below the 250 ft. major strand.
These are estimated by
30 and 12 ft. above the lake successively, It is noted, also, that the lower
beaches all show less erosion than those above them. This certainly points

period, while on the other hand there is much evidence that there has been
a considerable rise in the water within the historic period. Date palms and

little distance from the present shore where the water is several feet deep.
These are of such size as to show that for many years the soil in which they
                                        Merrill noticed
such trees standing in the water 40 ft. from the shore, near the Northeast

palms and tamarisks can now be seen submerged to a similar extent along
the western shore. In 1818
company of Arabs ford the lake from Point Molyneux to the west side, and

been stuck into the bottom. In 1838 Robinson found the water at such a
stage that the ford was impracticable and so it has been reported by all
                              Forder, having recently examined the
evidence for the Palestine Exploration Fund, learns from the older Arabs

that formerly there was a well-known causeway leading from el-Lisan opposite Wady Kerak to Wady Umm Baghek, across which sheep, goats and men could pass, while camels and mules could be driven across anywhere in the water. Moreover the Arab guide said that the channel "was so narrow that the people of his tribe used to sit on the edge of the Lisan and parley with Arabs from the west as to the return of cattle that had been stolen by one or other of the parties." (See PEFS (April, 1910), 112.)

III. LEVEL OF, IN EARLY HISTORIC TIMES.

Numerous general considerations indicate that in the early historic period the level of the water was so much lower than now that much of the bay South of Point Molyneux was dry land. In <0652>Joshua 15:2,5 f the south border of Judah is said to extend from "the bay (tongue, Lisan) that looketh southward"; while the "border of the north quarter was from the bay (tongue, Lisan) of the sea at the end of the Jordan; and the border went up to Beth-hoglah, and passed along by the north of Beth-arabah." If the limits of the north end of the Dead Sea were the same then as now the boundary must have turned down to the mouth of the Jordan by a sharp angle. But according to the description it runs almost exactly East and West from beyond Jerusalem to Beth-hoglah, and nothing is said about any change in direction, while elsewhere, any such abrupt change in direction as is here supposed is carefully noted. Furthermore, in detailing the boundary of Benjamin (<0681.9>Joshua 18:19) we are told that "the border passed along to the side of Beth-hoglah northward; and the goings out of the border were at the north bay (tongue, Lisan) of the Salt Sea, at the south end of the Jordan: this was the south border." This can hardly have any other meaning than that the north end of the Dead Sea was at Beth-hoglah. From these data Mr. Clermont-Ganneau (see Recueil d'archeologie orientale, V (1902), 267-80) inferred that in the time of Joshua the level of the sea was so much higher than now that a tongue-like extension reached the vicinity of Beth-hoglah, while the underlying topography was essentially the same as now. On the contrary, our present knowledge of the geologic forces in operation would indicate that at that time the Dead Sea was considerably lower than now, and that its rise to its present level has been partly caused by the silting up of a bay which formerly extended to Beth-hoglah.

The geological evidence concerning this point is so interesting, and of so much importance in its bearing upon our interpretation of various historical

statements concerning the region, that it is worth while to present it

see ARABAH

the Dead Sea is determined by the equilibrium established between the
evaporation (estimated at 20,000,000 cubic ft. per diem) over the area and

present area of the sea is, in round numbers, 300 square miles. The
historical evidence shows that this evaporating surface has not varied

of the Jordan upon this area, as well as of the deltas of several other
streams, must have been very great since that period. The effect of this

rise until it overflowed enough of the low land at the south end to restore
the equilibrium.

encroachments have tended to narrow the limits of the original lake. The
sediment deposited by the Jordan, at the north end of the Dead Sea, is

the Sea of Galilee — the latter serving as a catch-basin to retain the
sediment brought down from the upper part of the valley. The
narrow channel which the Jordan has eroded in the sedimentary plain
through which it flows (*JORDAN, VALLEY OF*), is approximately half

formerly filled this has been swept into the head of the sea, while the
Jarmuk, the
from the bordering heights of Gilead, three or four thousand ft. above the

number of shorter tributaries which descend an equal amount from the
mountains of Galilee,
to this part of the Jordan is not less than 3,000 square miles.

All writers are impressed by the evidence of the torrential floods which fill

permits the water after each rainfall to run off without delay, and so
intensifies its eroding power. The well-known figure of our Lord
⊲40726▷Matthew 7:26
built upon the sand, when the rains descend and the winds beat upon it, is
drawn from Nature. The delta terraces at the mouths of such mountain
debouch on the lowlands are formed and re-formed

with extreme rapidity, each succeeding storm tending to wash the previous delta down to lower levels and carry away whatever was built upon it.

The storms which descend upon the plains of Gilead, as well as those upon the Judean hills, are exceedingly destructive. For though the rainfall at Jerusalem, according to the observations of Chaplin (see J. Glaisher, "On the Fall of Rain at Jerusalem," PEFS (January, 1894), 39) averages but 20 inches annually, ranging from 32,21 inches in 1878 to 13,19 inches in 1870, nearly all occurs in the three winter months, and therefore in quantities to be most effective in erosive capacity. And this is effective upon both sides of the Jordan valley, in which the rainfall is very slight. "Day after day," Tristram remarks, "we have seen the clouds, after pouring their fatness on Samaria and Judea, pass over the valley, and then descend in torrents on the hills of Gilead and Moab," a phenomenon naturally resulting from the rising column of heated air coming up from the torrid conditions of the depressed Jordan valley.

Tristram (The Land of Moab, 23, 24) gives a vivid description of the effect of a storm near Jerusalem. As his party was encamped during the night the whole slope upon which they pitched became a shallow stream, while "the deep ravines of the wilderness of Judah (were) covered with torrents, and tiny cascades rolling down from every rock. .... So easily disintegrated is the soft limestone of these wadies, that the rain of a few hours .... did more to deepen and widen the channels than the storms of several years could effect on a Northumbrian hillside. No geologist could watch the effect of this storm without being convinced that in calculating the progress of denudation, other factors than that of time must be taken into account, and that denudation may proceed most rapidly where rains are most uncertain."

Lieutenant Lynch writes that while ascending the Kerak "there came a shout of thunder from the dense cloud which had gathered at the summit of the gorge, followed by a rain, compared to which the gentle showers of our more favored clime are as dew drops to the overflowing cistern. .... The black and threatening cloud soon enveloped the mountain tops, the lightning playing across it in incessant flashes, while the loud thunder reverberated from side to side of the appalling chasm. Between the peals we soon heard a roaring and continuous sound. It was the torrent from the rain cloud, sweeping in a long line of foam down the steep declivity, bearing along huge fragments of rocks, which, striking against each other, sounded like mimic thunder."

I can bear similar testimony from observations when traveling in Turkestan

seen raging upon the mountains 20 miles away, where it spent its entire force without shedding a drop upon the plain. Upon skirting the base of the

distance 2 or 3 ft. deep with debris which had been washed down by the cloudburst. No one can have any proper comprehension of the erosive

extent and the steepness of the descent from the highlands on either side,

Mountains would be called arroyos. After the debris has been brought into the Jordan by these torrents, and the rise of water makes it "overflow all its

All these considerations indicate that the deltas of the streams coming into the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea must be increasing at an

other deltas upon which direct observations have been made. The Mississippi River is sweeping into the Gulf of Mexico sediment at a rate

extending from the Rocky Mountains to the Alleghenies, in a little less than 5,000 years. The
1,464 years, while the river Po is reducing its level a foot in 729 years. So
Po filled up its valley that the city of Adria, which was

The Tigris and Euphrates rivers have silted up the head of the Persian Gulf nearly 100 miles. (See
Formation of Vegetable Mould through the Action of Worms, 233.) From these considerations it is a conservative estimate that the tributaries of the

sediment enough to lower the basin one foot in 2,000 years, so that since the time of Abraham 167,270,400,000 cubic feet of solid matter have been

into consideration the probable depth of water at the north end of the sea, it is, therefore, not an extravagant supposition that the Jordan delta has

evaporating surface to that extent and causing the level of the water to rise, and extend an equal amount over the low lands at the south end.

At the same time the other streams coming directly into the lake have been contributing deltas to narrow its margin at various points. The Kerak, the Amen and the Zerka Ma'ain bring in an immense amount of sediment from the East; el-Hessi, el-Jeib and el-Fikri from the South; and Wady el. Muhauwdt, el-Areyeh and the Kedron, with numerous smaller intermediate streams, from the West. A detailed examination of these deposits will serve the double purpose of establishing the point in question and of giving a vivid conception of the sea and its surroundings.

Throughout the lower part of its course the river Jordan flows as has been already said, through a narrow gorge called the Zor, which the river has eroded in the soft sedimentary deposits which cover the bottom of the valley (or Ghor) from side to side. Opposite Jericho the Ghor is about 15 miles wide. The Zor, however, does not average more than one-half mile in width and is about 100 ft. lower than the general level of the Ghor, But at "the Jews' Castle." about 8 miles from the mouth of the Jordan, the Zor begins to enlarge and merge into a true delta. The embankment of the Zor slopes away in a Southwest direction till it reaches the Judean mountains at Khurbet Kumran. 10 miles distant, leaving a triangle of low land between it and the Dead Sea averaging fully one mile in width and being nearly 3 miles wide opposite the mouth of the Jordan. The face of the embankment separating the Zor from the Ghor has in several places been deeply cut into by the small wadies which come down from the western mountains, and the wash from these wadies as well as that from more temporary streams after every shower has-considerably raised the western border of the Zor throughout this distance. But it can safely be estimated that the original boundary of the Dead Sea has here been encroached upon to the extent of 10 or 15 square miles. Again, upon the eastern side of the Jordan the other limb of the delta, though smaller, is equally in evidence. Merrill (East of the Jordan, 223, 224), in describing his survey of the region, says he was compelled to walk for some hours along the shore and then north to reach his horses, which evidently had been coming over the harder and more elevated surface of the Ghor. "The plain." he says, "for many square miles north of the sea is like ashes in which we often. sank over shoe."

Returning to the Northwest corner of the lake we find the delta deposit which we left at Khurbet Kumran extending 2 miles farther south with an average width of one-half mile to Ras Feshkah, which rises abruptly from the water's edge, and renders it impossible for travelers to follow along the shore. But just beyond Ras Feshkah a delta half a mile or more in length

and width is projected into the sea at the mouth of   Nar, which
comes down from Jerusalem and is known in its upper portions as
This is the wady which passes the convent of Mar
such a striking manner in Ezekiel 47. Like most of the other wadies coming

defiles and has built up a delta at its mouth covered with "fragments of
rock or boulders swept along by the torrent in its periodical overflows"
                    Saulcy, I, 137, 138).

From   Feshkah to Ras
bordered with a deposit of sand and gravel averaging a half a mile in width,
while opposite   Derajeh and Wady
from Bethlehem and the wilderness of Tekoah) the width is, fully one mile.
                                                Saulcy noted
what geologists call a "cone of dejection" where "the gravel washed down

Ras Mersid, again, obstructs the passage along the shore almost as
                    Ras Feshkah, but farther south there is no other
                          gedi, connected in such an interesting manner
with the history of David and with numerous other events of national

mile broad and a mile in length." This consists of material brought down
for the most part by   el-'Areijeh, which descends from the vicinity of
Hebron with one branch passing through
leading from the west side of the Dead Sea to the hills of Judea follows the
                    wady.

Between En-   Sebbeh (Masada), a distance of 10 miles, the

space numerous wadies course their way bringing down an immense

projecting deltas were noticed by Robinson as he looked southward from
the height above En-

"One feature of the sea," he says, "struck us immediately, which was
unexpected to us, namely, the number of shoal-like points and peninsulas

or islands. Below us on the South were two such projecting banks on the
western shore, composed probably of pebbles and gravel, extending out

into the sea for a considerable distance. The larger and more important of these is on the South of the spot called Birket el-Khulil, a little bay or indentation in the western precipice, where the water, flowing into shallow basins when it is high, evaporates, and deposits salt. This spot is just South of the mouth of Wady el-Khubarah" (BR, I, 501). One of these deltas is described by Deuteronomy Saulcy as 500 yds. in breadth and another as indefinitely larger.

Six miles South of Masada, probably at the mouth of Wady Umm Baghek, Lynch notes a delta extending "half a mile out into the sea." Still farther South the combined delta of the Wady Zuweirah and Wady Muhauwat covers an area of 2 or 3 square miles, and is dotted with boulders and fragments of rock a foot or more in diameter, which have been washed over the area by the torrential floods. Beyond Jebel Usdum, Wady el-Fikreh, draining an area of 200 or 300 square miles, has deposited an immense amount of coarse sediment on the West side of the Sebkah (a mud flat which was formerly occupied, probably by a projection of the Dead Sea). Into the South end of the depression, extending from the Sebkah to the Ascent of Akrabbim, deltas of Wady el-Jeib, Wady el-Khanzireh and Wady Tufileh have in connection with Wady Fikreh encroached upon the valley to the extent of 12 or 15 square miles. Although these wadies drain an area of more than 3,000 sq. miles, and the granitic formations over which they pass have been so disintegrated by atmospheric influences that an excessive amount of coarse sediment is carried along by them (see Hull, Mount Seir, etc., 104-106). In ascending them, one encounters every indication of occasional destructive floods.

Following up the eastern shore, Wady el-Hessi coming down from the mountains of Edom has built up the plain of Safieh which pushes out into the neck of the Sebkah and covers an area of 3 or 4 square miles. Farther North, Wady Kerak and Wady Beni Hamid have with their deltas encroached to the extent of 2 or 3 square miles upon the head of the bay, projecting into the Lisan east of Point Costigan. Still farther North, Wady Mojib (the Arnon) and Wady Zerka Ma'ain (coming down from the hot springs of Callirrhoe) have built up less pronounced deltas because of the greater depth of the water on the East side, but even so they are by no means inconsiderable, in each case projecting a half-mile or more into the lake.

Putting all these items together, there can be little doubt that the area of the

since the time of Abraham and that this has resulted in a rise of the general level of the water sufficient to overflow a considerable portion of the

only escape from this conclusion is the supposition that the rainfall of the region is less than it was at the dawn of history, and so the smaller

this we have no adequate evidence. On the contrary there is abundant evidence that the climatic conditions connected with the production of the

Siddim by Amraphel and his confederates (Genesis 14).

credibility to the persistent tradition that the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah are covered by the shallow water at the South end of the sea, and also to

supposition that they were at the South end of the sea) was like the garden of the Lord; for that plain was then much larger than it is now, and was

apparent. Furthermore, this supposed lower level of the lake in early times may have greatly facilitated the passage of armies and caravans from one

statements relating to the earliest periods of occupation. Even now the road at the base of   Usdum which is open at low water is impassable at high water. On the last of December, 1883, Professor Hull (Mount etc., 133) traversed the shore at the base of the salt cliffs along a gravel terrace 100 ft. wide, which "abruptly terminated in a descent of about 5 ft.

the 1st of January, 1901, the water along the base of the salt cliffs was so deep that it was impossible for my party to pass along the shore. It is easy

margin of shore which could be traversed on the West side from one end to the other.

As in the case of all enclosed basins, the waters of the Dead Sea are impregnated to an excessive degree with saline matter. "The salt which

but is mostly the chloride and bromide of magnesium and calcium, so that they are not merely a strong brine, but rather resemble the mother liquors of a saltpan left after the common salt has crystallized out" (Dawson, Egypt and Syria, 123). The following analysis is given by Booth and Muckle of water brought by Commander Lynch and taken by him May 5 from 195 fathoms deep opposite the mouth of Wady Zerka Ma'ain. Other analyses vary from this more or less, owing doubtless to the different localities and depths from which the specimens had been obtained.

Specific gravity at 60 degrees 1,22742

Chloride of magnesium 145,8971

Chloride of calcium 31.0746

Chloride of sodium 78,5537

Chloride of potassium 6,5860

Bromide of potassium 1,3741

Sulphate of lime 0,7012

sub-total: 264,1867

Water 735,8133

Total: 1000.0000

Total amount of solid matter found
by direct experiment 264.0000

What is here labeled bromide of potassium, however, is called by most other analysts bromide of magnesium, it being difficult to separate and distinguish these elements in composition. The large percentage of bromide, of which but a trace is found in the ocean, is supposed to have been derived from volcanic emanations. As compared with sea water, it is worthy of note that that of the Dead Sea yields 26 lbs. of salts to 100 lbs. of water, whereas that of the Atlantic yields only 6 lbs. in the same quantity. Lake Urumiah is as salty as the Dead Sea.

As results of this salinity the water is excessively buoyant and is destructive of all forms of animal life. Lynch found that his metal boats sank an inch deeper in the Jordan when equally heavily laden than they did in the Dead

Sea. All travelers who bathe in it relate that when they throw themselves upon their backs their bodies will be half out of the water. Josephus (BJ, IV, viii, 4) relates that the emperor Vespasian caused certain men who could not swim to be thrown into the water with their hands tied behind them, and they floated on the surface. Dead fish and various shells are indeed often found upon the shore, but they have evidently been brought in by the tributary fresh-water streams, or belong to species which live in the brackish pools of the bordering lagoons, which are abundantly supplied with fresh water. The report extensively circulated in earlier times that birds did not fly over the lake has no foundation in fact, since some species of birds are known even to light upon the surface and frolick upon the waters. The whole depression is subject to frequent storms of wind blowing through its length. These produce waves whose force is very destructive of boats encountering them because of the high specific gravity of the water; but for the same reason the waves rapidly subside after a storm, so that the general appearance of the lake is placid in the extreme.

The source from which these saline matters have been derived has been a subject of much speculation — some having supposed that it was derived from the dissolution of the salt cliffs in Jebel Usdum. But this theory is disproved by the fact that common salt forms but a small portion of the material held in solution by the water. It is more correct to regard this salt mountain as a deposit precipitated from the saturated brine which had accumulated, as we have supposed, during the Cretaceous age. Probably salt is now being deposited at the bottom of the lake from the present saturated solution to appear in some future age in the wreck of progressive geological changes. The salts of the Dead Sea, like those in all similarly enclosed basins, have been brought in by the streams of water from all over the drainage basin. Such streams always contain more or less solid matter in solution, which becomes concentrated through the evaporation which takes. place over enclosed basins. The ocean is the great reservoir of such deposits, but is too large to be affected to the extent noticeable in smaller basins. The extreme salinity of the Dead Sea water shows both the long continuance of the isolation of the basin and the abundance of soluble matter contained in the rocks of the inscribed area. The great extent of recent volcanic rocks, especially in the region East of the Jordan, accounts for the large relative proportion of some of the ingredients.

V. CLIMATE.

Because of the great depression below sea level, the climate is excessively warm, so that palms and other tropical trees flourish on the borders of the rivers wherever fresh water finds soil on which to spread itself. Snow never falls upon the lake, though it frequently covers the hills of Judea and the plateau of Moab. As already explained the rainfall in the Jordan valley is less than on the bordering mountains. During the winter season the Arab tribes go down to the valley with their flocks of sheep and goats and camp upon the surrounding plains. But the excessive heat of the summer, rising sometimes to 130 degrees F., drives them back to the hills again.

VI. ROADS.

Except at the North end, the approaches to the Dead Sea are few and very difficult to travel. On the West side the nearest approach is at En-gedi, and this down a winding descent of 2,000 ft. where a few men at the top of the cliff could hold an army at bay below. The path up Wady Zuweirah from the North end of Jebel Usdum is scarcely better. Upon the South end the path leads up Wady Fikreh for a considerable distance on the West side of the Mud Flat, and then crosses over to the Wady el-Jeib, up whose torrential bed during the dry season caravans can find their way through the Arabah to Akabah. More difficult paths lead up from the East of the Mud Flat into the Arabah, and through the mountains of Moab to Petra into the plains beyond and the Pilgrim route from Damascus to Mecca. From the Lisan a difficult path leads up Wady Kerak to the fortress of the same name 20 miles distant and 5,000 ft. above the lake. Another path a little farther north leads up the Wady Beni Hamid to Ar of Moab. From the Arnon to the North end of the Dead Sea the mountains are so precipitous that travel along the shore is now practically impossible. But there are, according to Tristram (The Land of Moab, 355), remnants of an "old and well-engineered road of ancient times" extending as far South at least as the Zerka Ma'ain.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

There are numerous points around the border of the lake of special interest:

1. The Plain of the Jordan:

When Lot and Abraham looked down from the heights of Bethel
(^{◁01310▷}Genesis 13:10 ff) they are said to have beheld "all the Plain of the
Jordan, that it was well watered every where, before Yahweh destroyed
Sodom and Gomorrah, like the garden of Yahweh, like the land of Egypt,
as thou goest unto Zoar. So Lot chose him all the Plain of the Jordan; and
Lot journeyed east: .... and Lot dwelt in the cities of the Plain, and moved
his tent as far as Sodom." The word here translated "Plain" is *kikkar*
(Ciccar), meaning "circle," and indicating the appearance from Bethel of
the Jordan valley surrounding the North end of the Dead Sea. From this
fact, many recent writers have located Sodom and Gomorrah at that end of
the sea (*see CITIES OF THE PLAIN*). But it is by no means certain that it
is necessary thus to narrow down the meaning of the phrase. Though the
South end. of the Dead Sea is not visible from the heights of Bethel, it is so
connected with the general depression that it may well have been in the
minds of Abraham and Lot as they were dividing the country between
them, one choosing the plain, a part of which was visible, the other
remaining on the bordering mountainous area, so different in all its natural
resources and conditions. The extent of the region chosen by Lot may
therefore be left to be determined by other considerations.

2. Ain Jidi (En-gedi):

Ain Jidi, "fountain of the kid" (?) (*see EN-GEDI*) is an oasis at the base of
the western cliffs about half-way between the North and the South ends of
the lake, fed by springs of warm water which burst from beneath the
overhanging cliffs. The 650 ft. shore line composed of shingle and
calcareous marl is here prominent, and, as already remarked, there is an
extensive gravel terrace at the present water level. Palms and vines
formerly flourished here (Song 1:14), but now only a few bushes of acacia
and tamarisk are to be found. From time immemorial, however, it has been
the terminus of the principal trail which zig-zags up the cliffs to the
plateau, across which paths lead to Hebron and Bethlehem.

3. The Fortress of Masada:

The Fortress of Masada was the last stronghold held by the fanatical Jews
(Zealots) after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and offers a
bird's-eye view of the Dead Sea, which is as instructive as it is interesting.
It is situated half-way between Jebel Usdum and En-gedi, directly opposite

the northern promontory of el-Lisan. Here on a precipitous height, 2,000 ft. above the sea, is a plateau about 700 yds. long, and 200 wide, adorned with ruins of dwellings, palaces and temples of the Herodian age. Standing upon this height one sees the outlines of the Roman camp, near the shore of the sea, and those of another camp in a depression several hundred yards to the West, from which the final attack of the besiegers was made over a pathway constructed along a sloping ridge. Here many miles away from their base of supplies the Romans slowly but irresistibly drew in their besieging lines to the final tragic consummation when the last remnant of the defenders committed suicide (BJ, VII, ix, 1). The view gives one a profound impression of the difficulties attending military campaigns in all that region. Upon lifting up one's eyes to take in the broader view, he sees the Dead Sea in its whole length with the low ridge of Jebel Usdum, the Valley of Salt, the Ascent of Akrabbim, the depression of the Arabah, and Mt. Hor, to the South, while across the whole horizon to the East is the long wall of Moab dissected by Wady Kerak and the river Arnon, leading up to the strongholds of Ker, Aroer and Dibon, of Moab; while immediately in the front are the white cliffs of el-Lisan, and to the North, near by, the green oasis of En-gedi, and, dimmed by distance, the plains of Jericho, and the cluster of peaks surrounding Mt. Pisgah; while the sea itself sparkles like a gem of brilliant azure in the midst of its desolate surroundings, giving no token of the deadly elements which permeate its water.

4. Jebel Usdum (Mount of Sodom):

Jebel Usdum (Mount of Sodom) is a salt mountain extending 7 or 8 miles along the Southwest shore of the lake and on the West side of the Valley of Salt to its southern boundary. Its name is derived from the traditional belief that Sodom was located at the South end of the sea; but, on the other hand, it is not unlikely that the name would become attached to it because of its seeming to contain the pillar of salt, which, according to the ordinary translation, marked the place where Lot's wife was overwhelmed. The mountain rises 600 ft. above the lake, and has a general level surface except where streams have worn furrows and gullies in it. The eastern face presents a precipitous wall of rock salt, which, as said above, at the time of my visit (January, 1901), was washed by the waves of the lake making it impossible to pass along its base. At other times. when the water is low, travelers can pass along the whole length of the shore. This wall of salt presents much the appearance of a glacier, the salt being as transparent as

ice, while the action of the waves has hollowed out extensive and picturesque caverns and left isolated towers and connected pinnacles of salt often resembling a Gothic cathedral. These towers and pinnacles are, of course, being displaced from time to time, while others are formed to continue the illusion. Any pillar of salt known to the ancients must be entirely different from those which meet the eye of the modern traveler. It follows also as a matter of course that the gradual dissolution of this salt must partly account for the excessive salinity of the Dead Sea.

It is uncertain how deep the deposit extends below the surface. It rises upward 200 or 300 ft., where it is capped by consolidated strata of sedimentary material, consisting of sand and loam, which most geologists think was deposited at the time of the formation of the 650 ft. terrace already described, and which they connect with the climatic conditions of the Glacial period.

This view is presented as follows by Professor B. K. Emerson: "In the earlier portion of the post-glacial stadium, a final sinking of a fraction of the bottom of the trough, near the South end of the lake, dissected the low salt plateau, sinking its central parts beneath the salt waters, while fragments remain buttressed against the great walls of the trench forming the plains of Jebel Usdum and the peninsula el-Lisan with the swampy Sebkah between. .... It exposed the wonderful eastern wall of Jebel Usdum: 7 miles long, with 30-45 m. of clear blue salt at the base, capped by 125-140 m. of gypsum-bearing marls impregnated with sulphur, and conglomerates at times cemented by bitumen" ("Geological Myths," Proc. Am. Assoc. for Adv. of Sci. (1896), 110, 111). If this was the case there has been a depression of the South end of the Dead Sea to the extent of several hundred feet within a comparatively few thousand years, in which case the traditional view that Sodom and Gomorrah were overwhelmed by Dead Sea water at the time of their destruction would refer to an occurrence exactly in line with movements that have been practically continuous during Tertiary, Glacial, and post-Glacial times.

With more reason, Lartet contends that this salt is a Cretaceous or Tertiary deposit covered with late Tertiary strata, in which case the sinking of the block between Jebel Usdum and el-Lisan, for the most part, took place at a much earlier date than the formation of the 650 ft. terrace. A striking corollary of this supposition would be that the climatic conditions have been practically the same during all of the post-Carboniferous times, there

having been cycles of moist and dry climate in that region succeeding each other during all these geological periods.

The Vale of Siddim ([01143]Genesis 14:3,8,10) is probably the same as the Valley of Salt ([12407]2 Kings 14:7; [13182]1 Chronicles 18:12; [14251]2 Chronicles 25:11).

5. Vale of Siddim:

This is in all probability the plain extending from the southern end of the Dead Sea to the "Ascent of Akrabbim" which crosses the valley from side to side, and forms the southern margin of the Ghor. At present the area of the vale is about 50 square miles; but if our theory concerning the lower level of the Dead Sea in the time of Abraham is correct, it may then have included a considerable portion of the lagoon South of el-Lisan and so have been a third larger than now. In [01140]Genesis 14:10 the vale is said to have been full of slime (that is, of bitumen or asphalt) pits. In modern times masses of asphalt are occasionally found floating in the southern part of the Dead Sea. After the earthquake of 1834 a large quantity was cast upon the shore near the Southwest corner of the lake, 3 tons of which were brought to market by the Arab natives. After the earthquake of January, 1837, a mass of asphalt was driven aground on the West side not far from Jebel Usdum. The neighboring Arabs swam off to it, cut it up with axes and carried it to market by the camel load, and sold it to the value of several thousand dollars. At earlier times such occurrences seem to have been still more frequent. Josephus affirms that "the sea in many places sends up black masses of asphalt having the form and size of headless oxen"; while Diodorus Siculus relates that the bitumen (asphalt) was thrown up in masses covering sometimes two or three acres and having the appearance of islands (Josephus, BJ, IV, viii, 4; Diod. Sic. ii.48; Pliny, NH, vii.13; Tac. Hist. verse 6; Dioscor., Deuteronomy re Med., i.99).

Since asphalt is a product of petroleum from which the volatile elements have been evaporated, the ultimate source of these masses is doubtless to be found in the extensive beds of bituminous limestone which appear in numerous places on both sides of the Dead Sea. An outcrop of it can be observed at Neby Mousa, on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, which Dawson describes as resembling dry chalk saturated with coal tar. When long weathered this becomes white and chalky at the surface, so that a mass of it, quite white externally, reveals an intense blackness when broken. It is this that the people of Bethlehem call "Dead Sea stone," and

which they carve into various ornamental articles and expose for sale. Some specimens of it are sufficiently bituminous to burn with flame like cannel-coal. These beds are still more abundant around the South end of the lake and doubtless underlie the whole region, and for all time must have been exuding bituminous and gaseous matter, but much more abundantly in former times than now.

In these accumulations of bitumen at the South end of the Ghor we probably have the incentive which led the Babylonians under Amraphel and Chedorlaomer to make such long expeditions for the sake of conquering the region and holding it under their power. Bitumen was much in demand in Babylonia.

6. El-Lisan:

El-Lisan (the Tongue), which projects half-way across the lake from the mouth of Wady Kerak, is, like Jebel Usdum, a promontory of white calcareous sediment containing beds of salt and gypsum, and breaking off on its western side in a cliff 300 ft. high. Its upper surface rises in terraces to the 600 ft. level on the East, as Jebel Usdum does on the West. The length of the promontory from North to South is 9 miles. This corresponds so closely in general structure and appearance to Jebel Usdum on the opposite side of the lake that we find it difficult to doubt theory of Professor Emerson, stated above, that the formation originally extended across and that a block of the original bottom of the lake has dropped down, leaving these remnants upon the sides. Frequent occurrences similar to this are noted by the United States geologists in the Rocky Mountain region.

VIII. HISTORY.

Difficulty of access has prevented the Dead Sea from playing any important part in history except as an obstruction both to commerce and to military movements. Boats have never been used upon it to any considerable extent. From earliest times salt has been gathered on its western shores and carried up to market over the difficult paths leading to Jerusalem. A similar commerce has been carried on in bitumen; that from the Dead Sea being specially prized in Egypt, while as already remarked, it is by no means improbable that the pits of bitumen which abounded in the "Vale of Siddim" were the chief attraction leading the kings of Babylonia to undertake long expeditions for the conquest of the region. Productive as

may have been the plain at the South end of the sea, it was too far outside the caravan route leading through Petra to the South end of the Arabah and the mines of the Sinaitic Peninsula to divert the course of travel. Still the settlements on the eastern border of the Vale of Siddim were of sufficient importance in medieval times to induce the Crusaders to visit the region and leave their marks upon it. The Arabian town of Zoghar, probably the Biblical Zoar, appears at one time to have been a most important place, and was the center of considerable commercial activity. Indigo was grown there, and the oasis was noted for its fine species of dates. The country round about abounded in springs and there was much arable land (see Leviticus Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 286 ff). The hot springs upon the eastern shore of the Dead Sea at Callirrhoe some distance up the Wady Zerka Ma'ain were much resorted to for their medicinal properties. Here Herod came as a last resort, to secure relief from his loathsome malady, but failed of help. The fortress of Macherus, where John the Baptist was imprisoned, is situated but a few miles South of the Zerka Ma'ain, but access to this region is possible only through a difficult road leading over the mountains a few miles East of the sea.

On four occasions important military expeditions were conducted along the narrow defiles which border the Southwest end of the Dead Sea:

(1) That of Amraphel and his confederates from Babylonia, who seem first to have opened the way past Petra to the mines of the Sinaitic Peninsula, and then to have swept northward through the land of the Amalekites and Amorites and come down to the Dead Sea at En-gedi, and then to have turned to subdue the Cities of the Plain, where Lot was dwelling. This accomplished, they probably retreated along the west shore of the lake, which very likely afforded at that time a complete passageway to the valley of the Jordan. Or they may have gone on eastward to the line of the present pilgrim route from Damascus to Mecca and followed it northward.

(2) In the early part of the reign of Jehoshaphat (2 Chronicles 20), the Moabites, Ammonites and some other tribes joined together, forming a large army, and, following around the South end of the Dead Sea, marched along the West shore to En-gedi, and having ascended the zigzag path leading up the precipitous heights to the wilderness of Tekoa, were there thrown into confusion and utterly annihilated.

(3) Not many years later Jehoram and Jehoshaphat "fetched a compass (the Revised Version (British and American) "made a circuit") of seven days' journey" (⟨⟩2 Kings 3:9) around the South end of the Dead Sea and attacked the Moabites in their own country, but returned without completing the conquest. The particulars of this expedition are given in 2 Kings 3 and in the inscription on the Moabite Stone.

(4) The Romans shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem conducted a long siege of the fortress of Masada, of which an account has already been given in a previous section (VII, 3). All their supplies must have come down the tortuous path to En-gedi and thence been brought along the western shore to the camp, the remains of which are still to be seen at the base of the fortress.

For many centuries, indeed for nearly 1,800 years, the Dead Sea remained a mystery, and its geology and physical characteristics were practically unknown. The first intimation of the depression of the lake below sea level was furnished in 1837 by Moore and Beke, who made some imperfect experiments with boiling water from which they inferred a depression of 500 ft. In 1841 Lieutenant Simmons of the British navy, by trigonometrical observations, estimated the depression to be 1,312 ft. In 1835. Costigan, and again in 1847 Lieutenant Molyneux ventured upon the sea in boats; but the early death of both, consequent upon their exposures, prevented their making any full reports. Appropriately, however, their names have been attached to prominent points on the Lisan. In 1848 Lieutenant Lynch, of the United States navy, was dispatched to explore the Jordan and the Dead Sea. The results of this expedition were most important. Soundings of the depths were carefully and systematically conducted, and levels were run from the Dead Sea by Jerusalem to the Mediterranean, giving the depression at the surface of the Dead Sea as 1,316,7 ft., and its greatest depth 1,278 ft. More recently Sir C. W. Wilson in connection with the Ordinance Survey of Palestine carried levels over the same route with the result of reducing the depression to 1,292 ft., which is now generally accepted to be correct. But as already stated the stage of water in the lake is not given, and that is known to vary at least 15 ft. annually, and still more at longer intervals.

LITERATURE.

Hull, Mount Seir, Sinai and Western Palestine, 1889; Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation, 1911; Lartet, Voyage d'exploration de la Mer

Morte, 1880; Lynch, Report of U.S. Expedition to the Jordan and Dead Sea, 1852; Robinson, BR, 1841; Deuteronomy Saulcy, Voyage dans la Syrie, 1853; Tristram, Land of Israel, 2nd edition, 1872, The Land of Moab, 1873; G. A. Smith, HGHL; Wright; Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament Hist, 1906, and Journal of Biblical Lit., 1911.

George Frederick Wright

DEAD, STATE OF THE

See HADES.

DEAF

<def> ([∨ⲅе̣е̣ *cheresh*]; [κωφός, *kophos*]): Used either in the physical sense, or figuratively as expressing unwillingness to hear the Divine message (<19504>Psalm 58:4), or incapacity to understand it for want of spirituality (<19813>Psalm 38:13). The prophetic utterances were sufficiently forcible to compel even such to hear (<23218>Isaiah 42:18; 43:8) and thereby to receive the Divine mercy (<23918>Isaiah 29:18; 35:5).
The expression "deaf adder that stoppeth her car" (<19504>Psalm 58:4) alludes to a curious notion that the adder, to avoid hearing the voice of the charmer, laid its head with one car on the ground and stopped the other with the tip of its tail (*Diary of John Manninghan*, 1602). The adder is called deaf by Shakespeare (2 Hen VI, iii, 2, 76; Troilus and Cressida, ii, 2, 172). The erroneous idea probably arose from the absence of external ears. Physical deafness was regarded as a judgment from God (<00411>Exodus 4:11; <33716>Micah 7:16), and it was consequently impious to curse the deaf (<03194>Leviticus 19:14). In New Testament times deafness and kindred defects were attributed to evil spirits (<41098>Mark 9:18 ff).
See DUMB.

Alex. Macalister

DEAL

<del>: The noun "deal" is not found in the Revised Version (British and American). The King James Version translation of [ˆ/ⲅⲤ[̣i *`issaron*], "the tenth deal" (<02940>Exodus 29:40; <03440>Leviticus 14:10, et al.) is rendered uniformly "the tenth part" in the Revised Version (British and American) (*see WEIGHTS AND MEASURES*). The verb "to deal" often means "to apportion," "to distribute" (compare <10619>2 Samuel 6:19; <13608>1 Chronicles

16:3; Isaiah 58:7; Romans 12:3), but more frequently it is used in the sense of "to act" "to do," "to have transaction of any kind with." In the Psalms "to deal" always means "to confer benefit," "to deal bountifully," with the exception of Psalm 105:25, where it means "to deal subtly with." The expression "to deal," i.e. "to be engaged in," is not found in the Scriptures. The translation of [συγχράομαι, *sugchraomai*], in John 4:9, "Jews have no dealings with Samaritans," conveys the idea that they have nothing in common.

A. L. Breslich

DEAR; DEARLY

<der>, *<der'-li>* ("held at a great price," "highly valued"): In Acts 20:24, Paul does not hold his life "dear" ([τίμιος, *timios*], "at a price"); compare 1 Corinthians 3:12, "costly stones"; 1 Peter 1:19, "precious blood." Luke 7:2, the servant was "dear" to the centurion ([ἔντιμος, *entimos*], "highly prized"; compare Philippians 2:29; 1 Peter 2:6). 1 Thessalonians 2:8, "very dear to us" ([ἀγαπητός, *agapetos*], "beloved"). In the Revised Version (British and American), agapetos is generally translated "beloved." "Dearly" before "beloved" of the King James Version is omitted in all passages in the Revised Version (British and American). The word "dear" occurs but once in the Old Testament, namely, Jeremiah 31:20. the Revised Version (British and American) correctly changes "dear Son" of the King James Version (Colossians 1:13) into "the Son of his love."

H. E. Jacobs

DEARTH

<durth>.

See *FAMINE.*

DEATH

([twm; *maweth*]; [θάνατος, *thanatos*]):

PHYSIOLOGICAL AND FIGURATIVE VIEW

The word "Death" is used in the sense of

(1) the process of dying (Genesis 21:16);

(2) the period of decease ([⚑]Genesis 27:7);

   (3) as a possible synonym for poison ([⚑]2 Kings 4:40);

   (4) as descriptive of person in danger of perishing ([⚑]Judges 15:18; "in deaths oft" [⚑]2 Corinthians 11:23). In this sense the shadow of death is a familiar expression in Job, the Psalms and the Prophets;

(5) death is personified in [⚑]1 Corinthians 15:55 and [⚑]Revelation 20:14. Deliverance from this catastrophe is called the "issues from death" ([⚑]Psalm 68:20 the King James Version; translated "escape" in the Revised Version (British and American)). Judicial execution, "putting to death," is mentioned 39 times in the Levitical Law.
Figuratively: Death is the loss of spiritual life as in [⚑]Romans 8:6; and the final state of the unregenerate is called the "second death" in [⚑]Revelation 20:14.

                                            Alex. Macalister

THEOLOGICAL VIEW

1. Conception of Sin and Death:

According to [⚑]Genesis 2:17, God gave to man, created in His own image, the command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and added thereto the warning, "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Though not exclusively, reference is certainly made here in the first place to bodily death. Yet because death by no means came upon Adam and Eve on the day of their transgression, but took place hundreds of years later, the expression, "in the day that," must be conceived in a wider sense, or the delay of death must be attributed to the entering-in of mercy ([⚑]Genesis 3:15). However this may be, [⚑]Genesis 2:17 places a close connection between man's death and his transgression of God's commandment, thereby attaching to death a religious and ethical significance, and on the other hand makes the life of man dependent on his obedience to God. This religious-ethical nature of life and death is not only decidedly and clearly expressed in Genesis 2, but it is the fundamental thought of the whole of Scripture and forms an essential element in the revelations of salvation. The theologians of early and more recent times, who have denied the spiritual significance of death and have separated the connection between ethical and physical life, usually endeavor to trace back their opinions to Scripture; and those passages which undoubtedly see in death a punishment for sin ([⚑]Genesis 2:17; [⚑]John 8:44; [⚑]Romans

5:12; 6:23; [46152]1 Corinthians 15:21), they take as individual opinions, which form no part of the organism of revelation. But this endeavor shuts out the organic character of the revelation of salvation. It is true that death in Holy Scripture is often measured by the weakness and frailty of human nature ([01319]Genesis 3:19; [18401]Job 14:1,12; [19905]Psalm 39:5,6; 90:5; 103:14,15; [21050]Ecclesiastes 3:20, etc.). Death is seldom connected with the transgression of the first man either in the Old Testament or the New Testament, or mentioned as a specified punishment for sin ([43844]John 8:44; [45512]Romans 5:12; 6:23; [46152]1 Corinthians 15:21; [59015]James 1:15); for the most part it is portrayed as something natural ([01505]Genesis 5:5; 9:29; 15:15; 25:8, etc.), a long life being presented as a blessing in contrast to death in the midst of days as a disaster and a judgment ([19A223]Psalm 102:23 f; [23650]Isaiah 65:20). But all this is not contrary to the idea that death is a consequence of, and a punishment for, sin. Daily, everyone who agrees with Scripture that death is held out as a punishment for sin, speaks in the same way. Death, though come into the world through sin, is nevertheless at the same time a consequence of man's physical and frail existence now; it could therefore be threatened as a punishment to man, because he was taken out of the ground and was made a living soul, of the earth earthy ([01207]Genesis 2:7; [46155]1 Corinthians 15:45,47). If he had remained obedient, he would not have returned to dust ([01319]Genesis 3:19), but have pressed forward on the path of spiritual development ([46146]1 Corinthians 15:46,51); his return to dust was possible simply because he was made from dust (*see ADAM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT*). Thus, although death is in this way a consequence of sin, yet a long life is felt to be a blessing and death a disaster and a judgment, above all when man is taken away in the bloom of his youth or the strength of his years. There is nothing strange, therefore, in the manner in which Scripture speaks about death; we all express ourselves daily in the same way, though we at the same time consider it as the wages of sin. Beneath the ordinary, everyday expressions about death lies the deep consciousness that it is unnatural and contrary to our innermost being.

2. *The Meaning of Death:*

This is decidedly expressed in Scripture much more so even than among ourselves. For we are influenced always more or less by the Greek, Platonic idea, that the body dies, yet the soul is immortal. Such an idea is utterly contrary to the Israelite consciousness, and is nowhere found in the Old Testament. The whole man dies, when in death the spirit ([19B604]Psalm

146:4; Ecclesiastes 12:7), or soul (Genesis 35:18; 2 Samuel 1:9; 1 Kings 17:21; Jon 4:3), goes out of a man. Not only his body, but his soul also returns to a state of death and belongs to the nether-world; therefore the Old Testament can speak of a death of one's soul (Genesis 37:21 (Hebrew); Numbers 23:10 m; Deuteronomy 22:21; Judges 16:30; Job 36:14; Psalm 78:50), and of defilement by coming in contact with a dead body (Leviticus 19:28; 21:11; 22:4; Numbers 5:2; 6:6; 9:6; 19:10 ff; Deuteronomy 14:1; Haggai 2:13). This death of man is not annihilation, however, but a deprivation of all that makes for life on earth. The Sheol (*she'ol*) is in contrast with the land of the living in every respect (Job 28:13; Proverbs 15:24; Ezekiel 26:20; 32:23); it is an abode of darkness and the shadow of death (Job 10:21,22; Psalm 88:12; 143:3), a place of destruction, yea destruction itself (Job 26:6; 28:22; 31:12; Psalm 88:11; Proverbs 27:20), without any order (Job 10:22), a land of rest, of silence, of oblivion (Job 3:13,17,18; Psalm 94:17; 115:17), where God and man are no longer to be seen (Isaiah 38:11), God no longer praised or thanked (Psalm 6:5; 115:17), His perfections no more acknowledged (Psalm 88:10-13; Isaiah 38:18,19), His wonders not contemplated (Psalm 88:12), where the dead are unconscious, do no more work, take no account of anything, possess no knowledge nor wisdom, neither have any more a portion in anything that is done under the sun (Ecclesiastes 9:5,6,10). The dead ("the Shades" the Revised Version, margin; compare article DECEASED) are asleep (Job 26:5; Proverbs 2:18; 9:18; 21:6; Psalm 88:11; Isaiah 14:9), weakened (Isaiah 14:10) and without strength (Psalm 88:4).

3. Light in the Darkness:

The dread of death was felt much more deeply therefore by the Israelites than by ourselves. Death to them was separation from all that they loved, from God, from His service, from His law, from His people, from His land, from all the rich companionship in which they lived. But now in this darkness appears the light of the revelation of salvation from on high. The God of Israel is the living God and the fountain of all life (Deuteronomy 5:26; Joshua 3:10; Psalm 36:9). He is the Creator of heaven and earth, whose power knows no bounds and whose dominion extends over life and death (Deuteronomy 32:39; 1 Samuel 2:6; Psalm 90:3). He gave life to man (Genesis 1:26; 2:7), and creates and sustains every man still (Job 32:8; 33:4; 34:14; Psalm 104:29; Ecclesiastes

12:7). He connects life with the keeping of His law and appoints death for the transgression of it (Genesis 2:17; Leviticus 18:5; Deuteronomy 30:20; 32:47). He lives in heaven, but is present also by His spirit in Sheol (Psalm 139:7,8). Sheol and Abaddon are open to Him even as the hearts of the children of men (Job 26:6; 38:17; Proverbs 15:11). He kills and makes alive, brings down into Sheol and raises from thence again (Deuteronomy 32:39; 1 Samuel 2:6; 2 Kings 5:7). He lengthens life for those who keep His commandments (Exodus 20:12; Job 5:26), gives escape from death, can deliver when death menaces (Psalm 68:20; Isaiah 38:5; Jeremiah 15:20; Daniel 3:26), can take Enoch and Elijah to Himself without dying (Genesis 5:24; 2 Kings 2:11), can restore the dead to life (1 Kings 17:22; 2 Kings 4:34; 13:21). He can even bring death wholly to nothing and completely triumph over its power by rising from the dead (Job 14:13-15; 19:25-27; Hosea 6:2; 13:14; Isaiah 25:8; 26:19; Ezekiel 37:11,12; Daniel 12:2).

4. Spiritual Significance:

This revelation by degrees rejects the old contrast between life on earth and the disconsolate existence after death, in the dark place of Sheol, and puts another in its place. The physical contrast between life and death gradually makes way for the moral and spiritual difference between a life spent in the fear of the Lord, and a life in the service of sin. The man who serves God is alive (Genesis 2:17); life is involved in the keeping of His commandments (Leviticus 18:5; Deuteronomy 30:20); His word is life (Deuteronomy 8:3; 32:47). Life is still for the most part understood to mean length of days (Proverbs 2:18; 3:16; 10:30; Isaiah 65:20). Nevertheless it is remarkable that Proverbs often mentions death and Sheol in connection with the godless (2:18; 5:5; 7:27; 9:18), and on the other hand only speaks of life in connection with the righteous. Wisdom, righteousness, the fear of the Lord is the way of life (8:35,36; 11:19; 12:28; 13:14; 14:27; 19:23). The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death (14:32). Blessed is he who has the Lord for his God (Deuteronomy 33:29; Psalm 1:1,2; 2:12; 32:1,2; 33:12; 34:9, etc.); he is comforted in the greatest adversity (Psalm 73:25-28; Habakkuk 3:17-19), and sees a light arise for him behind physical death (Genesis 49:18; Job 14:13-15; 16:16-21; 19:25-27; Psalm 73:23-26). The godless on the contrary, although enjoying for a time much prosperity, perish and come to an end (Psalm 1:4-6; 73:18-

20; [23482]Isaiah 48:22; [39403]Malachi 4:3, etc.).

The righteous of the Old Testament truly are continually occupied with the problem that the lot of man on earth often corresponds so little to his spiritual worth, but he strengthens himself with the conviction that for the righteous it will be well, and for the wicked, ill ([21082]Ecclesiastes 8:12,13; [23610]Isaiah 3:10,11). If they do not realize it in the present, they look forward to the future and hope for the day in which God's justice will extend salvation to the righteous, and His anger will be visited on the wicked in judgment. So in the Old Testament the revelation of the new covenant is prepared wherein Christ by His appearance hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel ([55010]2 Timothy 1:10). *See* ABOLISH. This everlasting life is already here on earth presented to man by faith, and it is his portion also in the hour of death ([43036]John 3:36; 11:25,26). On the other hand, he who lives in sin and is disobedient to the Son of God, is in his living dead ([40082]Matthew 8:22; [42152]Luke 15:32; [43036]John 3:36; 8:24; [49001]Ephesians 2:1; [51213]Colossians 2:13); he shall never see life, but shall pass by bodily death into the second death ([66021]Revelation 2:11; 20:6,14; 21:8).

5. Death in Non-Christian Religions and in Science:

This view of Scripture upon death goes much deeper than that which is found in other religions, but it nevertheless receives support from the unanimous witness of humanity with regard to its unnaturalness and dread. The so-called nature-peoples even feel that death is much more of an enigma than life; Tiele (Inleiding tot de goddienst-artenschap, II (1900), 202, referring to Andrew Lang, Modern Mythology, chapter xiii) says rightly, that all peoples have the conviction that man by nature is immortal, that immortality wants no proof, but that death is a mystery and must be explained. Touching complaints arise in the hearts of all men on the frailty and vanity of life, and the whole of mankind fears death as a mysterious power. Man finds comfort in death only when he hopes it will be an end to a still more miserable life. Seneca may be taken as interpreter of some philosophers when he says: Stultitia est timore morris mori ("It is stupid to die through the fear of death") and some may be able, like a Socrates or a Cato, to face death calmly and courageously; what have these few to say to the millions, who through fear of death are all their lifetime subject to bondage ([58215]Hebrews 2:15)? Such a mystery has death remained up to the present day. It may be said with Kassowitz, Verworm and others that the "cell" is the beginning, and the old, gray man is the natural end of an

uninterrupted life-development, or with Metschnikoff, that science will one day so lengthen life that it will fade away like a rose at last and death lose all its dread; death still is no less a riddle, and one which swallows up all the strength of life. When one considers, besides, that a number of creatures, plants, trees, animals, reach a much higher age than man; that the larger half of mankind dies before or shortly after birth; that another large percentage dies in the bloom of youth or in the prime of life; that the law of the survival of the fittest is true only when the fact of the survival is taken as a proof of their fitness; that the graybeards, who, spent and decrepit, go down to the grave, form a very small number; then the enigma of death increases more and more in mysteriousness. The endeavors to bring death into connection with certain activities of the organism and to explain it by increasing weight, by growth or by fertility, have all led to shipwreck. When Weismann took refuge in the immortality of the "einzellige Protozoen," he raised a hypothesis which not only found many opponents, but which also left mortality of the "Korperplasma" an insoluble mystery (Beth, "Ueber Ursache und Zweck des Todes, Glauben und Wissen (1909), 285-304, 335-48). Thus, science certainly does not compel us to review Scripture on this point, but rather furnishes a strong proof of the mysterious majesty of death. When Pelagius, Socinus, Schleiermacher, Ritschl and a number of other theologians and philosophers separate death from its connection with sin, they are not compelled to do so by science, but are led by a defective insight into the relation between *ethos* and *phusis*. Misery and death are not absolutely always consequences and punishment of a great personal transgression (Luke 13:2; John 9:3); but that they are connected with sin, we learn from the experience of every day. Who can number the victims of mammonism, alcoholism and licentiousness? Even spiritual sins exercise their influence on corporal life; envy is a rottenness of the bones (Proverbs 14:30). This connection is taught us in a great measure by Scripture, when it placed the not yet fallen man in a Paradise, where death had not yet entered, and eternal life was not yet possessed and enjoyed; when it sends fallen man, who, however, is destined for redemption, into a world full of misery and death; and at last assigns to the wholly renewed man a new heaven and a new earth, where death, sorrow, crying or pain shall no longer exist (Revelation 21:4). Finally, Scripture is not the book of death, but of life, of everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord. It tells us, in oft-repeated and unmistakable terms, of the dreaded reality of death, but it proclaims to us still more loudly the wonderful power of the life which is in Christ Jesus.

See also DECEASE.

Herman Bavinck

ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος,

rybD]   rbD]

rybD]   Δαβείρ,

1. THE MEANING OF THE NAME:

(1) *Debir* is usually accepted as meaning "back," but this is doubtful; the word *debhir* is used to denote the "holy of holies" (⟨1005⟩1 Kings 6:5). According to Sayce (HDB), "the city must have been a sacred one with a well-known temple." Kiriath-sepher is translated "town of books," and Sayce and others consider that in all probability there was a great storehouse of clay tablets here; perhaps the name may have been *qiryath copher*, "town of scribes." *Kiriath-sannah* (⟨0659⟩Joshua 15:49) is probably a corruption of *Kiriath-sepher*; the Septuagint has here as in references to the latter [πόλις γραμμάτων, *polis grammaton*], "town of books."

2. THE SITE:

Unfortunately this site, important even if the speculations about the books are doubtful, is still a matter of uncertainty. *Edh-Dhaheriyeh*, some 11 miles Southwest of Hebron, has a good deal of support. It was unquestionably a site of importance in ancient times as the meeting-place of several roads; it is in the Negeb (compare ⟨0015⟩Judges 1:15), in the neighborhood of the probable site of Anab (⟨0612⟩Joshua 11:21; 15:50); it is a dry site, but there are "upper" and "lower" springs about 6 1/2 miles to the North. A more thorough examination of the site than has as yet been undertaken might produce added proofs in favor of this identification. No other suggestion has any great probability. See PEF, III, 402; PEFS, 1875.

(2) *Debir*, on the border between Judah and Benjamin (⟨0657⟩Joshua 15:7), must have been somewhere East of Jerusalem not far from the modern Jericho road. *Thoghgret ed Debr*, "the pass of the rear," half a mile Southwest of the *Tal`at ed Dumm* (*see ADUMMIN*), close to the so-called, "Inn of the Good Samaritan," may be an echo of the name which has lingered in the neighborhood. Many authorities consider that there is no place-name in this reference at all, the text being corrupt.

(3) *Debir* the Revised Version, margin, *Lidebir* (⟨0635⟩Joshua 13:26), a town on the border of Gad, near Mahanaim; Ibdar, South of the Yarmuk has been suggested. May be identical with Lo-debar (⟨1094⟩2 Samuel 9:4).

E. W. G. Masterman

DEBORAH

‹deb'-o-ra› ([hr̄ɔbD] *debhorah*], signifying "bee"):

(1) Rebekah's nurse, who died near Bethel and was buried under "the oak

of weeping" (⟨0358⟩Genesis 35:8 margin).

(2) A prophetess, fourth in the order of the "judges." In aftertime a palm tree, known as the "palm tree of Deborah," was shown between Ramah and Bethel, beneath which the prophetess was wont to administer justice. Like the rest of the "judges" she became a leader of her people in times of national distress. This time the oppressor was Jabin, king of Hazor, whose general was Sisera. Deborah summoned Barak of Kedesh-naphtali and delivered to him the Divine message to meet Sisera in battle by the brook Kishon. Barak induced Deborah to accompany him; they were joined by 10,000 men of Zebulun and Naphtali. The battle took place by the brook Kishon, and Sisera's army was thoroughly routed. While Barak pursued the fleeing army, Sisera escaped and sought refuge with Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite, near Kedesh. The brave woman, the prototype of Judith, put the Canaanite general to sleep by offering him a draft of milk and then slew him by driving a peg into his temple. Thus runs the story in Judges 4. It is on the whole substantiated by the ode in chapter 5 which is ascribed jointly to Deborah and Barak. It is possible that the editor mistook the archaic form [יTimק″ , *qamti*], in 5:7 which should be rendered "thou arosedst" instead of "I arose." Certainly the ode was composed by a person who, if not a contemporary of the event, was very near it in point of time. The song is spoken of as one of the oldest pieces of Hebrew literature. Great difficulties meet the exegete. Nevertheless the general substance is clear. The Lord is described as having come from Sinai near the "field of Edom" to take part in the battle; `for from heaven they fought, the very stars from their courses fought against Sisera' (5:20). The nation was in a sad plight, oppressed by a mighty king, and the tribes loth to submerge their separatist tendencies. Some, like Reuben, Gilead, Daniel and Asher remained away. A community by the name of Meroz is singled out for blame, `because they came not to the help of Yahweh, to the help of Yahweh among the mighty' (5:23; compare the Revised Version, margin). Ephraim, Issachar, Machir, Benjamin were among the followers of Barak; "Zebulun .... jeopardized their lives unto the death, and Naphtali, upon the high places of the field" (verse 18). According to the song, the battle was fought at Taanach by the waters of Megiddo; Sisera's host was swept away by "that ancient river, the river Kishon" (verse 21). Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, receives here due reward of praise for her heroic act. The paean vividly paints the waiting of Sisera's mother for the home-coming of the general; the delay is ascribed to the great booty which the conqueror is distributing among his Canaanite host. "So let all thine

enemies perish," concludes the song; "O Yahweh: but let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might." It is a song in praise of the "righteous acts" of the Lord, His work of victory which Israel's leaders, `the long-haired princes,' wrought, giving their lives freely to the nation's cause. And the nation was sore bestead because it had become faithless to the Lord and chosen new gods. Out of the conflict came, for the time being, victory and moral purification; and the inspiring genius of it all was a woman in Israel, the prophetess Deborah.

(3) Tobit's grandmother (the King James Version "Debora," Tobit 1:8).

Max L. Margolis

DEBT; DEBTOR

<det>, *<det'-er>*: It is difficult nowadays to think of debt without associating with it the idea of interest, and even usury. Certain it is that this idea is associated with the Old Testament idea of the word, at least in the later period of Old Testament history. This is true of the New Testament entire. The Hebrew word ([גְּשִׁי] *neshi*]) always carries with it the idea of "biting interest" (compare 2 Kings 4:7). The Greek words [δάνειον, *daneion*] (Matthew 18:27), and [ὀφειλή, *opheile*] (Matthew 18:32), may point only to the fact of indebtedness; the idea of interest, however, is clearly taught in the New Testament (compare Matthew 25:27).

Quite extensive legislation is provided in the Old Testament governing the matter of debt and debtors. Indebtedness and loaning had not, however, the commercial aspect among the Jews so characteristic of the nations surrounding Palestine. Indeed the Mosaic legislation was seemingly intended to guard against just such commercialism. It was looked upon as a misfortune to be in debt; it indicated poverty brought on probably by blighted harvests; consequently those in debt were to be looked upon with pity and dealt with in leniency. There must be no oppression of the poor under such circumstances (Exodus 22:25; Deuteronomy 23:19,20; Ezekiel 18:18). Even where a pledge is given and received, certain restrictions are thrown around it, e.g. the creditor must not take a mill, nor a necessary garment, nor a widow's ox, etc., in pledge (Exodus 22:25-27; Deuteronomy 24:6,10-13; Job 22:6; Amos 2:8). And further, the pledge is to be restored in some instances "before the sun goeth down" (Exodus 22:26,27), and in all cases full redemption in the seventh and

jubilee years (⟨16081⟩Nehemiah 10:31, etc.). The Jews were strictly exhorted to take no interest at all from their own nation (⟨02225⟩Exodus 22:25; ⟨05239⟩Deuteronomy 23:19,20). Strangers, however, might be charged interest (ibid.). A devout Jew would not lend money to another Jew on interest. It would seem that as Israel came into contact with the surrounding nations, debt became increasingly a commercial matter. The Mosaic laws regarding clemency toward the poor who were compelled for the time being to become debtors were utterly disregarded, and the poor were oppressed by the rich. An illustration of the severity with which debtors came to be dealt with is to be found in ⟨12040⟩2 Kings 4:1-7, in which, because of the inability of a widow to pay a small debt contracted by her dead husband, the woman complains to the prophet that the creditors have come to sell her two children in order that the debt might be paid. Strangely the prophet, while helping the widow by miraculously multiplying the oil in order that the debt might be paid, says nothing by way of condemnation of such conduct on the part of the creditors. Are we to understand by this that commercialism had already so powerful a grip upon Israel that even to a prophet the practice had come to seem proper, or at least expected? The debtor himself or his family might be sold for debt, or the debtor might become a slave for a certain length of time until the debt was paid (⟨03259⟩Leviticus 25:39,47; ⟨23501⟩Isaiah 50:1). So oppressive had the commercial system in Israel become that the debtor cursed the creditor and the creditor the debtor (⟨24510⟩Jeremiah 15:10). Sometimes debtors were outlawed, as in the case of the men who came to David in the cave of Adullam (⟨09212⟩1 Samuel 22:2). That the matter of borrowing and lending had assumed very grievous proportions is evident from the very sharp warnings concerning the matter in the Book of Proverbs (6:1; 11:15; 20:16, etc.).

The teaching of the New Testament on this subject is confined very largely to the parables of our Lord. Some think that the expression, "Owe no man anything" (⟨45138⟩Romans 13:8), is an absolute warning against indebtedness. Quite a noticeable advance in the matter of debts and debtors is noticed as we enter the time of the New Testament. We read of bankers, exchangers, moneychangers, interest, investments, usury (⟨40516⟩Matthew 25:16-27; ⟨43213⟩John 2:13-17). The taking of interest does not seem to be explicitly condemned in the New Testament. The person of the debtor, as well as his family and lands, could be seized for non-payment of debt (⟨40821⟩Matthew 18:21-26). Indeed, the debtor was often cast into prison and tormented because of non-payment (⟨40830⟩Matthew 18:30,34). That compassion and leniency should be exercised toward those in debt is the clear teaching of

Christ in the parables of the Unmerciful Servant (◁018‍23▷Matthew 18:23-35) and the Two Debtors (◁207‍41▷Luke 7:41-43).

Figurative: Debt and debtor are used in a moral sense also as indicating the obligation of a righteous life which we owe to God. To fall short in righteous living is to become a debtor. For this reason we pray, "Forgive us our debts" (◁406‍12▷Matthew 6:12). Those who are ministered to in spiritual things are said to be debtors to those who minister to them (◁515‍27▷Romans 15:27). To make a vow to God is to put one's self in debt in a moral sense (◁023‍16▷Matthew 23:16-18; the Revised Version, margin "bound by his oath"). In a deeply spiritual sense the apostle Paul professed to be in debt to all men in that he owed them the opportunity to do them good (◁501‍14▷Romans 1:14).

The parables of Jesus as above named are rich with comforting truth. How beautiful is the willingness of God, the great and Divine Creditor, to release us from our indebtedness! Just so ought we to be imitators of the Father in heaven who is merciful.

William Evans

DECALOGUE

<dek'-a-log>.

See *TEN COMMANDMENTS.*

DECAPOLIS

<de-kap'-o-lis> ([Δεκάπολις, *Dekapolis*]): The name given to the region occupied by a league of "ten cities" (◁404‍25▷Matthew 4:25; ◁406‍20▷Mark 5:20; 7:31), which Eusebius defines (in Onomastica) as "lying in the Peraea, round Hippos, Pella and Gadara." Such combinations of Greek cities arose as Rome assumed dominion in the East, to promote their common interests in trade and commerce, and for mutual protection against the peoples surrounding them. This particular league seems to have been constituted about the time of Pompey's campaign in Syria, 65 BC, by which several cities in Decapolis dated their eras. They were independent of the local tetrarchy, and answerable directly to the governor of Syria. They enjoyed the rights of association and asylum; they struck their own coinage, paid imperial taxes and were liable to military service (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; BJ, I, vii, 7; II, xviii, 3; III, ix, 7; Vita, 65, 74). Of the ten cities, Scythopolis, the

ancient Bethshean, alone, the capital of the league, was on the West side of Jordan. The names given by Pliny (NH, v.18) are Scythopolis (*Beisan*), Hippos (*Susiyeh*), Gadara (*Umm Qeis*), Pella (*Fahil*), Philadelphia (`*Amman*), Gerasa (*Jerash*), Dion (*Adun?*), Canatha (*Qanawat*), Damascus and Raphana. The last named is not identified, and Dion is uncertain. Other cities joined the league, and Ptolemy, who omits Raphans, gives a list of 18. The Greek inhabitants were never on good terms with the Jews; and the herd of swine (<41051>Mark 5:11 ff) indicates contempt for what was probably regarded as Jewish prejudice. The ruins still seen at Gadara, but especially at Kanawat (*see KENATH*) and Jerash, of temples, theaters and other public buildings, attest the splendor of these cities in their day.

W. Ewing

DECAY

<*de-ka'*>: Although this word is still in good use in both its literal sense, of the putrefaction of either animal or vegetable matter, and its derived sense, denoting any deterioration, decline or gradual failure, the Revised Version (British and American) has replaced it by other expressions in <02555>Leviticus 25:35; <21018>Ecclesiastes 10:18; <23426>Isaiah 44:26; <50813>Hebrews 8:13; in some of these cases with a gain in accuracy of translation. In <16040>Nehemiah 4:10 ([לֹשֵׁ‎; *kashal*], "to be feeble," "stumble") the Revised Version (British and American) retains "is decayed"; in <18411>Job 14:11 ([בּרֱ‎; *charebh*], "to be dried up") the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "wasteth," and in <43139>John 11:39 the American Standard Revised Version has "the body decayeth" instead of the more literal translation offensive to modern ears ([ὄζει, *ozei*], "emits a smell").

F. K. Farr

DECEASE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCYPHRA

<*de-ses'*> ([רפא‎; *rapha'*], plural *repha'im*, "ghosts," "shades," is translated by "dead," "dead body," and "deceased" in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)): The word seems to mean "soft," "inert," but its etymology is uncertain (*see REPHAIM*). The various writers of the Old Testament present, as is to be expected on such a subject, different conceptions of the condition of the deceased. In the beginning probably a vague idea of the continuation of existence was

held, without the activities (Isaiah 59:10) and the joys of the present life (Psalm 49:17). They dwell in the "land of forgetfulness" (Job 14:21; Psalm 88:5; compare Isaiah 26:14), they "tremble" of cold (Job 26:5), they totter and "stumble at noonday as in the twilight" (Isaiah 59:10), their voice is described as low and muttering or chirping (Isaiah 8:19; 29:4), which may refer to the peculiar pitch of the voice of the spirit medium when a spirit speaks through him. (The calling up of the dead, which was strictly forbidden to Israel (Leviticus 19:31; 20:27) is referred to in 1 Samuel 28:13 and perhaps in Isaiah 14:9.) The deceased are separated from their friends; love and hatred have both ceased with them (Ecclesiastes 9:5,6); "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in Sheol" (Ecclesiastes 9:10). The deceased are unable to praise Yahweh (Psalm 6:5; 88:10-12; Isaiah 38:18; Baruch 2:17; Sirach 17:27,28). Nor does there seem to have been at first an anticipation of reward or punishment after death (Psalm 88:10; Sirach 41:4), probably because the shades were supposed to be lacking the organs by which either reward or punishment could be perceived; nevertheless they are still in the realm of God's power (1 Samuel 2:6; Psalm 86:13; 139:8; Proverbs 15:11; Isaiah 7:11; Hosea 13:14; Amos 9:2; Tobit 13:2).

Gradually the possibility of a return of the departed was conceived (Genesis 5:24; 2 Kings 13:21; Psalm 49:15; 73:24; 86:13; Hosea 13:14; The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1-7; 4:13,14; 6:18,19; 10:14). Even here it is often more the idea of the immortality of the soul than that of the resurrection of the body, and some of these passages may be interpreted as allegorical expressions for a temporal rescue from great disaster (e.g. 1 Samuel 2:6); nevertheless this interpretation presupposes the existence of a deliverance from the shadows of Sheol to a better life in the presence of Yahweh. Some passages refer clearly to such an escape at the end of the age (Daniel 12:2; Isaiah 26:19). Only very few of the Old Testament believers reached the sublime faith of Job (19:25,26) and none the blessed expectation taught in the New Testament, for none but Christ has "brought life and immortality to light" (2 Timothy 1:10; John 5:28,29).

The opinion that the dead or at least the newly buried could partake of the food which was placed in graves, a custom which recent excavations have clearly shown to have been almost universal in Palestine, and which is referred to in Deuteronomy 26:14 and Tobit 4:17, was soon doubted (Sirach 30:18), and food and drink prepared for the funeral was henceforth

intended as the "bread of comfort" and the "cup of consolation" for the mourners (⁴⁴⁶⁰⁷Jeremiah 16:7; ¹⁰⁰⁸⁸⁵2 Samuel 3:35; ²⁵²⁴⁴⁷Ezekiel 24:17). Similarly the offering and burning of incense, originally an homage to the deceased, became a relief for the mourner (⁴⁴¹⁶¹⁴2 Chronicles 16:14; 21:19; ²⁸⁴⁰⁵Jeremiah 34:5). See also The Wisdom of Solomon 3:2; 7:6; Sirach 38:23, and articles on *CORPSE; DEATH; HADES; SHEOL.*

H. L. E. Luering

DECEASE, IN NEW TESTAMENT

<de-ses'> ([τελευτάω, *teleutao*], "to come to an end," "married and deceased" (⁴¹²²²⁵Matthew 22:25)): With [θανάτῳ, *thanato*], "death," "die the death" (⁴⁰¹⁵⁰⁴Matthew 15:4; ⁴¹⁰⁷¹⁰Mark 7:10, the Revised Version, margin "surely die"). Elsewhere the word is translated "die" (⁴⁰²¹⁹Matthew 2:19; 9:18; ⁴¹⁰⁹⁴⁸Mark 9:48 and often; ⁵⁸¹²²Hebrews 11:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "end was nigh").
Also the substantive, [ἔξοδος, *exodos*], "exodus," "exit," "departure," "his decease which he was about to accomplish" (⁴²⁰⁹⁸¹Luke 9:31, the Revised Version, margin "departure"); "after my decease" (⁶¹⁰⁰¹⁵2 Peter 1:15, the Revised Version, margin "departure").

DECEIT

<de-set'> ([hmrìhì *mirmah*;] ([δόλος, *dolos*]): The intentional misleading or beguiling of another; in Scripture represented as a companion of many other forms of wickedness, as cursing (¹⁹¹⁰⁰⁷Psalm 10:7), hatred (²⁰²⁶²⁴Proverbs 26:24), theft, covetousness, adultery, murder (⁴¹⁰⁷²²Mark 7:22; ⁴⁵⁰¹²⁹Romans 1:29). The Revised Version (British and American) introduces the word in ²⁰¹⁴²⁵Proverbs 14:25; ⁵⁰²¹⁰2 Thessalonians 2:10; but in such passages as ¹⁹⁵⁵¹¹Psalm 55:11; ²⁰¹⁰⁰⁷Proverbs 20:17; 26:26; ⁵¹⁰⁰⁸1 Thessalonians 2:3, renders a variety of words, more accurately than the King James Version, by "oppression," "falsehood," "guile," "error."

DECEIVABLENESS; DECEIVE

<de-sev'-a-b'-l-nes>, *<de-sev'>* ([avh; *nasha'*], "to lead astray"): "The pride of thy heart hath deceived thee" (²⁴⁴⁹¹⁶Jeremiah 49:16), i.e. "Thy stern mountain fastnesses have persuaded thee that thou art impregnable." In ²⁴²⁰⁰⁷Jeremiah 20:7, "O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived," [htP; *pathah*], signifies "to be enticed," "persuaded," as in the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version, margin.

In the Old Testament most often, and in the New Testament regularly, the various words rendered in the King James Version "deceive" denote some deliberate misleading in the moral or spiritual realm. False prophets (⟨2908⟩Jeremiah 29:8), false teachers (⟨4056⟩Ephesians 5:6) and Satan himself (⟨6029⟩Revelation 12:9) are deceivers in this sense. In the gospels, the King James Version "deceive" ([πλανάω, *planao*], 9 times ⟨4204⟩Matthew 24:4,5 parallel ⟨4135⟩Mark 13:5,6 parallel ⟨2208⟩Luke 21:8; ⟨4041⟩Matthew 24:11,24; ⟨4072⟩John 7:12,47) becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) "lead astray"; the same change is made in ⟨0126⟩1 John 2:26; 3:7; but elsewhere (13 t) both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render *planao* by "deceive."

"Deceivableness" ([ἀπάτη, *apate*]), only in ⟨5210⟩2 Thessalonians 2:10, signifies power to deceive, not liability to deception; the Revised Version (British and American) "deceit."

F. K. Farr

DECENTLY

<de'-sent-li> ([εὐσχημόνως, *euschemonos*]): Only once is this word found in our English Bible (⟨6140⟩1 Corinthians 14:40). It is in the last verse of that remarkable chapter on the proper use of spiritual gifts in the church and the proper conduct of public worship. It does not refer here to absence of impurity or obscenity. It rather refers to good order in the conduct of public worship. All things that are done and said in public worship are to be in harmony with that becoming and reverent spirit and tone that befit the true worshippers of God.

DECISION

<de-sizh'-un>: Has several different shades of meaning. It expresses the formation of a judgment on a matter under consideration. It expresses the quality of being firm or positive in one's actions. It expresses the termination of a contest or question in favor of one side or the other, as the decision of the battle, or the decision of the judge.

1. NATIONAL DECISIONS:

Until recent times the decision of disputed points between nations was determined by force of arms. Thus the questions of dispute were decided

between Israel and the surrounding tribes, between Israel and Assyria, between Israel and Egypt, and later between Judea and Rome.

2. JUDICIAL DECISIONS:

In the earliest times the questions of dispute between individuals were decided by the patriarch who was the head of the family. When Israel became a nation men were appointed to decide the difficulties between the people. At first this was one of the most important duties of Moses, but when the task became too great he appointed judges to assist him (see ⁰²⁸¹³Exodus 18:13-26). One important function of those who are called judges was to decide the difficulties between the people (see ⁰⁷⁴⁰⁴Judges 4:4,5). The kings also decided questions of dispute between individuals (see ⁰¹⁵⁰¹2 Samuel 15:1-6; ¹¹³¹⁶1 Kings 3:16-28). As the people developed in their national ideals the decisions in judicial matters were rendered by councils appointed for that purpose.

3. METHODS OF FORMING DECISIONS:

Perplexing questions were many times decided by the casting of lots. The people believed that God would in this way direct them to the right decision (²⁰⁶³³Proverbs 16:33; ⁰⁶⁷¹⁰Joshua 7:10-21; 14:2; ⁰⁹¹⁰⁰1 Samuel 10:20 f). Casting lots must have been a common method of deciding perplexing questions (see ⁰⁹⁴⁴¹1 Samuel 14:41,42; Jon 1:7). It was resorted to by the apostles to decide which of the two men they had selected should take the place of Judas (⁴⁴⁰²¹Acts 1:21-26). The custom gradually lost in favor, and decisions, even of perplexing questions, were formed by considering all the facts.

See AUGURY IV, 3; LOTS.

A. W. Fortune

DECISION, VALLEY OF

See JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.

DECLARATION; DECLARE

<dek-la-ra'-shun>, *<deklar'>*: "Declare" is the translation of a variety of Hebrew and Greek words in the Old Testament and New Testament, appearing to bear uniformly the meaning "to make known," "set forth," rather than (the older meaning) "to explain" (⁰⁵¹⁰⁵Deuteronomy 1:5).

Declaration (Est 10:2 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "full account"; ⟨18317⟩Job 13:17; Ecclesiasticus 43:6; Luke 11 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "narrative"; ⟨47089⟩2 Corinthians 8:19 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "to show") has the like meaning.

DECLINE

<de-klin'> ([ⲅⲱⲥ, cur], or [ⲅⲱⲥ, sur], [ⲏⲫⲛ; *naTah*]): In the King James Version this word occurs 9 times in its original sense (now obsolete) of "turn aside." the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "turn aside" in ⟨02302⟩Exodus 23:2; ⟨05171⟩Deuteronomy 17:11; ⟨14342⟩2 Chronicles 34:2; ⟨18231⟩Job 23:11. In ⟨19A211⟩Psalm 102:11; 109:23, the lengthening shadows of afternoon are said to "decline," and the Revised Version (British and American) introduces the word in the same general sense in ⟨07908⟩Judges 19:8; ⟨12010⟩2 Kings 20:10; ⟨24064⟩Jeremiah 6:4.

See AFTERNOON.

DEDAN; DEDANITES

<de'-dan>, *<de'dan-its>* (the King James Version Dedanim, ded'-a-nim; [ˆⲇⲆ] *dedhan*], "low," [ⲙⲩⲛⲇⲆ] *dedhanim*]): An Arabian people named in ⟨01007⟩Genesis 10:7 as descended from Cush; in ⟨01503⟩Genesis 25:3 as descended from Keturah. Evidently, they were, like the related Sheba (Sabaeans), of mixed race (compare ⟨01007⟩Genesis 10:7,28). In ⟨23213⟩Isaiah 21:13 allusion is made to the "caravans of Dedanites" in the wilds of Arabia, and Ezekiel mentions them as supplying Tyre with precious things (⟨26720⟩Ezekiel 27:20; in verse 15, "Dedan" should probably be read as in Septuagint, "Rodan," i.e. Rhodians). The name seems still to linger in the island of Dadan, on the border of the Persian Gulf. It is found also in Min. and Sab. inscriptions (Glazer, II, 392 ff).

James Orr

DEDICATE; DEDICATION

<ded'-i-kat>, *<ded-ika'-shun>* ([ⲏⲕⲛⲩⲝ} *chanukkah*], "initiation," "consecration"; [ⲟⲇⲝ; *qadhesh*], "to be clean," "sanctify"; [ⲙⲅⲏ*cherem*], "a thing devoted (to God)"): Often used in Hebrew of the consecration of persons, but usually in the English Versions of the Bible of the setting apart of things to a sacred use, as of the altar (⟨00710⟩Numbers 7:10 f,84,88;

compare ²⁷⁸²Daniel 3:2,3, "the dedication of the image"), of silver and gold (¹⁰⁸¹¹2 Samuel 8:11; ¹²²⁰⁴2 Kings 12:4), of the Temple (¹⁰⁶⁵³1 Kings 8:63; ¹⁵⁶¹⁶Ezra 6:16 f; compare ⁰²⁹⁴⁴Exodus 29:44), of the wall of Jerusalem (¹⁶²²⁷Nehemiah 12:27), of private dwellings (⁰⁵¹⁰⁵Deuteronomy 20:5). the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "devoted" for "dedicated" in ²⁶⁴²⁹Ezekiel 44:29.

See CONSECRATION; SANCTIFICATION.

DEDICATION, FEAST OF

<ded-i-ka'-shun> ([τὰ ἐγκαίνια, *ta egkainia*], ⁴³¹⁰²John 10:22): A feast held by the Jews throughout the country for eight days, commencing on the 25th Kiclev (December), in commemoration of the cleansing of the temple and dedication of the altar by Judas Maccabeus after their desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 4:56,59). The feast was to be kept "with mirth and gladness." 2 Macc 10:6,7 says it was kept like the Feast of the Tabernacles, with the carrying of palm and other branches, and the singing of psalms. Josephus calls it "Lights," from the joy which accompanied it (Ant., XII, vii, 7). At this winter feast Jesus delivered in the temple the discourse recorded in ⁴³¹⁰⁴John 10:24 ff, at Jerusalem.

James Orr

DEED

<ded>: Used in its ordinary modern sense in EV. In the Old Testament it is used to translates five Hebrew words: *gemylah*, literally, "recompense" (²³⁹¹⁸Isaiah 59:18); *dabhar*, literally, "word," "thing" (⁴⁴⁵²⁷2 Chronicles 35:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "acts"; Est 1:17,18; ²⁴⁰⁵⁸Jeremiah 5:28); *ma`aseh* (<sup>01209</sup>Genesis 20:9; 44:15; <sup>15913</sup>Ezra 9:13); *`alilah* (¹³⁶⁰⁸1 Chronicles 16:8 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "doings"; ^{19A501}Psalm 105:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "doings"); *po`al* (¹⁹⁸⁰⁴Psalm 28:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "work"; ²²⁵¹⁴Jeremiah 25:14). In the New Testament "deed" very frequently translates [ἔργον, *ergon*] (same root as English "work"; compare "energy"), which is still more frequently (espescially in the Revised Version (British and American)) rendered "work." In ⁴²²⁵¹Luke 23:51; ⁴⁴⁹¹⁸Acts 19:18; ⁴⁵⁸¹³Romans 8:13; ⁵¹⁸⁰⁹Colossians 3:9 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "doings," it stands for Greek [πρᾶξις, *praxis*] (literally, "a doing,"

"transaction"), each time in a bad sense, equivalent to wicked deed, crime, a meaning which is frequently associated with the plural of *praxis* (compare English "practices" in the sense of trickery; so often in Polybius; Deissmann maintains that *praxis* was a technical term in magic), although in [40627]Matthew 16:27 (the King James Version "works") and [45124]Romans 12:4 the same Greek word has a neutral meaning. In [59025]James 1:25 the King James Version "deed" is the translation of Greek [ποίησις, *poiesis*], more correctly rendered "doing" in the Revised Version (British and American).

D. Miall Edwards

DEEP

([μ/hT] *tehom*]; [ἄβυσσος, *abussos*], [42083]Luke 8:31 the King James Version; [45007]Romans 10:7 the King James Version; [βάθος, *bathos*], [42054]Luke 5:4; [βυθός, *buthos*], [47125]2 Corinthians 11:25): The Hebrew word ("water in commotion") is used

(1) of the primeval watery waste ([01002]Genesis 1:2), where some suggest a connection with Babylonian Tiamat in the creation-epic;

(2) of the sea ([23510]Isaiah 51:10 and commonly);

(3) of the subterranean reservoir of water ([01071]Genesis 7:11; 8:2; 49:25; [05313]Deuteronomy 33:13; [26304]Ezekiel 31:4, etc.). In the Revised Version (British and American) the Greek word first noted is rendered, literally, "abyss."

See ABYSS; also ASTRONOMY, III, 7.

DEEP SLEEP

See SLEEP, DEEP.

DEER

<der> ([l Ya" , *'ayyal*], feminine [hl Ya" , *'ayyalah*], and [tl Ya" , *'ayyeleth*] (compare Arabic, *'ayyal* and *'iyal*, "deer" and [l yà" , *'ayil*], "ram," and Latin *caper* and *capra*, "goat," *caprea*, *capreolus*, "wild goat," "chamois," or "roe deer"); [rWmj ÿ" , *yachmur*] (compare Arabic, *yachmur*, "deer"); [hl {ÿ" , *ya`alah*], feminine of [l {ç, *ya`el*] (compare Arabic, *wa`l*, "Pers wild goat"); [ybix] *tsebhi*], and feminine [hYbix] *tsebhiyah*] (compare Arabic, *zabi* and feminine *zabiyah*, "gazelle"); [rp[ρ

`opher*] (compare Arabic, *ghafr* and *ghufr*, "young of the mountain goat")):

Of the words in the preceding list, the writer believes that only the first two, i.e. *'ayyal* (with its feminine forms) and *yachmur* should be translated "deer," *'ayyal* for the roe deer and *yachmur* for the fallow deer. Further, he believes that *ya`el* (including *ya`alah*) should be translated "ibex," and *tsebhi*, "gazelle." `Opher is the young of a roe deer or of a gazelle.

'Ayyal and its feminine forms are regularly in English Versions of the Bible rendered "hart" and "hind," terms which are more commonly applied to the male and female of the red deer, Cervus elaphus, which inhabits Great Britain, the continent of Europe, the Caucasus and Asia Minor, but which has never been reported as far south as Syria or Palestine. The roe deer, Capreolus caprea, however, which inhabits the British Isles, the greater part of Europe, the Caucasus and Persia, is certainly found in Palestine. The museum of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut possesses the skeleton of a roe deer which was shot in the mountains near Tyre. As late as 1890 it was fairly common in southern Lebanon and Carmel, but has now (1912) become very scarce. The fallow deer, Cervus dama, is a native of Northern Africa and countries about the Mediterranean. It is found in central Europe and Great Britain, where it has been introduced from its more southern habitat. A variety of the fallow deer, sometimes counted as a separate species under the name of Cervus Mesopotamicus, inhabits northeastern Mesopotamia and Persia. It may in former times have been found in Palestine, and Tristram reports having seen the fallow deer in Galilee (Fauna and Flora of Pal), but while Tristram was a remarkably acute observer, he appears sometimes to have been too readily satisfied, and his observations, when unaccompanied, as in this case, by specimens, are to be accepted with caution. Now *'ayyal* (and its feminine forms) occurs in the Bible 22 times, while *yachmur* occurs only twice, i.e. in the list of clean animals in ⁰⁵⁴¹⁵Deuteronomy 14:5, and in ¹¹⁰²³1 Kings 4:23, in the list of animals provided for Solomon's table. In both places the King James Version has "fallow deer" and the Revised Version (British and American) "roebuck." In view of the fact that the roe deer has within recent years been common in Palestine, while the occurrence of the fallow deer must be considered doubtful, it seems fair to render *'ayyal* "roe deer" or "roebuck," leaving *yachmur* for fallow deer.

The Arabs call the roe deer both *'ayyal* and *wa`l. Wa`l* is the proper name of the Persian wild goat, Capra aegagrus, and is also often used for the

Arabic or Sinaitic ibex, Capra beden, though only by those who do not live within its range. Where the ibex is at home it is always called beden. This looseness of nomenclature must be taken into account, and we have no reason to suppose that the Hebrews were more exact than are the Arabs. There are many examples of this in English, e.g. panther, coney, rabbit (in America), locust, adder and many others.

Ya`el* (including *ya`alah) occurs 4 times. In [8901]Job 39:1; [19418]Psalm 104:18; [0242]1 Samuel 24:2, English Versions of the Bible render *ya`el* by "wild goat." For *ya`alah* in [20519]Proverbs 5:19, the King James Version has "roe," while the Revised Version (British and American) has "doe," which is non-committal, since the name, "doe," may be applied to the female of a deer or of an ibex. Since the Arabic, wa`l, which is etymologically closely akin to *ya`el*, means the Persian wild goat, it might be supposed that that animal was meant, were it not that it inhabits the plains of the Syrian desert, and not the mountains of Southern Palestine, where the ibex lives. At least two of the passages clearly indicate the latter locality, i.e. [19418]Psalm 104:18: "The high mountains are for the wild goats," and [0242]1 Samuel 24:2: "Saul .... went to seek David and his men upon the rocks of the wild goats." The conclusion then seems irresistible that *ya`el*, and consequently *ya`alah*, is the ibex.

Tsebhi (including *tsebhiyah*) is uniformly rendered "roe" or "roebuck" in the King James Version, while the Revised Version (British and American), either in the text or in the margin, has in most cases "gazelle." In two places "roe" is retained in the Revised Version (British and American) without comment, i.e. [10218]2 Samuel 2:18: "Asahel was as light of foot as a wild roe," and [13208]1 Chronicles 12:8: "were as swift as the roes upon the mountains." *'Ayyal* and *tsebhi* occur together in [05125]Deuteronomy 12:15,22; 14:5; 15:22; [11023]1 Kings 4:23; Song 2:9,17, i.e. in 7 of the 16 passages in which we find *tsebhi*. If therefore it be accepted that *'ayyal* is the roe deer, it follows that *tsebhi* must be something else. Now the gazelle is common in Palestine and satisfies perfectly every passage in which we find *tsebhi*. Further, one of the Arabic names of the gazelle is zabi, a word which is etymologically much nearer to *tsebhi* than appears in this transliteration.

'Opher is akin to `aphar, "dust," and has reference to the color of the young of the deer or gazelle, to both of which it is applied. In Song 2:9,17 and 8:14, we have `opher ha-'ayyalim, English Versions of the Bible "young hart," literally, "fawn of the roe deer." In Song 4:5 and 7:3, we

have `*opharim te'ome tsebhiyah*, the King James Version "young roes that are twins," the Revised Version (British and American) "fawns that are twins of a roe," the Revised Version, margin "gazelle" (for "roe"). For further reference to these questions, **see *ZOOLOGY***.

With the exception of mere lists of animals, as in Deuteronomy 14 and 1 Kings 4, the treatment of these animals is highly poetical, and shows much appreciation of their grace and beauty.

Alfred Ely Day

DEFAME; DEFAMING

<*de-fam'*>, <*de-fam'-ing*>: These words occur but twice in the King James Version, and are translations of [hBDi *dibbah*], "slander," from *dabhath*, "to slander," or spread an evil report, and [βλασφημέω, *blasphemeo*], "to speak injuriously" of anyone (Jeremiah 20:10; 1 Corinthians 4:13). "To defame" differs from "to revile" in that the former refers to *public* slander, the latter to *personal* abuse.

DEFECT; DEFECTIVE

<*de-fekt'*>, <*de-fekt'-iv*> ([ἥττημα, *hettema*], "loss," "a defect"): Occurs in 1 Corinthians 6:7: "Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you (the King James Version "there is utterly a fault among you"), that ye have lawsuits one with another." "Defect" means "want or absence of something necessary for completeness" (the Revised Version, margin "a loss to you"). The meaning of the passage in the Revised Version (British and American) is that when Christians have lawsuits one with another it produces a lack of something which brings them short of completeness, they suffer a spiritual loss or defeat, and perhaps defect is not quite strong enough fully to express that idea.
Defective: Sirach 49:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "committed trespass."

A. W. Fortune

DEFENCE

<*de-fens'*>.

See *COURTS, JUDICIAL*.

DEFENCED

See FORTIFICATION.

DEFER

<de-fur'> ([rj " a; *'achar*] (in Hiphil), [Ër" a; *'arakh*] (in Hiphil), [Ëv" m; *mashakh*] (in Niphal), "to postpone," more or less definitely; "delay"): In Old Testament passages such as [2349]Isaiah 48:9; [2625]Ezekiel 12:25,28; [2009]Daniel 9:19, the idea of indefinite postponement agrees with the Hebrew and with the context. In the only New Testament occurrence of the word [ἀναβάλλω, *anaballo*], in the middle voice, [402]Acts 24:22) a definite postponement is implied.

DEFILE; DEFILEMENT

<de-fil'>, *<de-fil'-ment>* (Anglo-Saxon, afylau, etc.; Middle English, defoulen, "make foul," "pollute," render (the King James Version) 9 Hebrew roots (the Revised Version (British and American) six): [l [ß; *ga`al*], "defile"; [l l " j; *chalal*], "defile" (from "untie, loosen, open," i.e. "make common," hence, "profane"); [tnè; *chaneph*], "incline away" (from right or religion), hence, "profane," "defile" ([2009]Jeremiah 3:9, the American Standard Revised Version "pollute"); [amfi; *Tame'*], the principal root, over 250 times translated "defile" 74 times "to become, or render, unclean"; [tn" f; *Tanaph*], "to soil" (Song 5:3); [l l " [; *`alal*], "deal severely, or decidedly, with," "roll" ([1865]Job 16:15, the King James Version, the American Revised Version, margin); [hn[; *`anah*], "humble" ([0342]Genesis 34:2 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "humble"); [vd" q; *qadhash*], "separate," "sanctify," "devote to religious use," hence, "forfeit" ([5209]Deuteronomy 22:9 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "forfeit," margin "consecrated"). They also render 6 (the King James Version) Greek roots (American Revised Version, 4): [κοινός, *koinos*], etc., "common" or "unclean," because appertaining to the outside world and not to the people of God, opposite of *katharos*, "clean," used 13 times; [μιαίνω, *miaino*], [μίασμα, *miasma*], [μιασμός, *miasmos*], "stain," "tinge," "dye": "In their dreamings defile the flesh," [5108]Jude 1:8; [μολύνω, *moluno*], "stain," "contaminate": "not defile their garments" ([6604]Revelation 3:4); [σπιλόω, *spiloo*], "spot," "stain": "defile the whole body" ([5006]James 3:6); [φθείρω,

phtheiro], "corrupt," "destroy": the temple of God (⟨46817⟩1 Corinthians 3:17 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "destroyeth"); [ἀρσενοκοίτης, *arsenokoites*]: "defile themselves with men" (⟨54010⟩1 Timothy 1:10 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "abusers of")):

1. DEFILEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

Defilement in the Old Testament was physical, sexual, ethical, ceremonial, religious, the last four, especially, overlapping.

(1) Physical: "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" (Song 5:3).

(2) Sexual: which might be ceremonial or moral; of individuals by illicit intercourse (⟨03820⟩Leviticus 18:20), or by intercourse at forbidden times (⟨03524⟩Leviticus 15:24; ⟨09205⟩1 Samuel 21:5); of the land by adultery: "Shall not that land be greatly defiled?" (⟨24801⟩Jeremiah 3:1 the American Standard Revised Version "polluted," usually substituted where the moral or religious predominates over the ceremonial).

(3) Ethical: "Your hands are defiled with blood" (⟨23903⟩Isaiah 59:3); "Neither shall they defile themselves any more with .... any of their transgressions" (⟨26723⟩Ezekiel 37:23).

(4) Ceremonial: to render ceremonially unclean, i.e. disqualified for religious service or worship, and capable of communicating the disqualification.

(a) Persons were defiled by contact with carcasses of unclean animals (⟨03124⟩Leviticus 11:24); or with any carcass (⟨03715⟩Leviticus 17:15); by eating a carcass (⟨03208⟩Leviticus 22:8); by contact with issues from the body, one's own or another's, e.g. abnormal issues from the genitals, male or female (⟨03502⟩Leviticus 15:2,25); menstruation (⟨03519⟩Leviticus 15:19); by contact with anyone thus unclean (⟨03524⟩Leviticus 15:24); copulation (⟨03516⟩Leviticus 15:16-18); uncleanness after childbirth (⟨03202⟩Leviticus 12:2-5); by contact with unclean persons (⟨03503⟩Leviticus 5:3), or unclean things (⟨03206⟩Leviticus 22:6), or with leprosy (especially defiling; ⟨03314⟩Leviticus 13:14), or with the dead (⟨04062⟩Numbers 6:12), or with one unclean by such contact (⟨04922⟩Numbers 19:22), or by funeral rites (⟨03201⟩Leviticus 21:1); by contact with creeping things (⟨03205⟩Leviticus 22:5), or with unclean animals (⟨03126⟩Leviticus 11:26).

(b) Holy objects were ceremonially defiled by the contact, entrance or approach of the defiled (⟨03531⟩Leviticus 15:31; ⟨04913⟩Numbers 19:13); by the

presence of dead bodies, or any remains of the dead (⟨26907⟩Ezekiel 9:7; ⟨12316⟩2 Kings 23:16: Josiah's defilement of heathen altars by the ashes of the priests); by the entrance of foreigners (⟨19701⟩Psalm 79:1; see ⟨42128⟩Acts 21:28); by forbidden treatment, as the altar by being tooled (⟨02105⟩Exodus 20:25); objects in general by contact with the unclean. Ceremonial defilement, strictly considered, implied, not sin, but ritual unfitness.

(5) Religious: not always easily distinguished or entirely distinguishable from the ceremonial, still less from the ethical, but in which the central attitude and relationship to Yahweh as covenant God and God of righteousness, was more fully in question. The land might be defiled by bloodshed (⟨04533⟩Numbers 35:33), especially of the just or innocent; by adultery (⟨24001⟩Jeremiah 3:1); by idolatry and idolatrous practices, like sacrificing children to idols, etc. (⟨03103⟩Leviticus 20:3; ⟨19A639⟩Psalm 106:39); the temple or altar by disrespect (⟨39007⟩Malachi 1:7,12); by offering the unclean (⟨37214⟩Haggai 2:14); by any sort of unrighteousness (⟨26617⟩Ezekiel 36:17); by the presence of idols or idolatrous paraphernalia (⟨24730⟩Jeremiah 7:30).

2. DEFILEMENT IN NEW TESTAMENT:

The scope of defilement in its various degrees (direct, or primary, as from the person or thing defiled; indirect, or secondary, tertiary, or even further, by contact with the defiled) had been greatly widened by rabbinism into a complex and immensely burdensome system whose shadow falls over the whole New Testament life. Specific mentions are comparatively few. Physical defilement is not mentioned. Sexual defilement appears, in a figurative sense: "These are they that were not defiled with women" (⟨66404⟩Revelation 14:4). Ceremonial defilement is found in, but not approved by, the New Testament. Examples are: by eating with unwashed, "common," not ceremonially cleansed, hands (⟨41002⟩Mark 7:2); by eating unclean, "common," food (⟨44014⟩Acts 10:14; Peter's vision); by intimate association with Gentiles, such as eating with them (not expressly forbidden in Mosaic law; ⟨44103⟩Acts 11:3), or entering into their houses (⟨43828⟩John 18:28; the Pharisees refusing to enter the Pretorium); by the presence of Gentiles in the Temple (⟨42128⟩Acts 21:28).

But with Christ's decisive and revolutionary dictum (⟨41019⟩Mark 7:19): "This he said, making all meats clean," etc., and with the command in Peter's vision: "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common" (⟨44015⟩Acts 10:15), and with Paul's bold and consistent teaching: "All things indeed are clean" (⟨45140⟩Romans 14:20, etc.), the idea of ceremonial or ritual defilement, having accomplished its educative purpose, passed. Defilement in the New

Testament teaching, therefore, is uniformly ethical or spiritual, the two constantly merging. The ethical is found more predominantly in: "The things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart; and they defile the man" (⁽⁴⁰¹⁵¹⁸⁾Matthew 15:18); "that did not defile their garments" (⁽⁶⁶⁰⁴⁾Revelation 3:4); "defileth the whole body" (⁽⁵⁹⁰⁶⁾James 3:6). The spiritual seems to predominate in: "defiled and unbelieving" (⁽⁵⁰¹¹⁵⁾Titus 1:15); "conscience being weak is defiled" (by concession to idolatry.) (⁽⁴⁶⁰⁷⁾1 Corinthians 8:7); "lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby the many be defiled" (⁽⁵⁸¹²¹⁵⁾Hebrews 12:15). For the supposed origins of the idea and details of defilement, as from hygienic or aesthetic causes, "natural aversions," "taboo," "totemism," associations with ideas of death, or evil life, religious symbolism, etc., *see POLLUTION; PURIFICATION; UNCLEAN*. Whatever use God may have made of ideas and feelings common among many nations in some form, the Divine purpose was clearly to impress deeply and indelibly on the Israelites the ideas of holiness and sacredness in general, and of Yahweh's holiness, and their own required holiness and separateness in particular, thus preparing for the deep New Testament teachings of sin, and of spiritual consecration and sanctification.

Philip Wendell Crannell

DEFY

<de-fi'> ([tr″h; *charaph*], [μ[ז; *za`am*]): In ⁽⁰⁹¹⁷¹⁰⁾1 Samuel 17:10,25,26,36,45 (the story of David and Goliath) and kindred passages, this word is used in its most familiar sense — "to taunt," "challenge to combat" (Hebrew *charaph*). In ⁽⁰²³⁷⁾Numbers 23:7,8 "denounce" would be a better translation than "defy" (Hebrew *za`am*).

DEGENERATE

<de-jen'-er-at>: Only in ⁽²⁴⁰²¹⁾Jeremiah 2:21, where Judah is compared to a "noble vine" which it "turned into the degenerate branches of a foreign vine." It represents Hebrew *curim* = "stray" or "degenerate (shoots)," from *cur* = "to turn aside," especially to turn aside from the right path (Greek *pikria*, literally, "bitterness").

DEGREE

<de-gre'> ([hl [מ″, *ma`alah*], "a going up" or "ascent," hence, a staircase or flight of steps; "rank": [ταπεινός, *tapeinos*], "low"): By

derivation it should mean "a step down" (Latin, de, down, gradus, step). It is used, however, of any step, up or down; then of grade or rank, whether high or low.

(1) In its literal sense of step (as of a stair), it is used in the plural to translate Hebrew *ma`aloth* ("steps"), in the parallel passages ^{<12209>}2 Kings 20:9-11 the King James Version (5 t); ^{<23808>}Isaiah 38:8 the King James Version (3 t), where we read of the "degrees" (the Revised Version (British and American) "steps") on the "dial of Ahaz" (Hebrew "steps of Ahaz"). *See DIAL OF AHAZ.* It seems to mean steps or progressive movements of the body toward a certain place in the phrase "A Song of Degrees" (the Revised Version (British and American) "Ascents"), which forms the title of each of the Psalms 120 through 134, probably because they were sung on the way up to the great feasts at Jerusalem. *See PSALMS*

 (2) The secondary (but now the more usual) sense of rank, order, grade is found in the following passages:

(a) ^{<13518>}1 Chronicles 15:18, "their brethren of the second (degree)," literally, "of the seconds" (Hebrew *mishnim*; compare ^{<14207>}2 Chronicles 28:7, "Elkanah that was next to the king," Hebrew, "the king's second," i.e. in rank);

 (b) ^{<13717>}1 Chronicles 17:17, "a man of high degree" (Hebrew *ma`alah*, "step");

(c) ^{<19609>}Psalm 62:9, "men of low degree .... men of high degree," a paraphrase of Hebrew "sons of man .... sons of man," the first "man" being Hebrew *'adham* ("common humanity"; compare Greek *anthropos*, Latin homo, Welsh dyn), and the second Hebrew *'ish* (man in a superior sense; compare Greek *aner*, Latin vir, Welsh gwr) ;

(d) "of low degree" for Greek *tapeinos* in Sirach 11:1; ^{<42052>}Luke 1:52; ^{<59009>}James 1:9;

 (e) In ^{<54313>}1 Timothy 3:13 the King James Version "a good degree" (Greek *bathmos kalos*, the Revised Version (British and American) "a good standing") is assured to those who have "served well as deacons." Some take this to mean promotion to a higher official position in the church; but it probably means simply a position of moral weight and influence in the church gained by faithfulness in service (so Hort).

DEGREES, SONGS OF

([t/l [M" j " ryvi *shir ha-ma`aloth*]; Septuagint [ῷδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν, *ode ton anabathmon*]; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) *canticum graduum*, the Revised Version (British and American) "a song of ascents"): The title prefixed to 15 psalms (Pss 120 through 134) as to the significance of which there are four views:

(1) The Jewish interpretation. According to the Mishna, Middoth 2 5, Cukkah 51b, there was in the temple a semi-circular flight of stairs with 15 steps which led from the court of the men of Israel down to the court of the women. Upon these stairs the Levites played on musical instruments on the evening of the first day of Tabernacles. Later Jewish writers say that the 15 psalms derived their title from the 15 steps.

(2) Gesenius, Delitzsch and others affirm that these psalms derive their name from the step-like progressive rhythm of their thoughts. They are called Songs of Degrees because they move forward climactically by means of the resumption of the immediately preceding word. But this characteristic is not found in several of the group.

(3) Theodoret and other Fathers explain these 15 hymns as traveling songs of the returning exiles. In ⁽¹⁵⁷⁰⁾Ezra 7:9 the return from exile is called "the going up (*ha-ma`alah*) from Babylon." Several of the group suit this situation quite well, but others presuppose the temple and its stated services.

(4) The most probable view is that the hymns were sung by pilgrim bands on their way to the three great festivals of the Jewish year. The journey to Jerusalem was called a "going up," whether the worshipper came from north or south, east or west. All of the songs are suitable for use on such occasions. Hence, the title Pilgrim Psalms is preferred by many scholars.

See DIAL OF AHAZ.

John Richard Sampey

DEHAITES

<de-ha'-tez> ([awhD, *dehawe'*]; the King James Version Dehavites): A

people enumerated in ¹⁵⁴⁹Ezra 4:9 with Elamites, ere, as among those settled by the Assyrian king Osnappar (Assurbanipal) in Samaria. The identification is uncertain.

DEHORT

<de-hort'> ([ἀποστρέφω, *apostrepho*]; the Revised Version (British and American) DISSUADE): Not found in the English Bible; once only in Apocrypha (1 Macc 9:9). An obsolete English word; the opposite of "exhort." It means "to dissuade," "to forbid," "to restrain from."

DEKAR

<de'-kar> ([rqD, *deqer*], "lancer"): Father of one of Solomon's commissaries (¹⁰⁴⁹1 Kings 4:9 the King James Version).
See BEN-DEKER.

DELAIAH

<de-la'-ya> ([hylD] *delayah*], "God has raised"):

(1) A descendant of David (¹³⁸²⁴1 Chronicles 3:24; the King James Version "Dalaiah").

(2) One of David's priests and leader of the 23rd course (¹³²⁴⁸1 Chronicles 24:18).

(3) One of the princes who pleaded with Jehoiakim not to destroy the roll containing the prophecies of Jeremiah (²⁴⁸⁶²Jeremiah 36:12,25).
(4) The ancestor of a post-exilic family whose genealogy was lost (¹⁵¹²⁰Ezra 2:60; ¹⁶⁰⁷²Nehemiah 7:62; 1 Esdras 5:37 margin).
See DALAN.

(5) The father of timorous Shemaiah (¹⁶⁰⁶⁰Nehemiah 6:10).

DELAY

<de-la'>: The noun "delay" (⁴⁴⁵¹⁷Acts 25:17, "I made no delay"; the King James Version "without any delay") means "procrastination." The verb "to delay" (⁰²²²⁹Exodus 22:29; [rj ″ a; *'achar*]) involves the idea "to stop for a time," the people being admonished not to discontinue a custom. The Pil. perfect of [vWB, *bush*] (⁰²³⁰¹Exodus 32:1), "Moses delayed to come,"

expresses not only the fact that he tarried, but also the disappointment on the part of the people, being under the impression that he possibly was put to shame and had failed in his mission, which also better explains the consequent action of the people. "To delay" ([χρονίζω, *chronizo*]) is used transitively in ⁴⁰²⁴⁸Matthew 24:48 (the Revised Version (British and American) "My lord tarrieth") and in ⁴²¹²⁵Luke 12:45. The meaning here is "to prolong," "to defer."

A. L. Breslich

DELECTABLE

<de-lek'-ta-bl> ([dm″ h; *chamadh*], "to desire"): Found only in ²³⁴⁰⁹Isaiah 44:9, King James Version: "Their delectable things shall not profit," the King James Version margin"desirable." the American Standard Revised Version translates: "the things that they delight in." The reference is to idols or images. Delitzsch renders the phrase: "Their *darlings* are good for nothing." The word may be traced back to the Latin *delectabilis*, "pleasant," or "delightful."

DELICACY

<del'-i-ka-si> ([τὸ στρῆνος, *to strenos*]): Found only in ⁶⁶⁸⁰³Revelation 18:3, King James Version: "The merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies." the Revised Version (British and American) has very properly changed delicacies to "wantonness," and "luxury" in the margin, which is much nearer to the original.

DELICATE; DELICATELY

<del'-i-kat>, *<del'-i-kat-li>* ([ˆd[e`*edhen*], [gnɸ; `*anogh*]; [ἐν τρυφῇ, *en truphe*]): "Delicate" usually an adjective, but once a substantive (²⁵³⁴Jeremiah 51:34 the King James Version). "He hath filled his belly (the Revised Version (British and American) "maw") with my delicates." the Revised Version (British and American) retains the word, but the American Standard Revised Version very properly has replaced it with "delicacies." In Sirach 30:18, the Revised Version (British and American) *agatha*, "good things." The adjective seems to have two meanings, though not easily distinguished:

(1) tenderly reared, and

(2) wanton or voluptuous. In ⁰⁵²⁸⁵⁴Deuteronomy 28:54,56; ²³⁴⁷⁰¹Isaiah 47:1; ²⁰⁶²Jeremiah 6:2, "luxurious" or "daintily bred" would certainly be nearer

the original than "delicate." "Delicate children" of ⁣Micah 1:16, the King James Version, is changed by the Revised Version (British and American) to "children of thy delight," i.e. beloved children, rather than children begotten in passion. The adverb "delicately" is employed in the same sense as the adjective (Lamentations 4:5; Luke 7:25). In the old English writers "delicate" is often used for voluptuous: "Dives for his delicate life to the devil went" (Piers Ploughman). The meaning of "delicately" (*ma`adhan*) in 1 Samuel 15:32 (the King James Version) is a real puzzle. The King James Version reads, "And Agag came unto him delicately," with a possible suggestion of weakness or fear. the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version, margin substitute "cheerfully." Others, by metathesis or change of consonants in the Hebrew word, translation "in bonds" or "fetters."

W. W. Davies

DELICIOUSLY

<de-lish'-us-li> ([στρηνιάω, *streniao*] "to live hard or wantonly"): "She (Babylon) .... lived deliciously" (Revelation 18:7,9 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "wantonly," the Revised Version, margin "luxuriously").

DELIGHT

<de-lit'> (verb, [6pḃ; *chaphets*], [hxr; *ratsah*], [[[֥; *sha`a`*]; [συνήδομαι, *sunedomai*]): "To delight" is most frequently expressed by *chaphets*, which means originally "to bend" (compare Job 40:17, "He moveth his tail"), hence, "to incline to," "take pleasure in." It is used of God's pleasure in His people (Numbers 14:8; 2 Samuel 22:20; Psalm 18:19, etc.), and in righteousness, etc. (Isaiah 66:4; Jeremiah 9:24; Micah 7:18, etc.), also of man's delight in God and His will (Psalm 40:8; 73:25; the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "There is none upon earth that I desire besides thee"), and in other objects (Genesis 34:19; 1 Samuel 18:22; Est 2:14; Isaiah 66:3); *sha`a`*, "to stroke," "caress," "be fond of," occurs in Psalm 94:19, "Thy comforts delight my soul"; 119:16,47,70, "I will delight myself in thy statutes." Similarly, Paul says (Romans 7:22), "I delight (*sunedomai*) in (margin, the Revised Version (British and American) "Greek with") the law of God after the inward man." This is the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament.

"To delight one's self" (in the Lord) is represented chiefly by `*anagh* ([48226]Job 22:26; 27:10; [49704]Psalm 37:4,11; [25814]Isaiah 58:14). Delight (noun), chiefly *chephets* ([09152]1 Samuel 15:22; [49102]Psalm 1:2; 16:3), *ratson* ([20101]Proverbs 11:1,20; 12,22; 15:8), *sha`ashu`im* ([49924]Psalm 119:24,77,92,143,174; [20803]Proverbs 8:30,31). the Revised Version (British and American) has "delight" for "desire" ([16011]Nehemiah 1:11; [19208]Psalm 22:8; 51:16), for "observe," different reading ([20236]Proverbs 23:26), "no delight in" for "smell in" ([30521]Amos 5:21), "delightest in me" for "favorest me" ([19411]Psalm 41:11), "his delight shall be in" (m "Hebrew `scent' ") for "of quick understanding" ([23103]Isaiah 11:3).

The element of joy, of delight in God and His law and will, in the Hebrew religion is noteworthy as being something which we are apt to fall beneath even in the clearer light of Christianity.

W. L. Walker

DELIGHTSOME

<*de-lit'-sum*>: [6pj ֶchephets], is rendered "delightsome": [39012]Malachi 3:12, "Ye shall be a delightsome land," literally, "a land of delight."

DELILAH

<*de-li'-la*> ([hl yl D] *delilah*], "dainty one," perhaps; Septuagint [Δαλειδά, *Daleida*], [Δαλιδά, *Dalida*]): The woman who betrayed Samson to the Philistines (Judges 16). She was presumably a Philistine, though that is not expressly stated. She is not spoken of as Samson's wife, though many have understood the account in that way. The Philistines paid her a tremendously high price for her services. The account indicates that for beauty, personal charm, mental ability, self-command, nerve, she was quite a wonderful woman, a woman to be admired for some qualities which she exhibits, even while she is to be utterly disapproved.

See SAMSON.

Willis J. Beecher

DELIVER

<*de-liv'-er*> ([l x″ n; *natsal*], [ˆt″ n; *nathan*]; [ῥύομαι, *rhuomai*], [παραδίδωμι, *paradidomi*]): Occurs very frequently in the Old

Testament and represents various Hebrew terms. The English word is used in two senses,

(1) "to set free," etc.,

(2) "to give up or over."

(1) The word most often translated "deliver" in the first sense is *natsal*, meaning originally, perhaps, "to draw out." It is used of all kinds of deliverance (Genesis 32:11; Psalm 25:20; 143:9, etc.; Jeremiah 7:10; Ezekiel 3:19, etc.; Zephaniah 1:18, etc.). The Aramaic netsal occurs in Daniel 3:29; 6:14; 8:4,7; *yasha`*, "to save," in Judges 3:9,31 the King James Version, etc.; malaT, "to let or cause to escape," in Isaiah 46:2, "recover," etc. In the New Testament rhuomai, "to rescue," is most frequently translated "deliver" in this sense (Matthew 6:13 the King James Version, "Deliver us from evil"); katargeo, "to make useless" or "without effect" (Romans 7:6 the Revised Version (British and American), "discharged"). In the New Testament "save" takes largely the place of "deliver" in the Old Testament, and the idea is raised to the spiritual and eternal.

(2) For "deliver" in the sense of "give over, up," etc., the most frequent word is nathan, the common word for "to give" (Genesis 32:16; 40:13 the King James Version; Exodus 5:18). Other words are *maghan* (Hosea 11:8, the King James Version and the English Revised Version "How shall I deliver thee Israel?" i.e. "How shall I give thee up?" as in the first clause of the verse, with a different word (*nathan*), the American Standard Revised Version "How shall I cast thee off?"), *yehabh*, Aramaic (Ezra 5:14). In the New Testament paradidomi, "to give over to," is most frequent (Matthew 5:25; 11:27, "All things have been delivered (given or made over) unto me of my Father"; Mark 7:13; Luke 1:2; 1 Timothy 1:20, etc.); *charizomai*, "to grant as a favor" (Acts 25:11,16 the King James Version).

(3) *Yaladh*, "to bring forth," is also rendered "deliver" in the sense of childbirth (Genesis 25:24; Exodus 1:19, etc.). In the New Testament this sense is borne by [τίκτω, *tikto*] (Luke 1:57; 2:6; Revelation 12:2,4), and [γεννάω, *gennao*] (John 16:21).

In the Revised Version (British and American) there are many changes, such as, for "deliver," "restore" (Genesis 37:22; 40:13; Exodus 22:26; Deuteronomy 24:13); for "delivered," "defended" (1 Chronicles 11:14); for "cannot deliver thee," "neither .... turn thee aside"

([18368]Job 36:18); for "betray," "betrayed" we have "deliver," "delivered up," etc. ([40104]Matthew 10:4 margin; [41312]Mark 13:12; 14:10 f; [42116]Luke 21:16); for "delivered into chains," "committed to pits" ([61004]2 Peter 2:4, margin "some ancient authorities read chains"; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 17:17); "Deliver us from evil," omitted in [42104]Luke 11:4, margin "Many ancient authorities add but deliver us from the evil one (or, from evil)."

W. L. Walker

DELOS

<de'-los> ([Δῆλος, *Delos*]): An island, now deserted, one of the Cyclades in the Aegean Sea, about 3 miles long and 1 mile broad, with a rocky mountain (Cynthus) several hundred feet high in the center. In antiquity Delos enjoyed great prosperity. According to Greek legend the island once floated on the surface of the water, until Poseidon fastened it on four diamond pillars for the wandering Leto, who, like Io, was pursued by the vengeful Hera. It was here that Apollo and Artemis were born; hence, the island was sacred, and became one of the chief seats of worship of the two deities. Numerous temples embellished Delos. The most magnificent was that of Apollo, which contained a colossal statue of the god, a dedicatory offering of the Naxians. This temple was a sanctuary visited by all the Greeks, who came from far and near to worship at the deity's shrine. There was a Dorian peripteral temple in Delos from the beginning of the 4th century BC. To the North was a remarkable altar composed entirely of ox-horns. The various Ionian cities sent sacred embassies (*theoriai*) with rich offerings. There was also a celebrated oracle in Delos which was accounted one of the most trustworthy in the world. Every five years the famous Delian festival was celebrated with prophecies, athletic contests and games of every kind. All the nations of Greece participated.

The earliest inhabitants of Delos were Carians; but about 1000 BC the island was occupied by Ionians. For a long time it enjoyed independence. In 478 Delos was chosen as the place for the convention of the representatives of the Greek states for deliberation about means for defense against Persia. The treasury of the Athenian Confederacy was kept here after 476. The island became independent of Athens in 454. During the 2nd and 1st centuries BC it became one of the chief ports of the Aegean. This was partly due to its location, and partly to the fact that the Romans, after 190 BC, favored the island as a rival to the sea-power of Rhodes. In 166

Delos was given to Athens; the inhabitants fled to Achea, and the island was colonized by Athenians, together with Romans.

The ruins of the city of Delos, which became a flourishing commercial port, are to the North of the temple. It became the center of trade between Alexandria and the Black Sea, and was for a long time one of the chief slave markets of the Greek world. But Delos received a severe blow, from which it never recovered, in the war between Rome and Mithridates. The latter's general landed in 88 BC and massacred many, and sold the remainder of the defenseless people, and sacked and destroyed the city together with the temple and its countless treasures. At the conclusion of peace **(84)** Delos came into the possession of the Romans, who later gave it back to Athens. Under the Empire the island lost its importance entirely.

Delos was one of the states to which Rome addressed letters in behalf of the Jews (138-137 BC; see 1 Macc 15:16-23). Among those who came to Delos from the East must have been many of this nation. Josephus cites in full a decree passed in Delos which confirmed the Jewish exemption from military service (Ant., XIV, x, 4).

The excavations of the French have laid bare 8 temples within the sacred enclosure (Apollo, Artemis, Dionysus). Numerous statues, dating from the earliest times of Greek art down to the latest, have been discovered; also 2,000 inscriptions, among which was an inventory of the temple treasure.

By the side of Delos, across a very narrow strait, lies Rheneia, another island which was the burying-ground of Delos; for on the sacred isle neither births, deaths nor burials were permitted. In 426 BC Delos was "purified" by the Athenians — by the removal of the bodies that had been interred there previously.

LITERATURE.

Lebegue, Recherches sur Delos (Paris, 1876); V. v. Schoffer, Deuteronomy Deli Insulae rebus, Berliner Studien fur klass. Phil. (Berlin, 1889); Homolle, S. Reinach and others, in the Bulletin de corresp. Hellen. (VI, 1-167; VII, 103-25, 329-73; VIII, 75-158; XIV, 389-511; XV, 113-68); Homolle, Archives de l'intendance sacree a Delos; Jebb, Journal of Hellenic Studies (1880), 7-62.

J. E. Harry

DELUGE, OF NOAH, THE

<del'-uj>

1. THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT:

The means described in Genesis 6 through 8 by which the Lord destroyed, on account of their wickedness, all the members of the human race except Noah and his family. According to the account, Noah was warned of the event 120 years before (Genesis 6:3; 1 Peter 3:20; 2 Peter 2:5). During all this time he is said to have been a "preacher of righteousness" "while the ark was a preparing," when we may well suppose (according to theory to be presently propounded) the physical events leading up to the final catastrophe may have given point to his preaching. When the catastrophe came, the physical means employed were twofold, namely, the breaking up of the "fountains of the great deep" and the opening of "the windows of heaven" (Genesis 7:11). But the rain is spoken of as continuing as a main cause only 40 days, while the waters continued to prevail for 150 days (Genesis 7:24), when (Genesis 8:2,3) "the fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained; and the waters returned from off the earth continually," so that after 10 months the ark rested upon "the mountains of Ararat" (not the peak of Mount Ararat, but the highlands of Armenia in the upper part of the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris; *see ARARAT*). Here it rested 40 days before the water subsided sufficiently to suggest disembarking, when a raven (which could easily find its food on the carcasses of the animals which had been destroyed) was sent forth, and did not return (Genesis 8:7); but a dove sent out at the same time found no rest and returned empty to the ark (Genesis 8:9). After 7 days, however, it was sent out again and returned with a fresh olive leaf (Genesis 8:11). After 7 days more the dove was sent forth again and did not return. After 56 days more of waiting Noah and his family departed from the ark.

2. "NOAH'S LOG BOOK":

The following are the leading points in the story which has been appropriately styled by Sir William Dawson "Noah's log book" (see Southeast Bishop's article in Biblical Sac. (1906), 510-17, and Joseph B. Davidson in the author's Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, 180-184).

It will thus be seen that there is no need of supposing any duplication and overlapping of accounts in the Biblical story. There is continual progress in the account from beginning to end, with only such repetitions for literary effect as we are familiar with in oriental writings. In ^{◁0065▷}Genesis 6:5 through 7:13 the wickedness of the world is assigned as the reason which prevailed in the Divine counsels for bringing about the contemplated catastrophe. While emphasizing the righteousness of Noah which led to his preservation, 6:13-21 contains the direction for the making of the ark and of the preparations to bring into it a certain number of animals. This preparation having been made, the order was given (7:1-4) for the embarkation which (7:5) was duly accomplished. We are then told that Noah and his family, and beasts both clean and unclean, were shut up in the ark during the prevalence of the water and its final subsidence. Altogether the account is most graphic and impressive (see W. H. Green, Unity of the Book of Genesis, 83 ff).

Compared with other traditions of the Deluge, the Biblical account appears in a most favorable light, while the general prevalence of such traditions strongly confirms the reality of the Biblical story.

3. THE EGYPTIAN TRADITION:

An Egyptian legend of the Deluge is referred to in Plato's Timaeus, where the gods are said to have purified the earth by a great flood of water from which only a few shepherds escaped by climbing to the summit of a high mountain. In the Egyptian documents themselves, however, we find only that Ra' the creator, on account of the insolence of man, proceeded to exterminate him by a deluge of blood which flowed up to Heliopolis, the home of the gods; but the heinousness of the deed so affected him that he repented and swore never more to destroy mankind.

4. THE INDIAN TRADITION:

In Indian mythology there is no reference to the Flood in the Rig Veda, but in the laws of Manu we are told that a fish said to Manu, "A deluge will sweep all creatures away ..... Build a vessel and worship me. When the waters rise enter the vessel and I will save thee ..... When the Deluge came, he had entered the vessel. .... Manu fastened the cable of the ship to the horn of the fish, by which means the latter made it pass over the mountains of the North. The fish said: `I have saved thee; fasten the vessel to a tree that the water may not sweep it away while thou art in the mountain; and in

proportion as the waters decrease, thou shalt descend.' Manu descended with the waters, and this is what is called the Descent of Manu on the mountains of the North. The Deluge had carried away all creatures, and Manu remained alone" (translated by Max Muller).

5. THE CHINESE TRADITION:

The Chinese tradition is embodied in sublime language in their book of Li-Ki: "And now the pillars of heaven were broken, the earth shook to its very foundation; the sun and the stars changed their motions; the earth fell to pieces, and the waters enclosed within its bosom burst forth with violence, and overflowed. Man having rebelled against heaven, the system of the universe was totally disordered, and the grand harmony of nature destroyed. All these evils arose from man's despising the supreme power of the universe. He fixed his looks upon terrestrial objects and loved them to excess, until gradually he became transformed into the objects which he loved, and celestial reason entirely abandoned him."

6. THE GREEK TRADITION:

The Greeks, according to Plutarch, had five different traditions of the Deluge, that of Deucalion being the most important. According to this, Prometheus warned his son Deucalion of the flood which Zeus had resolved to bring upon the earth by reason of its wickedness. Accordingly, Deucalion constructed an ark and took refuge in it, but with his vessel was stranded on Mount Parnassus in Thessaly, whereupon they disembarked and repopulated the earth by the fantastic process revealed to them by the goddess Themis of throwing stones about them, those which Deucalion threw becoming men and those which Pyrrha threw becoming women. Lucian's form of the legend, however, is less fantastic and more nearly in line with Semitic tradition. In the Greek legend as in the Semitic, a dove is sent forth which returns both a first and a second time, its feet being tinged with mud the second time, intimating the abatement of the flood. But neither Homer nor Hesiod have this tradition. Probably it was borrowed from the Semites or the Hindus.

7. THE BRITISH TRADITION:

In Britain there is a Druid legend that on account of the profligacy of mankind, the Supreme Being sent a flood upon the earth when "the waves of the sea lifted themselves on high round the border of Britain. The rain

poured down from heaven and the waters covered the earth." But the patriarch, distinguished for his integrity, had been shut up with a select company in a strong ship which bore them safely upon the summit of the waters (Editor Davies in his Mythology and Rites of British Druids). From these the world was again repopulated. There are various forms of this legend but they all agree in substance.

8. THE AMERICAN INDIAN TRADITIONS:

Among the American Indians traditions of the Deluge were found by travelers to be widely disseminated. Mr. Catlin says, "Among the 120 different tribes which I visited in North, South, and Central America, not a tribe exists that has not related to me distinct or vague traditions of such a calamity, in which one, or three, or eight persons were saved above the waters upon the top of a high mountain" (quoted by Wm. Restelle in Biblical Sac. (January, 1907), 157). While many, perhaps most, of these traditions bear the stamp of Christian influence through the early missionaries, the Mexican legend bears evident marks of originality. According to it the 4th age was one of water, when all men were turned into fishes except Tezpi and his wife Hochiquetzal and their children, who with many animals took refuge in a ship which sailed safely over the tumultuous waters which overwhelmed the earth. When the flood subsided the ship stranded on Mount Cohuacan, whereupon he sent forth a vulture which did not return, and then a humming bird which returned with some leaves in its beak. The Peruvian story differs from this in many particulars. According to it a single man and woman took refuge in a box and floated hundreds of miles from Cuzco to an unknown land where they made clay images of all races, and animated them.

The Moravian missionary Cranz, in his History of Greenland, says that "the first missionaries among the Greenlanders found a tolerably distinct tradition of the Deluge" to the effect that "the earth was once tilted over and all men were drowned" except one "who smote afterward upon the ground with a stick and thence came out a woman with whom he peopled the earth again." Moreover, the Greenlanders point to the remains of fishes and bones of a whale on high mountains where men never could have dwelt, as proof that the earth was once flooded. Among the North American Indians generally legends of the Deluge are so embellished that they become extremely fantastic, but in many of them there are peculiarities which point unquestionably to a common origin of extreme antiquity.

The unprejudiced reader cannot rise from the study of the subject without agreeing in general with Francois Lenormant, who writes: "As the case now stands, we do not hesitate to declare that, far from being a myth, the Biblical Deluge is a real and historical fact, having, to say the least, left its impress on the ancestors of three races — Aryan, or Indo-European, Semitic, or Syrio-Arabian, Chamitic, or Kushite — that is to say on the three great civilized races of the ancient world, those which constitute the higher humanity — before the ancestors of these races had as yet separated, and in the part of Asia together inhabited" (Contemporary Review, November, 1879).

9. THE BABYLONIAN TRADITION:

The most instructive of these traditions are those which have come down to us from Babylonia, which until recently were known to us only through the Greek historian Berosus of the 4th century BC, who narrates that a great deluge happened at some indefinite time in the past during the reign of Xisuthrus, son of Ardates. Xisuthrus was warned beforehand by the deity Cronos, and told to build a ship and take with him his friends and relations and all the different animals with all necessary food and trust himself fearlessly to the deep, whereupon he built "a vessel 5 stadia (3,000 ft.) long and 2 stadia (1,200 ft.) broad." After the flood subsided Xisuthrus, like Noah, sent out birds which returned to him again. After waiting some days and sending them out a second time, they returned with their feet tinged with mud. Upon the third trial they returned no more, whereupon they disembarked and Xisuthrus with his wife, daughter and pilot offered sacrifice to the gods and were translated to live with the gods. It was found that the place where they were was "the land of Armenia," but they were told to return to Babylon. Berosus concluded his account by saying that "the vessel being thus stranded in Armenia, some part of it yet remains in the Corcyrean mountains."

10. CUNEIFORM TABLETS:

An earlier and far more important tradition was found inscribed on cuneiform tablets in Babylonia dating from 3000 BC. These were discovered by George Smith in 1870 and filled as many as 180 lines. The human hero of the account, corresponding to Noah of the Bible and Xisuthrus of Berosus, is Gilgamesh, who lived is Shurippak, a city full of violence, on the banks of the Euphrates. He was warned of an approaching

flood and exhorted to pull down his house and build a ship and cause "seed of life of every sort to go up into it." The ship, he says, was to be "exact in its dimensions, equal in its breadth and its length. .... Its sides were 140 cubits high, the border of its top equaled 140 cubits. .... I constructed it in 6 stories, dividing it into 7 compartments. Its floors I divided into 9 chambers. .... I chose a mast (or rudder pole), and supplied what was necessary. Six sars of bitumen I poured over the outside; three sars of bitumen over the inside." After embarking, the storm broke with fearful violence and the steering of the ship was handed over to Bezur-Bel, the ship man. But amidst the roll of thunder and the march of mountain waves the helm was wrenched from the pilot's hands and the pouring rain and the lightning flashes dismayed all hearts. "Like a battle charge upon mankind" the water rushed so that the gods even were dismayed at the flood and cowered like dogs, taking refuge in the heaven of Anu while Ishtar screamed like a woman in travail, and repenting of her anger, resolved to save a few and "to give birth to my people" till like "the fry of fishes they fill the sea." The ship was therefore turned to the country of Nizir (Armenia).

It is worthy of notice that the cuneiform tablet exhibits as much variety of style as does the Biblical account. Plain narrative and rhetorical prose are intermingled in both accounts, a fact which effectually disposes of the critical theory which regards the Biblical account as a clumsy combination made in later times by piecing together two or more independent traditions. Evidently the piecing together, if there was any, had been accomplished early in Babylonian history.

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA.

On comparing the Biblical account with that of the cuneiform tablets, the following similarities and contrasts are brought to light:

(1) That the cuneiform inscription is from start to finish polytheistic (II. 3-17), whereas the narrative in Genesis is monotheistic.

(2) The cuneiform agrees with the Biblical narrative in making the Deluge a Divine punishment for the wickedness of the world (II. 5, 6).

(3) The names differ to a degree that is irreconcilable with our present knowledge.

(4) The dimensions of the ark as given in Genesis (6:15) are reasonable, while those of Berosus and the cuneiform tablets are unreasonable. According to Gen, the ark was 300 cubits (562 1/2 ft.) long, 50 cubits (93 2/3 ft.) wide, and 30 cubits (56 1/4 ft.) deep, which are the natural proportions for a ship of that size, being in fact very close to those of the great steamers which are now constructed to cross the Atlantic. The "Celtic" of the White Star line, built in 1901, is 700 ft. long, 75 ft. wide and 49 1/3 ft. deep. The dimensions of the "Great Eastern," built in 1858 (692 ft. long, 83 ft. broad, and 58 ft. deep), are still closer to those of the ark. The cuneiform tablets represent the length, width and depth each as 140 cubits (262 ft.) (II. 22, 23, 38-41), the dimensions of an entirely unseaworthy structure. According to Berosus, it was 5 stadia (3,000 ft.) and 2 stadia (1,200 ft.) broad; while Origen (Against Celsus, 4,41), represented it to be 135,000 ft. (25 miles) long, and 3,750 ft. (3/4 mile) wide.

(5) In the Biblical account, nothing is introduced conflicting with the sublime conception of holiness and the peculiar combination of justice and mercy ascribed to God throughout the Bible, and illustrated in the general scheme of providential government manifest in the order of Nature and in history; while, in the cuneiform tablets, the Deluge is occasioned by a quarrel among the gods, and the few survivors escape, not by reason of a merciful plan, but by a mistake which aroused the anger of Bel (II. 146-50).

(6) In all the accounts, the ark is represented as floating up stream. According to Gen, it was not, as is usually translated, on "Mount Ararat" (8:4), but in the "mountains of Ararat," designating an indefinite region in Armenia upon which the ark rested; according to the inscriptions, it was in Nizir (II. 115-20), a region which is watered by the Zab and the Tornadus; while, according to Berosus, it was on the Corcyrean Mountains, included in the same indefinite area. In all three cases, its resting-place is in the direction of the headwaters of the Euphrates valley, while the scene of the building is clearly laid in the lower part of the valley.

(7) Again, in the Biblical narrative, the spread of the water floating the ark is represented to have been occasioned, not so much by the rain which fell, as by the breaking-up of "all the fountains of the great deep" (Genesis 7:11), which very naturally describes phenomena connected with one of the extensive downward movements of the earth's crust with which geology

has made us familiar. The sinking of the land below the level of the ocean is equivalent, in its effects, to the rising of the water above it, and is accurately expressed by the phrases used in the sacred narrative. This appears, not only in the language concerning the breaking-up of the great deep which describes the coming-on of the Flood, but also in the description of its termination, in which it is said, that the "fountains also of the deep .... were stopped, ... and the waters returned from off the earth continually" (Genesis 8:2,3). Nothing is said of this in the other accounts.

(8) The cuneiform tablets agree in general with the two other accounts respecting the collecting of the animals for preservation, but differ from Genesis in not mentioning the sevens of clean animals and in including others beside the family of the builder (II. 66-69).

(9) The cuneiform inscription is peculiar in providing the structure with a mast, and putting it in charge of a pilot (II. 45, 70, 71).

(10) The accounts differ decidedly in the duration of the Flood. According to the ordinary interpretation of the Biblical account, the Deluge continued a year and 17 days; whereas, according to the cuneiform tablets, it lasted only 14 days (II. 103-7, 117-22).

(11) All accounts agree in sending out birds; but, according to Genesis (8:8) a raven was first sent out, and then in succession two doves (8:8-12); while the cuneiform inscription mentions the dove and the raven in reverse order from Gen, and adds a swallow (II. 121-30).

(12) All accounts agree in the building of an altar and offering a sacrifice after leaving the ark. But the cuneiform inscription is overlaid with a polytheistic coloring: "The gods like flies swarmed about the sacrifices" (II. 132-43).

(13) According to the Biblical account, Noah survived the Flood for a long time; whereas Nuhnapishtim and his wife were at once deified and taken to heaven (II. 177-80).

(14) Both accounts agree in saying that the human race is not again to be destroyed by a flood (Genesis 9:11; II. 162-69).

Close inspection of these peculiarities makes it evident that the narrative in Genesis carries upon its face an appearance of reality not found in the other accounts. It is scarcely possible that the reasonable dimensions of the ark,

its floating up stream, and the references to the breaking-up of the fountains of the great deep should have been hit upon by accident. It is in the highest degree improbable that correct statements of such unobvious facts should be due to the accident of legendary guesswork. At the same time, the duration of the Deluge, according to Genesis, affords opportunity for a gradual progress of events which best accords with scientific conceptions of geological movements. If, as the most probable interpretation would imply, the water began to recede after 150 days from the beginning of the Flood and fell 15 cubits in 74 days, that would only be 3 2/3 inches per day — a rate which would be imperceptible to an ordinary observer. Nor is it necessary to suppose that the entire flooded area was uncovered when Noah disembarked. The emergence of the land may have continued for an indefinite period, permitting the prevailing water to modify the climate of all western and central Asia for many centuries. Evidence that this was the case will be found in a later paragraph.

11. WAS THE FLOOD UNIVERSAL?:

In considering the credibility of the Biblical story we encounter at the outset the question whether the narrative compels us to believe the Flood to have been universal. In answer, it is sufficient to suggest that since the purpose of the judgment was the destruction of the human race, all the universality which it is necessary to infer from the language would be only such as was sufficient to accomplish that object. If man was at that time limited to the Euphrates valley, the submergence of that area would meet all the necessary conditions. Such a limitation is more easily accepted from the fact that general phrases like "Everybody knows," "The whole country was aroused," are never in literature literally interpreted. When it is said (⁰¹⁴⁵⁴Genesis 41:54-57) that the famine was "in all lands," and over "all the face of the earth," and that "all countries came into Egypt .... to buy grain," no one supposes that it is intended to imply that the irrigated plains of Babylonia, from which the patriarchs had emigrated, were suffering from drought like Palestine (For other examples of the familiar use of this hyperbole, see ⁰⁵⁰²⁵Deuteronomy 2:25; ¹⁸⁷⁰³Job 37:3; ⁴⁴⁰²⁵Acts 2:25; ⁴⁵¹⁰⁸Romans 1:8.)

As to the extent to which the human race was spread over the earth at the time of the Flood, two suppositions are possible. First, that of Hugh Miller (Testimony of the Rocks) that, owing to the shortness of the antediluvian chronology, and the violence and moral corruption of the people,

population had not spread beyond the boundary of western Asia. An insuperable objection to this theory is that the later discoveries have brought to light remains of prehistoric man from all over the northern hemisphere, showing that long before the time of the Flood he had become widely scattered.

Another theory, supported by much evidence, is that, in connection with the enormous physical changes in the earth's surface during the closing scenes of the Glacial epoch, man had perished from off the face of the earth except in the valley of the Euphrates, and that the Noachian Deluge is the final catastrophe in that series of destructive events (*see ANTEDILUVIANS*). The facts concerning the Glacial epoch naturally lead up to this conclusion. For during the entire epoch, and especially at its close, the conditions affecting the level of the land surfaces of the northern hemisphere were extremely abnormal, and continued so until some time after man had appeared on the earth.

The Glacial epoch followed upon, and probably was a consequence of, an extensive elevation of all the land surfaces of the northern hemisphere at the close of the Tertiary period. This elevation was certainly as much as 2,000 ft. over the northern part of the United States, and over Canada and Northern Europe. Snow accumulated over this high land until the ice formed by it was certainly a mile thick, and some of the best authorities say 2, or even 3 miles. The surface over which this was spread amounted to 2,000,000 square miles in Europe and 4,000,000 in North America. The total amount of the accumulation would therefore be 6,000,000 cubic miles at the lowest calculation, or twice or three times that amount if the largest estimates are accepted. (For detailed evidence see Wright, Ice Age in North America, 5th edition) But in either case the transference of so much weight from the ocean beds to the land surfaces of the northern hemisphere brings into the problem a physical force sufficient to produce incalculable effects. The weight of 6,000,000 cubic miles of ice would be twenty-four thousand million million (24,000,000,000,000,000) tons, which is equal to that of the entire North American continent above sea level. Furthermore this weight was first removed from the ocean beds, thus disturbing still more the balance of forces which secure the stability of the land. The geological evidence is abundant that in connection with the overloading of the land surfaces in the Northern Hemisphere, and probably by reason of it, the glaciated area and a considerable margin outside of it sank down until it was depressed far below the present level. The post-Glacial depression in

North America was certainly 600 ft. below sea level at Montreal, and several hundred feet lower further north. In Sweden the post-Glacial sea beaches show a depression of the land 1,000 ft. below the sea.

The evidences of a long-continued post-Glacial subsidence of the Aral-Caspian basin and much of the surrounding area is equally conclusive. At Trebizond, on the Black Sea, there is an extensive recent sea beach clinging to the precipitous volcanic mountain back of the city 750 ft. above the present water level. The gravel in this beach is so fresh as to compel a belief in its recent origin, while it certainly has been deposited by a body of water standing at that elevation after the rock erosion of the region had been almost entirely effected. The deposit is about 100 ft. thick, and extends along the precipitous face of the mountain for a half-mile or more. So extensive is it that it furnishes an attractive building place for a monastery. When the water was high enough to build up this shore line, it would cover all the plains of southern Russia, of Western Siberia and of the Aral-Caspian depression in Turkestan. Similar terraces of corresponding height are reported by competent authorities on the south shore of the Crimea and at Baku, on the Caspian Sea.

Further and most interesting evidence of this post-Glacial land depression is found in the existence of Arctic seal 2,000 miles from the Arctic Ocean in bodies of water as widely separated as the Caspian Sea, the Aral Sea and Lake Baikal. Lake Baikal is now 1,500 ft. above sea level. It is evident, therefore, that there must have been a recent depression of the whole area to admit the migration of this species to that distant locality. There are also clear indications of a smaller depression around the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, where there are abandoned sea beaches from 200 to 300 ft. above tide, which abound in species of shells identical with those now living nearby.

These are found in Egypt, in the valley of the Red Sea, and in the vicinity of Joppa and Beirut. During their formation Asia and Africa must have been separated by a wide stretch of water connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea. The effect of such lingering wide expanses of water upon the climate of Western Asia must have been profound, and would naturally provide those conditions which would favor the early development of the human race in Armenia (where even now at an elevation of 5,000 ft. the vine is indigenous), from which the second distribution of mankind is said to have taken place.

Furthermore there is indubitable evidence that the rainfall in central Asia was, at a comparatively recent time, immensely greater than it has been in the historic period, indicating that gradual passage from the conditions connected with the Deluge to those of the present time, at which we have hinted above. At the present time the evaporation over the Aral Sea is so great that two rivers (the ancient Oxus and the Jaxartes), coming down from the heights of central Asia, each with a volume as great as that of Niagara, do not suffice to cause an overflow into the Caspian Sea. But the existence of such an overflow during the prehistoric period is so plain that it has been proposed to utilize its channel (which is a mile wide and as distinctly marked as that of any living stream) for a canal.

Owing to the comparatively brief duration of the Noachian Deluge proper, we cannot expect to find many positive indications of its occurrence. Nevertheless, Professor Prestwich (than whom there has been no higher geological authority in England during the last century) adduces an array of facts relating to Western Europe and the Mediterranean basin which cannot be ignored (see Phil. Trans. of the Royal Soc. of London, CXXIV (1893), 903-84; Wright, Scientific Confirmation of the Old Testament History, 238-82). Among these evidences one of the most convincing is to be found in the cave of San Ciro at the base of the mountains surrounding the plain of Palermo in Sicily. In this cave there was found an immense mass of the bones of hippopotami of all ages down to the fetus, mingled with a few of the deer, ox and elephant. These were so fresh when discovered that they were cut into ornaments and polished and still retained a considerable amount of their nitrogenous matter. Twenty tons of these bones were shipped for commercial purposes in the first six months after their discovery. Evidently the animals furnishing these bones had taken refuge in this cave to escape the rising water which had driven them in from the surrounding plains and cooped them up in the amphitheater of mountains during a gradual depression of the land. Similar collections of bones are found in various ossiferous fissures, in England and Western Europe, notably in the Rock of Gibraltar and at Santenay, a few miles South of Chalons in central France, where there is an accumulation of bones in fissures 1,000 ft. above the sea, similar in many respects to that in the cave described at San Ciro, though the bones of hippopotami did not appear in these places; but the bones of wolves, bears, horses and oxen, none of which had been gnawed by carnivora, were indiscriminately commingled as though swept in by all-pervading currents of water. Still further evidence is

adduced in the deposits connected with what is called the rubble drift on both sides of the English Channel and on the Jersey Islands. Here in various localities, notably at Brighton, England, and near Calais, France, elephant bones and human implements occur beneath deep deposits of unassorted drift, which is not glacial nor the product of limited and local streams of water, but can be accounted for only by general waves of translation produced when the land was being reelevated from beneath the water by a series of such sudden earthquake shocks as cause the tidal waves which are often so destructive.

Thus, while we cannot appeal to geology for direct proof of the Noachian Deluge, recent geological discoveries do show that such a catastrophe is perfectly credible from a scientific point of view; and the supposition that there was a universal destruction of the human race, in the northern hemisphere at least, in connection with the floods accompanying the melting off of the glacial ice is supported by a great amount of evidence. There was certainly an extensive destruction of animal species associated with man during that period. In Europe the great Irish elk, the machairodus, the cave lion, the rhinoceros, the hippopotamus and the elephant disappeared with prehistoric man, amid the floods at the close of the Glacial epoch. In North America equally large felines, together with horses, tapirs, llamas, great mastodons and elephants and the huge megalonyx went to destruction in connection with the same floods that destroyed so large a part of the human race during the dramatic closing scenes of the period. It is, therefore, by no means difficult for an all-round geologist to believe in a final catastrophe such as is described in Gen. If we disbelieve in the Biblical Deluge it is not because we know too much geology, but too little.

George Frederick Wright

DELUSION

<de-lu'-zhun>:

(1) [26604]Isaiah 66:4, "I also will choose their delusions" (the Revised Version, margin "mockings"), Hebrew *ta`alulim*, which occurs only here and [23004]Isaiah 3:4 (where it is translated "babes," the Revised Version, margin "childishness"). Its meaning is somewhat ambiguous. The best translation seems to be "wantonness," "caprice." "Their wanton dealing, i.e. that inflicted on them" (BDB). Other translations suggested are

"insults" (Skinner), "freaks of fortune" (Cheyne), "follies" (Whitehouse). Septuagint has *empaigmata*, "mockings," Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) *illusiones*.

(2) ⁵³²¹²2 Thessalonians 2:11 the King James Version, "God shall send them strong delusion" (the Revised Version (British and American) "God sendeth them a working of error"), [πλάνη, *plane*], "a wandering," "a roaming about," in the New Testament "error" either of opinion or of conduct.

D. Miall Edwards

DEMAND

<de-mand'>: The peremptory, imperative sense is absent from this word in its occurrences in the King James Version, where it means no more than "ask," "inquire" (compare French, *demander*) one or the other of which the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes in ⁰¹⁰¹⁰⁷2 Samuel 11:7; ⁴⁰²⁰⁴Matthew 2:4; ⁴²⁰⁵¹⁴Luke 3:14; 17:20; ⁴⁴²¹³³Acts 21:33. the Revised Version (British and American) retains "demand" in ⁰²⁰⁵¹⁴Exodus 5:14; ¹⁸³⁸⁰³Job 38:3; 40:7; 42:4; ²⁷⁰²²⁷Daniel 2:27; and inserts it (the King James Version "require") in ¹⁶⁰⁵¹⁸Nehemiah 5:18.

DEMAS

<de'-mas> ([Δημᾶς, *Demas*], "popular"): According to ⁵¹⁰⁴¹⁴Colossians 4:14; ⁵⁵⁰⁴¹⁰2 Timothy 4:10; Philem 1:24, one who was for a time a "fellow-worker" with Paul at Rome (Col, Philem), but at last, "having loved this present world," forsook the apostle and betook himself to Thessalonica (2 Tim). No other particulars are given concerning him.

See APOSTASY; DEMETRIUS.

DEMETRIUS (1)

<de-me'-tri-us> ([Δημήτριος, *Demetrios*], "of" or "belonging to Demeter," an ordinary name in Greece):

(1) Demetrius I, surnamed [Σωτήρ, *Soter*] ("saviour"), was the son of Seleucus IV (Philopator). He was sent as a boy to Rome, by his father, to serve as a hostage, and remained there quietly during his father's life. He was detained also during the reign of his uncle, *ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES* (which see) from 175 to 164 BC; but when Antiochus died Demetrius, who

was now a young man of 23 (Polyb. xxxi.12), chafed at a longer detention, particularly as his cousin, Antiochus Eupator, a boy of 9, succeeded to the kingdom with Lysias as his guardian. The Roman Senate, however, refused to listen to his plea for the restoration to Syria, because, as Polybius says, they felt surer of their power over Syria with a mere boy as king.

In the meantime, a quarrel had arisen between Ptolemy Philometor and Euergetes Physkon (Livy Epit. 46; Diod. Sic. fr xi), and Gnaeus Octavius, who had been sent to quell the disorder, was assassinated in Syria, while plundering the country. Demetrius, taking advantage of the troubled condition of affairs, consulted with his friend Polybius as to the advisability of attempting to seize the throne of Syria (op. cit. xxxi. 19). The historian advised him not to stumble twice on the same stone, but to venture something worthy of a king, so after a second unsuccessful appeal to the Senate, Demetrius escaped to Tripolis, and from there advanced to Antioch where he was proclaimed king (162 BC). His first act was to put to death young Antiochus, his cousin, and his minister Lysias (Appian, Syriac., c. 47; Ant, XII, x, 1; 1 Macc 7:1-4; 2 Macc 14:1,2).

As soon as he was established in power, Demetrius made an attempt to placate the Romans by sending them valuable gifts as well as the assassin of Gn. Octavius (Polyb. xxi.23); and he then tried to secure the Hellenizing party by sending his friend *BACCHIDES* (which see) to make the wicked Alcimus high priest. After a violent struggle and much treachery on the part of Bacchides (Ant., XII, x, 2), the latter left the country, having charged all the people to obey Alcimus, who was protected by an army.

The Jews under Judas resented his presence, and Judas inflicted severe punishment on all who had gone over to Alcimus (1 Macc 7:24). Alcimus, in fear, sent a message for aid to Demetrius, who sent to his assistance Nicanor, the best disposed and most faithful of his friends, who had accompanied him in his flight from Rome (Ant., XII, x, 4). On his arrival in Judea, he attempted to win by guile, but Judas saw through his treachery, and Nicanor was forced to fight openly, suffering two signal defeats, the first at Capharsalama (1 Macc 7:31,32), and the second (in which Nicanor himself was killed), at Adasa (1 Macc 7:39 ff; 2 Macc 15:26 ff).

In a short while, however, Demetrius, hearing of the death of Nicanor, sent Bacchides and Alcimus into Judea again (1 Macc 9:1). Judas arose against them with an army of 3,000 men, but when these saw that 20,000 opposed

them, the greater part of them deserted, and Judas, with an army of 800, lost his life, like another Leonidas, on the field of battle (1 Macc 9:4,6,18). Then Bacchides took the wicked men and made them lords of the country (1 Macc 9:25); while Jonathan, who was appointed successor to Judas, fled with his friends (1 Macc 9:29 ff).

During the next seven years, Demetrius succeeded in alienating both the Romans (Polyb. xxxii.20) and his own people, and *ALEXANDER BALAS* (which see) was put forward as a claimant to the throne, his supporters maintaining that he was the son of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 10:1-21; Ant, XIII, ii, 1-3). Both Alexander and Demetrius made bids for the support of the Jews, the former offering the high-priesthood and the title of King's Friend (1 Macc 10:20), and the latter freedom from taxes, tributes and customs (1 Macc 10:28 ff). Alexander's bait proved more alluring, since the Jews "gave no credence" to the words of Demetrius, and with the aid of the Maccabees, he vied with Demetrius for the space of two years for the complete sovereignty of Syria. At the end of this time, a decisive battle took place, in which Demetrius was slain, and Alexander became king of Syria (150 BC) (1 Macc 10:48-50; Ant, XIII, ii, 4; Polyb. iii.5; see also *MACCABEES*).

(2) Demetrius II, surnamed [Νικάτωρ, *Nikator*] ("conqueror"), was the son of Demetrius Soter. When Balas was warring with Demetrius I, he sent his son to a place of safety in Crete. Three years after his father's death (147 BC), the unpopularity of Alexander gave the young man an opportunity to return and seize the government. He landed in Cilicia with Cretan mercenaries and secured the support of all Syria with the exception of Judea (1 Macc 10:67 ff). Apollonius, his general, the governor of Coele-Syria, who essayed the conquest of the Jews, was defeated at Azotus with great loss.

Ptolemy Philometor, whose daughter was the wife of Alexander Balas, now entered into the struggle, and taking Cleopatra, his daughter, from Alexander, he gave her to Demetrius (1 Macc 11:12). He then joined Demetrius' army and the combined forces inflicted a defeat on Balas (145 BC), and from this Demetrius received his surname *Nikator* (Ant., XIII, iv, 8; 1 Macc 11:14 ff).

Jonathan now concluded a favorable treaty with Demetrius, whereby three Samaritan provinces were added to Judea and the whole country was made

exempt from tax (1 Macc 11:20-37; Ant, XIII, iv, 9). Demetrius then dismissed his army except the foreigners, thinking himself safe with the loyalty of the Jews assured. In the meantime, Tryphon, one of Balas' generals, set up the son of Alexander, Antiochus, as a claimant to the throne, and secured the assistance of the discarded army of Demetrius. Jonathan's aid was sought and he quelled the rebellion, on condition that the Syrian garrison be removed from Jerusalem (1 Macc 11:41-52; Ant, XIII, v, 2-3).

The king, however, falsified all that he had said, and kept none of his promises, so the Jews, deserting him, took sides with Tryphon and supported the claims of the boy Antiochus (1 Macc 11:53-59; Ant, XIII, v, 5-11). Demetrius' generals then entered Syria but were defeated by Jonathan at Hazor (1 Macc 11:63-74), and by skillful generalship he made futile a second attempt at invasion (1 Macc 12:24 ff).

Tryphon, who was now master of Syria, broke faith with Jonathan (1 Macc 12:40) and essayed the conquest of Judea. Jonathan was killed by treachery, and Simon, his successor, made proposals of peace to Demetrius, who agreed to let bygones be bygones (1 Macc 13:36-40; Ant, XIII, vi, 7). Demetrius then left Simon to carry on the war, and set out to Parthia, ostensibly to secure the assistance of the king, Mithridates, against Tryphon (1 Macc 14:1). Here he was captured and imprisoned (14:3; Ant, XIII, v, 11; Josephus, however, puts this event in 140 rather than 138 BC).

After an imprisonment of ten years, he was released and resumed the sovereignty 128 BC, but becoming involved in a quarrel with Ptolemy Physkon, he was defeated in battle at Damascus. From this place, he fled to Tyre, where he was murdered in 125 BC, according to some, at the instigation of Cleopatra, his wife (Josephus, Ant, XIII, ix, 3).

(3) Demetrius III, [Εὔκαιρος, *Eukairos*] ("the fortunate"), was the son of Antiochus Grypus, and grandson of Demetrius Nikator. When his father died, civil war arose, in which his two elder brothers lost their lives, while Philip, the third brother, secured part of Syria as his domain. Demetrius then took up his abode in Coele-Syria with Damascus as his capital (Ant., XIII, xiii, 4; BJ, I, iv, 4).

War now broke out in Judea between Alexander Janneus and his Pharisee subjects, who invited Demetrius to aid them. Thinking this a good

opportunity to extend his realm, he joined the insurgent Jews and together they defeated Janneus near Shechem (Ant., XIII, xiv, 1; BJ, 1, iv, 5).

The Jews then deserted Demetrius, and he withdrew to Berea, which was in the possession of his brother Philip. Demetrius besieged him, and Philip summoned the Parthians to his assistance. The tables were turned, and Demetrius, besieged in his camp and starved into submission, was taken prisoner and sent to Arsaces, who held him captive until his death (Ant., XIII, xiv, 3). The dates of his reign are not certain.

Arthur J. Kinsella

DEMETRIUS (2)

<de-me'-tri-us> ([Δημήτριος, *Demetrios*], "belonging to Ceres"): The name of two persons:

(1) A Christian disciple praised by John (³⁰⁰¹²3 John 1:12).

(2) A silversmith of Ephesus who manufactured the little silver shrines of the goddess Diana to sell to the visiting pilgrims (⁴⁴⁹²³Acts 19:23 ff). Because the teachings of Paul were injuring the trade of the silversmiths, there arose a riot of which Demetrius was the chief. Upon an inscription which Mr. Wood discovered among the ruins of the city, there appeared the name Demetrius, a warden of the Ephesian temple for the year 57 AD, and some authors believe the temple warden to be identical with the ringleader of the rebellion. The name, however, has been most common among the Greeks of every age. Because of its frequent use it cannot be supposed that Demetrius, the disciple of ⁶⁰⁰¹²3 John 1:12, was the silversmith of Ephesus, nor that Demas of ⁵⁰⁴⁰2 Timothy 4:10, who bore the name in a contracted form, may be identified with him.

E. J. Banks

DEMON; DEMONIAC; DEMONOLOGY

<dem'-mon>, *<de-mo'-ni-ak>*, *<de-mon-ol'-o-ji>* ([Δαιμόνιον, *daimonion*], earlier form [δαίμων, *daimon*] = [πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, πονηρόν, *pneuma akatharton, poneron*], "demon," "unclean or evil spirit," incorrectly rendered "devil" in the King James Version):

I. DEFINITION.

The word *daimon* or *daimonion* seems originally to have had two closely related meanings; a deity, and a spirit, superhuman but not supernatural. In the former sense the term occurs in the Septuagint translation of ^{⟨05217⟩}Deuteronomy 32:17; ^{⟨19A657⟩}Psalm 106:37; ^{⟨44718⟩}Acts 17:18. The second of these meanings, which involves a general reference to vaguely conceived personal beings akin to men and yet belonging to the unseen realm, leads to the application of the term to the peculiar and restricted class of beings designated "demons" in the New Testament.

II. THE ORIGIN OF BIBLICAL DEMONOLOGY.

An interesting scheme of development has been suggested (by Baudissin and others) in which Biblical demonism is brought through polytheism into connection with primitive animism.

1. The Evolutionary Theory:

A simple criticism of this theory, which is now the ascendant, will serve fittingly to introduce what should be said specifically concerning Biblical demonology.

(1) Animism, which is one branch of that general primitive view of things which is designated as spiritism, is theory that all Nature is alive (see Ladd, Phil. Rel., I, 89 f) and that all natural processes are due to the operation of living wills.

(2) Polytheism is supposed to be the outcome of animism. The vaguely conceived spirits of the earlier conception are advanced to the position of deities with names, fixed characters and specific functions, organized into a pantheon.

(3) Biblical demonology is supposed to be due to the solvent of monotheism upon contemporary polytheism. The Hebrews were brought into contact with surrounding nations, especially during the Persian, Babylonian and Greek periods, and monotheism made room for heathenism by reducing its deities to the dimension of demons. They are not denied all objective reality, but are denied the dignity and prerogatives of deity.

2. Objections to the Theory:

The objections to this ingenious theory are too many and too serious to be overcome.

(1) The genetic connection between animism and polytheism is not clear. In fact, the specific religious character of animism is altogether problematical. It belongs to the category of primitive philosophy rather than of religion. It is difficult to trace the process by which spirits unnamed and with characteristics of the vaguest become deities — especially is it difficult to understand how certain spirits only are advanced to the standing of deities. More serious still, polytheism and animism have coexisted without close combination or real assimilation (see Sayce, Babylonia and Assyria, 232; Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 75 f) for a long course of history. It looks as if animism and polytheism had a different raison d'etre, origin and development. It is, at least, unsafe to construct a theory on the basis of so insecure a connection.

(2) The interpretation of heathen deities as demons by no means indicates that polytheism is the source of Biblical demonology. On general principles, it seems far more likely that the category of demons was already familiar, and that connection with polytheism brought about an extension of its application. A glance at the Old Testament will show how comparatively slight and unimportant has been the bearing of heathen polytheism upon Biblical thought. The demonology of the Old Testament is confined to the following passages: ^{⟨B1621⟩}Leviticus 16:21,22; 17:7; ^{⟨23I32I⟩}Isaiah 13:21; 34:13; ^{⟨D5217⟩}Deuteronomy 32:17; ^{⟨19A637⟩}Psalm 106:37 (elsewhere commented upon; *see COMMUNION WITH DEMONS*). Gesenius well says of ^{⟨B1621⟩}Leviticus 16:21 that it is "vexed with the numerous conjectures of interpreters." If the prevalent modern view is accepted we find in it an actual meeting-point of popular superstition and the religion of Yahweh (*see AZAZEL*). According to Driver (HDB, I, 207), this item in the Levitical ritual "was intended as a symbolical declaration that the land and the people are now purged from guilt, their sins being handed over to the evil spirit to whom they are held to belong, and whose home is in the desolate wilderness remote from human habitations (verse 22, into a land cut off)." A more striking instance could scarcely be sought of the way in which the religion of Yahweh kept the popular spiritism at a safe distance. ^{⟨B1707⟩}Leviticus 17:7 (*see COMMUNION WITH DEMONS*) refers to

participation in the rites of heathen worship. The two passages — ²³¹³Isaiah 13:20,21; 34:13,14 — are poetical and really imply nothing as to the writer's own belief. Creatures both seen and unseen supposed to inhabit places deserted of man are used, as any poet might use them, to furnish the details for a vivid word-picture of uninhabited solitude. There is no direct evidence that the narrative of the Fall (⁰¹⁰¹Genesis 3:1-19) has any connection with demonology (see HDB, I, 590 note), and the suggestion of Whitehouse that the mention of satyrs and night-monsters of current mythology with such creatures as jackals, etc., implies "that demons were held to reside more or less in all these animal denizens of the ruined solitude" is clearly fanciful. It is almost startling to find that all that can possibly be affirmed of demonology in the Old Testament is confined to a small group of passages which are either legal or poetical and which all furnish examples of the inhibiting power of high religious conceptions upon the minds of a naturally superstitious and imaginative people. Even if we add all the passages in which a real existence seems to be granted to heathen deities (e.g. ⁰²¹²Numbers 21:29; ²³⁹⁰Isaiah 19:1, etc.) and interpret them in the extreme sense, we are still compelled to affirm that evidence is lacking to prove the influence of polytheism in the formation of the Biblical doctrine of demons.

(3) This theory breaks down in another still more vital particular. The demonology of the Bible is not of kin either with primitive animism or popular Sere demonism. In what follows we shall address ourselves to New Testament demonology — that of the Old Testament being a negligible quantity.

III. NEW TESTAMENT DEMONOLOGY.

The most marked and significant fact of New Testament demonology is that it provides no materials for a discussion of the nature and characteristics of demons. Whitehouse says (HDB, I, 593) that New Testament demonology "is in all its broad characteristics the demonology of the contemporary Judaism stripped of its cruder and exaggerated features." How much short of the whole truth this statement comes will appear later, but as it stands it defines the specific direction of inquiry into the New Testament treatment of demons; namely, to explain its freedom from the crude and exaggerated features of popular demonism. The presence among New Testament writers of an influence curbing curiosity and restraining the imagination is of all things the most important for us to

discover and emphasize. In four of its most vital features the New Testament attitude on this subject differs from all popular conceptions:

(a) in the absence of all imaginative details concerning demons;

(b) in the emphasis placed upon the moral character of demons and their connection with the ethical disorders of the human race;

(c) in the absence of confidence in magical methods of any kind in dealing with demons;

(d) in its intense restrictions of the sphere of demoniacal operations.

A brief treatment under each of these heads will serve to present an ordered statement of the most important facts.

(a) In the New Testament we are told practically nothing about the origin, nature, characteristics or habits of demons. In a highly figurative passage (Matthew 12:43) our Lord speaks of demons as passing through "waterless places," and in the story of the Gadarene demoniac (Luke 8:31) the "abyss" is mentioned as the place of their ultimate detention. The method of their control over human beings is represented in two contrasted ways (compare Mark 1:23 ff; Luke 4:33 ff), indicating that there was no fixed mode of regarding it. With these three scant items our direct information ceases. We are compelled to infer from the effects given in the limited number of specific instances narrated. And it is worthy of more than passing mention that no theoretical discussion of demons occurs. The center of interest in the Gospels is the person of Jesus, the sufferers and the cures. Interest in the demons as such is absent. Certain passages seem to indicate that the demons were able to speak (see Mark 1:24,26,34; Luke 4:41, etc.), but comparing these statements with others (compare Mark 1:23; Luke 8:28) it is seen that no distinction is drawn between the cries of the tormented in the paroxysms of their complaint and the cries attributed to the demons themselves. In other particulars the representation is consistent. The demons belong to the unseen world, they are incapable of manifestation except in in the disorders which they cause — there are no materializations, no grotesque narratives of appearances and disappearances, no morbid dealing with repulsive details, no license of speculation in the narratives. In contrast with this reticence is not

merely the demonology of primitive people, but also that of the non-canonical Jewish books. In the Book of Enoch demons are said to be fallen angels, while Josephus holds that they are the spirits of the wicked dead. In the rabbinical writings speculation has run riot in discussing the origin, nature and habits of demons. They are represented as the offspring of Adam and Eve in conjunction with male and female spirits, as being themselves sexed and capable of reproduction as well as performing all other physical functions. Details are given of their numbers, haunts and habits, of times and places where they are especially dangerous, and of ways and methods of breaking their power (*see EXORCISM*). Full sweep is also given to the imagination in descriptive narratives, oftentimes of the most morbid and unwholesome character, of their doings among men. After reading some of these narratives one can agree with Edersheim when he says, "Greater contrast could scarcely be conceived than between what we read in the New Testament and the views and practices mentioned in Rabbinic writings" (LTJM, II, 776).

(b) It is also clearly to be noted that while in its original application the term daimonion is morally indifferent, in New Testament usage the demon is invariably an ethically evil being. This differentiates the New Testament treatment from extra-canonical Jewish writings. In the New Testament demons belong to the kingdom of Satan whose power it is the mission of Christ to destroy. It deepens and intensifies its representations of the earnestness of human life and its moral issues by extending the sphere of moral struggle to the invisible world. It clearly teaches that the power of Christ extends to the world of evil spirits and that faith in Him is adequate protection against any evils to which men may be exposed. (For significance of this point see Plummer, Luke (ICC), 132-33.)

(c) The New Testament demonology differs from all others by its negation of the power of magic rites to deliver from the affliction. Magic which is clearly separable from religion at that specific point (see Gwatkin, Knowledge of God, I, 249) rests upon and is dependent upon spiritism. The ancient Babylonian incantation texts, forming a surprisingly large proportion of the extant documents, are addressed directly to the supposed activities and powers of demons. These beings, who are not trusted and prayed to in the sense in which deities are,

command confidence and call forth prayer, are dealt with by magic rites and formulas (see Rogers, op. cit., 144). Even the Jewish non-canonical writings contain numerous forms of words and ceremonies for the expulsion of demons. In the New Testament there is no magic. The deliverance from a demon is a spiritual and ethical process (*see EXORCISM*).

(d) In the New Testament the range of activities attributed to demons is greatly restricted. According to Babylonian ideas: "These demons were everywhere; they lurked in every corner, watching for their prey. The city streets knew their malevolent presence, the rivers, the seas, the tops of mountains; they appeared sometimes as serpents gliding noiselessly upon their victims, as birds horrid of mien flying resistlessly to destroy or afflict, as beings in human forms, grotesque, malformed, awe-inspiring through their hideousness. To these demons all sorts of misfortune were ascribed — a toothache; a headache, a broken bone, a raging fever, an outburst of anger, of jealousy, of incomprehensible disease" (Rogers, op. cit., 145). In the extra-canonical Jewish sources the same exuberance of fancy appears in attributing all kinds of ills of mind and body to innumerable, swarming hosts of demons lying in wait for men and besieging them with attacks and ills of all descriptions. Of this affluence of morbid fancy there is no hint in the New Testament. A careful analysis of the instances will show the importance of this fact. There are, taking repetitions and all, about 80 references to demons in the New Testament. In 11 instances the distinction between demon-possession and diseases ordinarily caused is clearly made (Matthew 4:24; 8:16; 10:8; Mark 1:32,34; 6:13; 16:17,18; Luke 4:40,41; 9:1; 13:32; Acts 19:12). The results of demon-possession are not exclusively mental or nervous (Matthew 9:32,33; 12:22). They are distinctly and peculiarly mental in two instances only (Gadarene maniac, Matthew 8:28 and parallels, and Acts 19:13 f). Epilepsy is specified in one case only (Matthew 17:15). There is distinction made between demonized and epileptic, and demonized and lunatic (Matthew 4:24). There is distinction made between diseases caused by demons and the same disease not so caused (compare Matthew 12:22; 15:30). In most of the instances no specific symptoms are mentioned. In an equally large proportion, however, there are occasional fits of mental excitement often due to the presence and teaching of Christ.

CONCLUSIONS:

A summary of the entire material leads to the conclusion that, in the New Testament cases of demon-possession, we have a specific type of disturbance, physical or mental, distinguishable not so much by its symptoms which were often of the most general character, as by its accompaniments. The aura, so to say, which surrounded the patient, served to distinguish his symptoms and to point out the special cause to which his suffering was attributed. Another unique feature of New Testament demonology should be emphasized. While this group of disorders is attributed to demons, the victims are treated as sick folk and are healed. The whole atmosphere surrounding the narrative of these incidents is calm, lofty and pervaded with the spirit of Christ. When one remembers the manifold cruelties inspired by the unreasoning fear of demons, which make the annals of savage medicine a nightmare of unimaginable horrors, we cannot but feel the worldwide difference between the Biblical narratives and all others, both of ancient and modern times, with which we are acquainted. Every feature of the New Testament narratives points to the conclusion that in them we have trustworthy reports of actual cures. This is more important for New Testament faith than any other conclusion could possibly be.

It is also evident that Jesus treated these cases of invaded personality, of bondage of depression, of helpless fear, as due to a real superhuman cause, to meet and overcome which He addressed Himself. The most distinctive and important words we have upon this obscure and difficult subject, upon which we know far too little to speak with any assurance or authority, are these: "This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer" (Mark 9:29).

LITERATURE.

(1) The most accessible statement of Baudissin's theory is in Whitehouse's article "Demons," etc., in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes).

(2) For extra-canonical Jewish ideas use Lange, Apocrypha, 118, 134; Edersheim, LTJM, Appendices XIII, XVI.

(3) For spirit-lore in general see Ladd, Phil. Rel., index under the word, and standard books on Anthropology and Philosophy of Religion under Spiritism.

(4) For Babylonian demonology see summary in Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 144 ff.

Louis Matthews Sweet

DEMOPHON

<*dem'-o-fon*> ([Δημοφῶν, *Demophon*]): A Syrian general in Palestine under Antiochus V (Eupator) who continued to harass the Jews after covenants had been made between Lysias and Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 12:2).

DEN

([ˆ/[m; *ma`on*], [hn/[m, *me`onah*], "habitation"; [hr[m, *me`arah*], and [σπήλαιον, *spelaion*], "cave"; [hrWam, *me'urah*] (Isaiah 11:8), "a light-hole," from [r/a, *'or*], "light," perhaps for *me`arah*; [Ës, *cokh*] (Psalm 10:9 the King James Version), and [hKsu, *cukkah*] (Job 38:40), "a covert," elsewhere "booth"; [bra, *'erebh*] (Job 37:8), "covert," as in the Revised Version (British and American); [bGO, *gobh*]; compare Arabic jubb, "pit" (Daniel 6:7); [t/rhnm, *minharoth*], "fissure" or "cleft" (Judges 6:2)): In the limestone mountains of Palestine caves, large and small, are abundant, the calcium carbonate, of which the rock is mainly composed, being dissolved by the water as it trickles over them or through their crevices. Even on the plains, by a similar process, pits or "lime sinks" are formed, which are sometimes used by the Arabs for storing straw or grain. Of this sort may have been the pit, bor, into which Joseph was cast by his brethren (Genesis 37:20). Caves and crevices and sometimes spaces among piled-up boulders at the foot of a cliff or in a stream bed are used as dens by jackals, wolves and other wild animals. Even the people, for longer or shorter periods, have lived as troglodytes. Compare Judges 6:2: "Because of Midian the children of Israel made them the dens (*minharoth*) which are in the mountains, and the caves (*me`arah*), and the strongholds (*metsadh*)." The precipitous sides of the valleys contain many caves converted by a little labor into human habitations. Notable instances are the valley of the Kidron near *Mar-Saba*,

and *Wadi-ul-Chamam* near the Sea of Tiberias.

See *CAVE.*

Alfred Ely Day

DENARIUS

<de-na'-ri-us> ([δηνάριον, *denarion*]): A Roman silver coin, 25 of which went to the aureus, the standard gold coin of the empire in the time of Augustus, which was equal in value to about one guinea or $5,25; more exactly œ1.0,6 = $5.00, the œ = $4,866. Hence, the value of the denarius would be about 20 cents and this was the ordinary wage of a soldier and a day laborer. The word is uniformly rendered "penny" in the King James Version and "shilling" in the American Standard Revised Version, except in [41219]Matthew 22:19; [41215]Mark 12:15 and [42024]Luke 20:24, where the Latin word is used, since in these passsages it refers to the coin in which tribute was paid to the Roman government.

See *MONEY.*

H. Porter

DENOUNCE

<de-nouns'>: Occurs in [05018]Deuteronomy 30:18: "I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish." It is used here in the obsolete sense of "to declare," to make known in a solemn manner. It is not found in the Bible with the regular meaning of "to censure," "arraign," etc.

DENY

<de-ni'>: This word is characteristic of the New Testament rather than the Old Testament, although it translates three different Hebrew originals, namely, [vj ″ K; *kachash*], "to lie," "disown" ([01815]Genesis 18:15; [06247]Joshua 24:27; [18088]Job 8:18; 31:28; [20009]Proverbs 30:9); [[n″ m; *mana`*], "to withhold," "keep back" ([11207]1 Kings 20:7; [20007]Proverbs 30:7); [bWv, *shubh*], "to turn back," "say no" ([11016]1 Kings 2:16).
In the New Testament, [ἀντιλέγω, *antilego*], is once translated "deny," in the case of the Sadducees who denied the resurrection ([42027]Luke 20:27 the King James Version), and where it carries the sense of speaking against the doctrine. But the word commonly is [ἀρνέομαι, *arneomai*], with or without the prefix *ap-*. In the absence of the prefix the sense is "to

disown," but when it is added it means "to disown totally" or to the fullest extent. In the milder sense it is found in ⁽⁴⁰¹⁶³⁾Matthew 10:33; 26:70,72; of Simon Peter, ⁽⁴¹⁴⁶⁸⁾Mark 14:68,70 (⁽⁴⁴⁸¹³⁾Acts 3:13,14; ⁽⁵⁵²¹²⁾2 Timothy 2:12,13; ⁽⁶¹⁰⁰¹⁾2 Peter 2:1; ⁽⁶²²²²⁾1 John 2:22,23; ⁽⁶⁵⁰⁰⁴⁾Jude 1:4; ⁽⁶⁶²¹³⁾Revelation 2:13; 3:8). But it is significant that the sterner meaning is associated with ⁽⁴⁰¹⁶²⁴⁾Matthew 16:24 and its parallels, where Christ calls upon him who would be His disciple to deny himself and take up his cross and follow Him.

See also PETER, SIMON.

James M. Gray

DEPOSIT

<de-poz'-it> ([παραθήκη, *paratheke*], ⁽⁵⁴⁰⁶⁰⁾1 Timothy 6:20; ⁽⁵⁵⁰¹²⁾2 Timothy 1:12,14 the Revised Version, margin, paraphrased in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) into "that which is committed" (*see COMMEND*)): The noun was used in the classical Greek, just as its English equivalents, for "that which is placed with another for safe keeping," a charge committed to another's hands, consisting often of money or property; compare ⁽⁰²²⁰⁷⁾Exodus 22:7; ⁽⁰³⁰⁶²⁾Leviticus 6:2. This practice was common in days when there were no banks.

(1) In ⁽⁵⁴⁰⁶⁰⁾1 Timothy 6:20; also ⁽⁵⁵⁰¹⁴⁾2 Timothy 1:14, the reference is to a deposit which God makes with man, and for which man is to give a reckoning. The context shows that this deposit is the Christian faith, "the pattern of sound words" (⁽⁵⁵⁰¹³⁾2 Timothy 1:13), that which is contrasted with the "oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called" (⁽⁵⁴⁰⁶⁰⁾1 Timothy 6:20). "Keep the talent of the Christian faith safe and undiminished" (Vincentius Lirenensis).

(2) In ⁽⁵⁵⁰¹²⁾2 Timothy 1:12, the deposit is one which man makes with God. The key to the meaning of this expression is found probably in ⁽¹⁹³¹⁰⁵⁾Psalm 31:5: "Into thy hand I commend my spirit: Thou hast redeemed me," i.e. "All that I am, with all my interests, have been entrusted to Thy safe keeping, and, therefore, I have no anxieties with respect to the future. The day of reckoning, `that day,' will show how faithful are the hands that hold this trust."

H. E. Jacobs

DEPTH

See ABYSS.

DEPUTY

<dep'-u-ti>: This is the correct rendering of [bXni *nitsabh*] (�<1247>1 Kings 22:47). In Est 8:9 and 9:3 the term improperly represents [ˆgS; *caghan*], in the King James Version, and is corrected to "governor" in the Revised Version (British and American). In the New Testament "deputy" represents [ἀνθύπατος, *anthupatos*] (�<4137>Acts 13:7,8,12; 18:12; 19:38), which the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "proconsul" (which see). The Roman proconsuls were officers invested with consular power over a district outside the city, usually for one year. Originally they were retiring consuls, but after Augustus the title was given to governors of senatorial provinces, whether they had held the office of consul or not. The proconsul exercised judicial as well as military power in his province, and his authority was absolute, except as he might be held accountable at the expiration of his office.

See GOVERNMENT.

William Arthur Heidel

DERBE

<dur'-be> ([Δέρβη, *Derbe*], �<4140>Acts 14:20,21; 16:1; [Δερβαῖος, *Derbaios*], 20:4; [Δερβήτης, *Derbetes*], Strabo, Cicero): A city in the extreme Southeast corner of the Lycaonian plain is mentioned twice as having been visited by Paul (on his first and second missionary journeys respectively), and it may now be regarded as highly probable that he passed through it on his third journey (to the churches of Galatia). The view that these churches were in South Galatia is now accepted by the majority of English and American scholars, and a traveler passing through the Cilician Gates to Southern Galatia must have traversed the territory of Derbe.

1. HISTORY:

Derbe is first mentioned as the seat of Antipater, who entertained Cicero, the Roman orator and governor of Cilicia. When the kingdom of Amyntas passed, at his death in 25 BC, to the Romans, it was made into a province and called Galatia (*see GALATIA*). This province included Laranda as well as Derbe on the extreme. Southeast, and for a time Laranda was the frontier city looking toward Cappadocia and Cilicia and Syria via the Cilician Gates. But between 37 and 41 AD Laranda was transferred to the "protected" kingdom of Antiochus, and Derbe became the frontier city. It

was the last city on distinctively Roman territory, on the road leading from Southern Galatia to the East; it was here that commerce entering the province had to pay the customs dues. Strabo records this fact when he calls Derbe a limen or "customs station." It owed its importance (and consequently its visit from Paul on his first journey) to this fact, and to its position on a great Roman road leading from Antioch, the capital of Southern Galatia, to Iconium, Laranda, Heracleia-Cybistra, and the Cilician Gates. Roman milestones have been found along the line of this road, one at a point 15 miles Northwest of Derbe. It was one of those Lycaonian cities honored with the title "Claudian" by the emperor Claudius; its coins bear the legend "Claudio-Derbe." This implied considerable importance and prosperity as well as strong pro-Roman feeling; yet we do not find Derbe standing aloof, like the Roman colonies Iconium and Lystra, from the Common Council of Lycaonian cities (*Koinon Lykaonias*).

Derbe remained in the province Galatia till about 135 AD, when it passed to the jurisdiction of the triple province Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia. It continued in this division till 295 AD, and was then included in the newly formed province Isauria. This arrangement lasted till about 372 AD, when Lycaonia, including Derbe, was formed into a separate province. The statement of Stephanus of Byzantium that Derbe was "a fortress of Isauria" originated in the arrangement which existed from 295 to 372 AD. Coins of the city represent Heracles, Fortuna and a winged Victory writing on a shield (after the pattern of the Venus of Melos, in the Louvre, Paris). Derbe is mentioned several times in the records of the church councils. A bishop, Daphnus of Derbe, was present at the Council of Constantinople in 381.

2. SITUATION:

The site of Derbe was approximately fixed by the American explorer Sterrett, and more accurately by Sir W. M. Ramsay, who, after carefully examining all the ruins in the neighborhood, placed it at Gudelisin. Up to 1911, certain epigraphic evidence fixing the site had not been found, but Ramsay's identification meets all the conditions, and cannot be far wrong. On the East, Derbe was conterminous with Laranda, on the Northeast with Barata in the Kara Dagh. It bordered on the territory of Iconium on the Northwest, and on Isauria on the West. Its territory touched the foothills of Taurus on the South, and the site commands a fine view of the great mountain called Hadji Baba or the Pilgrim Father. The Greeks of the

district say that the name is a reminiscence of Paul, "over whose travels" the mountain "stood as a silent witness."

The remains are mostly of the late Roman and Byzantine periods, but pottery of an earlier date has been found on the site. An inscription of a village on the territory of Derbe records the erection of a building by two architects from Lystra. A line of boundary stones, separating the territory of Derbe from that of Barata, is still standing. It probably belongs to an early delimitation of the territory of the frontier town of Galatia (Ramsay).

3. PAUL AT DERBE:

In ⁽⁴⁴⁴⁰⁾Acts 14:20,21, it is narrated that Paul and Barnabas, after being driven out of Lystra, departed to Derbe, where they "preached the gospel .... and made many disciples." But they did not further. Paul's mission included only the centers of Greco-Roman civilization; it was no part of his plan to pass over the frontier of the province into non-Roman territory. This aspect of his purpose is illustrated by the reference to Derbe on his second journey (⁽⁴⁴⁶⁰⁾Acts 16:1). Paul started from Antioch and "went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (15:41). "Then he came to Derbe and Lystra" (16:1 the King James Version). The unwarned reader might forget that in going from Cilicia to Derbe, Paul must have, passed through a considerable part of Antiochus' territory, and visited the important cities of Heracleia-Cybistra and Laranda. But his work ends with the Roman Cilicia and begins again with the Roman Galatia; to him, the intervening country is a blank. Concentration of effort, and utilization only of the most fully prepared material were the characteristics of Paul's missionary journeys in Asia Minor. That Paul was successful in Derbe may be gathered (as Ramsay points out) from the fact that he does not mention Derbe among the places where he had suffered persecution (⁽⁵⁵⁸¹¹⁾2 Timothy 3:11). Gaius of Derbe (among others) accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, in charge of the donations of the churches to the poor in that city (⁽⁴²⁰⁰⁴⁾Acts 20:4).

LITERATURE.

The only complete account of Derbe is that given in Sir W. M. Ramsay's Cities of Paul, 385-404. On Paul's mission there, see the same author's Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen, 119, 178. Many inscriptions of the later Roman period are collected in Sterrett, Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor, Numbers 18-52. The principal ancient authorities, besides Acts, are

Cicero Ad Fam. xiii.73; Strabo xxx.569; Ptolemeus, v.6, 17; Steph. Byz., Hierocl., 675; Notit, Episcop., I, 404, and the Acta Conciliorum.

W. M. Calder

DERISION

<de-rizh'-un>: Three verbs are so translated [6ሠ , *luts*], "scorn" (Psalm 119:51); [g[; *la`agh*], "mock" (Psalm 2:4; 59:8; Ezekiel 23:32); and [qj ″ c; *sachaq*], "laugh at" (Job 30:1; Exodus 32:25 margin, "a whispering"; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 5:3). This word is found almost exclusively in the Psalms and Prophets; Jeremiah is fond of it. It is used both as a substantive and a verb, the latter in the phrase "to have in derision:"

DESCEND; DESCENT

<de-send'>, *<de-sent'>* ([dr ″ y; *yaradh*]; [καταβαίνω, *katabaino*], "go down"); ([κατάβασις, *katabasis*]): Of Yahweh (Exodus 34:5); of the Spirit (Matthew 3:16); of angels (Genesis 28:12; Matthew 28:2; John 1:51); of Christ (1 Thessalonians 4:16; Ephesians 4:9). "He also descended into the lower parts of the earth" is variously interpreted, the two chief interpretations being the one of the incarnation, and the other of the "descent into hell" (1 Peter 3:19). The former regards the clause "of the earth," an appositive genitive, as when we speak of "the city of Rome," namely, "the lower parts, i.e. the earth." The other regards the genitive as possessive, or, with Meyer, as governed by the comparative, i.e. "parts lower than the earth." For the former view, see full discussion in Eadie; for the latter, Ellicott and especially Meyer, in commentaries on Eph.

H. E. Jacobs

DESCENT, OF JESUS

<de-sent'>.

See *APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.*

DESCRIBE

<de-skrib'>: This verb, now obsolete, in the sense used in Joshua 18:4,6,8,9 and Judges 8:14, is a translation of [bt ″ K; *kathabh*],

usually rendered "to write" or "inscribe." But in the above passages it has the Old English meaning of dividing into parts or into lots, as for example: "Walk through the land, and describe it according to their inheritance" (⟨0680⟩Joshua 18:4); that is, describe in writing the location and size of the several parcels of land thus portioned out. In ⟨07084⟩Judges 8:14 "described" should be translated "wrote down a list of." "Describe" occurs twice in the King James Version of the New Testament (⟨5046⟩Romans 4:6 and 10:5), where [λέγω, *lego*], and [γράφω, *grapho*], are both rendered "describeth." the Revised Version (British and American) corrects both, and substitutes "pronounceth" in the first and "writeth" in the second passage.

Description = "list" (1 Esdras 5:39).

W. W. Davies

DESCRY

<*de-skri'*>: This word like "describe" came into the English through the French descrire (Latin, describere); it occurs only in the King James Version of ⟨07023⟩Judges 1:23: "And the house of Joseph sent to Bethel." [rWT, *tur*] the verb thus translated, signifies "to explore" or "examine," and the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "sent to spy out."

DESERT

<*dez'-ert*> [rBdmi, *midhbar*], [hBr]; *chorbah*], [ˆ/mvy] *yeshimon*], [hbr{} `arabhah], [hYxi, *tsiyah*], [WhTo, *tohu*]; [ἔρημος, *eremos*], [ἐρημία, *eremia*]): *Midhbar*, the commonest word for "desert," more often rendered "wilderness," is perhaps from the root *dabhar*, in the sense of "to drive," i.e. a place for driving or pasturing flocks. *Yeshimon* is from yasham, "to be empty", *chorbah* (compare Arabic kharib, "to lie waste"; khirbah, "a ruin"; kharab, "devastation"), from *charabh* "to be dry"; compare also `arabh, "to be dry," and `arabhah, "a desert" or "the Arabah" (*see CHAMPAIGN*). For *'erets tsiyah* (⟨19501⟩Psalm 63:1; ⟨23418⟩Isaiah 41:18), "a dry land," compare *tsiyim*, "wild beasts of the desert" (⟨23321⟩Isaiah 13:21, etc.). *Tohu*, variously rendered "without form" (⟨01002⟩Genesis 1:2 the King James Version), "empty space," the King James Version "empty place" (⟨18267⟩Job 26:7), "waste," the King James Version "nothing" (⟨18618⟩Job 6:18), "confusion," the Revised Version, margin, "wasteness" (⟨23240⟩Isaiah

24:10 the English Revised Version), may be compared with Arabic tah, "to go astray" at-Tih, "the desert of the wandering." In the New Testament we find *eremos* and *eremia*: "The child (John) .... was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (⟨4080⟩Luke 1:80); "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert" (⟨4061⟩John 6:31 the King James Version).

The desert as known to the Israelites was not a waste of sand, as those are apt to imagine who have in mind the pictures of the Sahara. Great expanses of sand, it is true, are found in Arabia, but the nearest one, an-Nufud, was several days' journey distant from the farthest southeast reached by the Israelites in their wanderings. Most of the desert of Sinai and of Palestine is land that needs only water to make it fruitful. East of the Jordan, the line between "the desert" and "the sown" lies about along the line of the Chijaz railway. To the West there is barely enough water to support the crops of wheat; to the East there is too little. Near the line of demarcation, the yield of wheat depends strictly upon the rainfall. A few inches more or less of rain in the year determines whether the grain can reach maturity or not. The latent fertility of the desert lands is demonstrated by the season of scant rains, when they become carpeted with herbage and flowers. It is marvelous, too, how the camels, sheep and goats, even in the dry season, will find something to crop where the traveler sees nothing but absolute barrenness. The long wandering of the Israelites in "the desert" was made possible by the existence of food for their flocks and herds. Compare ⟨19511⟩Psalm 65:11,12:

> *"Thou crownest the year with thy goodness;*
> *And thy paths drop fatness.*
> *They drop upon the pastures of the Wilderness.*
> *And the hills are girded with joy";*

and also ⟨29022⟩Joel 2:22: "The pastures of the wilderness do spring."

"The desert" or "the wilderness" (ha-midhbar) usually signifies the desert of the wandering, or the northern part of the Sinaitic Peninsula. Compare ⟨0101⟩Exodus 3:1 King James Version: "MOSES .... led theflock (of Jethro) to the backside of the desert"; ⟨0253⟩Exodus 5:3 King James Version: "Let us go .... three days' journey into the desert"; ⟨0292⟩Exodus 19:2 King James Version: "They .... were come to the desert of Sinai"; ⟨0231⟩Exodus 23:31 King James Version: "I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river" (Euphrates). Other uncultivated or pasture regions are known as Wilderness of Beersheba (⟨0214⟩Genesis 21:14), West of Judah (⟨0716⟩Judges 1:16), West of En-gedi (⟨0941⟩1 Samuel 24:1), West of Gibeon (⟨1024⟩2 Samuel 2:24), West of

Maon (⟨09234⟩1 Samuel 23:24), West of Damascus; compare Arabic *Badiyet-ush-Sham* (⟨11915⟩1 Kings 19:15), etc. *Midhbar yam*, "the wilderness of the sea" (⟨23210⟩Isaiah 21:1), may perhaps be that part of Arabia bordering upon the Persian Gulf.

Aside from the towns and fields, practically all the land was *midhbar* or "desert," for this term included mountain, plain and valley. The terms, "desert of En-gedi," "desert of Maon," etc., do not indicate circumscribed areas, but are applied in a general way to the lands about these places. To obtain water, the shepherds with their flocks traverse long distances to the wells, springs or streams, usually arranging to reach the water about the middle of the day and rest about it for an hour or so, taking shelter from the sun in the shadows of the rocks, perhaps under some overhanging ledge.

Alfred Ely Day

DESIRE

<de-zir'>: The verb "to desire" in the Scriptures usually means "to long for," "to ask for," "to demand," and may be used in a good or bad sense (compare ⟨05725⟩Deuteronomy 7:25 the King James Version). the Revised Version (British and American) frequently renders the more literal meaning of the Hebrew. Compare ⟨18020⟩Job 20:20, "delight"; ⟨20120⟩Proverbs 21:20, "precious"; ⟨19406⟩Psalm 40:6, "delight"; [αἰτέω, *aiteo*] (except ⟨51009⟩Colossians 1:9), and [ἐρωτάω, *erotao*] (except ⟨42736⟩Luke 7:36) are rendered "to ask" and [ζητέω, *zeteo*], "to seek" (compare ⟨42909⟩Luke 9:9 et. al.). The Hebrew [כָּסַף; *kacaph*], literally, "to lose in value," is translated (⟨36201⟩Zephaniah 2:1) by "hath no shame" (the Revised Version, margin "longing," the King James Version "not desired"). The literal translation "to lose in value," "to degenerate," would be more in harmony with the context than the translations offered. The Hebrew [חֶמְדָּה, *chemdah*] (⟨14210⟩2 Chronicles 21:20, "without being desired"), means according to the Arabic "to praise," "to give thanks." The context brings in contrast the burial of the king Jehoram with that of his fathers. In the latter case there was "burning," i.e. recognition and praise, but when Jehoram died, there was no *chemdah*, i.e. there was no praise for his services rendered to the kingdom. For "desire" in ⟨21205⟩Ecclesiastes 12:5, *see CAPERBERRY*.

A. L. Breslich

DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS

This phrase occurs only in ⁵⁰⁰⁷Haggai 2:7 (King James Version, the English Revised Version "desirable things," the American Revised Version, margin "things desired"), and is commonly applied to the Messiah.

At the erection of the temple in Ezra's time, the older men who had seen the more magnificent house of Solomon were disappointed and distressed at the comparison. The prophet, therefore, is directed to encourage them by the assurance that Yahweh is with them nevertheless, and in a little while will shake the heavens, the earth, the sea, the dry land and the nations, and "the desire of all nations" shall come, and the house shall be filled with glory, so that "the later glory of this house shall be greater than the former."

(1) Many expositors refer the prophecy to the first advent of Christ. The shaking of the heavens, the earth, the sea and the dry land is the figurative setting of the shaking of the nations, while this latter expression refers to those changes of earthly dominion coincident with the overthrow of the Persians by the Greeks, the Greeks by the Romans, and so on down to the beginning of our era. The house then in process of construction was filled with glory by the later presence of the Messiah, which glory was greater than the Shekinah of Solomon's time. Objections are presented to this view as follows: First, there is the element of time. Five centuries, more or less, elapsed between the building of Ezra's temple and the first advent of Christ, and the men of Ezra's time needed comfort for the present. Then there is the difficulty of associating the physical phenomena with any shaking of the nations occurring atthe first advent. Furthermore, in what sense, it is asked, could Christ, when He came, be said to be the desire of all nations? And finally, what comfort would a Jew find in this magnifying of the Gentiles?

(2) These difficulties, though not insuperable, lead others to apply the prophecy to the second advent of Christ. The Jews are to be restored to Jerusalem, and another temple is to be built (Ezekiel 40 through 48). The shaking of the nations and the physical phenomena find their fulfillment in the "Great Tribulation" so often spoken of in the Old Testament and Revelation, and which is followed by the coming of Christ in glory to set up His kingdom (³⁰⁰¹Malachi 3:1; ⁴¹²⁹Matthew 24:29,30 and other places). Some of the difficulties spoken of in the first instance apply here also, but not all of them, while others are common to both interpretations. One such

common difficulty is that Ezra's temple can hardly be identified with that of the time of Herod and Christ, and certainly not with that of Ezekiel; which is met, however, by saying that all the temples, including Solomon's, are treated as but one "house" — the house of the Lord, in the religious sense, at least, if not architecturally. Another such difficulty touches the question of time, which, whether it includes five centuries or twenty, is met by the principle that to the prophets, "ascending in heart to God and the eternity of God, all times and all things of this world are only a mere point." When the precise time of particular events is not revealed, they sometimes describe them as continuous, and sometimes blend two events together, having a near or partial, and also a remote or complete fulfillment. "They saw the future in space rather than in time, or the perspective rather than the actual distance." It is noted that the Lord Jesus so blends together the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, AD 70, and the days of the anti-Christ at the end of this age, that it is difficult to separate them, and to say which belongs exclusively to either (Matthew 24). That the words may have an ultimate fulfillment in the second advent of Christ receives strength from a comparison of <3022>Haggai 2:21,22 with <5826>Hebrews 12:26,27. The writer of that epistle condenses the two passages in <3006>Haggai 2:6,7 and <3022>Haggai 2:21,22, implying that it was one and the same shaking, of which the former verses denote the beginning, and the latter the end. The shaking, in other words, began introductory to the first advent and will be finished at the second. Concerning the former, compare <40317>Matthew 3:17; 27:51; 28:2; <44002>Acts 2:2; 4:31, and concerning the latter, <40247>Matthew 24:7; <66160>Revelation 16:20; 20:11 (Bengel, quoted by Canon Faussett). **(3)** Other expositors seek to cut the Gordian knot by altogether denying the application to the Messiah, and translating "the desire of all nations" by "the beauty," or "the desirable things of all nations," i.e. their precious gifts (see <23605>Isaiah 60:5,11; 61:6). This application is defended in the following way:

(a) The Hebrew word means the quality and not the thing desired;

(b) the Messiah was not desired by all the nations when He came;

(c) the verb "shall come" is plural, which requires the noun to be understood in the plural, whereas if the Messiah be intended, the noun is singular;

(d) "The silver is mine," etc. (<3008>Haggai 2:8) accords with the translation

"the desirable things of all nations";

   (e) the agreement of the Septuagint and Syriac versions with such rendering.

All these arguments, however, can be fairly met by counter-arguments, leaving the reader still in doubt.

   (a) An abstract noun is often put for the concrete;

   (b) the result shows that while the Jews rejected Christ, the Gentiles received and hence, desired Him;

   (c) where two nouns stand together after the manner of "the desire" and "nations," the verb agrees in number sometimes with the latter, even though the former be its nominative;

   (d) the 8th verse of the prophecy can be harmonized about as easily with one view as the other;

   (e) the King James Version is sustained by the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and early Jewish rabbis.

                                                    James M. Gray

DESOLATE

<des'-o-lat> (very frequently in the Old Testament for [µmɐ; *shamem*], and its derivatives; less frequently, [brè; *charebh*], and its derivatives, and other words. In the New Testament it stands for [ἔρημος, *eremos*] (⁴²³⁸Matthew 23:38; ⁴⁰²⁰Acts 1:20; ⁴⁸⁰⁷Galatians 4:27) *eremoo* (⁶⁶⁷¹⁶Revelation 17:16), and *monoo* (⁵⁴⁸⁵1 Timothy 5:5)): From Latin de, intens., solus, alone. Several shades of meaning can be distinguished:
(1) Its primary sense is "left lonely," "forlorn," e.g. ¹⁹²⁵¹⁶Psalm 25:16, "Have mercy upon me; for I am desolate" (Hebrew *yachidh*, "alone"); ⁵⁴⁸⁵1 Timothy 5:5, "she that is a widow indeed, and desolate" (Greek *memonomene*, "left alone").
(2) In the sense of "laid waste," "destitute of inhabitants," e.g. ²⁴⁰⁷Jeremiah 4:7, "to make thy land desolate, that thy cities be laid waste, without inhabitant."
(3) With the meaning "comfortless," "afflicted," e.g. ¹⁹⁵³⁰⁴Psalm 143:4, "My heart within me is desolate."

(4) In the sense of "barren," "childless," "unfruitful," e.g. ¹⁸⁵³⁴Job 15:34; ²³⁴²¹Isaiah 49:21 (Hebrew *galmudh*).

<div align="right">

D. Miall Edwards

</div>

DESOLATION, ABOMINATION OF

See ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

DESPAIR

<de-spar'>: The substantive only in ⁴⁷⁰⁴⁸2 Corinthians 4:8, "perplexed, but not in (the Revised Version (British and American) "yet not unto") despair," literally, "being at a loss, but not utterly at a loss." "Unto despair" here conveys the force of the Greek prefix *ex* ("utterly," "out and out"). Desperate, in ¹⁸⁶²⁶Job 6:26; ²³¹⁷¹Isaiah 17:11. In the latter instance, the Hebrew adjective is derived from a verb = "to be sick," and the literally, rendering would be "incurable" (compare ¹⁸⁴⁰⁶Job 34:6, "my wound is incurable"). Desperately in ²⁴¹⁷⁰Jeremiah 17:9 the King James Version, where the heart is said to be "desperately (i.e. incurably) wicked" or "sick."

DESPITE; DESPITEFUL

<de-spit'>, *<de-spit'-fool>*: "Despite" is from Latin *despectus*, "a looking down upon." As a noun (= "contempt") it is now generally used in its shortened form, "spite," while the longer form is used as a preposition (= "in spite of"). In English Versions of the Bible it is always a noun. In the Old Testament it translates Hebrew *she'aT*, in ²⁶⁵⁰⁶Ezekiel 25:6, and in the Revised Version (British and American) ²⁶⁵¹⁵Ezekiel 25:15; 36:5 ("with despite of soul"). In ⁵⁸⁰²⁹Hebrews 10:29 ("hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace") it stands for Greek *enubrizo*, "to treat with contempt." The adjective "despiteful" occurs in the King James Version ²⁶⁵¹⁵Ezekiel 25:15; 36:5; Sirach 31:31 ("despiteful words," the Revised Version (British and American) "a word of reproach"); ⁴⁵⁰³⁰Romans 1:30 (the Revised Version (British and American) "insolent" = Greek *hubristes*, from huper, "above"; compare English "uppish").

<div align="right">

D. Miall Edwards

</div>

DESSAU

<des'-o>, *<des'-a-u>* ([Δεσσαού, *Dessaou*] (2 Macc 14:16)): the Revised Version (British and American) *LESSAU* (which see).

DESTINY, (MENI)

<des'-ti-ni>: A god of Good Luck, possibly the Pleiades.

See *ASTROLOGY, 10; MENI.*

DESTROYER

<de-stroi'-er>: In several passages the word designates a supernatural agent of destruction, or destroying angel, executing Divine judgment.

(1) In ^{⟨01223⟩}Exodus 12:23, of the "destroyer" who smote the first-born in Egypt, again referred to under the same title in ^{⟨58128⟩}Hebrews 11:28 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "he that destroyed").

(2) In ^{⟨18322⟩}Job 33:22, "the destroyers" (literally, "they that cause to die") = the angels of death that are ready to take away a man's life during severe illness. No exact parallel to this is found in the Old Testament. The nearest approach is "the angel that destroyed the people" by pestilence (^{⟨10246⟩}2 Samuel 24:16,17 parallel ^{⟨13215⟩}1 Chronicles 21:15,16); the angel that smote the Assyrians (^{⟨12695⟩}2 Kings 19:35 = ^{⟨23736⟩}Isaiah 37:36 parallel ^{⟨14322⟩}2 Chronicles 32:21); "angels of evil" (^{⟨19789⟩}Psalm 78:49).

(3) In the Apocrypha, "the destroyer" is once referred to as "the minister of punishment" (Revised Version; literally, "him who was punishing"), who brought death into the world (The Wisdom of Solomon 18:22-25).

(4) In ^{⟨46010⟩}1 Corinthians 10:10, "the destroyer" is the angelic agent to whose instrumentality Paul attributes the plague of ^{⟨04646⟩}Numbers 16:46-49.

In later Jewish theology (the Targums and Midrash), the "destroyer" or "angel of death" appears under the name Sammael (i.e. the poison of God), who was once an arch-angel before the throne of God, and who caused the serpent to tempt Eve. According to Weber, he is not to be distinguished from Satan. The chief distinction between the "destroyer" of early thought and the Sammael of later Judaism is that the former was regarded as the emissary of Yahweh, and subservient to His will, and sometimes was not clearly distinguished from Yahweh Himself, whereas the latter was regarded as a perfectly distinct individuality, acting in independence or semi-independence, and from purely malicious and evil motives. The

change was largely due to the influence of Persian dualism, which made good and evil to be independent powers.

D. Miall Edwards

DESTRUCTION

<de-struk'-shun>: In the King James Version this word translates over 30 Hebrew words in the Old Testament, and 4 words in the New Testament. Of these the most interesting, as having a technical sense, is *'abhaddon* (from verb *'abhadh*, "to be lost," "to perish"). It is found 6 times in the Wisdom Literature, and nowhere else in the Old Testament; compare [66091]Revelation 9:11.

See ABADDON.

DESTRUCTION, CITY OF; HELIOPOLIS OR CITY OF THE SUN

([23918]Isaiah 19:18).
See ASTRONOMY, I, 2; IR-HA-HERES; ON.

DETERMINATE

<de-tur'-mi-nat> ([ὡρισμένος, *horismenos*], "determined," "fixed"): Only in [44023]Acts 2:23, "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of. God," Greek *horismenos*, from *horizo*, "to set boundaries," "determine," "settle" (compare English word "horizon" — literally, "that which bounds"). It is remarkable that Peter in one and the same sentence speaks of the death of Christ from two quite distinct points of view.

(1) From the historical standpoint, it was a crime perpetrated by men who were morally responsible for their deed ("him .... ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay").

(2) From the standpoint of Divine teleology, it was part of an eternal plan ("by the determinate," etc.). No effort is made to demonstrate the logical consistency of the two ideas. They represent two aspects of the one fact. The same Greek word is used in [42222]Luke 22:22, where Christ speaks of His betrayal as taking place "as it was (the Revised Version (British and American) "hath been") determined" (*kata to horismenon*). Compare [42426]Luke 24:26.

DETERMINE

<de-tur'-min>:

(1) "To resolve," "decide." This is the primary meaning of the word and it is also the one that is the most common. In the New Testament the Greek word [κρίνω, *krino*], is translated "determine," and it has the above meaning (Acts 20:16; 25:25; 1 Corinthians 2:2). The word occurs frequently in the Old Testament with this meaning (see Exodus 21:22; 1 Samuel 20:7,9,33).
(2) "To decree," "ordain," "mark out." The Greek word that is rendered "determine" with this meaning is horizo.

See DETERMINATE.

The Hebrew term *charats* is translated "determine" with the above meaning; as "his days are determined" (Job 14:5); "a destruction is determined" (Isaiah 10:22); "desolations are determined" (Daniel 9:26). The Hebrew term *mishpaT*, which means "judgment" or "sentence," is translated "determination" in Zephaniah 3:8.

A. W. Fortune.

DETESTABLE, THINGS

<de-tes'-ta-b'-l>, ([שִׁקּוּץ *shiqquts*]; [שֶׁקֶץ, *sheqets*], synonymous with [תּוֹעֵבָה, *to`ebhah*], "abomination," "abominable thing"): The translation of *shiqqutsim* in Jeremiah 16:18; Ezekiel 5:11; 7:20; 11:18,21; 37:23; a term always applied to idol-worship or to objects connected with idolatry; often also translated "abomination," as in 1 Kings 11:5,7 (bis); Jeremiah 4:1; Ezekiel 20:7,8,30. *Sheqets*, translated "abomination," is applied in the Scriptures to that which is ceremonially unclean (Leviticus 7:21), creatures forbidden as food, as water animals without fins or scales in Leviticus 11:10-12, birds of prey and the like (verse 18), winged creeping things (verses 20,23), creeping vermin (verses 41 f). Compare also Isaiah 66:17. By partaking of the food of the animals in question one makes himself detestable (Leviticus 11:43; 20:25). Similarly the idolatrous appurtenances are to be held in detestation; nothing of the kind should be appropriated for private use (Deuteronomy 7:26).

See ABOMINATION.

Max L. Margolis

DEUEL

<du'-el>, *<de-u'-el>* [l al[D] *de`u'el*], "knowledge of God"): A Gadite, the father of Eliasaph, the representative of the tribe of Gad in the census-taking (Numbers 1:14), in making the offering of the tribe at the dedication of the altar (Numbers 7:42,47), and as leader of the host of the tribe of the children of Gad in the wilderness (Numbers 10:20). Called Reuel in Numbers 2:14, d (d) being confused with r (r).

DEUTERO-CANONICAL, BOOKS

<du-ter-o-ka-non'-i-kal>: A term sometimes used to designate certain books, which by the Council of Trent were included in the Old Testament, but which the Protestant churches designated as apocryphal (*see APOCRYPHA*), and also certain books of the New Testament which for a long time were not accepted by the whole church as Scripture. Webster says the term pertains to "a second Canon or ecclesiastical writing of inferior authority," and the history of these books shows that they were all at times regarded by a part of the church as being inferior to the others and some of them are so regarded today. This second Canon includes Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclusiasticus, 2 Esdras, 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees of the Old Testament, and Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Jude, and Revelation of the New Testament.

1. THE OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS:

The Old Testament books under consideration were not in the Hebrew Canon and they were originally designated as apocryphal. The Septuagint contained many of the apocrphyal books, and among these were most of those which we have designated deutero-canonical. The Septuagint was perhaps the Greek Bible of New Testament times and it continued to be the Old Testament of the early church, and hence, these books were widely distributed. It seems, however, that they did not continue to hold their place along with the other books, for Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in his Festal Epistle in 367 gave a list of the books of the Bible which were to be read, and at the close of this list he said: "There are also other books besides these, not canonized, yet set by the Fathers to be read to those who have just come up and who wish to be informed as to the word of

godliness: Wisdom, Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the so-called Teaching of the Apes, and the Shepherd of Hermas." Jerome also made a distinction between the apocryphal books and the others. In his Preface, after enumerating the books contained in the Hebrew Canon, he adds: "This prologue I write as a preface to the books to be translated by us from the Hebrew into Latin, that we may know that all the books which are not of this number are apocrphyal; therefore Wisdom, which is commonly ascribed to Solomon as its author, and the book of Jesus the son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit and the Shepher are not in the Canon." Rufinus made the same distinction as did Jerome. He declared that "these books are not canonical, but have been called by our forefathers ecclesiastical." Augustine included these books in his list which he published in 397. He begins the list thus: "The entire canon of Scripture is comprised in these books." Then follows a list of the books which includes Tobit, Judith, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 2 Esdras, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, and it closes with these words: "In these 44 books is comprised all the authority of the Old Testament." Inasmuch as these books were regarded by the church at large as ecclesiastical and helpful, and Augustine had given them canonical sanction, they rapidly gained in favor and most of them are found in the great manuscripts.

See CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

2. THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS:

It is not probable that there was any general council of the church in those early centuries that set apart the various books of the New Testament and canonized them as Scripture for the whole church. There was no single historical event which brought together the New Testament books which were everywhere to be regarded as Scripture. These books did not make the same progress in the various provinces and churches. A careful study of conditions reveals the fact that there was no uniform New Testament canon in the church during at least the first 3 centuries. The Ethiopic church, for example, had 35 books in its New Testament, while the Syrian church had only 22 books.

From an early date the churches were practically agreed on those books which are sometimes designated as the protocanonical, and which Eusebius designated as the homologoumena. They differed, however, in regard to the 7 disputed books which form a part of the so-called deutero-canon, and

which Eusebius designated as the antilegomena. They also differed in regard to other ecclesiastical writings, for there was no fixed line between canonical and non-canonical books. While there was perhaps no council of the church that had passed on the books and declared them canonical, it is undoubtedly true that before the close of the 2nd century all the books that are in our New Testament, with the exception of those under consideration, had become recognized as Scripture in all orthodox churches.

The history of these seven books reveals the fact that although some of them were early used by the Fathers, they afterward fell into disfavor. That is especially true of Hebrews and Revelation. Generally speaking, it can be said that at the close of the 2nd century the 7 books under consideration had failed to receive any such general recognition as had the rest; however, all, with perhaps the exception of 2 Peter, had been used by some of the Fathers. He was freely attested by Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr; James by Hermas and probably by Clement of Rome; 2 John, 3 John and Jude by the Muratorian Fragment; Revelation by Hermas and Justin Martyr who names John as its author.

See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Jerome, who prepared the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) in the closing years of the 4th century, accepted all 7 of the doubtful books, yet he held that 2 John and 3 John were written by the Presbyter, and he intimated that 2 Peter and Jude were still rejected by some, and he said the Latins did not receive He among the canonical Scriptures, neither did the Greek churches receive Augustine, who was one of the great leaders during the last part of the 4th century and the first part of the 5th, accepted without question the 7 disputed books. These books had gradually gained in favor and the position of Jerome and Augustine practically settled their canonicity for the orthodox churches. The Council of Carthage, held in 397, adopted the catalogue of Augustine. This catalogue contained all the disputed books both of the New Testament and the Old Testament.

SINCE THE REFORMATION.

The Canon of Augustine became the Canon of the majority of the churches and the Old Testament books which he accepted were added to the Vulgate, but there were some who still held to the Canon of Jerome. The awakening of the Reformation inevitably led to a reinvestigation of the

Canon, since the Bible was made the source of authority, and some of the disputed books of the New Testament were again questioned by the Reformers. The position given the Bible by the Reformers led the Roman church to reaffirm its sanction and definitely to fix the books that should be accepted. Accordingly the Council of Trent, which convened in 1546, made the Canon of Augustine, which included the 7 apocphyal books of the Old Testament, and the 7 disputed books of the New Testament, the Canon of the church, and it pronounced a curse upon those who did not receive these books. The Protestants at first followed the example of Rome and adopted these books which had long had the sanction of usage as their Bible. Gradually, however, the questioned books of the Old Testament were separated from the others. That was true in Coverdale's translation, and in Matthew's Bible they were not only separated from the others but they were prefaced with the words, "the volume of the book called Hagiographa." In Cranmer's Bible, Hagiographa was changed into Apocrypha, and this passed through the succeeding edition into the King James Version.

A. W. Fortune

DEUTERONOMY

<*du-ter-on'-o-mi*>:

1. NAME:

In Hebrew [μyrbDh″ hLae *'elleh ha-debharim*], "these are the words"; in Greek, [Δευτερονόμιον, *Deuteronomion*], "second law"; whence the Latin deuteronomii, and the English Deuteronomy. The Greek title is due to a mistranslation by the Septuagint of the clause in Deuteronomy 17:18 rendered, "and he shall write for himself this repetition of the law." The Hebrew really means "and he shall write out for himself a copy of this law." However, the error on which the English title rests is not serious, as Deuteronomy is in a very true sense a repetition of the law.

2. WHAT DEUTERONOMY IS:

Deuteronomy is the last of the five books of the Pentateuch, or "five-fifths of the Law." It possesses an individuality and impressiveness of its own. In Exodus — Numbers Yahweh is represented as speaking unto Moses, whereas in Deuteronomy, Moses is represented as speaking at Yahweh's

command to Israel (1:1-4; 5:1; 29:1). It is a hortatory recapitulation of various addresses delivered at various times and places in the desert wanderings — a sort of homily on the constitution, the essence or gist of Moses' instructions to Israel during the forty years of their desert experience. It is "a Book of Reviews"; a translation of Israel's redemptive history into living principles; not so much a history as a commentary. There is much of retrospect in it, but its main outlook is forward. The rabbins speak of it as "the Book of Reproofs." It is the text of all prophecy; a manual of evangelical oratory; possessing "all the warmth of a Bernard, the flaming zeal of a Savonarola, and the tender, gracious sympathy of a Francis of Assisi." The author's interest is entirely moral. His one supreme purpose is to arouse Israel's loyalty to Yahweh and to His revealed law. Taken as a whole the book is an exposition of the great commandment, "Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." It was from Deuteronomy that Jesus summarized the whole of the Old Covenant in a single sentence (Matthew 22:37; compare Deuteronomy 6:5), and from it He drew His weapons with which to vanquish the tempter (Matthew 4:4,7,10; compare Deuteronomy 8:3; 6:16,13).

3. ANALYSIS:

Deuteronomy is composed of three discourses, followed by three short appendices:

(1) 1:1 through 4:43, historical; a review of God's dealings with Israel, specifying in great detail where and when delivered (1:1-5), recounting in broad oratorical outlines the chief events in the nation's experience from Horeb to Moab (1:6 through 3:29), on which the author bases an earnest appeal to the people to be faithful and obedient, and in particular to keep clear of all possible idolatry (4:1-40). Appended to this first discourse is a brief note (4:41-43) concerning Moses' appointment of three cities of refuge on the East side of the Jordan.

(2) 4:44 through 26:19, hortatory and legal; introduced by a superscription (4:44-49), and consisting of a resume of Israel's moral and civil statutes, testimonies and judgments. Analyzed in greater detail, this second discourse is composed of two main sections:

(a) chapters 5 through 11, an extended exposition of the Ten Commandments on which theocracy was based;

(b) chapters 12 through 26, a code of special statutes concerning worship, purity, tithes, the three annual feasts, the administration of justice, kings, priests, prophets, war, and the private and social life of the people. The spirit of this discourse is most ethical and religious. The tone is that of a father no less than that of a legislator. A spirit of humanity pervades the entire discourse. Holiness is its ideal.

(3) 27:1 through 31:30, predictive and minatory; the subject of this third discourse being "the blessings of obedience and the curses of disobedience." This section begins with directions to inscribe these laws on plastered stones to be set up on Mt. Ebal (27:1-10), to be ratified by an antiphonal ritual of blessings and cursings from the two adjacent mountains, Gerizim and Ebal (27:11-26). These are followed by solemn warnings against disobedience (28:1 through 29:1), and fresh exhortations to accept the terms of the new covenant made in Moab, and to choose between life and death (29:2 through 30:20). Moses' farewell charge to Israel and his formal commission of Joshua close the discourse (Deuteronomy 31). The section is filled with predictions, which were woefully verified in Israel's later history. The three appendices, spoken of above, close the book:

(a) Moses' Song (Deuteronomy 32), which the great Lawgiver taught the people (the Law was given to the priests, [0312]Deuteronomy 31:24-27);

(b) Moses' Blessing (Deuteronomy 33), which forecast the future for the various tribes (Simeon only being omitted);

(c) a brief account of Moses' death and burial (Deuteronomy 34) with a noble panegyric on him as the greatest prophet Israel ever had. Thus closes this majestic and marvelously interesting and practical book. Its keyword is "possess"; its central thought is "Yahweh has chosen Israel, let Israel choose Yahweh."

4. RULING IDEAS:

The great central thought of Deuteronomy is the unique relation which Yahweh as a unique God sustains to Israel as a unique people. "Hear O Israel; Yahweh our God is one Yahweh." The monotheism of Deuteronomy is very explicit. Following from this, as a necessary corollary

almost, is the other great teaching of the book, the unity of the sanctuary. The motto of the book might be said to be, "One God, one sanctuary."

(1) Yahweh, a Unique God.

Yahweh is the only God, "There is none else besides him" Deuteronomy (4:35,39; 6:4; 32:39), "He is God of gods, and Lord of lords" (10:17), "the living God" (5:26), "the faithful God, who keepeth covenant and lovingkindness with them that love him and keep his commandments" (7:9), who abominates graven images and every species of idolatry (7:25,26; 12:31; 13:14; 18:12; 20:18; 27:15), to whom belong the heavens and the earth (10:14), who rules over all the nations (7:19), whose relation to Israel is near and personal (28:58), even that of a Father (32:6), whose being is spiritual (4:12,15), and whose name is "Rock" (32:4,15,18,30,31). Being such a God, He is jealous of all rivals (7:4; 29:24-26; 31:16,17), and hence, all temptations to idolatry must be utterly removed from the land, the Canaanites must be completely exterminated and all their altars, pillars, Asherim and images destroyed (7:1-5,16; 20:16-18; 12:2,3).

(2) Israel, a Unique People.

The old Israel had become unique through the covenant which Yahweh made with them at Horeb, creating out of them "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Exodus 19:6). The new Israel who had been born in the desert were to inherit the blessings vouchsafed to their fathers, through the covenant just now being made in Moab (Deuteronomy 26:16-19; 27:9; 29:1; 5:2,3). By means of it they became the heirs of all the promises given unto their fathers the patriarchs (Deuteronomy 4:31; 7:12; 8:18; 29:13); they too became holy and peculiar, and especially beloved of Yahweh (Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2,21; 26:18,19; 28:9; 4:37), disciplined, indeed, but for their own good (Deuteronomy 8:2,3,5,16), to be established as a people, as Yahweh's peculiar lot and inheritance (Deuteronomy 32:6,9; 4:7).

(3) The Relation between Yahweh and Israel a Unique Relation.

Other nations feared their deities; Israel was expected not only to fear Yahweh but to love Him and cleave to Him (Deuteronomy 4:10; 5:29; 6:5; 10:12,20; 11:1,13,12; 13:3,4; 17:19; 19:9; 28:58; 30:6,16,20; 31:12,13). The highest privileges are theirs because they are partakers of the covenant blessings; all others are strangers and foreigners, except they be admitted into Israel by special permission (Deuteronomy 23:1-8).

5. UNITY:

The essential unity of the great kernel of Deuteronomy (Deuteronomy 5 through 26) is recognized and freely allowed by nearly everyone (e.g. Kautzsch, Kuenen, Dillmann, Driver). Some would even defend the unity of the whole of Deuteronomy 1 through 26 (Knobel, Graf, Kosters, Colenso, Kleinert). No other book of the Old Testament, unless it be the prophecies of Ezekiel, bears such unmistakable signs of unity in aim, language and thought. "The literary style of Deuteronomy," says Driver, "is very marked and individual; in his command of a chaste, yet warm and persuasive eloquence, the author of Deuteronomy stands unique among the writers of the OT" (Deuteronomy, lxxvii, lxxxviii). Many striking expressions characterize the style of this wonderful book of oratory: e.g. "cause to inherit"; "Hear O Israel"; the oft-repeated root, meaning in the Qal verb-species "learn," and in the Piel verb-species "teach"; "be willing"; "so shalt thou exterminate the evil from thy midst"; "as at this day"; "that it may be well with thee"; "the land whither thou goest in to possess it"; "with all thy heart and with all thy soul"; and many others, all of which occur frequently in Deuteronomy and rarely elsewhere in the Old Testament, thus binding, so far as style can, the different sections of the book into one solid unit. Barring various titles and editorial additions (Deuteronomy 1:1-5; 4:44-49; 29:1; 33:1,7,9,22; 34:1) and a few archaeological notes such as Deuteronomy 2:10-12,20-23; 3:9,11,14; 10:6-9, and of course the last chapter, which gives an account of Moses' death, there is every reason necessary for supposing that the book is a unit. Few writings in the entire field of literature have so clear a unity of purpose or so uniform a style of address.

6. AUTHORSHIP:

There is one passage bearing upon the authorship of Deuteronomy wherein it is stated most explicitly that Moses wrote "this law." It reads, "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi. .... And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished (i.e. to the end), that Moses commanded the Levites, that bare the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee" (Deuteronomy 31:9,24-27). This passage is of more than traditional value, and should not be ignored as is so often done (e.g. by

Ryle, article "Deuteronomy," HDB). It is not enough to say that Moses was the great fountain-head of Hebrew law, that he gave oral but not written statutes, or, that Moses was only the traditional source of these statutes. For it is distinctly and emphatically stated that "Moses wrote this law." And it is further declared (Deuteronomy 31:22) that "Moses wrote this song," contained in Deuteronomy 32. Now, these statements are either true, or they are false. There is no escape. The authorship of no other book in the Old Testament is so explicitly emphasized. The present writer believes that Moses actually wrote the great body of Deuteronomy, and for the following general reasons:

(1) Deuteronomy as a Whole Is Eminently Appropriate to What We Know of Moses' Times.

It closes most fittingly the formative period of Israel's history. The historical situation from first to last is that of Moses. The references to foreign neighbors — Egypt, Canaan, Amalek, Ammon, Moab, Edom — are in every case to those who flourished in Moses' own times. As a law book its teaching is based upon the Ten Commandments. If Moses gave the Ten Commandments, then surely he may have written the Book of Deuteronomy also. Besides, the Code of Hammurabi, which antedates Moses by at least 700 years, makes it possible certainly that Moses also left laws in codified or written form.

(2) Deuteronomy Is Represented as Emanating from Moses.

The language is language put into Moses' mouth. Nearly forty times his name occurs, and in the majority of instances as the authoritative author of the subject-matter. The first person is used predominatingly throughout: "I commanded Joshua at that time" Deuteronomy (3:21); and "I charged your judges at that time" (1:16); "And I commanded you at that time" (1:18); "I have led you forty years in the wilderness" (29:5). "The language surely purports to come from Moses; and if it was not actually used by him, it is a most remarkable case of impersonation, if not of literary forgery, for the writer represents himself as reproducing, not what Moses might have said, but the exact words of Moses" (Zerbe, The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Lit., 1911, 261).

(3) Deuteronomy Is a Military Law Book, a Code of Conquest, a Book of Exhortation.

It was intended primarily neither for Israel in the desert nor for Israel settled in Canaan, but for Israel on the borderland, eager for conquest. It is expressly stated that Moses taught Israel these statutes and judgments in order that they should obey them in the land which they were about to enter (4:5,14; 5:31). They must expel the aborigines (7:1; 9:1-3; 20:17; 31:3), but in their warfare they must observe certain laws in keeping with theocracy (20:1-20; 23:9-14; 21:10-14; 31:6,7), and, when they have finally dispossessed their enemies, they must settle down to agricultural life and live no longer as nomads but as citizens of a civilized land (19:14; 22:8-10; 24:19-21). All these laws are regulations which should become binding in the future only (compare Kittel, History Of the Hebrews, I, 32). Coupled with them are prophetic exhortations which seem to be genuine, and to have had their birth in Moses' soul. Indeed the great outstanding feature of Deuteronomy is its parenetic or hortatory character. Its exhortations have not only a military ring as though written on the eve of battle, but again and again warn Israel against allowing themselves to be conquered in religion through the seductions of idolatry. The book in short is the message of one who is interested in Israel's political and religious future. There is a paternal vein running throughout it which marks it with a genuine Mosaic, not a merely fictitious or artificial, stamp. It is these general features, so characteristic of the entire book, which compel one to believe in its Mosaic authorship.

7. DEUTERONOMY SPOKEN TWICE:

Certain literary features exist in Deuteronomy which lead the present writer to think that the bulk of the book was spoken twice; once, to the first generation between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea in the 2nd year of the Exodus wanderings, and a second time to the new generation, in the plains of Moab in the 40th year. Several considerations point in this direction:

(1) The Names of the Widely Separated Geographical Places Mentioned in the Title (Deuteronomy 1:1,2).

"These are the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond the Jordan in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Suph, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Di-zahab"; to which is added, "It is eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-

barnea." If these statements have any relevancy whatever to the contents of the book which they introduce, they point to a wide area, from Horeb to Moab, as the historico-geographical background of the book. In other words, Deuteronomy, in part at least, seems to have been spoken first on the way between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea, and later again when Israel were encamped on the plains of Moab. And, indeed, what would be more natural than for Moses when marching northward from Horeb expecting to enter Canaan from the south, to exhort the Israel of that day in terms of Deuteronomy 5 through 26? Being baffled, however, by the adverse report of the spies and the faithlessness of the people, and being forced to wait and wander for 38 years, what would be more natural than for Moses in Moab, when about to resign his position as leader, to repeat the exhortations of Deuteronomy 5 through 26, adapting them to the needs of the new desert-trained generation and prefacing the whole by a historical introduction such as that found in Deuteronomy 1 through 4?

(2) The Double Allusion to the Cities of Refuge (Deuteronomy 4:41-43; 19:1-13).

On the supposition that Deuteronomy 5 through 26 were spoken first between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea, in the 2nd year of the Exodus, it could not be expected that in this section the names of the three cities chosen East of the Jordan should be given, and in fact they are not (Deuteronomy 19:1-13); the territory of Sihon and Og had not yet been conquered and the cities of refuge, accordingly, had not yet been designated (compare Numbers 35:2:14). But in Deuteronomy 4:41-43, on the contrary, which forms a part of the historical introduction, which ex hypothesi was delivered just at the end of the 39 years' wanderings, after Sihon and Og had been subdued and their territory divided, the three cities of refuge East of the Jordan are actually named, just as might be expected.

(3) Section Deuteronomy 4:44-49.

The section Deuteronomy 4:44-49, which, in its original form, very probably introduced chapters 5 through 26 before these chapters were adapted to the new situation in Moab.

(4) The Phrase "Began Moses to Declare This Law" (1:5).

The phrase "began Moses to declare this law" (1:5), suggesting that the great lawgiver found it necessary to expound what he had delivered at

some previous time. The Hebrew word translated "to declare" is found elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Deuteronomy 27:8 and in Habakkuk 2:2, and signifies "to make plain."

(5) The Author's Evident Attempt to Identify the New Generation in Moab with the Patriarchs.

"Yahweh made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day," i.e. with us who have survived the desert discipline (Deuteronomy 5:3). In view of these facts, we conclude that the book in its present form (barring the exceptions above mentioned) is the product of the whole 39 years of desert experience from Horeb on, adapted, however, to meet the exigencies of the Israelites as they stood between the victories already won on the East of the Jordan and those anticipated on the West. The impression given throughout is that the aged lawgiver's work is done, and that a new era in the people's history is about to begin.

8. DEUTERONOMY'S INFLUENCE IN ISRAEL'S HISTORY:

The influence of Deuteronomy began to be felt from the very beginning of Israel's career in Canaan. Though the references to Deuteronomy in Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings are comparatively few, yet they are sufficient to show that not only the principles of Deuteronomy were known and observed but that they were known in written form as codified statutes. For example, when Jericho was taken, the city and its spoil were "devoted" (Joshua 6:17,18) in keeping with Deuteronomy 13:15 ff (compare Joshua 10:40; 11:12,15 with Deuteronomy 7:2; 20:16,17). Achan trespassed and he and his household were stoned, and afterward burned with fire (Joshua 7:25; compare Deuteronomy 13:10; 17:5). The fact that his sons and his daughters were put to death with him seems at first sight to contradict Deuteronomy 24:16, but there is no proof that they suffered for their father's sin (*see* ACHAN; ACHOR); besides the Hebrews recognized the unity of the household, even that of Rahab the harlot (Joshua 6:17). Again when Ai was taken, "only the cattle and the spoil" did Israel take for a prey unto themselves (Joshua 8:27), in keeping with Deuteronomy 20:14; also, the body of the king of Ai was taken down before nightfall from the tree on which he had been hanged (Joshua 8:29), which was in keeping with Deuteronomy 21:23 (compare Joshua 10:26,27). As in warfare, so in worship. For instance, Joshua built an altar on Mt. Ebal (Joshua 8:30,31), "as Moses the

servant of Yahweh commanded" (⟨05204⟩Deuteronomy 27:4-6), and he wrote on them a copy of the law (⟨06082⟩Joshua 8:32), as Moses had also enjoined (⟨05203⟩Deuteronomy 27:3,8). Moreover, the elders and officers and judges stood on either side of the ark of the covenant between Ebal and Gerizim (⟨06083⟩Joshua 8:33), as directed in ⟨05129⟩Deuteronomy 11:29; 27:12,13, and Joshua read to all the congregation of Israel all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings (⟨06084⟩Joshua 8:34,35), in strict accord with ⟨05311⟩Deuteronomy 31:11,12.

But the passage of paramount importance is the story of the two and a half tribes who, on their return to their home on the East side of the Jordan, erected a memorial at the Jordan, and, when accused by their fellow-tribesmen of plurality of sanctuary, emphatically disavowed it (⟨06229⟩Joshua 22:29; compare ⟨05205⟩Deuteronomy 12:5). Obviously, therefore, Deuteronomy was known in the days of Joshua. A very few instances in the history of the Judges point in the same direction: e.g. the utter destruction of Zephath (⟨07017⟩Judges 1:17; compare ⟨05702⟩Deuteronomy 7:2; 20:16 f); Gideon's elimination of the fearful and faint-hearted from his army (⟨07071⟩Judges 7:1-7; compare ⟨05201⟩Deuteronomy 20:1-9); the author's studied concern to justify Gideon and Manoah for sacrificing at altars other than at Shiloh on the ground that they acted in obedience to Yahweh's direct commands (⟨07625⟩Judges 6:25-27; 13:16); especially the case of Micah, who congratulated himself that Yahweh would do him good seeing he had a Levite for a priest, is clear evidence that Deuteronomy was known in the days of the Judges (⟨07713⟩Judges 17:13; compare ⟨05108⟩Deuteronomy 10:8; 18:1-8; 33:8-11). In ⟨09001⟩1 Samuel 1:1-9,21,24 the pious Elkanah is pictured as going yearly to worship Yahweh at Shiloh, the central sanctuary at that time. After the destruction of Shiloh, when the ark of the covenant had been captured by the Philistines, Samuel indeed sacrificed at Mizpah, Ramah and Bethlehem (⟨09007⟩1 Samuel 7:7-9,17; 16:5), but in doing so he only took advantage of the elasticity of the Deuteronomic law: "When .... he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety; then it shall come to pass that to the place which Yahweh your God shall choose, to cause his name to dwell there, thither shall ye bring all that I command you: your burnt-offerings, and your sacrifices" (⟨05210⟩Deuteronomy 12:10,11). It was not until Solomon's time that Israel's enemies were all subdued, and even then Solomon did not observe strictly the teachings of Deuteronomy; "His wives turned away his heart," so that he did not faithfully keep Yahweh's "covenant" and "statutes" (⟨11103⟩1 Kings 11:3,11). Political disruption followed, and religion necessarily suffered.

Yet Jehoiada the priest gave the youthful Joash "the crown" and "the testimony" (2 Kings 11:12; compare Deuteronomy 17:18). King Amaziah did not slay the children of the murderers who slew his father, in conscious obedience apparently to the law of Deuteronomy (2 Kings 14:6; compare Deuteronomy 24:16). Later on, Hezekiah, the cultured king of Judah, reformed the cult of his day by removing the high places, breaking down the pillars, cutting down the Asherahs, and even breaking in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made (2 Kings 18:4,22). Hezekiah's reforms were unquestionably carried through under the influence of Deuteronomy.

It is equally certain that the prophets of the 8th century were not ignorant of this book. For example, Hosea complains of Israel's sacrificing upon the tops of the mountains and burning incense upon the hills, and warns Judah not to follow Israel's example in coming up to worship at Gilgal and Beth-aven (Hosea 4:13,15). He also alludes to striving with priests (Hosea 4:4; compare Deuteronomy 17:12), removing landmarks (Hosea 5:10; compare Deuteronomy 19:14), returning to Egypt (Hosea 8:13; 9:3; compare Deuteronomy 28:68), and of Yahweh's tender dealing with Ephraim (Hosea 11:3; compare Deuteronomy 1:31; 32:10). The courage of Amos, the shepherd-prophet of Tekoa, can best be explained, also, on the basis of a written law such as that of Deuteronomy with which he and his hearers were already more or less familiar (Amos 3:2; compare Deuteronomy 7:6; 4:7,8). He condemns Israel's inhumanity and adultery in the name of religion, and complains of their retaining overnight pledges wrested from the poor, which was distinctly forbidden in Deuteronomy (Amos 2:6-8; compare Deuteronomy 24:12-15; 23:17). Likewise, in the prophecies of Isaiah there are conscious reflections of Deuteronomy's thought and teaching. Zion is constantly pictured as the center of the nation's religion and as Yahweh's secure dwellingplace (Isaiah 2:2-4; 8:18; 28:16; 29:1,2; compare Micah 4:1-4). In short, no one of the four great prophets of the 8th century BC — Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea — ever recognized "high places" as legitimate centers of worship.

9. THE CRITICAL THEORY:

Over against the Biblical view, certain modern critics since Deuteronomy Wette (1805) advocate a late origin of Deuteronomy, claiming that it was first published in 621 BC, when Hilkiah found "the book of the law" in the temple in the 18th year of King Josiah (2 Kings 22:8 ff). The kernel of

Deuteronomy and "the book of the law" discovered by Hilkiah are said to be identical. Thus, Dr. G. A. Smith claims that "a code like the Book of Deuteronomy was not brought forth at a stroke, but was the expression of the gradual results of the age-long working of the Spirit of the Living God in the hearts of His people" (Jerusalem, II, 115). According to Dr. Driver, "Deuteronomy may be described as the prophetic reformulation and adaptation to new needs, of an older legislation. It is probable that there was a tradition, if not a written record, of a final legislative address delivered by Moses in the steppes of Moab: the plan followed by the author would rest upon a more obvious motive, if he thus worked upon a traditional basis. But be that as it may, the bulk of the laws contained in Deuteronomy is undoubtedly far more ancient than the author himself. .... What is essentially new in Deuteronomy is not the matter, but the form. .... The new element in Deuteronomy is thus not the laws, but their parenetic setting" (Deuteronomy, lxi, lvi). This refined presentation of the matter would not be so very objectionable, were Drs. Smith and Driver's theory not linked up with certain other claims and allegations to the effect that Moses in the 15th century BC could not possibly have promulgated such a lofty monotheism, that in theological teaching "the author of Deuteronomy is the spiritual heir of Hosea," that there are discrepancies between it and other parts of the Pentateuch, that in the early history of Israel down to the 8th century plurality of sanctuaries was legally permissible, that there are no traces of the influence of the principal teachings of a written Deuteronomy discoverable in Hebrew literature until the time of Jeremiah, and that the book as we possess it was originally composed as a program of reform, not by Moses but in the name of Moses as a forgery or pseudepigraph. For example, F. H. Woods says, "Although not a necessary result of accepting the later date, the majority of critics believe this book of the law to have been the result of a pious fraud promulgated by Hilkiah and Shaphan with the retention of deceiving Josiah into the belief that the reforms which they desired were the express command of God revealed to Moses" (HDB, II, 368). Some are unwilling to go so far. But in any case, it is claimed that the law book discovered and published by Hilkiah, which brought about the reformation by Josiah in 621 BC, was no other than some portion of the Book of Deuteronomy, and of Deuteronomy alone. But there are several considerations which are opposed to this theory: **(1)** Deuteronomy emphasizes centralization of worship at one sanctuary (12:5); Josiah's reformation was directed rather against idolatry in general (2 Kings 23:4 ff).

(2) In ⁽⁵⁸⁰⁶⁾Deuteronomy 18:6-8, a Levite coming from the country to Jerusalem was allowed to minister and share in the priestly perquisites; but in ⁽¹²²⁰⁹⁾2 Kings 23:9, "the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem, but they did eat unleavened bread among their brethren." And according to the critical theory, "Levites" and "priests" are interchangeable terms.

(3) The following passages in Exodus might almost equally with Deuteronomy account for Josiah's reformation: ⁽⁰²¹⁰⁸⁾Exodus 20:3; 22:18,20; 23:13,14,32,33; 34:13,14-17.

(4) The law book discovered by Hilkiah was recognized at once as an ancient code which the fathers had disobeyed (⁽¹²²¹³⁾2 Kings 22:13). Were they all deceived? Even Jeremiah (compare ²⁴¹⁰⁸Jeremiah 11:3,4)? "There were many persons in Judah who had powerful motives for exposing this forgery if it was one" (Raven, Old Testament Introduction, 112).

(5) One wonders why so many archaic and, in Josiah's time, apparently obsolete laws should have been incorporated in a code whose express motive was to reform an otherwise hopeless age: e.g. the command to exterminate the Canaanites, who had long since ceased to exist (⁽⁰⁵⁰⁷¹⁸⁾Deuteronomy 7:18,22), and to blot out Amalek (⁽⁰⁵²⁵¹⁷⁾Deuteronomy 25:17-19), the last remnants of whom were completely destroyed in Hezekiah's time (⁽¹³⁰⁴¹⁾1 Chronicles 4:41-43). Especially is this true of the score and more of laws peculiar to Deuteronomy, concerning building battlements on the roofs of houses (⁽⁰⁵²²⁰⁸⁾Deuteronomy 22:8), robbing birds' nests (⁽⁰⁵²²⁰⁶⁾Deuteronomy 22:6,7), the sexes exchanging garments (⁽⁰⁵²²⁰⁵⁾Deuteronomy 22:5), going out to war (⁽⁰⁵²⁰⁰¹⁾Deuteronomy 20:1 ff), etc.

> **(6)** Especially remarkable is it that if Deuteronomy were written, as alleged, shortly before the reign of Josiah, there should be no anachronisms in it betraying a post-Mosaic origin. There are no allusions to the schism between Judah and Israel, no hint of Assyrian oppression through the exaction of tribute, nor any threats of Israel's exile either to Assyria or Babylonia, but rather to Egypt (⁽⁰⁵²⁸⁶⁸⁾Deuteronomy 28:68). "Jerusalem" is never mentioned. From a literary point of view, it is psychologically and historically well-nigh impossible for a writer to conceal all traces of his age and circumstances. On the other hand, no Egyptologist has ever discovered any anachronisms in Deuteronomy touching Egyptian matters. From first to last the author depicts the actual situation of the times of Moses. It is consequently hard to believe, as is alleged, that a later writer is studying to give "an imaginative revivification of the past."

(7) The chief argument in favor of Deuteronomy's late origin is its alleged teaching concerning the unity of the sanctuary. Wellhausen lays special emphasis upon this point. Prior to Josiah's reformation, it is claimed, plurality of sanctuaries was allowed. But in opposition to this, it is possible to point victoriously to Hezekiah's reformation (◁12804▷2 Kings 18:4,22), as a movement in the direction of unity; and especially to ◁02024▷Exodus 20:24, which is so frequently misinterpreted as allowing a multiplicity of sanctuaries. This classical passage when correctly interpreted allows only that altars shall be erected in every place where Yahweh records His name, "which presumably during the wanderings and the time of the judges would mean wherever the Tabernacle was" (Mackay, Introduction to Old Testament, 110). This interpretation of this passage is confirmed and made practically certain, indeed, by the command in ◁02314▷Exodus 23:14-19 that Israel shall repair three times each year to the house of Yahweh and there present their offering. On the other hand, Deuteronomy's emphasis upon unity of sanctuary is often exaggerated. The Book of Deuteronomy requires unity only after Israel's enemies are all overcome (◁05210▷Deuteronomy 12:10,11). "When" Yahweh giveth them rest, "then" they shall repair for worship to the place which "God shall choose." As Davidson remarks: "It is not a law that is to come into effect on their entry into Canaan; it is to be observed from the time that Yahweh shall have given them rest from all their enemies round about; that is, from the times of David, or more particularly, Solomon; for only when the temple was built did that place become known which Yahweh had chosen to place His name there" (Old Testament Theology, 361). Besides, it should not be forgotten that in Deuteronomy itself the command is given to build an altar in Mt. Ebal (27:5-7). As a matter of fact, the unity of sanctuary follows as a necessary consequence of monotheism; and if Moses taught monotheism, he probably also enjoined unity of worship. If, on the other hand, monotheism was first evolved by the prophets of the 8th century, then, of course, unity of sanctuary was of 8th-century origin also.

(8) Another argument advanced in favor of the later origin of Deuteronomy is the contradiction between the laws of Deuteronomy and those of Lev-Numbers concerning the priests and Levites. In ◁04160▷Numbers 16:10,35,40, a sharp distinction is drawn, it is alleged, between the priests and common Levites, whereas in ◁05180▷Deuteronomy 18:1-8, all priests are Levites and all Levites are priests. But as a matter of fact, the passage in Deuteronomy does not invest a Levite with priestly but with Levitical functions (compare 18:7). "The point insisted upon is that all Levites shall

receive full recognition at the sanctuary and be accorded their prerogatives. It goes without saying that if the Levite be a priest he shall serve and fare like his brethren the priests; if he be not a priest, he shall enjoy the privileges that belong to his brethren who are Levites, but not priests" (J. D. Davis, article "Deuteronomy," in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible, 117). The Book of Deuteronomy teaches not that all the tribe, but only the tribe of Levi may exercise priestly functions, thus restricting the exercise of priestly prerogatives to one and only one tribe. This was in perfect harmony with Lev-Numbers and also in keeping with the style of popular discourse.

> **(9)** Recently Professor Ed. Naville, the Egyptologist, has propounded a theory of the origin of "the Book of the Law" discovered by Hilkiah, which is not without some value. On the analogy of the Egyptian custom of burying texts of portions of "the Book of the Dead" at the foot of statues of gods and within foundations of temple walls, as at Hermopolis, he concludes that Solomon, when he constructed the Temple, probably deposited this "Book of the Law" in the foundations, and that when Josiah's workmen were about their tasks of repairing the edifice, the long-forgotten document came to light and was given to Hilkiah the priest. Hilkiah, however, upon examination of the document found it difficult to read, and so, calling for Shaphan the scribe, who was more expert in deciphering antique letters than himself, he gave the sacred roll to him, and he in turn read it to both Hilkiah and the king. The manuscript may indeed have been written in cuneiform. Thus, according to Naville, "the Book of the Law," which he identifies with Deuteronomy, must be pushed back as far as the age of Solomon at the very latest. Geden shares a similar view as to its date: "some time during the prosperous period of David and the United Monarchy" (Intro to the Hebrew Bible, 1909, 330).

But why not ascribe the book to the traditional author? Surely there can be no philosophical objection to doing so, in view of the now-known Code of Hammurabi, which antedates Moses by so many hundreds of years! No other age accounts so well for its origin as that of the great lawgiver who claims to have written the bulk of it. And the history of the disintegration of the book only shows to what extremes a false method may lead; for example, Steuernagel separates the "Thou" and "Ye" sections from each other and assigns them to different authors of late date: Kennett, on the other hand, assigns the earliest strata to the period of the Exile (Jour. of

Theol. Studies, 1904), On the whole, no theory is so satisfactory as that which, in keeping with ⟨6312⟩Deuteronomy 31:22,24, ascribes to Moses the great bulk of the book.

See also CRITICISM; PENTATEUCH.

LITERATURE.

On the conservative side: James Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, The Bross Prize, 1906; article "Deuteronomy," Illustrated Bible Dict., 1908; James Robertson, The Early Religion of Israel, 1892; article "Deuteronomy," The Temple Bible Dict., 1910; John D. Davis, article "Deuteronomy," Davis' Dict. of the Bible, 1911; John H. Raven, Old Testament Intro, 1906; A. S. Geden, Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, 1909; W. Moller, Are the Critics Right? 1903; R. B. Girdlestone, The Student's Deuteronomy, 1899; Hugh Pope, The Date of the Composition of Deuteronomy, 1911; A. S. Zerbe, The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Lit., 1911; Ed. Naville, The Discovery of the Book of the Law under King Josiah, 1911; E. C. Bissell, The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure, 1885; G. L. Robinson, The Expositor, "The Genesis of Deuteronomy," October and November, 1898, February, March, May, 1899; W. H. Green, Moses and the Prophets, 1891; The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, 1895; A. M. Mackay, The Churchman's Introduction to the Old Testament, 1901; J. W. Beardslee, Outlines of an Introduction to the Old Testament, 1903; G. Vos, The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes, 1886.

On the other side: S. R. Driver, A Crit. and Exeg. Commentary on Deuteronomy, 1895; The Hexateuch, by J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, I, II, 1900; G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 1908; W. Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 1895; A. Kuenen, The Hexateuch, 1886; H. E. Ryle, article "Deuteronomy," HDB, 1898; G. F. Moore, article "Deuteronomy," Encyclopedia Bibl., 1899; J. A. Paterson, article "Deuteronomy," Encyclopedia Brit, VIII, 1910.

In German: Deuteronomy Wette, Dissert. crit-exeget., 1805; Kleinert, Das Deuteronomy u. d. Deuteronomiker, 1872; Wellhausen, Die Comp. des Hexateuch. u. d. hist. Bucher des Altes Testament, 1889; Gesch. Israels, 1895; Steuernagel, Der Rahmen des Deuteronomy, 1894; Entsteh. des dt. Gesetzes, 1896.

George L. Robinson

DEVICE

<de-vis'>: "A scheme," "invention," "plot." In the Old Testament it stands for six Hebrew words, of which the most common is *machashebheth* (from *chashabh*, "to think," "contrive"). In the New Testament it occurs only twice, once for Greek *enthumesis* (⁴⁴¹⁷²⁹Acts 17:29), and once for *noema* (⁴⁷⁰²¹¹2 Corinthians 2:11). Sometimes the word means simply that which is planned or invented, without any evil implication, as in ⁴⁴⁰²¹⁴2 Chronicles 2:14; ⁴⁴¹⁷²⁹Acts 17:29 (of artistic work or invention), and ²¹⁰⁹¹⁰Ecclesiastes 9:10 (in the general sense of reasoning or contriving). But more frequently it is used in an evil sense, of a wicked purpose or plot, "Let us devise devices against Jeremiah" (²⁴¹⁸¹⁸Jeremiah 18:18); "For we are not ignorant of his (i.e. Satan's) devices" (⁴⁷⁰²¹¹2 Corinthians 2:11), etc.

D. Miall Edwards

DEVIL

<dev'-'-l>.

See *DEMON; SATAN.*

DEVOTED, THINGS

<de-vot'-ed>, ([μרj *echerem*]).

See *CURSE; DEDICATE.*

DEVOTION; DEVOTIONS

<de-vo'-shun>, [σεβάσματα, *sebasmata*]): For the King James Version "your devotions" (⁴⁴¹⁷²³Acts 17:23), the Revised Version (British and American) has "the objects of your worship," which is probably the intended meaning of the King James Version. the Revised Version (British and American) reads "devotion" for the King James Version "prayer" in ¹⁸¹⁵⁰⁴Job 15:4 (the Revised Version, margin "meditation," Hebrew *siach*).

DEVOUT

<de-vout'> ([εὐλαβής, *eulabes*], [εὐσεβής, *eusebes*], [σέβομαι, *sebomai*], "pious," "dutiful," "reverential"): The word is peculiar to Luke. Applied to Simeon (⁴²⁰²⁵Luke 2:25), Cornelius (⁴⁴⁰¹⁰²Acts 10:2,7), Ananias (⁴⁴²²¹²Acts 22:12). "Devout proselytes" (⁴⁴¹³⁴³Acts 13:43, the King James

Version "religious proselytes"), with possible reference to the proselytes of righteousness as distinguished from the proselytes of the gate (*see* *PROSELYTE*). "Devout women of honorable estate" (<44150>Acts 13:50), proselytes to Judaism and wives of the men in high position among the heathen (see Josephus, BJ, II, xx, 2). "Devout Greeks" (<44704>Acts 17:4), probably, though not necessarily, proselytes of the gate, heathen by birth, who attended the synagogue services and worshipped God. "Devout persons" (<44717>Acts 17:17), proselytes of the gate.

M. O. Evans

DEW

<du> ([l f″, *Tal*]; [δρόσος, *drosos*]).

1. FORMATION OF DEW:

Two things are necessary for the formation of dew, moisture and cold. In moist countries there is less dew because the change in temperature between day and night is too small. In the deserts where the change in temperature between day and night is sometimes as much as 40 degrees F., there is seldom dew because of lack of moisture in the atmosphere. Palestine is fortunate in being near the sea, so that there is always a large percentage of water vapor in the air. The skies are clear, and hence, there is rapid radiation beginning immediately after sunset, which cools the land and the air until the moisture is condensed and settles on cool objects. Air at a low temperature is not capable of holding as much water vapor in suspension as warm air. The ice pitcher furnishes an example of the formation of dew. Just as the drops of water form on the cool pitcher, so dew forms on rocks, grass and trees.

2. VALUE OF DEW IN PALESTINE:

In Palestine it does not rain from April to October, and were it not for the dew in summer all vegetation would perish. Dew and rain are equally important. If there is no rain the winter grass and harvests fail; if no dew, the late crops dry up and there is no fruit. Failure of either of these gifts of Nature would cause great want and hardship, but the failure of both would cause famine and death. Even on the edge of the great Syrian desert in Anti-Lebanon, beyond Jordan and in Sinai, a considerable vegetation of a certain kind flourishes in the summer, although there is not a drop of rain for six months. The dews are so heavy that the plants and trees are literally

soaked with water at night, and they absorb sufficient moisture to more than supply the loss due to evaporation in the day. It is more surprising to one who has not seen it before to find a flourishing vineyard practically in the desert itself. Some of the small animals of the desert, such as the jerboa, seem to have no water supply except the dew. The dew forms most heavily on good conductors of heat, such as metals and stones, because they radiate their heat faster and cool the air around them. The wetting of Gideon's fleece (⟨07058⟩Judges 6:38) is an indication of the amount of dew formed, and the same phenomenon might be observed any clear night in summer in Palestine

3. IMPORTANCE TO ISRAEL:

Dew was a present necessity to the people of Israel as it is today to the people of the same lands, so Yahweh says, "I will be as the dew unto Israel" (⟨28415⟩Hosea 14:5). Dew and rain are of equal importance and are spoken of together in ⟨11701⟩1 Kings 17:1. It was especially valued by the children of Israel in the desert, for it supplied the manna for their sustenance (⟨02163⟩Exodus 16:13; ⟨04109⟩Numbers 11:9).

4. SYMBOL OF BLESSING:

Isaac in blessing Jacob asked that the "dew of heaven" (⟨01728⟩Genesis 27:28) may be granted to him; that these things which make for fertility and prosperity may be his portion. "The remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many peoples as dew from Yahweh" (⟨33507⟩Micah 5:7), as a means of blessing to the nations. "Blessed of Yahweh for .... dew" (⟨05313⟩Deuteronomy 33:13).

5. SYMBOL OF REFRESHMENT:

Dew is the means of refreshing and reinvigorating all vegetation. Many Scripture references carry out this idea. The song of Moses says, "My speech shall distill as the dew" (⟨05302⟩Deuteronomy 32:2). "A cloud of dew" (⟨23804⟩Isaiah 18:4) refreshes the harvesters. "My head is filled with dew" (Song 5:2). "Like the dew of Hermon" (⟨19303⟩Psalm 133:3). "Thou hast the dew of thy youth" (⟨19003⟩Psalm 110:3). "Thy dew is as the dew of herbs" (⟨23619⟩Isaiah 26:19). Job said of the time of his prosperity, "The dew lieth all night upon my branch" (⟨18919⟩Job 29:19).
Other figures use dew as the symbol of stealth, of that which comes up unawares (⟨10172⟩2 Samuel 17:12), and of inconstancy (⟨28604⟩Hosea 6:4; 13:3). God's knowledge covers the whole realm of the phenomena of Nature

which are mysteries to man (^{⟨38928⟩}Job 38:28; ^{⟨20820⟩}Proverbs 3:20).

Alfred H. Joy

DIADEM

<di'-a-dem>: There are seven Bible references to the diadem, four in the Old Testament and three in the New Testament. The Hebrew words do not mark any clear distinctions.

(1) [ﬨ×‏‎; *tsaniph*], [ﬨﬡﬦ×‏; *tsanoph*], [ﬣﬡ×‏; *tsaniphah*] (all from [ﬨﬡ″ ×‏; *tsanaph*], primarily "to wrap," "dress," "roll") mean a headdress in the nature of a turban or piece of cloth wrapped or twisted about the head. The word is also rendered "hood," "mitre." ^{⟨18294⟩}Job 29:14: "My justice was as a robe and a diadem" (RVm, "turban"); ^{⟨26618⟩}Isaiah 62:3: "a royal diadem in the hand of thy God."

(2) [ﬣﬧ﬩ﬠ×‏, *tsephirah*], means "a crown," "diadem," i.e. something round about the head; ^{⟨23805⟩}Isaiah 28:5 "a diadem of beauty, unto the residue of his people."

(3) [ﬨﬧ×ﬢ×‏, *mitsnepheth*], means an official turban or tiara of priest or king, translated also "mitre." ^{⟨26216⟩}Ezekiel 21:26: "Remove the mitre, and take off the crown."

(4) [διάδημα, *diadema*], the Greek word in the New Testament for "diadem," means "something bound about the head." Found 3 t, all in ^{⟨66123⟩}Revelation 12:3: "a great red dragon .... and upon his heads seven diadems" (the King James Version "crowns"); ^{⟨66301⟩}Revelation 13:1: "a beast .... and on his horns ten diadems"; 19:11,12: "a white horse .... and upon his head are many diadems."

   See *CROWN.*

William Edward Raffety

DIAL, OF AHAZ, THE

<di'-al>, *<a'-haz>*:

1. HEZEKIAH'S SICKNESS AND THE SIGN:

One of the most striking instances recorded in Holy Scripture of the interruption, or rather reversal, of the working of a natural law is the going back of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz at the time of Hezekiah's recovery

from his illness. The record of the incident is as follows. Isaiah was sent to Hezekiah in his sickness, to say:

"Thus saith Yahweh, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I will heal thee; on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of Yahweh. .... And Hezekiah said unto Isaiah, What shall be the sign that Yahweh will heal me, and that I shall go up unto the house of Yahweh the third day? And Isaiah said, This shall be the sign unto thee from Yahweh, that Yahweh will do the thing that he hath spoken: shall the shadow go forward ten steps, or go back ten steps? And Hezekiah answered, It is a light thing for the shadow to decline ten steps: nay, but let the shadow return backward ten steps. And Isaiah the prophet cried unto Yahweh; and he brought the shadow ten steps backward, by which it had gone down on the dial of Ahaz" (12105 2 Kings 20:5-11). And in 23808 Isaiah 38:8, it is said, "Behold, I will cause the shadow on the steps, which is gone down on the dial of Ahaz with the sun, to return backward ten steps. So the sun returned ten steps on the dial whereon it was gone down."

2. THE SIGN A REAL MIRACLE:

The first and essential point to be noted is that this was no ordinary astronomical phenomenon, nor was it the result of ordinary astronomical laws then unknown. It was peculiar to that particular place, and to that particular time; otherwise we should not read of "the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon, who sent .... to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land" (44231 2 Chronicles 32:31). It is impossible, therefore, to accept the suggestion that the dial of Ahaz may have been improperly constructed, so as to produce a reversal of the motion of the shadow at certain times. For such a maladjustment would have occasioned the repetition of the phenomenon every time the sun returned to the same position with respect to the dial. The narrative, in fact, informs us that the occurrence was not due to any natural law, known or unknown, since Hezekiah was given the choice and exercised it of his own free will, as to whether a shadow should move in a particular direction or in the opposite. But there are no alternative results in the working of a natural law. "If a state of things is repeated in every detail, it must lead to exactly the same consequences." The same natural law cannot indifferently produce one result, or its opposite. The movement of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz was, therefore, a miracle in the strict sense of the term. It cannot be explained by the working of any astronomical law, known or unknown. We have no

information as to the astronomical conditions at the time; we can only inquire into the setting of the miracle.

3. THE "DIAL" A STAIRCASE:

It is unfortunate that one important word in the narrative has been rendered in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) by a term which describes a recognized astronomical instrument. The word "dial" (*ma'aloth*) is usually translated "degrees," "steps," or "stairs," and indeed is thus rendered in the same verse. There is no evidence that the structure referred to had been designed to serve as a dial or was anything other than a staircase, "the staircase of Ahaz." It was probably connected with that "covered way for the sabbath that they had built in the house, and the king's entry without," which Ahaz turned "round the house of Yahweh, because of the king of Assyria" (<12618>2 Kings 16:18 the Revised Version, margin). This staircase, called after Ahaz because the alteration was due to him, may have been substituted for David's "causeway that goeth up," which was "westward, by the gate of Shallecheth" (<13516>1 Chronicles 26:16), or more probably for Solomon's "ascent by which he went up unto the house of Yahweh" which so impressed the queen of Sheba (<14904>2 Chronicles 9:4).

4. TIME OF DAY OF THE MIRACLE:

At certain times of the day the shadow of some object fell upon this staircase, and we learn from both 2 Kings and Isaiah that this shadow had already gone down ten steps, while from Isaiah we learn in addition that the sun also was going down. The miracle therefore took place in the afternoon, when the sun moves on its downward course, and when all shadows are thrown in an easterly direction. We are not told what was the object that cast the shadow, but it must have stood to the west of the staircase, and the top of the staircase must have passed into the shadow first, and the foot of the staircase have remained longest in the light. The royal palace is understood to have been placed southeast of the Temple, and it is therefore probable that it was some part of the Temple buildings that had cast its shadow down the stairway in full view of the dying king, as he lay in his chamber. If the afternoon were well advanced the sun would be moving rapidly in altitude, and but little in azimuth; or, in other words, the shadow would be advancing down the steps at its quickest rate, but be moving only slowly toward the left of those who were mounting

them. It may well have been the case, therefore, that the time had come when the priests from Ophel, and the officials and courtiers from the palace, were going up the ascent into the house of the Lord to be present at the evening sacrifice; passing from the bright sunshine at the foot of the stairs into the shadow that had already fallen upon the upper steps. The sun would be going straight down behind the buildings and the steps already in shadow would sink into deeper shadow, not to emerge again into the light until a new day's sun had arisen upon the earth.

5. HEZEKIAH'S CHOICE OF THE SIGN:

We can therefore understand the nature of the choice of the sign that was offered by the prophet to the dying king. Would he choose that ten more steps should be straight-way engulfed in the shadow, or that ten steps already shadowed should be brought back into the light? Either might serve as a sign that he should arise on the third day and go up in renewed life to the house of the Lord; but the one sign would be in accordance with the natural progress of events, and the other would be directly opposed to it. It would be a light thing, as Hezekiah said, for the shadow to go forward ten steps; a bank of cloud rising behind the Temple would effect that change. But no disposition of cloud could bring the shadow back from that part of the staircase which had already passed into it, and restore it to the sunshine. The first change was, in human estimation, easily possible, "a light thing"; the second change seemed impossible. Hezekiah chose the seemingly impossible, and the Lord gave the sign and answered his prayer. We need not ask Whether the king showed more or less faith in choosing the "impossible" rather than the "possible" sign. His father Ahaz had shown his want of faith by refusing to put the Lord to the test, by refusing to ask a sign, whether in the heaven above or in the earth beneath. The faith of Hezekiah was shown in asking a sign, which was at once in the heaven above and in the earth beneath, in accepting the choice offered to him, and so putting the Lord to the test. And the sign chosen was most fitting, Hezekiah lay dying, whether of plague or of cancer we do not know, but his disease was mortal and beyond cure; he was already entering into the shadow of death. The word of the Lord was sure to him; on "the third day" he would rise and go up in new life to the house of God.

6. MEANING OF THE SIGN:

But what of the sign? Should the shadow of death swallow him up; should his life be swiftly cut off in darkness, and be hidden until a new day should dawn, and the light of a new life, a life of resurrection, arise? (Compare ^{4B124}John 11:24.) Or should the shadow be drawn back swiftly, and new years be added to his life before death could come upon him? Swift death was in the natural progress of events; restoration to health was of the impossible. He chose the restoration to health, and the Lord answered his faith and his prayer.

We are not able to go further into particulars. The first temple, the royal palace, and the staircase of Ahaz were all destroyed in the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and we have no means of ascertaining the exact position of the staircase with respect to Temple or palace, or the number of the steps that it contained, or the time of the day, or the season of the year when the sign was given. It is possible that if we knew any or all of these, a yet greater significance, both spiritual and astronomical, might attach to the narrative.

7. THE FIFTEEN "SONGS OF DEGREES":

Fifteen years were added to the life of Hezekiah. In the restoration of the second temple by Herod fifteen steps led from the Court of the Women to the Court of Israel, and on these steps the Levites during the Feast of Tabernacles were accustomed to stand in order to sing the fifteen "songs of degrees" (Pss 120 through 134). At the head of these same steps in the gateway, lepers who had been cleansed from their disease presented themselves to the priests. It has been suggested that Hezekiah himself was the compiler of these fifteen "songs of the steps," in thankfulness for his fifteen years of added life. Five of them are ascribed to David or as written for Solomon, but the remaining ten bear no author's name. Their subjects are, however, most appropriate to the great crises and desires of Hezekiah's life. His great Passover, to which all the tribes were invited, and so many Israelites came; the blasphemy of Rabshakeh and of Sennacherib's threatening letter; the danger of the Assyrian invasion and the deliverance from it; Hezekiah's sickness unto death and his miraculous restoration to health; and the fact that at that time he would seem to have had no son to follow him on the throne — all these subjects seem to find fitting expression in the fifteen Psalms of the Steps.

E. W. Maunder

DIAMOND

<di'-a-mund>.

See *STONES, PRECIOUS.*

DIANA; ARTEMIS

<di-an'-a> ([Ἄρτεμις, *Artemis*] "prompt," "safe"): A deity of Asiatic origin, the mother goddess of the earth, whose seat of worship was the temple in Ephesus, the capital of the Roman province of Asia. Diana is but the Latinized form of the Greek word Artemis, yet the Artemis of Ephesus should not be confused with the Greek goddess of that name.

She may, however, be identified with the Cybele of the Phrygians whose name she also bore, and with several other deities who were worshipped under different names in various parts of the Orient. In Cappadocia she was known as Ma; to the Syrians as Atargatis or Mylitta; among the Phoenicians as Astarte, a name which appears among the Assyrians as Ishtar; the modern name Esther is derived from it. The same goddess seems to have been worshipped by the Hittites, for a female deity is sculptured on the rocks at Yazili Kaya, near the Hittite city of Boghazkeui. It may be shown ultimately that the various goddesses of Syria and Asia Minor all owe their origin to the earlier Assyrian or Babylonian Ishtar, the goddess of love, whose chief attributes they possessed. The several forms and names under which she appears axe due to the varying developments in different regions.

Tradition says that Diana was born in the woods near Ephesus, where her temple was built, when her image of wood (possibly ebony; Pliny, NH, xvi. 40; Acts 19:35) fell from the sky (see also *ASTRONOMY* I, 8 **(2)**). Also according to tradition the city which was later called Ephesus was founded by the Amazons, and Diana or Cybele was the deity of those half-mythical people. Later when Ephesus fell into the possession of the Greeks, Greek civilization partly supplanted the Asiatic, and in that city the two civilizations were blended together. The Greek name of Artemis was given to the Asiatic goddess, and many of the Greek colonists represented her on their coins as Greek. Her images and forms of worship remained more Asiatic than Greek Her earliest statues were figures crudely carved in

wood. Later when she was represented in stone and metals, she bore upon her head a mural headdress, representing a fortitled city wall; from it, drapery hung upon each side of her face to her shoulders. The upper part of her body was completely covered with rows of breasts to signify that she was the mother of all life. The lower arms were extended. The lower part of the body resembled a rough block, as if her legs had been wrapped up in cloth like those of an Egyptian mummy. In later times her Greek followers represented her with stags or lions standing at her sides. The most renowned of her statues stood on the platform before the entrance to her temple in Ephesus. As the statues indicate, she impersonated the reproductive powers of men and of animals and of all other life.

At the head of her cult was a chief priest, originally a eunuch who bore the name and later the title Megabyzos. Under him were priests known as Essenes, appointed. perhaps from the city officials, for but a single year; it was their duty to offer the sacrifices to the goddess in behalf of the city. Other subordinate classes of priests known as Kouretes, Krobatai and Hilroi performed duties which are now obscure. The priestesses were even more numerous, and, probably from their great numbers, they were called Melissai or bees; the Ephesian symbol therefore which appears commonly upon the coins struck in the city, is a bee. The Melissai, which in the early times were all virgins, were of three classes; it is no longer known just what the special duties of each class were. The ritual of the temple services consisted of sacrifices and of ceremonial prostitution, a practice which was common to many of the religions of the ancient Orient, and which still exists among some of the obscure tribes of Asia Minor.

The temple of Diana was not properly the home of the goddess; it was but a shrine, the chief one, devoted to her service. She lived in Nature; she was everywhere wherever there was life, the mother of all living things; all offerings of every possible nature were therefore acceptable to her; hence, the vast wealth which poured into her temple. Not only was she worshipped in her temple, but in the minute shrines or naoi which were sometimes modeled after the temple. More frequently the shrines were exceedingly crude objects, either of silver or stone or wood or clay. They were made at Ephesus by dependents of the temple, and carried by the pilgrims throughout the world. Before them Diana might also be worshipped anywhere, just as now from the soil of the sacred Mesopotamian city of Kerbela, where the sons of Ali were martyred, little blocks are formed and are carried away by the Shiah Moslems that they

may pray upon sacred ground wherever they may be. The makers of the shrines of Diana formed an exceedingly large class among whom, in Paul's time, was Demetrius (⁴⁴⁹²⁴Acts 19:24). None of the silver shrines have been discovered, but those of marble and of clay have appeared among the ruins of Ephesus. They are exceedingly crude; in a little shell-like bit of clay, a crude clay female figure sits, sometimes with a tambourine in one hand and a cup in the other, or with a lion at her side or beneath her foot. Though the shrines were sold as sacred dwelling-places of the goddess, that the pilgrims who carried them to their distant homes, or buried them in the graves with their dead, might be assured of her constant presence, their real purpose was to increase the temple revenues by their sale at a price which was many times their cost. With the shrines of Diana may be compared the household gods of clay found in abundance among the ruins of the earlier Babylonian cities, especially those cities in which temples to the goddess Ishtar stood.

E. J. Banks

DIASPORA

<di-as'-po-ra>.

See *DISPERSION.*

DIBLAH

<dib'-la> ([הלבד *dibhlah*], "circle"; [Δεβλάθα, *Deblatha*]): The name occurs only in ²⁶⁶¹⁴Ezekiel 6:14 (the King James Version "Diblath"), and the place has not been identified. If the reading is correct it may possibly be represented by *Dibl*, a village in Upper Galilee, South of *Tibnin*. But more likely it is a scribal error for Riblah.

DIBLAIM

<dib'-la-im>, *<dib-la'-im>* ([םילבד *dibhlayim*], "two cakes"): A native of Northern Israel and father of Gomer, the wife of Hosea (²⁸⁰¹³Hosea 1:3).

DIBLATH

<dib'-lath>.

See *DIBLAH.*

DIBLATHAIM

<dib-la-tha'-im>.

See *ALMON-DIB-LATHAIM.*

DIBON; DIBON-GAD

<di'-bon> ([ˆwbyDi, *dibhon*], "washing"; [Δαιβών, *Daibon*]):

(1) A city of Moab captured by the Amorites (^{Numbers 21:30}Numbers 21:30), and held by them at the invasion by Israel. It was taken and given to the tribe of Gad, whence it is called Dibon-gad (^{Numbers 32:34}Numbers 32:34; 33:45). In ^{Joshua 13:17}Joshua 13:17 it is reckoned to Reuben. Along with other cities in the territory North of the Arnon, Dibon changed hands several times between Moab and Israel. Mesha claims it (MS), and in ^{Jeremiah 48:18}Jeremiah 48:18,22 it is named among the cities of Moab. The form of the name, Dimon, in ^{Isaiah 15:9}Isaiah 15:9, may have been given to make it resemble the Hebrew *dam*, "blood," to support the play upon words in the verse (HDB, under the word). It is represented by the modern Dhiban, about 4 miles North of Aroer (`Ara`ir), on the line of the old Roman road. The ruins that spread over two adjacent knolls are of no importance: walls, a tower, cistern, etc. Near Dibon the famous Moabite Stone was found.
(2) A town in Judah, occupied after the exile (^{Nehemiah 11:25}Nehemiah 11:25). It may be the same as Dimonah (^{Joshua 15:22}Joshua 15:22); unidentified.

W. Ewing

DIBRI

<dib'-ri> ([yrbDi, *dibhri*], "eloquent" (?)): A Danite, whose daughter Shelomith married an Egyptian. Their son was "cut off" (stoned) for blasphemy (^{Leviticus 24:11}Leviticus 24:11).

DICE-PLAYING

See *GAMES.*

DICTIONARIES

<dik'-shun-a-riz>: A dictionary is a word-book or a list of words arranged in some fixed order, generally alphabetical, for ready reference, and usually with definitions or longer treatises. The vocabulary or glossary is a mere

list of words, often without definitions; the Lexicon or dictionary of language (words or concepts) has bare definitions, and the alphabetical encyclopedia or dictionary of knowledge or information (objects, things, subjects, topics, etc.) has longer treatises, but they are all dictionaries: the alphabetical order being the main essential in modern use. There is, however, historically no good reason why the dictionary should not be logical or chronological. The earliest use of the word as quoted by Murray's Dictionary (Joh. de Garlandia, circa 1225) was of a collection of words classified and not alphabetical. So, too, almost the earliest use in English (J. Withal's Dictionarie, 1556) was of a book of words classified by subjects. A book like Roget's Thesaurus, which is a list of classified words without definition, or a systematic encyclopedia of treatises like Coleridge's unfortunate experiment, the Encyclopedia Metropolitana, is a dictionary in the historic sense. The earliest books usually quoted in the lists of Biblical dictionaries were also in fact classified or chronological, and not alphabetical (Eusebius' Onomasticon; Jerome's Deuteronomy viris illustribus). Classified word lists, syllabaries, etc., of pre-alphabetic times, as well as in Chinese and other non-alphabetic languages of today, are of course also non-alphabetic, but strictly dictionaries.

In pre-alphabetic times the dictionaries include, besides the syllabaries of which there were many examples in Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Cyprus, etc., and the word lists proper, chronological lists of kings and various classified lists of tribute, and of astronomical or other objects. They include, in short, all the many lists where the material is grouped round a series of catchwords.

The alphabetical dictionary began with the alphabet itself, for this is a list of names of objects. The earlier alphabetical dictionaries were sometimes called alphabets. In a sense the alphabetical acrostics are dictionaries rather than acrostics, and Psalm 119, where considerable material is grouped under each letter of the alphabet, comes rather close to the dictionary idea.

So long as the quantity of literary material remained small, there was very little need for the development of the alphabetical dictionary, and the examples are rather few, the Lexicon of Suidas being perhaps the most noteworthy. With the immense increase in literary material there was a rapidly growing appreciation of the advantage of alphabetical arrangement, over the chronological or the systematic, in all cases where the object is to refer to a specific topic, rather than to read a book through or survey many

topics with reference to their relation to one another. The number of alphabetical dictionaries of knowledge increased rapidly with the growth of learning from the 13th century; now it has become legion and there are few subjects so narrow that they cannot boast their dictionary of information.

1. BIBLE DICTIONARIES:

The earliest Bible dictionary is usually counted the Eusebius, Onomasticon of Eusebius, a geographical encyclopedia; then came Jerome's Deuteronomy nominibus hebraicis, and his Deuteronomy viris illustribus (chronological). The more noteworthy steps in the history of Bible dictionaries are represented by the names of Alsted, Calmet, Winer, Kitto, William Smith, Fairbairn, Schenkel. The best recent dictionaries among the larger works are the Encyclopedia Biblica, standing for the extreme higher critical wing; Hastings, representing the slightly less radical; and this present International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, which represents a growing distrust of the extreme positions of the 19th century higher critics. All of these are on a large scale and stand for the latest and best scholarship, and the same quality is reflected in at least two of the recent single-volume dictionaries, A Standard Bible Dictionary (M. W. Jacobus), and the single-volume Hastings' dictionary. Both of these in tendency stand between Cheyne's Encyclopedia Biblica and this dictionary, Hastings facing rather toward Cheyne, and Jacobus toward this present work.

2. BIBLIOGRAPHY:

The John Crerar Library list of encyclopedias forms an excellent guide to the literature of general encyclopedias within its scope, which includes chiefly technology and physical and social sciences, but includes among its reference books very admirably chosen first-reference dictionaries to language, history, fine arts, and even philosophy and religion.

Kroeger, Alice B. Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books, 2nd edition, Boston, 1908, is an admirable introduction. Its select lists and bibliographical references supplemented by the John Crerar and other reference library lists will give complete orientation.

Following is a list of previous dictionaries:

BIBLICAL DICTIONARIES

Ayre, J. Treasury of Bible Knowledge. London, 1866.

Barnum, Samuel W. A Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Appleton, 1867.

Barr, John. A Complete Index and Concise Dictionary of the Holy Bible. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1852.

Bastow, J. A. Biblical Dictionary. London, 1848, 3 volumes; condensed edition, London, 1859; 4th edition, 1877.

Beck, J. C. Vollstand. bibl. Worterbuch. Basel, 1770, 2 volumes.

Besser, H. Bibl. Worterbuch. Gotha, 1866.

Bible Cyclopaedia, The. London: Parker, 1841.

Bost, J. A. Dictionnaire de la Bible. Paris, 1865.

Bourazan, F. A. Sacred Dictionary. London: Nisbet, 1890.

Brown, John. A Dictionary of the Holy Bible. Edinburgh, 1768, 4th edition; London: Murray, 1797; American edition, from the 12th Edinburgh edition, New York: Harper, 1846.

Calmet, A. Dict. historique, critique, chronologique, geographique et litteral de la Bible. Paris, 1719.

Calmet, Augustine. Dictionary of the Holy Bible. 5th edition, revised and enlarged, 5 volumes, London: Holdsworth, 1829; new edition, London: Bohn, 1847; abridged by Buckley, new edition, London: Routledge, 1862.

Cassell's Bible Dictionary. Illustrated with nearly 600 engravings; London and New York, 2 volumes: Cassell, 1866; new edition, 1869.

Cheyne, T. K. and Black, J.S. Encyclopedia Biblica. London, 1899-1903, 4 volumes.

Conder, F. R. and C. R. A Handbook to the Bible. London: Longmans, 1879; 2nd edition, 1880, New York: Randolph, no date (1880).

Dalmasius, J. A. Dictionarium manuale biblicum. Aug. Vind., 1776, 2 volumes.

Davis, J. D. Dictionary of the Bible. Philadelphia, 1898; new edition, 1903.

Eadie, John. A Biblical Cyclopaedia. London: Rel. Tr. Soc., 1848; 14th edition, London: Griffin, 1873.

Easton, M. G. Illustrated Bible Dictionary. London: Nelson; New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1893.

Fairbairn, Patrick. The Imperial Bible Dictionary. London: Blackie, 1866, 2 volumes.

Farrar, John. A Biblical and Theological Dictionary. London: Mason, 1852; new edition, London: Wesl. Conf. Off., 1889.

Faussett, A. R. The Englishman's Bible Encyclopedia. London: Hodder, 1878. Republished with title. Bible Cyclopaedia, Critical and Expository. New York: Funk, 1891.

Gardner, J. Christian Encyclopedia. Edinburgh, no date

Gebhardt, G.L. Biblisches Worterb. Lemgo, 1793-96, 3 volumes.

Goodhue, W. and Taylor, W. C. Pictorial Dictionary of the Holy Bible. London, 1843, 2 volumes.

Granbery, John C. Bible Dictionary. Nashville: So. Meth. Pub. Soc., 1883.

Green, S. Biblical and Theol. Dictionary. London, 1840, 1860.

Guthe, H. Kurzes Bibelworterbuch. 1903.

Hagen. Lexicon biblicum. Paris, 1905-, 4 volumes (Roman Catholic).

Hamburger. Realencyklopadie fur Bibel und Talmud. New edition 1896-97; 2 volumes and 4 supplementary volumes (Jewish point of view).

Hamburger, J. Biblisch-talmudisches Worterbuch. Strelitz, 1866.

Hastings. Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh and New York, 1898-1902, 4 volumes and supplementary vol, 1904. 1-vol edition, 1909.

Hastings, James, and others. Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. New York: Scribner; Edinburgh: Clark, 1906-8, 2 volumes.

Haupt, C. G. Bibl. Real-Encyklopadie. Quedlinb., 1820-27, 3 volumes.

Hezel, W. F. Biblisches Real-Lexikon. Leipzig, 1783-85, 3 volumes.

Hoffmann, A. C. Allgem. Volks-Bibellexikon. Leipzig, 1842.

Hunter, R. Concise Bible Dict. London: Cassell, 1894.

Inglis, James. Bible Text Cyclopaedia. London: Houlston, 1861; new edition, Rel. Tr. Soc., 1865, Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1877.

Jacobus, M. W. A Standard Bible Dictionary. New York: Funk, 1909.

Jones, William. The Biblical Cyclopaedia; or Dictionary of the Holy Scriptures. London: Wightman, 1840; new edition, Tegg, 1847; revised, 1873.

Kitto, John. Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. 3rd ed., edition Alexander, Edinburgh, 1862-65, 3 volumes (best edition of Kitto), and after.

Krehl. Neutestamentl. Handworterbuch. Gottingen, 1857.

Lawson, J. P. Bible Cyclopaedia. London, 1849, 3 volumes.

Leun, F. G. Bibl. Encyklopadie. Gotha, 1793-98, 4 volumes.

Macbean, A. Dictionary of the Bible. London, 1779.

Macpherson, John. The Universal Bible Dictionary. London: Hodder, 1892.

Malcom, Howard. New Bible Dictionary. Boston: Gould; New York: Sheldon, 1852.

Malcom, H. Dictionary of the Bible. London, 1854.

Oetinger, F. C. Biblisches Worterb. Stuttgart, 1849.

Oliver, P. Scripture Lexicon. Birmingham, 1784; London, 1843.

Otho, J. H. Lex. Rabbinico-philologicum. Geneva, 1675.

Rand, W. W. A Dictionary of the Holy Bible. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., no date (1859); rev. edition, 1886.

Ravanel, P. Bibliotheca Sacra. Geneva, 1660.

Rawson, A. L. The Bible Handbook, for Sunday Schools. 4th edition, New York: Thompson, 1870.

Rechenbergius, A. Hierolexicon reale collectum. Leipzig und Frankfort, 1714, 2 volumes.

Rice, Edwin W. People's Dictionary of the Bible. Philadelphia: Am. S.S. U., 1893.

Riehm and Bathgen. Handworterbuch des biblischen Altertums. Bielefeld, 1893-94, 2 volumes.

Roberts, Francis. Clavis Bibliorum. 1675.

Robinson, E. Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Worthington, 1879.

Schaff, Philip. A Dictionary of the Bible. Philadelphia: Am. S.S. U., 1880; 5th edition, 1890.

Schenkel. Bibel Lexikon. 1869-75, 5 volumes.

Schneider, M. C. F. Worterb. ub. d. Bibel. Leipzig, 1795-1817, 4 volumes.

Simon, Richard. Grand dictionnaire de la Bible. Lyons, 1693.

Smith, W. Dictionary of the Bible. London, 1860-63, 3 volumes; 2nd edition, Smith and Fuller, 1893.

Smith, W. Dictionary of the Bible. Boston, no date, 4 volumes.

Smith, W. Bible Dictionary. Acme edition, New York: Alden, 1885.

Vigouroux. Dictionnaire de la Bible contenant tous les noms de personnes, de lieux .... mentionnes dans les s. Ecritures. Paris, 1895-.

Vollbeding, J. C. Bibl. Worterb. Berlin, 1800-1805, 3 volumes.

Watson, R. Biblical and Theol. Dictionary. London, 1831; New York, also Nashville.

Wahl, C. A. Bibl. Handworterb. Leipzig, 1828, 2 volumes.

Walbrecht, C. L. Biblisch. Worterbuch. Gottingen, 1837.

Westcott, A., and Watt, J. Concise Bible Dictionary. London: Isbister, 1893.

Wilson, T. Complete Christian Dictionary. London, 1661.

Winer, G. B. Biblisches Realworterb. 3rd edition, 1847-48, 2 volumes (still useful).

Zeller, H. Biblisches Worterb. Stuttgart, 1855-58, 2 volumes.

Other recent one-volume dictionaries are: Angus (1907), Bevis (1900); Gamble (1906), Ewing (1910), Hyamson (1907), Piercy (1908).

3. GENERAL RELIGIOUS ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

Next in importance for Bible students to the Bible dictionaries are the general dictionaries of religious knowledge. Many of the more recent of these, such as the Hauck edition of RE, the new Sch-Herz, Jew Encyclopedia, the Catholic Encyclopedia, and in general all the larger and some of the smaller recent ones have articles of real importance for Bible study, often better than some of the specific Bible dictionaries.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARIES

Abbott, Lyman. A Dictionary of Religious Knowledge. New York: Harper, 1875.

Addis, William E. A Catholic Dictionary. New York: Cath. Pub. Soc. Co., 1884; 4th edition, revised, London: Paul, 1893.

Aschbach. Kirchenlexikon. n.p. 1846-51, 4 volumes.

Benham, William. Dictionary of Religion. London and New York: Cassell, 1887.

Buchberger. Kirchliches Handlexikon. Munchen, 1907 (short but comprehensive).

Buck, Charles. A Theological Dictionary. Enlarged by Dr. Henderson. London: Tegg, 1847; American edition, revised and enlarged by George Bush; Philadelphia: Desliver, no date

Ceccaroni, A. Dizionaro ecclesiastico illustrato. Milano.

Dwight, H. O., Tupper, H. O., Jr. and Bliss, E. M. The Encyclopedia of Missions. New York, 1904.

Eadie, J. The Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia. London: Griffin, 1847; new edition, 1875.

Eden, Robert. The Churchman's Theological Dictionary. 2nd edition, London: Parker, 1846; new edition, 1859.

Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, The; or, Dictionary of the Bible. Rev. edition, Philadelphia: Claxton, 1870.

Farrar, John. An Ecclesiastical Dictionary. London: Mason, 1853, revised, 1871.

Gardner, James. The Christian Encyclopedia. London: Groombridge, 1854; new edition, 1858.

Glaire, J. B. Dictionnaire universel des sciences eccla, esiastiques. Paris, 1868, 2 volumes.

Herbermann, Pace, Pellen, Shahan and Wynne. Catholic Encyclopedia. New York, 1906-, 15 volumes.

Herzog. Realencyclopadie fur protestantische Theologie u. Kirche. 1853-68, 21 volumes; 3rd ed., edition Hauck, 1896-1908, 21 volumes, translation New York, 1908-(best of all the ecclesiastical dictionaries).

Herzog, J. J. A Protestant, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia. Vols I and II. Philadelphia: Lindsay, 1858-60.

Holtzmann and Zopffel. Lexikon fur Theologie und Kirchenwesen. 2nd edition, Brunswick, 1888 (Prot).

Jackson, Samuel Macauley. Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer. New York: Christian Lit. Co., 1890, 1891; 3rd edition, New York: Maynard, 1893.

Jackson, S. M. The New Schaff-Herzog. New York: Funk, 1908, sq. (good and modern).

Jewish Encyclopedia. New York, 1901-6, 12 volumes (most scholarly).

Lichtenberger, F. Dict. des sci. eccl. Paris, 1877-82, 15 volumes (French Protestant).

McClintock, John and Strong, James. Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. 10 volumes. New York: Earper, 1867-81. With supplements in 2 volumes, 1890.

Marsden, J. B. A Dictionary of Christian Churches and Sects. London: Bentley, 1857.

Migne. Encycl. theologique. Paris, 1844-75 (over 100 special lexicons).

Moroni. Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica. Venice, 1840-79, 103 volumes, and Index, 6 volumes.

Among the older ones the huge encyclopedia of Migne, which is a classified series of alphabetical dictionaries, and the Moroni, with its 109 volumes, are still of great usefulness to the scholar on out-of-the-way topics, not so much for Biblical topics but at least for Biblical related matters.

Perthes. Handlexikon fur evangelische Theol. Gotha, 1890-1901, 3 volumes.

Robinson, John. Theological, Biblical and Ecclesiastical Dictionary. London: Whittaker, 1815; 4th edition, 1835.

Schaff, Philip and Jackson, Samuel Macauley. A Religious Encyclopedia. New York: Christian Lit. Co., 1882; 3rd edition, New York: Funk, 1891. Together with an Encyclopedia of Living Divines, etc.

Schaffer. Handlexikon der kath. Theologie. Ratisbon, 1881-91, 3 volumes.

Schiele. Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Tubingen, 1909-, 5 volumes.

Shipley, Orby. A Glossary of Ecclesiastical Forms. London: Rivingtons, 1871.

Staunton, William. An Ecclesiastical Dictionary, New York: Prot. Ep. S.S. U., 1861.

Vacant and Mangenot. Dictionnaire de theologie catholique. Paris, 1903-.

Wetzer and Welte. Kirchenlexicon. Freiburg, 1847-60; 2nd edition, 1880-91, 13 volumes, and index, 1903 (Roman Catholic scientific best).

4. DICTIONARIES OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION:

The monumental dictionary in this class superseding all others is Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, but Forlong has served a useful purpose and some of the special dictionaries like Roscher are quite in the same class with Hastings.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION

Balfour, E. Cyclopaedia of India, and of East and South Asia. 3rd edition, London, 1885, 3 volumes.

Beale, Th. W. Oriental Biographical Dictionary. Calcutta, 1881; London, 1894.

Brewer, E. C. Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. London, 1905.

Encyclopedia of Islam. London: Luzac.

Forlong, J. G. R. Faiths of Man; a Cyclopaedia of Religions. London, 1906, 3 volumes.

Hastings, James. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edinburgh, Clark; New York, Scribner, 1908-.

Hazlitt, W. C. Faiths and Folklore; a Dictionary of National Beliefs. London, 1905.

Hughes, T. P. Dictionary of Islam. London, 1885.

5. DENOMINATIONAL DICTIONARIES:

The admirable Jewish and Catholic encyclopedias mentioned above, like the Methodist M'Clintock and Strong, belong rather to general than denominational encyclopedias, but the Catholic dictionaries of Addis and of Thien are denominational in the same sense as those of the Episcopal,

Lutheran, etc., churches, mentioned below, among which perhaps the best executed example is the Lutheran Encyclopedia of Jacobs.

DICTIONARIES OF DENOMINATIONS

Addis, W. E. A Catholic Dictionary, 3rd edition, New York, 1884.

Benton, A. A. The Church Cyclopaedia. Philadelphia, 1884.

Burgess, G. A. Free Baptist Cyclopaedia. Chicago: Free Bapt. Cyclop. Co., 1889.

Cathcart, Wm. The Baptist Encyclopedia. Philadelphia, 1881, 2 volumes.

Catholic Encyclopedia. New York, 1907 and following. See General Religious Encyclopedias.

Hook, Walter F. A Church Dictionary. Philadelphia: Butler, 1853; 7th edition, Tibbals, 1875.

Jacobs, H. E. and Haas, J. A. W. The Lutheran Cyclopedia. New York, 1905.

Jewish Encyclopedia. See General Theological Encyclopedias.

Nevin, A. Encyclopedia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia, 1884.

Simpson, M. Cyclopaedia of Methodism. Philadelphia, 1878.

Thein, J. Ecclesiastical Dictionary. New York, 1900 (Roman Catholic).

SPECIAL DICTIONARIES: ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Blunt, J. H. Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, etc. London, 1892.

Blunt, J. H. Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology. Philadelphia, 1870.

Brewer, E. C. A Dictionary of Miracles. Philadelphia, 1884.

Brodrick, M. Concise Dictionary of Egyptian Archaeol. London, 1902.

Cabrol. Dictionnaire d'archeologie chretienne et de liturgie. Paris, 1907-.

Chevalier, Ul. Repertoire des sources hist. du moyen-age. Bio-bibliog. Paris, 1905-7.

— — — Repertoire des sources historiques du moyen-age. Topo-bibliog. Montbeliard, 1894-1903, 2 volumes.

Fabricius, J. A. Bibliotheca latina mediae et infimae aetatis. Patavii, 1754, 6 volumes in 3.

Julian, J. edition A Dictionary of Hymnology. New York, 1892.

Kraus. Real-Encyklopadie der christlichen Alterthumer. Freiburg i. Br., 1882-86, 2 volumes.

Lee, F. G. A Glossary of Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Terms. London, 1877.

Martigny. Dictionnaire des antiquites chretiennes. 2nd edition, Paris, 1877.

Pauly. Realencyk. der klass. Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart, 1842-66, 6 volumes; edition Wissowa, 1894 and later.

Roscher, W. H. Lexikon der griechischen und romischen Mythologie. Leipzig, 1884-1902, 5 volumes.

Smith, Wm. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Boston, 1849, 3 volumes.

Smith, Wm. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. Boston, 1854-57, 2 volumes.

Smith, Sir William, Wayte, William, and Marindin, G. E. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. 3rd edition, enlarged London: Murray; Boston: Little, 1890-91, 2 volumes.

Smith, W. and Cheetham, A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. Boston, 1875-1880, 2 volumes.

Smith, W. and Wace, H. A Dictionary of Christian Biography. Boston, 1877-87, 4 volumes; abridged edition by Wace and Piercy, 1911.

Stadler and Helm. Heiligenlexikon. 1858-82, 5 volumes.

Wolcott, Mackenzie E. C. Sacred Archaeology. London: Reeve, 1868.

6. UNIVERSAL ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

What has been said of general religious encyclopedias applies almost equally to Biblical articles in the good general encyclopedias. Among these the Encyclopedia Britannica, of which a new edition appeared in 1911, is easily first, and has maintained through its many editions a high standard. The previous edition was edited by Professor Robertson Smith, who gave a peculiarly high quality of scholarship to its Biblical articles, while at the same time rather tingeing them with extreme views. Among the British encyclopedias, Chambers' is still kept up to a high standard. The recent American editions include the New International, the Nelson, and the Americana, the former, perhaps, contributing most on Bible matters. The annual supplement to the International gives a useful resume of the progress of Biblical archaeology during each year.

UNIVERSAL ENCYCLOPAEDIAS

America and England

Adams, Charles Kendall. Universal Cyclopaedia and Atlas. New York: Appleton, 1905, 12 volumes.

American Cyclopaedia. New York, 1858-63, 16 volumes; new edition, 1873-76 ("Appleton's encyclopedia").

Chambers, Ephraim. Cyclopaedia. London, 1728.

Chambers' Encyclopedia. London, 1860-68, 10 volumes; new edition, 1901.

Colby, Frank Moore. Nelson's Encyclopedia. (circa 1905-6), 12 volumes.

Encyclopedia Americana. New York: The Americana Co. (circa 1903-4), 16 volumes.

Encyclopedia Britannica. 1771; 9th edition, 1875-89, 29 volumes and Index, sup., 11 volumes, Index and atlas, 1902-3; 11th edition, Cambridge, England, 1910-11, 28 volumes.

Gilman, D. C. New International Encyclopedia. New York: Dodd, 1907 (circa 1902-7), 20 volumes.

Hunter. Encyclopaedic Dictionary. London, New York, 1879-88, 7 volumes.

Johnson's New Universal Encyc. New York, 1874-78, 4 volumes; new edition, 1893-95, 8 volumes.

Knight. English Cyclopedia. London, 1854-73, 27 volumes, and 4 supplementary volumes.

New International Year Book. New York: Dodd, 1908-.

Rees. New Encyclopedia. London, 1802-20. 45 volumes.

Schem. Deutsch-amerikanisches Konversations-Lex. New York, 1870-74.

Smedley (Coleridge?). Encyclopedia Metropolitana. 1818-45, 30 volumes (classed with some alphabetical sections).

<center>*France*</center>

Bayle. Dict. historique et critique. Rotterdam, 1695-97 (very widely circulated).

Berthelot, Derenbourg and others. Lamentations grande encyclopedie. See below.

Corneille, Thomas. (Dict.) Paris, 1694.

Dictionnaire de la conversation et de la lecture. 1851-58, 16 volumes.

Diderot and D'Alembert. Encyclopedic. Paris, 1751-52, 28 volumes; 5 sup. volumes, Amsterdam, 1776-77; 2 volumes Index, Paris, 1780. (Also Voltaire, Rousseau, etc. This is in the history of dictionary encyclopedias "the encyclopedia" paragraph excellence and epoch-making in the history of "free thought." Many editions; 1st edition, 30,000 copies.)

Encyclopedie des gens du monde. 1833-45, 22 volumes.

Encyclopedie du XIXe siecle. 1837-59, 75 volumes; 3rd edition, 1867-72. Continues as Annuaire encyc.

Encyclopedie moderne. 1846-51; new edition, 1856-72, 30 volumes, 12 sup. volumes, atlas, 2 volumes.

Furetiere. (Dict.) Rotterdam, 1690.

Gra**n**de encyclopedic. Paris: Lamirault, 1885-1903, 31 volumes (known as Lamirault's).

Larousse. Diet. univ., 1865-90; 17 volumes; new edition, 1895.

— — — . Dict. complet illustre. 129th edition, 1903.

Moerin. Grand dict. historique. Lyons, 1674.

Nouveau Larousse illustre. Paris, 1898-1904, 8 volumes.

Panckoucke and Agasse. Encyclopedie methodique. Paris, 1782-1832, 166 volumes, text, 51 volumes, illus. (classed -alphabetic method like Migne).

Germany

Allgemeine Realencyklopadie fur das katholische Deutschland. 1846-49, 13 volumes; 4th edition, 1880-90.

Brockhaas. Konversationslexikon. 14th edition, 1901 (B. and Meyer are the standard German encyclopedias).

Ersch and Gruber. Allgemeine encyklopadie. 1813-90, 99 plus 43 plus 25 volumes (scholarly and exhaustive; many articles are complete treatises).

Herder. Konversationslexikon. Freiburg, 1853-57, 5 volumes; 3rd edition, 1901-8, 8 volumes (Roman Catholic; high grade).

Hubner. Reales-, Staats-, Zeitungs-und Konversations-Lexikon; 31st edition, Leipzig, 1824-28.

Jablonski. Lexikon .... Leipzig, 1721.

Koster and Roos. (Encyc.) Frankfort, 1778-1804, 23 volumes (stops at "Kinol").

Krunitz (and others). Oekonomisch-technolog. Encykl. Berlin, 1773-1858, 242 volumes.

Ludewig, Y. J. von. Grosses, vollstandiges, Universal-Lexikon. Leipzig, 1731-54, 68 volumes ("Zedler," which was publisher's name; most admirable and still useful; on account of the vast number of topics it often serves when all other sources fail).

Meyer. Konversations-lexikon. Leipzig, 1840-52, 37 volumes; 6th edition, 1902, 20 volumes; 7th edition, abridged, 1907, 6 volumes (Meyer and Brockhaus are the standard German encyclopedias).

Pierer. Universallexikon. 7th edition, 1888-93, 12 volumes.

Spamer. Illustriertes Konversationslexikon. 1869-79, 8 volumes, supplementary volumes, 1879-82; 2nd edition, 1884-91.

Zedler. Universal-Lexikon. See Ludewig above.

Italy

Berri. Enciclopedia popolare economica. Milan, 1871. Coronelli. Biblioteca universale. Venice, 1701, 7 volumes (incomplete).

Lessona and Valle. Dizionario universale. Milan, 1874-83.

Nuova encic. popolare italiana. Turin, 1841-51, 14 volumes; 6th edition, 1875-89, 25 volumes, sup., 1889-99.

Piccola enciclopedia Hoepli. Milan, 1891.

Netherlands

Deuteronomy algemeene Nederlandsche Encyclopedic. Zutphen, 1865-68, 15 volumes.

Lobel. (Encyc.) Amsterdam, 1796-1810 ("first enc according to modern ideas").

Mollerup. Nordisk Konversationsleksikon. 3rd edition, Copenhagen, 1883-94.

Nieuwenhuis Woordenboek. Leyden, 1851-68.

Sijthoff. Woordenboek voor Kennis en Kunst. Leyden, 1891.

Winkler Prins. Geillustreerde Encyclopedie. Amsterdam, 1905, sq. 3rd edition

Russia and Poland

Meijer. Konversationsleksikon. 1889-94.

Brockhaus and Efron. Entciklopedicheskij Slovai. Petersburg, 1890-1902, 35 volumes.

Jushakow. Boljsaja Enciklopedija. Petersburg, 1899.

Sikoroski, Warsaw, 1890.

Orgelbrand. Encjklopedya Powszechna. Warsaw, 1859-68, 28 volumes.

Scandinavia

Blangstrup. Store Illustererede Konversationsleksikon. Copenhagen, 1891-1901, 12 volumes.

Johnsen, Norsk Haandbog. 1879-88.

Nordisk Familjsbok; Konversationslexikon. Stockholm, 1876-99, 20 volumes.

Salmonsen. Store Illustrerede Konversationsleksikon. Kjobenhavn, 1893-1907, 18 volumes.

Spain and Portugal

Diccionario Popular Hist. Geogr. Mytholog. Biograph. Lisbon, 1876-90, 16 volumes.

Enciclopedia Universal Illustrada Europeo-Americana. Barcelona, 1907-(Catholic).

Costa. Diccionario Universal Portuguez.

Lemos. Enciclopedia Portugueza Illustrada. 254 numbers to 1903.

Mellados. Enciclopedia moderna. Madrid, 1848-51, 34 volumes; 3 volumes of charts.

Montaner y Simon. Diccionario Encic Hispano-Americano. Barcelona, 1887-99, 25 volumes.

Other

Arabian Encyc. Discontinued when it reached the 9th vol, Beirut, 1876-87.

Enciclop. Romana. Herrmannstadt, 1896-1903, 3 volumes (Rumanian).

Kober. Slovnik Nancny. Prague, 1860-87, 12 volumes.

Otto. Ottuv Slovnik Nancny. Prague, 1888-1901, 17 volumes.

Pallas Nagy Lexikona. Budapest, 1893-97, 16 volumes; sup. 1900.

7. DICTIONARIES OF PHILOSOPHY:

The dictionaries of philosophy often bear on Bible study almost as much as the religious dictionaries. Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, which is the most comprehensive work, is also very full in its bibliographical reference, and has in volumes III and IV a colossal bibliography of philosophy continued and kept up to date in the Psychological Index. The dictionary of Eisler is on the historical principle and of very great importance in interpreting the doctrines of Biblical theology.

DICTIONARIES OF PHILOSOPHY

Baldwin, J. M. Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, New York, 1901 and following.

Eisler, R. Philosophisches Worterbuch. Berlin, 1904, 2 volumes; new edition, 3 volumes.

Frank. Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques. 3rd edition, 1885.

8. DICTIONARIES OF ART AND MUSIC:

The dictionaries of architecture often treat of Egyptian Babylonian, and sometimes Palestinian matters. The dictionaries of painting, engraving, music, etc., have less direct matter but are important and necessary in view of the fact that so large a part of the best work is on Biblical themes.

ART

Architectural Publication Society. Dictionary of Architecture. London, 1852-92, 6 volumes.

Bryan, Michael. Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers. New edition London: Bell, 1903-5, 5 volumes.

Champlin, John Denison, Jr. Cyclopedia of Painters and Painting. New York: Scribner, 1892 (circa 1885-87), 4 volumes.

Clement, Mrs. Clara Erskine Handbook of Christian Symbols.

Gwilt, Joseph. Encyclopedia of Architecture. New edition London: Longmans, 1888.

James, Ralph N. Painters and Their Works. London, 1896.

Muller, Hermann Alexander. Allgemeines Kunstlerlexicon. 3rd edition Frankfurt a. M., 1895-1901, 5 volumes.

Nagler, G. K. Neues allgemeines Kunstlerlexikon. 2. Aufl. Linz., 1904-7, volumes 1-10.

Seubert. Allgemeines Kunstlerlex. Frankfurt, 1879, 3 volumes.

Sturgis, Russell. Dictionary of Architecture and Building. New York: Macmillan, 1901, 3 volumes.

Thieme, Ulrich, and Becker, Felix. Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Kunstler. Leipzig, 1907.

Viollet-le-Duc, Eugene Emmanuel. Dictionnaire raisonne de l'architecture. Paris, 1868, 10 volumes.

MUSIC

Baker, Theodore. Biographical Dictionary of Musicians. New York: Schirmer, 1900.

Champlin, John Denison, Jr. Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians. New York: Scribner, 1893.

Eitner, R. Biog-bibliog. Lexikon d. Musiker. Leipzig, 1900-4, 10 volumes.

Fetis, Frantsois Joseph. Biographie universelle des musiciens. 2nd edition Paris, 1860-66, 8 volumes; 2nd sup. 1875-81.

Grove, George. Dictionary of Music. London: 1878-89, 4 volumes and supplements, 2nd edition by J. A. Fuller Maitland, 1905.

Kornmuller. Lexikon der kirchlichen Tonkunst. 2nd edition Ratisbon, 1891-95, 2 volumes.

Mendel and Reissmann. Musikalisches Konversations-lexikon. Berlin, 1870-83, 12 volumes and supplements.

Riemann, Hugo. Musik-Lexikon. 4th edition, 1894.

— — — . Dictionary of Music. London (1899).

Many of these bear occasionally or indirectly on Biblical topics.

9. DICTIONARIES OF SOCIAL SCIENCE:

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Birkmeyer. Encykl. der Rechtswissenschaft. Berlin, 1901.

Bliss, William Dwight Porter. New Encyclopedia of Social Reform. New York: Funk, 1908.

Bluntschli. Deutsches Staatsworterbuch. 1857-70, 2 volumes; new edition, 1869-74, 3 volumes.

Bruder. Staats-Lexikon of the Gorres Society. Freiburg i. Br., 1889-97, 5 volumes; 4th ed., edition Bachem, 1908-(Roman Catholic).

Buisson, F. Dictionnaire de pedagogie. Paris, 1882, 4 volumes.

Conrad, J. Handworterbuch der Staatswissenschaften. Jena, 1898 sq. 3rd edition to Vol XVIII (1911).

Conrad, Elster, Lexis and Loening. Handworterbuch der Staatswissenschaften. 1889-98, 6 volumes; 2 sup. volumes.

Cyclopaedia of Temperance and Prohibition. New York: Funk, 1891.

Elster. Worterbuch der Volkswirtschaft, 1808, 2 volumes; 2nd edition, 1907-.

Fay and Chailley. Nouveau dict. d'economie politique. Paris: 1891-92, 2 volumes.

Holtzendorff, F. von. Encyk. der Rechtswissenschaft. 6th edition, 1903-.

Lalor, J. J. Cyclopaedia of Political Science. New York, 1889-90, 3 volumes.

Palgrave, R. H. I. Dictionary of Political Economy. London, 1894-96, 3 volumes.

Reichesberg. Handworterbuch der schweizer. Volkswirtschaft. 1901.

Rotteck and Welcker. Staatslex. Altona, 1835-44, 15 volumes; 3rd edition, 1856-66, 14 volumes.

Schmid, K. A. Encyclopadie d. Erziehungswesens. Gotha.

Sonnenschein, W. S. Cyclopaedia of Education, arr. and edition by A. W. Fletcher, Syracuse, 1899.

Wagener, H. Staats-und Gesellschafts-Lex. Berlin, 1859-68, 26 volumes.

10. DICTIONARIES OF GEOGRAPHY:

The modern gazetteers are indispensable for identifications.

MODERN GAZETTEERS

Chisholm, George Goudie. Longmans' Gazetteer of the World. London, 1902.

Hunter, W. W. Imperial Gazetteer of India. London, 1881, 9 volumes.

Lippincott's New Gazetteer. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1906.

Ritter's geographisch-statistisches Lexikon. 9. umgearb. Aufl. Leipzig, 1905-6. 2 volumes.

Vivien de Saint Martin, Louis. Nouveau dictionnaire de geographie universelle. Paris, 1879-95, 7 volumes.

11. BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARIES:

The great modern biographical dictionaries, although of little use for Scripture names, are of much value to the Biblical student for the writings on Biblical subjects, and in the case of ancient biography, of much value for contemporary persons in other lands.

MODERN BIOGRAPHY

Aa, Anton Jacobus van der. Biographisch Woorden-boek der Nederlander. Haarlem, 1876-78, 21 volumes.

Academie royale de Belgique. Biographie nationale. Bruxelles. 1866-1907, volumes 1-19.

Allgemeine deutsche Biographie. Leipzig: 1875-1906, 52 volumes.

Allgemeine deutsche Biographie. Leipzig: Duncker, 1875-1900, 45 volumes.

Allibone, S. A. A Critical Dictionary of English Literature. Philadelphia, 1870-72, 3 volumes; 1891, 2 volumes.

Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography, edition by J. G. Wilson. New York: Appleton, 1888-1900, 7 volumes.

Biografiskt Lexikon ofver namnkunnige svenske Man. Stockholm, 1874, 23 volumes.

Biographisches Jahrbuch und deutscher Nekrolog. Berlin, 1897-1906, 9 volumes.

Bricka, Carl Frederik. Dansk biografisk Lexikon. 1887-1905, 19 volumes.

Century Cyclopedia of Names, edition by B. E. Smith. New York: Century Co. (circa 1894).

Dictionary of National Biography, edition by Leslie Stephen. London: Smith; New York: Macmillan, 1885-1900, 63 volumes.

Feller, F. X. de. Biographie universelle ou dictionnaire historique. Paris, 1847-50, 8 volumes in 4.

Giles, Herbert Allen. A Chinese Biographical Dictionary. London: Quaritch, 1898.

Glasius, B. Godeleerd Nederland. 1851-56, 3 volumes.

Hoefor, Ferdinand. Nouvelle biographie universelle. Paris: Didot, 1852-66, 46 volumes.

Hofberg, Herman. Svenskt biografiskt Handlexikon. Stockholm, 1906, volumes 1-2.

Joecher, C. G. Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon. Leipzig, 1750-51.

Lamb's Biographical Dictionary of the United States. Boston, 1900-1903, 7 volumes.

Michaud, Joseph Frantsois. Biographie universelle. Paris, 1842-65, 45 volumes.

National Cyclopaedia of American Biography. New York: White, 1892-1906, 13 volumes.

Schaff and Jackson. Encyclopedia of Living Divines and Christian Workers. New York, 1887.

Vapereau, L. G. Dictionnaire universel des litterateurs. Paris, 1876.

Vapereau. Dictionnaire des contemporains. Paris, 1858; 6th edition, 1893; supplements, 1895.

— — — . Dictionnaire des litterateurs. 1876; 2nd edition, 1884.

Wurzbach, C. von. Biographisches Lexikon Oesterreichs. 1856-91, 60 volumes.

— — — . Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreichs. Wien: **Zamarski**, 1856-91, 60 volumes.

12. DICTIONARIES OF LANGUAGE:

The lexicons of the Biblical languages and versions are treated under the head of the respective languages. The chief dictionaries in English are the great Murray and the encyclopaedic Century. The best one-vol dictionaries are perhaps the Standard and the last edition of Webster.

DICTIONARIES OF LANGUAGE

Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs, C. A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Boston, 1906.

Thayer, J. H. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York, 1887; corrected edition, 1889.

Century-Dictionary, an Encyclopedic Lexicon. New York: Century Co. (circa 1889-1901), 6 volumes.

Murray, James Augustus Henry. New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888-.

Standard Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Funk.

Stormonth's Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Scribner, 1899.

Webster, Noah. International Dictionary of the English Language. Springfield (Mass.), 1891 (circa 1864-90); new edition, 1909.

Worcester, Joseph Emerson. Dictionary of the English Language. New edition, enlarged Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1891.

The article, "Dictionary" in the new Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition) (11th edition) covers the whole matter of dictionaries of language with extraordinary fullness.

E. C. Richardson

DIDACHE

<did'-a-ke>.

See *LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC*.

DIDRACHMA

<di-drak'-ma>: Two drachmas.

See *DRACHMA, DRAM*.

DIDYMUS

<did'-i-mus> ([Δίδυμος, *Didumos*], i.e. "twin"): The surname of
THOMAS (which see).

DIE

([tWm, *muth*], [[w" G; *gawa`*]; [ἀποθνήσκω, *apothnesko*], [τελευτάω,
teleutao]): "To die," etc., is of very frequent occurrence, and in the Old
Testament is generally the translation of muth, meaning perhaps originally,
"to be stretched out" or "prostrate." "To die," should be the consequence
of eating the forbidden fruit (Genesis 2:17; compare 20:7; 2 Kings
1:4,6). "Die" is commonly used of natural death (Genesis 5:8; 25:8). It
is used also of violent death (Genesis 26:9,11; Exodus 21:20);
punitive (Exodus 19:12; 21:12,14; 28:43; Numbers 4:15; Ezekiel
3:1:8 ff); as the result of willfulness or indifference (Proverbs 10:21;
15:10; 19:16). To die "the death of the righteous" is something to be
desired (Numbers 23:10).
In the New Testament the word for "to die," etc., is generally *apothnesko*,
"to die off or away," used of dying in all forms: of natural death
(Matthew 22:24); of violent death (John 11:50,51; 19:7; Acts
25:11); of the death of Christ (John 12:33); of death as the consequence
of sin (John 8:21,24; Romans 8:13); *teleutao*, "to end (life)," also
occurs several times (Matthew 15:4); *thnesko*, "to die," occurs once
(John 11:21), and *apollumi*, "to destroy" (John 18:14); in Acts
25:16 (Textus Receptus) we have *eis apoleian*, "to destruction."

FIGURATIVE USE:

The figurative use of "to die" is not frequent, if indeed it ever occurs. In
1 Samuel 25:37 it may be equivalent to "faint," "His heart died within
him, and he became as a stone," but this may be meant literally. In
Amos 2:2 it is said that Moab "shall die," i.e. perish as a nation. Paul
describes the condition of the apostles of Christ as "dying, and behold, we
live" (2 Corinthians 6:9), and says, "I die daily" (1 Corinthians
15:31), but the references may be to exposure to death. When in
Romans 7:9 he says, "When the commandment came .... I died," he may
mean that it rendered him liable to death. In Romans 6:2 we have "we
who died to sin," i.e. in Christ, and in our acceptance of His death as
representing ours; similarly we read in 2 Corinthians 5:14, "One died

for all, therefore all died" (Revised Version (British and American)), i.e. representatively, and in ⁵⁰²⁰Colossians 2:20 "if ye died with Christ"; 3:3, "for ye died," the Revised Version (British and American) (in Christ). Compare ⁵⁰²¹2 Timothy 2:11; ⁶⁰²⁴1 Peter 2:24.

Of the changes in the Revised Version (British and American) may be mentioned "abode" for "died" (⁰¹²⁵¹⁸Genesis 25:18, margin "or settled, Hebrew fell"); "he that is to die" for "worthy of death" (⁰⁵¹⁷⁰⁶Deuteronomy 17:6); "died" for "are dead" (⁴³⁰⁶⁹John 6:49,58, and the American Standard Revised Version 8:52,53); "though he die" for "were dead" (⁴³¹¹²⁵John 11:25); "many died" for "were dead" (⁴⁵⁰⁵¹⁵Romans 5:15); "died for nought" for "in vain" (⁴⁸⁰²¹Galatians 2:21); "when his end was nigh" for "died" (⁵⁸¹¹²²Hebrews 11:22). Of special importance are the changes from "be, are, were, dead" in ⁴⁵⁰⁶²Romans 6:2,7,8; ⁴⁷⁰⁵¹⁴2 Corinthians 5:14; ⁵⁰²⁰Colossians 2:20; 3:3; ⁵⁰²¹2 Timothy 2:11, and "having died" for "being dead" in ⁶⁰²⁴1 Peter 2:24, as bringing out the truth that in the sight of God all men died in Christ.

See also DEATH.

W. L. Walker

DIET

<di'-et> ([hj ra} *'aruchah*], "prescribed"): A daily allowance or portion of food, as that given by King Evil-merodach to Jehoiachin, king of Judah (²⁴⁵²³⁴Jeremiah 52:34 the King James Version; compare ¹²²⁵⁰2 Kings 25:30).

DIG

([rWq, *qur*], "to dig", [rt″ j; *chathar*]; [διορύσσω, *diorusso*], "to dig through"): "I have digged (dug) and drunk strange waters" (¹²¹⁹²⁴2 Kings 19:24). In his campaigns on foreign soil, where the enemy had stopped up the watersprings, Sennacherib would at once dig fresh wells for his armies. "They dig through houses" (¹⁸²⁴⁶Job 24:16; ⁴⁰⁰⁶⁹Matthew 6:19,20 margin). Walls of eastern houses are often made of mud or clay, and frequently have no windows; and as the threshold of a Syrian house is sacred, the thief breaks in through the wall (see Trumbull, The Threshold Covenant).

M. O. Evans

DIGNITIES; DIGNITY

<dig'-ni-tiz>, *<dig'-ni-ti>* (Hebrew *marom*, *se'eth*, *gedhullah*): Rank or position, not nobility or austerity of personal character or bearing, is

denoted by this word in its Old Testament occurrences (⁰¹⁴⁰³Genesis 49:3; Est 6:3; ²¹⁰⁰⁶Ecclesiastes 10:6; ³⁵⁰⁰⁷Habakkuk 1:7). In ⁶¹⁰²¹⁰2 Peter 2:10; ⁶⁵⁰¹⁰⁸Jude 1:8, "dignities" ([δόξαι, *doxai*]) are angels, lofty spiritual beings, possible objects of blasphemy; compare the context in both passages.

DIKE

<di'-ke> ([δίκη, *dike*], "justice"): The avenging justice of God personified as a goddess (⁴⁴²⁸⁰⁴Acts 28:4).
   See *JUSTICE.*

DIKLAH

<dik'-la> ([hl qҎ¡ *diqlah*], "place of palms"): One of the "sons" of Joktan (⁰¹¹⁰²⁷Genesis 10:27; ¹³⁰¹²¹1 Chronicles 1:21). Perhaps a south-Arabian tribal or place-name connected with a palm-bearing district.

DILEAN

<dil'-e-an> ([ˆ[} Ҏ¡ *dil`an*], "cucumber"): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Migdal-gad and Mizpeh (⁰⁶¹⁵⁸Joshua 15:38, the English Revised Version "Dilan"), which lay probably on the North of Lachish and Eglon. It has not been identified.

DILIGENCE; DILIGENT; DILIGENTLY

<dil'-i-jens>, <dil'-i-jent-li>: This word is used in various senses in our English Bibles.

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In ¹⁵⁰⁵⁰⁸Ezra 5:8, "with diligence" means "with care"; in ¹⁵⁰⁵⁶²Ezra 6:12; 7:17, "with speed," "speedily"; in ²⁰⁰⁴²³Proverbs 4:23 "watchfulness"; in ⁰⁵⁰⁴⁰⁹Deuteronomy 4:9; 6:17; 19:18; ¹⁹⁷⁰⁶Psalm 77:6; ²⁰²⁷²³Proverbs 27:23; ²³⁵⁵⁰²Isaiah 55:2; ³³⁰⁷⁰³Micah 7:3, "with care," "scrupulously," "earnestly." Sometimes it means "early" "with haste" (¹⁸⁰⁸⁰⁵Job 8:5; ²⁰⁰⁸¹⁷Proverbs 8:17). It may mean "industrious," "exacting" (²⁰¹⁰⁰⁴Proverbs 10:4; 12:27; 22:29).

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The American revisers have rendered "diligence" for various words in the King James Version, e.g. for "business" in ⁴⁵¹²¹⁰Romans 12:11; "giving

diligence" for "endeavoring" (⟨4043⟩Ephesians 4:3); "give diligence" for "study" (⟨5015⟩2 Timothy 2:15,), for "labor" (⟨5041⟩Hebrews 4:11); "diligently" for "carefully" (⟨5038⟩Philippians 2:28; ⟨5217⟩Hebrews 12:17); "be diligent in" for "meditate upon" (⟨5045⟩1 Timothy 4:15). It is well also to remember that the Old English meaning of diligence is "with love," from *diligo*, "to love."

<div align="right">

G. H. Geberding

</div>

DILL

See *ANISE.*

DIMINISH

<di-min'-ish>: the Revised Version (British and American) has retained nearly all passages of the King James Version where "to diminish" is used. Some of these uses have become obsolete: ⟨0504⟩Deuteronomy 4:2, "neither shall ye diminish from it." "Diminish" generally means "to reduce," "to lessen." In this sense it is employed in ⟨2651⟩Ezekiel 5:11 from the Hebrew [[ר″G; *gara`*], literally, "to shear." The picture of shearing the beard, expressing degradation and loss of manhood, may underlie this passage.

DIMNAH

<dim'-na> ([hnmDi *dimnah*], "dung"; [Δαμνά, *Damna*]): A city of the Merarite Levites in the territory of Zebulun (⟨0623⟩Joshua 21:35). The name is probably a clerical error for Rimmon.

DIMON; DIMONAH

<di'-mon>, *<di-mo'-na>*.

See *DIBON.*

DINAH

<di'-na> ([hnyDi *dinah*], "justice"): The daughter of Jacob and Leah, whose violation by Shechem, son of Hamor, caused her brothers, especially Simeon and Levi, to slay the inhabitants of Shechem, although they had induced the Shechemites to believe, if they would submit to circumcision, Shechem, the most honored of all the house of his father, would be permitted to have the maiden to whom his soul clave for wife (⟨0134⟩Genesis 34:1-31). The political elements of the story (compare ⟨0134⟩Genesis 34:21-

23 and 30) suggest a tribal rather than a personal significance for the narrative.

Nathan Isaacs

DINAITES

<di'-na-its> ([אֲרֵיןדִּ *dinaye'*]): A people mentioned in [1509]Ezra 4:9, as settled in the city of Samaria by Osnappar (Assurbanipal). The identification is uncertain.

DINHABAH

<din'-ha-ba>, <din-ha'-ba> ([הבָהְנְדִּ *dinhabhah*]): The royal city of Bela, son of Beor; king of Edom ([0152]Genesis 36:32; [1048]1 Chronicles 1:43). There may be a resemblance in the name of *Hodbat et-Teneib*. about 8 miles East of Heshbon; but this is in the land of Moab, and probably much too far to the North. No satisfactory identification has been proposed.

DINNER

<din'-er> ([ἄριστον, *ariston*]; [4204]Matthew 22:4; [2138]Luke 11:38 (the Revised Version, margin "breakfast"); 14:12; compare [0814]Ruth 2:14; [4213]John 21:13): In oriental as in classical lands it was customary, in ancient times, as now, to have but two meals in the day, and the evidence, including that of Josephus, goes to show that the second or evening meal was the principal one. The "morning morsel," as the Talmud calls it, was in no sense a "meal." The peasant or artisan, before beginning work, might "break (his) fast" ([4212]John 21:12,15) by taking a bit of barley bread with some simple relish, but to "eat (a full meal) in the morning" was a reproach ([21016]Ecclesiastes 10:16). The full meal was not to be taken until a little before or after sunset, when the laborers had come in from their work ([2177]Luke 17:7; compare the "supper time" of 14:17). The noon meal, taken at an hour when climatic conditions called for rest from exertion (the ariston of the Greeks, rendered "dinner" in English Versions of the Bible, [4204]Matthew 22:4; [2138]Luke 11:38, the Revised Version, margin "breakfast"), was generally very simple, of bread soaked in light wine with a handful of parched corn ([0814]Ruth 2:14), or of "pottage and bread broken into a bowl" (Bel and the Dragon 33), or of bread and broiled fish ([4213]John 21:13). Many, when on journey especi content with one meal a day, taken after sunset. In general, eating at other times is casual and informal; evening is the time for the formal meal, or feast.

See MEALS.

<div align="right">

George B. Eager

</div>

DIONYSIA

<di-o-nish'-i-a> ([Διονύσια, *Dionusia*], "festivals of Dionysus" (Bacchus)): The rural (vintage) Dionysia were celebrated in the month of Poseideon (19th day), which is roughly our December. The celebration consisted of feasts, processions, songs and (sometimes) scenic performances. The Ascolia formed one of the most prominent features. After sacrificing a goat to the god, they filled the wine-skin with wine, made it slippery on the outside with oil, and then tried to hop on it with one leg. Whoever fell down furnished great sport for the spectators, but if anyone succeeded in maintaining an upright position to the end, he was declared victor. The demarch conducted the festival, the expenses of which were paid by the deme.

The Lenea were celebrated on the 12th of Gamelion (January) in Athens, and later in Ionia in Asia Minor. At this festival also the new wine was tasted. A procession was formed and they marched through the city, indulging in all sorts of jesting and buffoonery, to attend the pantomimic performances.

The Anthesteria (Flower-Feast) came in the month of Anthesterion (February), when the first flowers appeared. This festival resembled somewhat our Christmas. On the first day (11th of the month) the wine-cask was opened; on the second was the feast of pitchers. Wine was drunk, and contests in trumpet-playing were held. At the drinking contest everybody was permitted to make as much merriment as he pleased. There was also a mystic marriage of the king archon's wife to Dionysus (compare the marriage of the Doges of Venice to the sea). On the third day they offered pots filled with vegetables to Hermes, Conductor of the Dead. This day was sacred to the gods of the nether world and to the spirits of the departed (All Souls' Day); and the people celebrated Persephone's resurrection and reunion with the god.

The Greater, or City Dionysia, were held in Elaphebolion (March) as a spring festival. This is the most important of all the Dionysia (for us), since practically all the great tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides were performed in conjunction with this festival. All the demes took part.

They accompanied the ancient image of Dionysus Eleutherios (from Eleutherae in Boeotia, one of the first places in which the worship of the god was established in Greece), as it was carried in solemn procession from the Lenaeon (the original center of his cult in Athens) to a small temple in the Ceramicus in the northwestern part of the city, while choruses of men and boys sang the dithurambos (the ancient hymn to Dionysus). Crowned with the vine and dressed in unusual costumes, they greeted the god with loud shouts of joy.

The festival was revived with great pomp by the Pisistratidae. In theater of Dionysus all the people beheld an imposing rehearsal of their great achievements. Even the poorest and humblest were given an opportunity to see and hear the contests between the professional rhapsodists, who recited Homer, between choruses specially trained to sing the dithyrambs, and between poets, whose great dramatic productions were presented for the first time. The state set aside a special fund for the purchase of tickets for those who were too poor to buy for themselves. Comedies, tragedies and satyr dramas were presented after elaborate preparation and at a great expenditure of money. The prize, a bronze tripod, was erected with an appropriate inscription on the Street of Tripods. The awarding of prizes to the victors concluded the festival.

The quinquennial festival at Brauron in Attica was also celebrated with extraordinary license and merriment. The city of Athens sent delegates regularly to attend the festival.

There were also Dionysiac clubs in Athens at the time of the Peloponnesian War. These had peculiar doctrines and observances. They had their foundation in Orphic mysticism. The members refrained from eating the flesh of animals. They possessed holy scriptures and had peculiar propitiatory rites. The Dionysiac religious observance continued as a state cult down to 366 AD.

See BACCHUS.

J. E. Harry

DIONYSIUS

<di-o-nish'-i-us> ([Διονύσιος, *Dionusios*], surnamed "the Areopagite"): One of the few Athenians converted by Paul (Acts 17:34). We know nothing further about him (*see AREOPAGUS*). According to one account

he was the first bishop of the church at Athens; according to another he suffered martyrdom in that city under Domitian. We are even told that he migrated to Rome and was sent to Paris, where he was beheaded on Montmartre (Mount of the Martyr). The patron saint of France is Denys; compare the French "Denys d'Halicarnasse" (Dionysius of Halicarnassus). The mystical writings which were circulated in the Middle Ages and are still extant, are pronounced by the best authorities to be forgeries, and date from a period not earlier than the 5th century.

J. E. Harry

DIONYSUS, (BACCHUS)

<di-o-ni'-sus> ([Διόνυσος, *Dionusos*]): The youngest of the Greek gods. In Homer he is not associated with the vine. In later Greek legend he is represented as coming from India, as traversing Asia in a triumphal march, accompanied by woodland beings, with pointed ears, snub noses and goat-tails. These creatures were called satyrs. The vine was cultivated among European-Aryans first in Thrace, and here Dionysus is said to have established his worship first in Europe. Then the cult of Dionysus passed down through the Balkan peninsula to Thebes; and in the localized form of the myth the deity was born here — son of Zeus and Semele.

> *"Offspring of Zeus on high*
> *Thou that carest for all*
> *Who on Bacchus in Italy call*
> *And in Deo's sheltered plain*
> *Of Eleusis lord dost reign,*
> *Whither worshippers repair!*
>
> *O Bacchus that dwellest in Thebes,*
> *On whose broad and fertile glebes*
> *Fierce warriors from the dragon's teeth rose,*
> *Where Ismenus softly flows,*
> *The city that Semele bare!"*
> *— Sophocles, Antigone.*

Among all the Greek deities none appealed more vividly to the imagination than Dionysus. Greek tragedy is a form of worship, the ritual cult of the god of wine, who makes the initiate wise and the ungodly mad. Dionysus speaks most strongly to the sense and to the spirit at the same time. There is nothing monotonous in the Dionysiac legend; it is replete with both joy

and sorrow — in some aspects it is a "passion" in others a triumph. All the passion plays of the world (even the Oberammergau Schauspiel) are in the ancient spirit. One Dionysus after another has been substituted, but from the first there has been a desire on the part of the devotee to realize his god vividly with thrilling nearness, to partake of his joys and sorrows and triumphs in his manifold adventures. In the early myths Dionysus was one of the lesser gods; he is mentioned only twice in the Iliad and twice in the Odyssey; but he is always represented as being more nearly akin to man than the great august deities of Olympus. He is a man-god, or god-man. To the inhabitants of the vine-clad slopes of Attica, to which his cult had been brought from Phrygia through Thracian Boeotia, he was particularly dear. At their vintage feasts last year's cask of wine was opened; and when the new year brought life again to the vines, the bountiful god was greeted with songs of joyful praise. The burial of the wine in the dark tomb of the jars through the winter, and the opening of these jars at the spring festival symbolized the great awakening of man himself, the resurrection of the god's worshippers to a fuller and more joyous life. The vine was not the only manifestation of the god — oil and wheat were also his; he was the god of ecstasy, the giver of physical joy and excitement, the god of life, the god of certain laws of Nature, germination and extinction, the external coming into being and the dying away of all things that are, fructification in its widest aspect whether in the bursting of the seed-grain that lies intreasured in the earth, or in the generation of living creatures. Hence, the prominence given to the phallus in the solemn processions in honor of the god.

Nicanor (2 Macc 14:33) and Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 6:7) thought that the cult of Dionysus would not be objectionable to the Jews. Ptolemy Philopator branded the Jews with an ivy-leaf (3 Macc 2:29), which was sacred to Dionysus.

See also BACCHUS.

J. E. Harry

DIOSCORINTHIUS

<di-os-ko-rin'-thi-us>: A certain (unidentified) month (2 Macc 11:21).

See CALENDAR; TIME.

DIOSCURI

<di-os'-ku-ri> ([Διόσκουροι, *Dioscouroi*]; in ⁴²⁸¹Acts 28:11, the King James Version Castor and Pollux, the Revised Version (British and American) *THE TWIN BROTHERS*; in margin, "Dioscuri"): The sign of the ship on which Paul sailed from Melita to Syracuse and Rhegium. The Dioscuri (i.e. sons of Zeus), Castor and Pollux, are the two chief stars in the constellation of the Twins. Some 4,000 years BC they served as pointers to mark the beginning of the new year by setting together with the first new moon of springtime. The constellation of the Twins was supposed to be especially favorable to sailors, hence, ships were often placed under the protection of the twin gods.

E. W. Maunder

DIOTREPHES

<di-ot'-re-fez> ([Διοτρεφής, *Diotrephes*]): A person mentioned in ⁶⁰¹⁰⁹3 John 1:9,10 as contentiously resisting the writer's authority and forbidding others from exercising the Christian hospitality which he himself refused to show. The words "who loveth to have the preeminence, among them" may indicate that he was a church official, abusing his position.

DIP

Priests when offering a sin offering were required to dip a finger into the blood of the sacrificed bullock and "to sprinkle of the blood seven times before Yahweh" (compare ⁰³⁰⁶Leviticus 4:6, et al.). See also the law referring to the cleansing of infected houses (⁰³⁴⁵¹Leviticus 14:51) and the cleansing of a leper (⁰³⁴⁴⁶Leviticus 14:16). In all such cases "to dip" is "to moisten," "to besprinkle," "to dip in," the Hebrew [l b″ f; *Tabhal*], or the Greek [βάπτω, *bapto*]. See also *ASHER*. In ¹⁹⁸²³Psalm 68:23 "dipping" is not translated from the Hebrew, but merely employed for a better understanding of the passage: "Thou mayest crush them, dipping thy foot in blood" (the King James Version "that thy foot may be dipped in the blood"). ⁶⁶⁹¹³Revelation 19:13 is a very doubtful passage. the King James Version reads: "a vesture dipped in blood" (from *bapto*, "to dip"); the Revised Version (British and American) following another reading (either *rhaino*, or *rhantizo*, both "to sprinkle"), translates "a garment sprinkled with blood." the Revised Version, margin gives "dipped in."

See also SOP.

DIPHATH

<di'-fath> ([תָּפַ יְדִ *diphath*]): A son of Gomer, son of Japheth, son of Noah (◁13006▷1 Chronicles 1:6), called *RIPHATH* (which see) in the corresponding genealogy in ◁01003▷Genesis 10:3.

DISALLOW

<dis-a-lou'>: "To disallow" as used in the Scriptures means either "to oppose," "not permit" (Hebrew *no'*, ◁04305▷Numbers 30:5,8,11), or "to reject" (Greek *apodokimazo*, literally, "to consider useless," ◁60204▷1 Peter 2:4,7 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "rejected").

DISANNUL

<dis-a-nul'>.

See *ANNUL.*

DISAPPOINT

<dis-a-point'>: "To disappoint" may be used transitively or intransitively. In the former case it naturally has a more forceful meaning. Therefore the Revised Version (British and American) changes the translation of the King James Version wherever "disappoint" is used with an object: ◁18512▷Job 5:12, "frustrateth"; ◁19713▷Psalm 17:13, "confront him," the Revised Version, margin "forestall"; Judith 16:6, "brought them to nought"; but the Revised Version (British and American) retains "disappoint" where the person wh disappoints is not expressed. Compare ◁20152▷Proverbs 15:22.

DISCERN

<di-zurn'>: Five Hebrew words are thus translated: *bin*, *yadha`*, *nakhar*, *ra'ah* and *shama`*. It may simply mean "observe" (*bin*), "I discerned among the youths" (◁20707▷Proverbs 7:7); or discriminating knowlege, "A wise man's heart discerneth time and judgment" (◁21805▷Ecclesiastes 8:5, *yadha`*); "He discerned him not, because his hands," etc. (◁01723▷Genesis 27:23, *nakhar*); "Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked" (◁39318▷Malachi 3:18, *ra'ah*); "So is my lord the king to discern good," etc. (◁10417▷2 Samuel 14:17, *shama`*). In the New Testament the words

anakrino, *diakrino* and *dokimazo* are thus translated, expressing close and distinct acquaintance with or a critical knowledge of things. Used in ⁴⁶²¹⁴1 Corinthians 2:14 the King James Version of "the things of the spirit of God"; in ⁴⁶¹²⁹1 Corinthians 11:29 of "the (Lord's) body" in the sacrament; in ⁴⁰¹⁶³Matthew 16:3 of "the face of the heaven"; in ⁵⁸⁵¹⁴Hebrews 5:14 of a clear knowledge of good and evil as the prerogative of a full-grown man. See also next article.

<div align="right">

Henry E. Dosker

</div>

DISCERNINGS, OF SPIRITS

<di-zurn'-inz>, ([διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, *diakriseis pneumaton*], "judicial estimation," "through judgment or separation"): Occurs in ⁴⁶²¹⁰1 Corinthians 12:10 as being one of the gifts of the Spirit. The Greek word occurs in ⁵⁸⁵¹⁴Hebrews 5:14; and ⁴⁵¹⁴⁰Romans 14:1: "But him that is weak in faith receive ye, yet not for decision of scruples." This translation scarcely expresses the meaning, which Thayer has freely rendered, "not for the purpose of passing judgment on opinions, as to which one is to be preferred as the more correct." Taking these three passages together it is evident that the Greek term which is rendered "discerning" means a distinguishing or discriminating between things that are under consideration; hence, the one who possessed the gift of "discernings of spirits" was able to make distinction between the one who spoke by the Spirit of God and the one who was moved by a false spirit. This gift seems to have been exercised chiefly upon those who assumed the role of teachers, and it was especially important in those days, because there were many false teachers abroad (see ⁶³⁰⁰⁷2 John 1:7; ⁴⁴²⁰⁹Acts 20:29,30).

See also SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

<div align="right">

A. W. Fortune

</div>

DISCIPLE

<di-si'-p'-l>:

(1) Usually a substantive ([μαθητής, *mathetes*], "a learner," from *manthano*, "to learn"; Latin *discipulus*, "a scholar"): The word is found in the Bible only in the Gospels and Acts. But it is good Greek, in use from Herodotus down, and always means the pupil of someone, in contrast to the master or teacher ([διδάσκαλος, *didaskalos*]). See ⁴⁰⁰²⁴Matthew 10:24; ⁴²⁰⁶⁰Luke 6:40. In all cases it implies that the person not only accepts

the views of the teacher, but that he is also in practice an adherent. The word has several applications. In the widest sense it refers to those who accept the teachings of anyone, not only in belief but in life. Thus the disciples of John the Baptist (⁴⁰⁹¹⁴Matthew 9:14; ⁴²⁰⁷¹⁸Luke 7:18; ⁴³⁰³²⁵John 3:25); also of the Pharisees (⁴⁰²²¹⁶Matthew 22:16; ⁴¹⁰²¹⁸Mark 2:18; ⁴²⁰⁵³³Luke 5:33); of Moses (⁴³⁰⁹²⁸John 9:28). But its most common use is to designate the adherents of Jesus.

> **(a)** In the widest sense (⁴⁰¹⁰⁴²Matthew 10:42; ⁴²⁰⁶¹⁷Luke 6:17; ⁴³⁰⁶⁶⁶John 6:66, and often). It is the only name for Christ's followers in the Gospels. But

(b) especially the Twelve Apostles, even when they are called simply the disciples (⁴⁰¹⁰⁰¹Matthew 10:1; 11:1; 12:1, et al.). In the Acts, after the death and ascension of Jesus, disciples are those who confess Him as the Messiah, Christians (⁴⁴⁰⁶⁰¹Acts 6:1,2,7; 9:36 (feminine, *mathetria*); ⁴⁴¹¹²⁶Acts 11:26, "The disciples were called Christians"). Even half-instructed believers who had been baptized only with the baptism of John are disciples (⁴⁴¹⁹⁰¹Acts 19:1-4).
(2) We have also the verb, [μαθητεύω, *matheteuo*], "Jesus' disciple" (literally, "was discipled to Jesus," ⁴⁰²⁷⁵⁷Matthew 27:57); "Make disciples of all the nations" (the King James Version "teach," ⁴⁰²⁸¹⁹Matthew 28:19); "had made many disciples" (the King James Version "taught many," ⁴⁴¹⁴²¹Acts 14:21); "every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven" (the King James Version "instructed," ⁴⁰¹³⁵²Matthew 13:52). The disciple of Christ today may be described in the words of Farrar, as "one who believes His doctrines, rests upon His sacrifice, imbibes His spirit, and imitates His example."

The Old Testament has neither the term nor the exact idea, though there is a difference between teacher and scholar among David's singers (¹³²⁵⁰⁸1 Chronicles 25:8), and among the prophetic guilds the distinction between the rank and file and the leader (⁰⁹¹⁹⁰1 Samuel 19:20; ¹²⁰⁶⁶⁵2 Kings 6:5).

G. H. Trever

DISCIPLINE

<dis'-i-plin> ([רסֻם, *mucar*]): In the King James Version only in ¹⁸³⁶¹⁰Job 36:10, where it refers to moral discipline, the strenuous cultivation of the righteous life; the Revised Version (British and American) "instruction."

the Revised Version (British and American) in ⁵⁰¹⁰⁷2 Timothy 1:7 has "discipline" for a Greek word (*sophronismos*) meaning "sobering"; in ⁵⁵³¹⁶2 Timothy 3:16 margin, for Greek *paideia*, "instruction." In classic Greek *paideia* means "education," mental culture. Through the influence of the Septuagint, which translates the Hebrew *mucar* by *paideia*, the meaning of "chastisement" accompanies *paideia* in the New Testament. Compare ⁵⁸²⁰⁵Hebrews 12:5,7,8,11.

See CHASTISEMENT; *and for ecclesiastical discipline* see *CHURCH.*

DISCOMFIT; DISCOMFITURE

<dis-kum'-fit>, *<dis-kum'-fi-tur>* ([μllh, *hum*], [hmllhm, *mehumah*]): These words are now obsolete or at least obsolescent and are confined in Biblical literature wholly to the Old Testament. The meaning in general is "to annoy," "harass," "confuse," "rout" and "destroy." The most common usage is that based upon the root meaning, "to trouble" or "annoy," sometimes to the point of destruction (⁰⁶¹⁰⁰Joshua 10:10; ⁰⁷⁴¹⁵Judges 4:15; ⁰⁹⁷¹⁰1 Samuel 7:10; ¹⁰²¹⁵2 Samuel 22:15).

The King James Version errs in the translation in ²³¹⁰⁸Isaiah 31:8, where the meaning is obviously "to become subject to task work" or "to place a burden upon one." There seems also to be an unwarranted use of the word in ⁰⁴⁴⁴⁵Numbers 14:45, where it means rather "to bruise" or "strike." The purest use is perhaps in ⁰⁹⁴²⁰1 Samuel 14:20, where the statement is made that "every man's sword was against his fellow, and there was a very great discomfiture."

Walter G. Clippinger

DISCOURSE

<dis-kors'>: In the Revised Version (British and American) of ⁴⁴²⁰⁷Acts 20:7,9, the translation of Greek *dialegomai* (the King James Version "preach"), elsewhere rendered, according to the implications of the context, "reason" or "dispute," as ⁴⁴⁷⁰²Acts 17:2; 19:9 (the King James Version "disputing," the Revised Version (British and American) "reasoning"); ⁶⁵¹⁰⁹Jude 1:9.

DISCOVER

<dis-kuv'-er>: In modern usage the word "discover" signifies "to get first sight or knowledge of," "to ascertain," or "to explore." Such usage

appears in [09206]1 Samuel 22:6 of the discovery of David's hiding-place, where the Hebrew uses [[d" y; *yadha`*]. In the King James Version the word "discover" often occurs in a sense now archaic or even obsolete. (Note in the cases cited below the Hebrew word is [hl G; *galah*], except [24336]Jeremiah 13:26 ([tv" j ; *chashaph*], "to make bare") and [35813]Habakkuk 3:13 ([rr" [; `*arar*], "to make naked").)

(1) "To exhibit," "uncover" (or "betray"), in which examples the English Revised Version also reads with the King James Version "discover"; the American Standard Revised Version "uncover" ([02206]Exodus 20:26; [18122]Job 12:22; [25708]Isaiah 57:8 ("discovered thyself" the King James Version and the English Revised Version); [24336]Jeremiah 13:26; [25214]Lamentations 2:14; [28701]Hosea 7:1; [34805]Nahum 3:5).

    (2) "To cause to be no longer a covering," "to lay bare" ([10216]2 Samuel 22:16 the King James Version).

(3) "To bring to light," "disclose" ([09408]1 Samuel 14:8,11 (the English Revised Version with the King James Version "discover")).

(4) "To unmask" or "reveal oneself" ([20182]Proverbs 18:2 the King James Version).

(5) "To take away the covering of" ([23208]Isaiah 22:8 the King James Version).

(6) "To lay bare" ([35813]Habakkuk 3:13). In [19209]Psalm 29:9, the King James Version reads: "The voice of the Lord .... discovereth the forests," where the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "strippeth the forests bare," i.e. "strippeth the forests of their leaves" (Perowne, The Psalms, I, 248); "strippeth bare the forests" (Briggs, Psalms, I, 251, 253).

In the New Testament (the King James Version), the word "discover" occurs as a translation of the Greek *anaphanantes* in [44208]Acts 21:3, and for *katenooun* in [44279]Acts 27:39, where the Revised Version (British and American) reads in the first instance "had come in sight of," and in the latter case "perceived."

<div align="right">

W. N. Stearns

</div>

DISCREPANCIES, BIBLICAL

<dis-krep'-an-siz>, *<bib'-li-kal>*:

1. DEFINITION:

By this term should be understood substantial disagreements in the statements of Biblical writers. Such disagreements might subsist between the, statements of different writers or between the several statements of a single writer. Contradictions of Biblical views from extra-Biblical sources as history, natural science, philosophy, do not fall within the scope of our subject.

2. CRITICISM VERSUS DOCTRINE OF INERRANCY:

Observant Bible readers in every age have noted, with various degrees of insight, that the Scriptures exhibit manifold interior differences and contrasts. Differences of literary form and method have ever seemed, except to those who maintained a mechanical theory of inspiration, wholly natural and fitting. Moreover, that there was progress in the Biblical revelation, especially that the New Testament of Jesus Christ signifies a vastly richer revelation of God than the Old Testament, has been universally recognized. In fulfilling the law and the prophets Christ put a marked distance between Himself and them, yet He certainly affirmed rather than denied them. The Christian church has ever held to the essential unity of the Divine library of the Holy Scriptures. Moreover, the evangelical churches have recognized the Bible as "the only and sufficient rule of both faith and practice." Indeed, in the generation following the Reformation, the strictest and most literal theory of inspiration and inerrancy found general acceptance. Over against such a body of presuppositions, criticism, some generations later, began to allege certain errors and discrepancies in the Bible. Of course the orthodox sought to repel all these claims; for they felt that the Bible, whatever the appearances might seem to indicate, must be free from error, else it could not be the word of God. So there came with criticism a long period of sturdy defense of the strictest doctrine of Biblical inerrancy. Criticism, however, kept on its way. It has forced the church to find a deeper and surer ground of confidence in the authority of the Bible as the witness to God's self-revelation to man. In our day the church has for the most part overcome the notion that the certainty of the saving grace of God in Christ stands or falls with the absolute inerrancy of each several statement contained in the Bible. Still there remains, and doubtless ever must remain, a need of a clear understanding of the issue involved in the allegation — along with other "human limitations" — of Biblical discrepancies.

3. SYNOPSIS OF THE ARGUMENT:

Alleged discrepancies pertain

(1) to statements of specific, concrete facts, and

(2) to the utterance of principles and doctrines. Under the first head fall disagreements respecting numbers, dates, the form and order of historical events, records of spoken words, geography, natural history, etc.

Under the second head fall disagreements respecting moral and religious truths, the "superhistorical" realities and values. Our inquiry resolves itself into three parts:

(1) to determine whether there be discrepancies, of either or both sorts, in the Bible;

(2) to obtain at least a general understanding of the conditions and causes that may have given rise to the discrepancies, real or apparent;

(3) to determine their significance for faith.

4. ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES PERTAINING TO FACTS:

As to the first point, it should be observed that apparent inconsistencies may not be real ones; as so often in the past, so again it may come about that the discovery of further data may resolve many an apparent contradiction. On the other hand, the affirmation a priori that there can be and are no real discrepancies in the Bible is not only an outrage upon the human understanding, but it stands also in contradiction to the spirit of freedom that is of faith. Besides, it should not be overlooked that the discoveries of modern historical and archaeological research, which have tended to confirm so many Biblical statements, seem just as surely to reveal error in others. In any event we must bow to reality, and we may do this with fearless confidence in "the God of things as they are." But are there real discrepancies in the Bible? It is no part of the present plan to attempt the impossible and at all events useless task of exhibiting definite statistics of all the alleged discrepancies, or even of all the principal ones. Passing by the childish folly that would find a "discrepancy" in mere rhetorical antitheses, such as that in Proverbs 26:4,5 ("Answer not a fool," and "Answer a fool according to his folly"), or instances of merely formal

contrariety of expression, where the things intended are manifestly congruous (e.g. Matthew 12:30; Luke 11:23 contrasted with Mark 9:40; Luke 9:50: "He that is not with me is against me," "He that is not against us is for us"), it will serve our purpose to notice a few representative examples of real or apparent discrepancy. The chronologies of Kings and Chronicles are inconsistent (compare CHRONOLOGY OF OLD TESTAMENT). The genealogies in Genesis 46; Numbers 26; 1 Chronicles 2:7 show considerable variations. The two lists of exiles who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2; Nehemiah 7:6 ff) show many discrepancies, including a marked difference in the enumeration. The accounts of the creation in Genesis 1 and 2 (compare *CREATION*) — to take an example dependent upon the results of modern criticism — are mutually independent and in important particulars diverse. But the center of interest in our inquiry is the gospel history. Since Tatian and his Diatessaron in the 2nd century, the variations and contrasts in the Gospels have not only been noted and felt, but many have striven to "harmonize" them. After all, however, there remain some irreducible differences. The Gospels, generally speaking, do not give us ipsissima verba of Jesus; in reporting His discourses they show many variations. In so far as the essential meaning is the same in all, no one speaks of discrepancies; but where the variation clearly involves a difference of meaning (e.g. Matthew 12:39,40 and Luke 11:29,30), one may say that at least a technical discrepancy exists. In recording sayings or events the evangelists manifestly do not always observe the same chronological order; Lk, e.g. records in wholly different connections sayings which Matthew includes as parts of the Sermon on the Mount (e.g. the Lord's Prayer, Matthew 6:9 ff; Luke 11:1-4; compare *JESUS CHRIST; CHRONOLOGY OF NEW TESTAMENT*). We have two distinct genealogies of Jesus (Matthew 1:1-16; Luke 3:23 ff; compare *GENEALOGY*). We may even note that Pilate's superscription over the cross of Jesus is given in four distinct forms. Here, however, the discrepancy is not real except in the most technical sense, and is worth mentioning only to show that the evangelists' interest does not lie in a mere objective accuracy. That a perfect agreement as to the significance of an event exists where there are undeniable discrepancies in external details may be illustrated by the two accounts of the healing of the centurion's servant (Matthew 8:5 ff; Luke 7:1 ff). Of enormously greater interest are the various accounts of the appearances of the risen Christ. If a complete certainty as to the form and order of these events is necessary to faith, the case is not a happy one, for the harmonists

have been unable to render a perfect account of these matters (compare *JESUS CHRIST; RESURRECTION*). Turning from the Gospels to apostolic history, we meet some real problems, e.g. how to relate Paul's autobiographical notes in Galatians 1 with the accounts in Acts.

5. ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES PERTAINING TO DOCTRINE:

The discrepancies thus far noted pertain to historical matters, and not one of them involves the contradiction of a fact in which faith is interested. But are there also real or apparent discrepancies in matters of doctrine? Many scholars maintain, for instance, that the ideal of the prophets and that of the priestly class stand in a relative (not absolute) opposition to each other (compare, e.g. [2011b]Isaiah 1:11; [3068]Micah 6:8 with the ritualism of Leviticus and Dt). Or, to turn to the New Testament, some would assert — among them Luther — that James stands in opposition to Paul in respect to faith and works (compare [59217]James 2:17 ff in contrast with [48216]Galatians 2:16 and many other passages in Paul). But particular interest attaches to the problem of Christ's attitude toward the Old Testament law. His "but I say unto you" ([40522]Matthew 5:22 and passim) has been interpreted by many as a distinct contradiction of the Old Testament. Another question of acute interest is the agreement of the Johannine picture of Jesus with that of the Synoptists.

It can scarcely require proof that some of these alleged discrepancies are not such at all. For example, Jesus' attitude toward the Old Testament was one of profound reverence and affirmation. He was perfectly conscious that the Old Testament law represented a stage in the Divine education of mankind. His "but I say unto you" was not a denying of the degree of advancement represented by the Old Testament law, but a carrying out of the principle of the law to its full expression (compare *LAW; FULFILMENT*). Of course, the Divine education of Israel did not mean the mere inculcation of the truth in a fallow and hitherto unoccupied soil. There was much superstition and error to be overcome. If then one should insist that the errors, which revelation was destined to overcome, still manifest themselves here and there in the Old Testament, it may be replied that at all events the one grand tendency of Divine revelation is unmistakably clear. An idea is not "Scriptural" simply by virtue of its having been incidentally expressed by a Biblical writer, but because it essentially and inseparably belongs to the organic whole of the Biblical testimony. In the case of James versus Paul the antithesis is one of emphasis, not of contradiction of a first principle. And as for the variations

in the gospel history, these do not deserve to be called real discrepancies so long as the Gospels unite in giving one harmonious picture and testimony concerning the personal life and the work and teaching of Jesus. Even from this point of view, John, though so much more theological, preaches the same Christ as the Synoptists.

6. CAUSES OF DISCREPANCIES:

As to the conditions under which discrepancies may arise, it may suffice, first, to call attention to the general law that God in revealing Himself to men and in moving men by His Spirit to speak or write, never lifts them out of the normal relations of human intelligence, so far as matters of history or science are concerned. It is their witness to Himself and His will which is the result of revelation and inspiration. Their references to history and Nature are not therefore in any sense super-human; accordingly they have no direct authority for faith (compare *REVELATION; INSPIRATION*). On this basis the divergences of human traditions or documents as exhibited in different genealogies, chronologies and the like are natural in the best sense and wholly fitting. As for the rest, errors of copyists have played a part.

7. THEIR SIGNIFICANCE FOR FAITH:

Faith, however, has no interest in explaining away the human limitations in God's chosen witnesses. It is God's way to place the heavenly "treasure in earthen vessels" (2 Corinthians 4:7). It seems that God has purposely led the church to see, through the necessity of recognizing the human limitations of the Bible, just where her faith is grounded. God has made Himself known through His Son. The Scriptures of the New Testament, and of the Old Testament in preparation for Him, give us a clear and sufficient testimony to the Christ of God. The clearness and persuasive power of that testimony make all questions of verbal and other formal agreement essentially irrelevant. The certainty that God has spoken unto us in His Son and that we have this knowledge through the Scripture testimony lifts us above all anxious concern for the possible errors of the witnesses in matters evidently nonessential.

LITERATURE.

Besides the literature noted under *REVELATION* and *INSPIRATION*, J. W. Haley, An Examination of the Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible,

Andover, 1873; M. S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics, New York, 1883; Kahler, Zur Bibelf rage, Leipzig, 1907.

J. R. Van Pelt

DISCUS

<dis'-kus> ([δίσκος, *diskos*], "the summons of the discus," 2 Macc 4:14 margin, "to the game of the discus," the King James Version "the game of discus"): The discus was a round stone slab or metal plate of considerable weight (a kind of quoit), the contest of throwing which to the greatest distance was one of the exercises in the Greek *gymnasia*, being included in the pentathlon. It was introduced into Jerusalem by Jason the high priest in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, 175-164 BC, in the Palaestra he had formed there in imitation of the Greek games. His conduct led to his being described in 2 Macc 4:13,14 as that "ungodly man" through whom even the priests forsook their duties to play at the discus. A statue of a discobolos (discus-thrower) is in the British Museum. From discus we have the words "disc," "dish," "desk."

See GAMES.

W. L. Walker

DISEASE; DISEASES

<di-zez'>, *<di-zez'-iz>* ([חלה; *chalah*], [חלי ,*choli*]; [νόσος, *nosos*]): Palestine, from its position and physical conditions, ought to be a healthy country. That it is not so depends on the unsanitary conditions in which the people live and the absence of any attempts to check the introduction or development of zymotic diseases. The number of marshes or pools is fairly small, and the use of active measures to destroy the larvae of mosquitos might easily diminish or abolish the malarial fevers which now prevail all over the country. The freeing of Ismailieh and Port Said from these pests is an object-lesson in sanitation. When one examines the conditions of life in towns and villages all over the country, the evidences of the ravages of these fevers and their sequelae appear on every hand as they affect all ages from infancy to middle age, and one meets but few individuals of extreme old age. The absence of any adequate system of drainage and the pollution of the water supplies are also factors of great importance in preserving this unhealthiness.

In ancient times it was regarded as healthier than Egypt, as it well might be, hence, the diseases of Egypt are referred to as being worse than those of Palestine (⟨05715⟩Deuteronomy 7:15; 28:60; ⟨30410⟩Amos 4:10). The sanitary regulations and restrictions of the Priestly Code would doubtless have raised the standard of public health, but it is unlikely that these were ever observed over any large area.

The types of disease which are referred to in the Bible are those that still prevail. Fevers of several kinds, dysentery, leprosy, intestinal worms, plague, nervous diseases such as paralysis and epilepsy, insanity, ophthalmia and skin diseases are among the commonest and will be described under their several names. Methods of treatment are described under MEDICINE; PHYSICIAN. The word "disease" or "diseases" in the King James Version is changed to "sickness" in the Revised Version (British and American) in ⟨12002⟩2 Kings 1:2; 8:8; ⟨41085⟩Matthew 9:35, and left out in ⟨43504⟩John 5:4; while in ⟨40817⟩Matthew 8:17 "sicknesses" is replaced by "diseases." the Revised Version (British and American) also changes "infirmity" in ⟨42721⟩Luke 7:21 to "diseases," and in ⟨19807⟩Psalm 38:7 "a loathsome disease" is changed to "burning."

Alex. Macalister

DISEASES OF THE EYE

See EYES, DISEASES OF.

DISH

The rendering in English Versions of the Bible in some connections of three Hebrew and one Greek word. The *qe`arah* of ⟨02529⟩Exodus 25:29; 37:16; ⟨04047⟩Numbers 4:7 was apparently a kind of salver, in this case of gold, for holding the loaves of the "presence bread." The same word represents the silver "platters" (⟨04713⟩Numbers 7:13 ff) brought by the princes as a dedication gift. The *cephel* of ⟨07625⟩Judges 5:25 was a large bowl, so translated in ⟨07638⟩Judges 6:38. "Lordly dish" is literally, "bowl of (fit for) nobles." The tsallachath of ⟨12213⟩2 Kings 21:13; ⟨20924⟩Proverbs 19:24; 26:15 (last two the King James Version "bosom" after the Septuagint) refers probably to the wide, deep dish in which the principal part of the meal was served. Of somewhat similar form may have been the trublion Septuagint for *qe`arah*) mentioned in connection with the Passover meal (⟨40623⟩Matthew 26:23; ⟨41420⟩Mark 14:20).

Benjamin Reno Downer

DISHAN; DISHON

<di'-shan>, <di'-shon> ([ˆvyDi *dishan*], [ˆcyDi *dishon*], "antelope," "pygarg"): A Horite clan, mentioned as the youngest "son" and elsewhere as the "grandson" of Seir. The form Dishon occurs several times in the list of Horite clans, together with many other totem names (Genesis 36 *passim*; ⁽¹³⁰³⁸⁾1 Chronicles 1:38,41). See Gray, HPN, 89.

DISHONESTY

<dis-on'-es-ti>: Only in ⁽⁴⁷⁰⁴²⁾2 Corinthians 4:2, the King James Version rendering of Greek *aischune*; the King James Version elsewhere and the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly, "shame."

DISOBEDIENCE; DISOBEDIENT

<dis-o-be'-di-ens>, ([hⲅm; *marah*]; [ἀπειθέω, *apeitheo*], [παρακούω, *parakouo*]): The word used chiefly in the New Testament has the general meaning of a lack of regard for authority or rulership. The stronger meaning of actual stubbornness or violence is perhaps conveyed in the Old Testament (⁽¹¹³³⁶⁾1 Kings 13:26; ⁽¹⁶⁹²⁶⁾Nehemiah 9:26; compare ⁽¹¹¹³²¹⁾1 Kings 13:21).

In the New Testament there seem to be two rather clearly defined uses of the word, one objective and practical, the other ethical and psychological. The first refers more to conduct, the second to belief and one's mental attitude toward the object of disobedience. To the first belong such passages as refer to the overt act of disobedience to one's parents (⁽⁴⁵⁰¹³⁾Romans 1:30; ⁽⁵⁸⁰²²⁾2 Timothy 3:2). Illustrating this more fully, the translation according to the King James Version of ⁽⁵⁴⁰⁰⁹⁾1 Timothy 1:9 is given as "unruly" in the Revised Version (British and American). By far the greater emphasis, however, is placed upon the distinctly ethical quality in which disobedience is really an attitude of the mind and finds its essence in a heart of unbelief and unfaithfulness (⁽⁶⁰²⁰⁷⁾1 Peter 2:7,8; ⁽⁴⁹⁰²²⁾Ephesians 2:2; 5:6; ⁽⁵¹⁰⁸⁶⁾Colossians 3:6). In the latter three references "children (sons) of disobedience" are mentioned, as if one should become the very offspring of such an unhappy and unholy state of mind. The classic phrase of New Testament literature (⁽⁴⁴²⁶¹⁹⁾Acts 26:19) contains both the practical and the ethical aspects. Paul's convictions were changed by the vision and his conduct was made to conform immediately to it.

Walter G. Clippinger

DISORDERLY

<dis-or'-der-li> ([ἄτακτος, *ataktos*]): The word is found four times in the Epistles to the Thess (⟨5014⟩1 Thessalonians 5:14; ⟨5006⟩2 Thessalonians 3:6,7,11), "Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly."; "We behaved not ourselves disorderly."; "We hear of some that walk among you disorderly." The word is a military term and has reference to the soldier who does not keep the ranks (*inordinatus*, Liv). Then it refers to people who refuse to obey the civil laws, and thus it gets its meaning, "disorderly." It points to members in the early church, who, by their lives, became a reproach to the gospel of Christ (compare ⟨5041⟩1 Thessalonians 4:11,12).

Henry E. Dosker

DISPATCH

<dis-pach'>: Occurs Tobit 7:8 in the sense of dispatch of business, "Let this business be dispatched" (the Revised Version (British and American) "finished"); 2 Macc 12:18, "before he had dispatched anything" (the Revised Version (British and American) "without accomplishing"); The Wisdom of Solomon 11:19 **(20)** in the sense of finishing, destroying, "dispatch them at once" (the Revised Version (British and American) "consume"); 2 Macc 9:4 "dispatch the journey" (*katanuein*), which may mean "finish it q Revised Version (British and American) spells "despatch."

DISPENSATION

<dis-pen-sa'-shun>: The Greek word (*oikonomia*) so translated signifies primarily, a stewardship, the management or disposition of affairs entrusted to one. Thus ⟨4097⟩1 Corinthians 9:17, the King James Version "A dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me," the Revised Version (British and American) "I have stewardship entrusted to me." The idea is similar in ⟨4082⟩Ephesians 3:2 parallel ⟨5025⟩Colossians 1:25 (the Revised Version, margin "stewardship"). In ⟨4010⟩Ephesians 1:10 God's own working is spoken of as "dispensation."

DISPERSION, THE

<dis-pur'-shun>, ([διασπορά, *diaspora*]):

1. GOLAH AND DISPERSION:

The Dispersion is the comprehensive designation applied to Jews living outside of Palestine and maintaining their religious observances and customs among the Gentiles. They were known as the Golah (Aramaic *Galutha'*), the captivity — an expression describing them in relation to their own land; and the Diaspora, the Dispersion, an expression describing them in relation to the nations among whom they were scattered. On a notable occasion Jesus said, "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me: and where I am, ye cannot come. The Jews therefore said among themselves, Whither will this man go that we shall not find him? Will he go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?" (<43734>John 7:34,35).

2. PURPOSE OF DISPERSION:

In 2 Maccabees certain priests of Jerusalem are represented as praying to God: "Gather together our Dispersion, set at liberty them that are in bondage among the heathen" (2 Macc 1:27; compare 2 Esdras 2:7; <59010>James 1:1; <60010>1 Peter 1:1). The thought of such a Dispersion as a punishment for the disobedience of the people finds frequent expression in the Prophets: Hosea (9:3), Jeremiah (8:3; 16:15, etc.), Ezekiel (4:13), and Zechariah (10:9). And it appears also in the Deuteronomic Law (<05X25>Deuteronomy 28:25; 30:1). That the Dispersion of the Jews was for the benefit of the Gentiles is a conception to which expression is given in utterances of psalmists and prophets (Psalm 67; <33057>Micah 5:7, etc.). It is found also in the Apocrypha Baruch, a work belonging to the 1st century AD: "I will scatter this people among the Gentiles, that they may do good to the Gentiles" (1:7).

3. CAUSES OF DISPERSION:

The causes of the Dispersion most obvious to the student of Old Testament history were the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, when the king of Assyria carried Israel away into his own land and placed them in Halah, and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes (<12176>2 Kings 17:5 ff); and when in the reign of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, Judah was carried away into Babylonia (<12244>2 Kings 24:14). *See CAPTIVITY*. But there were other captivities which helped to scatter the children of Abraham. Ptolemy I of Egypt (322-285 BC) by his expeditions to Palestine and his capture of Jerusalem added largely to the Jewish population of Alexandria. Antiochus the Great of Syria (223-187 BC)

removed from the Jewish communities in Mesopotamia and Babylon 2,000 families and settled them in Phrygia and Lydia (Josephus, Ant, XII, iii, 4). Pompey after his capture of Jerusalem in 63 BC carried off hundreds of Jews to Rome, where they were sold as slaves, but, afterward, many of them obtained their freedom and civic rights.

4. EXTENT OF DISPERSION:

There was, besides, a voluntary emigration of Jewish settlers for purposes of trade and commerce into the neighboring countries, and especially into the chief cities of the civilized world. The successors of Alexander, and their successors in turn, encouraged immigration into their territories and the mingling of nationalities. They needed colonists for the settlements and cities which they established, and with the offer of citizenship and facilities for trade and commerce they attracted many of the Jewish people.

"In this way," says Philo, "Jerus became the capital, not only of Judea, but of many other lands, on account of the colonies which it sent out from time to time into the bordering districts of Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Coele-Syria, and into the more distant regions of Pamphylia, Cilicia, the greater part of Asia Minor as far as Bithynia, and the remotest corners of Pontus. And in like manner into Europe: into Thessaly, and Boeotia, and Macedonia, and Aetolia, and Attica and Argos, and Corinth, and into the most fertile and fairest parts of the Peloponnesus. And not only is the continent full of Jewish colonists, but also the most important islands, such as Euboea, Cyprus, and Crete. I say nothing of the countries beyond the Euphrates. All of them except a very small portion, and Babylon, and all the satrapies which contain fruitful land, have Jewish inhabitants" (Philo, Leg ad Caium, 36).

About the middle of the 2nd century BC the Sibylline Oracles could say of the Jewish people: "Every land and every sea is full of thee" (3:271). About the same period the Roman Senate, being anxious to extend protection to the Jews, had a circular letter written in their favor to the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamum, Cappadocia and Parthia, and to a great number of provinces, cities and islands of the Mediterranean, where presumably there was a larger or smaller number of Jews (1 Macc 15:15 ff). It is no surprise, therefore, to read that for the Feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem, there were present after the ascension of Jesus: "Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and

the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians" (⟨44019⟩Acts 2:9-12).

5. THE EASTERN DISPERSION:

The Eastern Dispersion, caused by the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, seems to have increased and multiplied, and to have enjoyed a considerable measure of liberty, and of prosperity. When the return from the captivity took place Under Zerubbabel, it was only a small proportion of the exiles who sought a home again in the land of their fathers. Nor did the numbers who accompanied Ezra from Babylon greatly diminish the exiles who remained behind. In the time of Christ, Josephus could speak of the Jews in Babylenia by "innumerable myriads" (Ant., XI, v, 2). He also tells us of the 2,000 Jewish families whom Antiochus transferred from Babylon and Mesopotamia to Phrygia and Syria. Of the peculiarities of the Jews as a people living apart and observing their own customs and arousing the ill-will of the neighbors, we have a glimpse in the Persian period in the Book of Est (3:8). Babylonia remained a focus of eastern Judaism for centuries, and from the discussions in rabbinical schools there were elaborated the Talmud of Jerusalem in the 5th century of our era, and the Talmud of Babylon a century later. The two chief centers of Mesopotamian Judaism were Nehardea, a town on the Euphrates, and Nisibis on the Mygdonius; an affluent of the Chaboras, which were also centers of Syrian Christianity.

6. THE EGYPTIAN DISPERSION:

The Egyptian Dispersion is of special interest and importance, and recent discoveries have thrown unexpected light upon it. As far back as the days of Sheshenq, the founder of the 22nd Dynasty, the Shishak of ⟨11025⟩1 Kings 14:25 f; ⟨44202⟩2 Chronicles 12:2 f, who invaded Palestine in the 10th century BC, and engraved on the South wall of the great Temple of Karnak the names of many districts and cities he had captured, prisoners of war and hostages may have been carried off to Egypt by the conqueror. At a later time Jewish mercenaries are said to have fought in the expedition of Psammetichus II against Ethiopia, to which expedition belong the famous inscriptions of Abu Simbel (594-589 BC). So we learn from the well-known Letter of Aristeas. But the clearest and best-known example of a settlement of Jews in Egypt is that connected with the prophet Jeremiah. When Gedaliah, the governor of Judea, after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BC, had been treacherously murdered, the depressed and dispirited

remnant under Johnnan, the son of Kareah, resolved to take flight into Egypt, against the counsel of Jeremiah. A host of fugitives, including Jeremiah and his friend Baruch, accordingly set out thither, and settled at Migdol and Tahpanhes and Noph (Memphis), and in the country of Pathros in upper Egypt (Jeremiah 43; 44). It was in Egypt with those fugitives that Jeremiah ended his life. Many of the fugitives were taken prisoners by Nebuchadrezzar on one of his latest expeditions to the west, and were transported to Babylon (Josephus, Ant, X, ix, 7; compare [2408]Jeremiah 43:8 f).

7. TESTIMONY OF ARAMAIC PAPYRI:

Of this colony of Jews it is natural to see a strong confirmation in the recent discovery of Aramaic papyri at Assouan, the Syene of the ancients. The papyri were the contents of a deed box of a member of a Jewish colony in upper Egypt, and the deeds refer to house property in which Jews are concerned. Here then at Assouan, about 470 BC is a colony of Jews who have acquired houses and other property, and have become bankers and money lenders, within a century of the death of Jeremiah. In the papyri there is evidence of the existence of a tribunal of the Hebrews, a court where cases could be decided, as fully recognized by law as any of the other courts, Egyptian or Persian, for Egypt, "the basest of kingdoms," was then subject to a Persian suzerain. Most significant of all, Yahweh is acknowledged as the God of the Jews, and the existence of a chapel and even of an altar of sacrifice is beyond all doubt. Evidently these Jews in Egypt did not consider that an altar of Yahweh could not stand anywhere else than at Jerusalem, or that outside Jerusalem the worship of the synagogue was the only worship of the God of their fathers. These facts are rendered still more striking when we regard them as a fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy: "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. In that day there shall be an altar to Yahweh in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to Yahweh" ([23918]Isaiah 19:18,19). These papyri give information similar to that which the clay tablets discovered at Nippur give regarding the house of Murashu Sons (*see CAPTIVITY*) about the same time — the time when Ezra was setting out from Babylon to restore at Jerusalem the worship of the temple which Zerubbabel had rebuilt. It was just about a century from the time that Jeremiah had gone down to Egypt that we have the first of these deeds, and it was the grandfathers, or great-grandfathers, of the

persons concerned whom he had accompanied thither so much against his will.

8. JEWISH TEMPLE AT SYENE:

These papyri were discovered in 1904, and a year or two later, additional papyri were discovered in a mound which stands on the site of the ancient Elephantine or Yeb, an island in the Nile, on the frontier also. One of these papyri contains a petition from the Jewish colony in Elephantine addressed to Bagohi (called Bagoas by Josephus, Ant, XI, vii, 7), the Persian governor of Judah, about 408 BC. They ask for assistance to enable them to rebuild the temple of Yahweh in Elephantine, which had been destroyed at the instigation of the priests of the rain-headed Egyptian god Khnub, who had a temple in the fortress of Yeb or Elephantine. This Jewish temple had been erected to Yahweh at least 125 years before and had been spared by Cambyses in 525 BC when he destroyed all the temples erected to the gods of Egypt. The destruction of the temple at Yeb occurred in the 14th year of Darius, 411 BC. It contained an altar for burnt sacrifice, and there were gold and silver vessels in which the blood of sacrifice was collected. The head of the college of priests presenting this petition is Jedoniah, a name found in an abbreviated form in Jadon (Nehemiah 3:7).

9. THEORIES OF THE SYENE SETTLEMENT:

An attempt has been made to show that the bearers of these Hebrew names were descended from the captivity of the Northern Kingdom. It is suggested that they had come into Egypt with the Persian army under Cambyses from their adopted homes in Assyria and the cities of the Medes and had obtained possessions on the southern frontier of Egypt. Names believed to point to the Northern Kingdom, like Hosea and Menahem, occur very frequently, but this is too narrow a foundation for such a theory, and the Israelite origin of the Syene colonists is not established (JQR (1907), 441 ff). There is more to be said in favor of the view that they were the descendants of a Jewish military colony. That Jewish mercenaries fought in the campaigns of the Pharaohs we have already seen. And that Elephantine was an important garrison town on the frontier is also certain. Josephus (Ant., XIV, vi, 2) mentions a Jewish military colony holding a post at Pelusium in the century before Christ, and this might be a similar garrison stationed at the opposite extremity of the land in the 5th century. Such a garrison would attract Jews engaged in business and in the occupations of civil life, and so a distinct Jewish community would be

formed. It has even been suggested that the tidings of the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem furnished the motive to these Egyptian Jews to build the temple and rear the altar of burnt offering which the heathen priests of Khnub had destroyed.

10. IMPORTANCE OF THE DISCOVERY:

While the petition to the religious authorities at Jerusalem indicates that the priests of Elephantine regarded their temple as dependent upon the temple at Jerusalem, it is significant. that they were also, as is shown in their letter, in communication with Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria. That this was Nehemiah's enemy (Nehemiah 4:1; 6:1, etc.) is impossible, for he lived nearly a century earlier. But the association with descendants of his, themselves Samaritans, gives a schismatical appearance to the position of the Elephantine temple. The existence of this temple with its priesthood, its altar of sacrifice, and its offerings, from 500 years BC, is an important fact in the history of the Dispersion. It was meant to keep those Jewish exiles true to the religion of their fathers and in religious fellowship with their brethren in Palestine. For a like purpose the Temple of Onias at Leontopolis was erected in the early years of the Maccabean struggle. Onias had to flee from Jerusalem with a number of priests and Levites, and for the aid he rendered to Ptolemy Philometor, the king of Egypt, he received a gift of land upon which he built a temple like to the Temple at Jerusalem. Professor Flinders Petrie believes he has discovered this temple of Onias IV at Tel el-Yehudiyeh (Hyksos and Israelite Cities, 31). The discovery confirms the account given of the temple by Josephus, who is our only authority for its erection (Ant., XIII, iii, 2; XIV, viii, 2).

11. A NEW CHAPTER OF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY:

The Elephantine-Syene papyri have added a new and valuable chapter to Old Testament history. We know now of a Jewish temple in Egypt which certainly reaches 400 years further into antiquity than the temple of Onias IV at Leontopolis, and we obtain important information as to the relations of its priesthood with the leaders of the Jerusalem Jews and the Samaritans. We know now from unbiased authorities that the Jewish settlements in the Valley of the Nile are much older than has hitherto been believed. We have valuable confirmation not only of the notices in the Book of Jeremiah, but also of the statements in the later Hellenistic literature. Moreover, it is now

shown that the skepticism which has prevailed in some quarters as to the very existence of any considerable Egyptian Dispersion before the time of Alexander the Great is unwarranted (Peters, *Die judische Gemeinde von Elephantine-Syene*, 50 f; Schurer, GJV4, III, 19 f) .

12. ALEXANDRIAN JUDAISM:

What exactly were the fortunes of this Jewish community at a later time, no record has yet been found to tell. Possibly it decayed in course of time, for Herodotus who visited Egypt about 450 BC makes no mention of it and found no Jews in sufficient numbers to attract his attention. It was undoubtedly with the founding of Alexandria in 332 BC that the flourishing period of Judaism in Egypt commenced. Alexander the Great had hastened from the field of victory at Issus 333 BC, through Syria by way of Tyre, the siege of which occupied him some months, showing clemency to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and severity to the recalcitrant inhabitants of Gaza till by its eastern gate he entered Egypt and took possession of the land of the Pharaohs. The Jews appear to have been friendly to Macedonian conquest, and in Alexander's new city they received the rights of citizenship and two quarters all to themselves. That they were restricted to their own quarters does not appear, and in the time of Philo, at the commencement of the Christian era, they had synagogues and places of prayer in all parts of the city. Alexander died in 323 BC but the favor which he had accorded to the Jews was continued by the Ptolemies who succeeded to his Egyptian empire. The first Ptolemy, Lagi or Soter (322-285 BC), increased the Jewish population of Alexandria by raids into Palestine on which he brought back a large number of captives, both Jews and Samaritans. Other Jews, hearing of his liberality and of the prosperity of their coreligionists, were attracted to Egypt and settled in Alexandria of their own accord (Josephus, Ant, XII, i, 1). Under their own ethnarch they enjoyed great prosperity and had full religious liberty. The principal synagogue of the city was on a scale of great magnificence. In the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (182-146 BC) they were allowed to set up the temple at Leontopolis, as we have already noticed. In the time of Philo the Jewish colony in Egypt was considered to number a million.

13. THE JEWS AND HELLENISM:

It was in Alexandria that the Jews first came so powerfully under the influence of Hellenism, and here that the peculiar Greco-Jewish philosophy

sprang up of which Philo was the most notable representative. The same soil was eminently favorable to early Christianity which had from the end of the 2nd century onward its greatest teachers and their learned catechetical school.

  See ALEXANDRIA.

14. THE SEPTUAGINT:

The great monument of Hellenistic Judaism, which had its chief seat in Alexandria, is the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, which became such a powerful praeparatio evangelica, and was the Bible of the Apostles and the first Christians, even of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. It is ascribed in the Letter of Aristeas to the interest of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-247 BC) in a proposal to secure a copy of the Jewish Law in an accessible translation for the famous Royal Library. It is more likely that as familiarity with their Hebrew tongue diminished in their new surroundings, the need of an intelligible version of the Law to begin with was felt, and Jewish hands were set to work to produce it. In course of time the rest followed, but from the tradition of its being the work of 70 or 72 translators it is known as the Septuagint.

  See SEPTUAGINT.

15. EARLY EVIDENCE OF A JEWISH COMMUNITY:

The question has been raised whether too much has not been made of a Jewish community in Alexandria so early, and it has been asserted that we can scarcely speak of a Jewish Dispersion anywhere before the Maccabean period in the second half of the 2nd century BC. The evidence as we have seen points to the existence of Jewish communities continuously from the days of Jeremiah. Papyri prove the presence of Jews in Egypt, not only in the towns but in country districts from a comparatively early period. A remarkable inscription has recently come to light showing that at Schedia, some 20 miles from Alexandria, there existed a Jewish community which had built a synagogue and dedicated it to the honor of Ptolemy III Euergetes (247-222 BC) and his queen Berenice. If such a community was organized in the little town of Schedia at that date, we can well believe the cosmopolitan city of Alexandria to have had a considerable Jewish community at a still earlier date.

16. DISPERSION IN SYRIA:

When we turn to Syria, we find large numbers of Jews, notwithstanding the hatred of Greeks and Syrians. Josephus (BJ, VII, iii, 3) says that it is the country which has the largest percentage of Jewish inhabitants, and Antioch among the towns of Syria had the preeminence. In Damascus, which seems to have had a Jewish quarter or Jewish bazaars in the days of Ahab (⊲1084⊳1 Kings 20:34 and Burney's note at the place), the Jewish population was numbered by thousands. From Galilee and Gilead and the region of the Hauran, Judas Maccabeus and his brother Jonathan brought bodies of Jews, who were settlers among a pagan population, for safety to Judea (1 Macc 5).

17. IN ARABIA:

Even in Arabia Judaism had considerable footing. Edward Glaser, who prosecuted valuable archaeological researches in Arabia (see Hilprecht, Recent Researches in Bible Lands, 131 ff), professes to have found Himyaritic inscriptions of the 4th and 5th centuries of our era which are monotheistic and therefore Jewish, but there is still uncertainty as to this. In the beginning of the 6th century a Jewish king actually reigned in Arabia, and because of his persecution of the Christians he was attacked and overthrown by the Christian king of Abyssinia.

18. IN ASIA MINOR:

Of the widespread distribution of the Dispersion in Asia Minor there is abundant testimony, not only in the texts of the apostles, but in classical and early Christian literature and in the epigraphic literature which has been accumulating for the last 30 years. At Pergamum, in Lydia, in Karia, at Magnesia, at Tralles, at Miletum, in Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Pontus, considerable Jewish communities existed at the beginning of the Christian era. At Smyrna the Jews played a prominent part in the death of Polycarp 155 AD, being especially zealous in heaping up fagots upon the fire that consumed the martyr. In his Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia Sir William Ramsay mentions numerous indications found on inscriptions of Jewish settlers, and his chapter on "The Jews in Phrygia" focuses the results of his inquiries (op. cit., 667 ff; compare 649 ff). He has also made it extremely probable that long before Paul's day there was a strong body of Jews in Tarsus of Cilicia, and he holds that a Jewish colony was settled there as

early as 171 BC. "The Seleucid kings," he says, like the Ptolemies, "used the Jews as an element of the colonies which they founded to strengthen their hold on Phrygia and other countries." But it is difficult to trace out the profound influence they exerted in the development of their country from the fact that they adopted to such an extent Greek and Roman names and manners, and were thus almost indistinguishable. At Laodicea and Hierapolis there have been found many evidences of their presence: for example, at the latter place an inscription on a gravestone tells how the deceased Publius Aelius Glycon mortified a sum of money to provide for the decoration of his tomb every year at the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

19. AMONG GREEKS PROPER:

The Dispersion among the Greeks proper had attained to considerable dimensions in the time of Christ. Philo, as noticed above, mentions Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Aetolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth and the fairest and most fertile parts of the Peloponnesus as having Jewish inhabitants. Inscriptions recovered from Delphi and elsewhere relating to the manumission of slaves in the 2nd century BC contain the names of Jews (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 325 f). In Sparta and Sicyon, Jews lived in the days of the Maccabees (1 Macc 15:23). At Philippi we know from [44616]Acts 16:16 there was a proseuche, or place of of prayer, and at Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth there were synagogues in Paul's time. On the islands of the Greek archipelago and the Mediterranean there were Jews. Cyprus, the home of Barnabas, had a large Jewish population; and Euboea and Crete are named by Philo as Jewish centers. Rhodes has the distinction of having produced two opponents of Judaism in the first half of the 1st century BC. Clearchus of Soli, a disciple of Aristotle, introduces in one of his dialogues a Jew from Coele-Syria, Hellenic not in speech only but in mind, representing him as having come in his travels to Asia Minor and there conversed with Aristotle. Such an experience may have been rare so early; the incident may not be fact, but fiction; yet such as it is it tells a tale of the spread of Judaism.

20. THE ROMAN DISPERSION:

The relations of Rome with the Jewish people lend special interest to the Dispersion there. Jews do not appear to have been settled in Rome before the Maccabean period. There is a certain pathos in the appeal made to the Roman state by Judas Maccabeus, amid the difficulties that were gathering

round his position, for "a league of amity and confederacy" with the Roman people (1 Macc 8:17-32). His brother and successor, Jonathan, followed this up later (1 Macc 12:1-4,16). And in 140 BC Simon sent a delegation which concluded a treaty, offensive and defensive, with Rome, which was duly intimated by the Senate to their allies in various countries, especially of the East. During the stay of the mission at Rome its members seem to have made attempts at religious propagandism, and the praetor Hispalus compelled them to return to their homes for attempting to corrupt Roman morals by introducing the worship of Jupiter Sabazius which is no doubt the Roman interpretation of the Lord of Hosts (Yahweh Sabaoth). But ere long in Rome, as in Alexandria, they formed a colony by themselves, occupying Trastevere, the Transtiberine portion of the city, together with an island in the Tiber. Their prosperity grew with their numbers. When Cicero in 59 BC was defending Flaccus he speaks of gold being sent out of Italy, and all the provinces, to Jerusalem, and there was present among his listeners a large body of Jews interested in the case.

21. JEWS AND POMPEY:

When Pompey had captured Jerusalem in 63 BC, he brought back with him to Rome a number of Jewish captives. They were sold as slaves, but many of them received their freedom and rights to citizenship. When Julius Caesar, who was a great patron and protector of the Jews, was assassinated, they wept over him for nights on end.

22. JEWS AND THE FIRST CAESARS:

Augustus protected and encouraged them. Tiberius, however, adopted repressive measures toward them, and 4,000 Jews were deported by him to Sardinia while others were driven out of the city. With the downfall of Sejanus, the unworthy favorite of Tiberius, this repressive policy was reversed and they were allowed to return to Rome. Claudius again devised measures against them (circa 50 AD), and they were banished from the city. They had, however, so multiplied and they had attained such influence that it was impossible to get rid of them altogether.

23. INFLUENCE OF JEWS IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE:

Their customs and religious observances brought down upon them the scorn of Juvenal and others, while Empire their faith and worship had attractions for the thoughtful and the superstitious.

"The Jews from the time of the first Caesar," says Sir Samuel Dill, "have worked their way into every class of society. A Jewish prince had inspired Caligula with an oriental ideal of monarchy. There were adherents of Judaism in the household of the great freedmen of Claudius, and their growing influence and turbulence compelled that emperor to expel the race from his capital. The worldly, pleasure-loving Poppea had, perhaps, yielded to the mysterious charms of the religion of Moses. But it was under the Flavians, who had such close associations with Judea, that Jewish influences made themselves most felt. And in the reign of Domitian, two members of the imperial house, along with many others, suffered for following the Jewish mode of life" (Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, 84).

In recent excavations, which have laid bare much of subterranean Rome, many Jewish tombs have been examined and have yielded much additional knowledge of the conditions of Jewish life in the capital of the Caesars. Probably Jews gracing Pompey's triumph after his Syrian campaign, 61 BC, made the first Roman catacombs similar to those on Jewish hillsides and especially round Jerusalem; and in these Jewish catacombs pagans and Christians were never laid.

24. JEWS IN ITALY, GAUL, SPAIN AND NORTH AFRICA:

In Italy, apart from Roman and Southern Italy, where they were widely spread, the number of Jews at the beginning of our era was not large. In Southern Gaul they were numerous and in Spain they were numerous and powerful. In North Africa there were Jewish communities in many centers, and Cyrene was the home of a large and flourishing Jewish population.

25. THE NUMBERS OF THE DISPERSION:

It is not easy to form a trustworthy estimate of the Jewish population of the world in the times of Christ. Harnack reckons up four or four and a half millions (Expansion of Christianity, I, 10) within the Roman Empire. The Judaism of the Dispersion would at least be several times more numerous than the Judaism of Palestine.

26. JEWISH PROSELYTISM:

The question has been discussed how far the Jews of the Dispersion recruited their ranks by proselytism. That they should maintain a

propaganda on behalf of their ancestral faith would only be in keeping with the character of their religion as a religion of revelation. Although they had to live within "the hedge of the Law" to protect them against the corruptions and idolatries of the Gentiles, there was nevertheless at the heart of Judaism a missionary purpose, as we see from the universalism of the Psalms and the Prophets. Judaism was burdened with a message which concerned all men, to the effect that there was one God, holy and spiritual, Creator of heaven and earth, who had committed to the family of Abraham in trust for the world His Law. To witness for the Living God, and to proclaim His Law, was the chief element of the Jewish propaganda in the Roman empire, and their system of proselytism enabled them to gain adherents in numbers. In this the Old Testament Scriptures and the observance of the Sabbath were important factors, and enabled them to win the adherence of intelligent and educated people.

27. INTERNAL ORGANIZATION:

That the Jews of the Dispersion had an internal organization with courts of their own, having considerable jurisdiction, not only in spiritual but in civil affairs, there is no doubt. This would only be in accordance with the analogy of their constitution as seen in the New Testament, and of their commercial organization in many lands to this day.

28. UNITY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE:

In all the lands of their Dispersion the Jews never lost touch with the land of their fathers, or Jerusalem, the city of the Great King. The bond of unity was maintained by the pilgrimages they made from all the countries where they were scattered to their three great national feasts; by the payment of the half-shekel toward the services of the Temple as long as it stood; and by their voluntary submission, so long as they had a national polity, to the decrees of the great Sanhedrin.

29. DISPERSION INFLUENCED BY GREEK THOUGHT:

That Judaism was influenced in its Dispersion by contact of the larger world of life and thought in which the Jews had their place outside of Palestine we can see by the example of Alexandria. It was there that it felt most powerfully the penetrating and pervasive influence of Greek thought, and the large apocryphal and apocalyptic literature which sprang up there is one of the most notable results. "The Alexandrian Jew was in reality both

a Jew and a Greek; he held the faith of Yahweh and sincerely worshiped the God of his fathers, but he spoke the Greek language, had received a Greek education, and had contracted many Greek ideas and habits. Still those in his position were Jews first, and Greeks afterward, and on all `The fundamentals' were in thorough sympathy with their Palestinian brethren" (Fairweather, From the Exile to the Advent, 109 f).

30. THE DISPERSION A PREPARATION FOR THE ADVENT OF CHRIST:

The Jewish people thus widely distributed over the Roman world with their monotheism, with their Scriptures, and with their Messianic hopes, did much to prepare the way for the advent of the Redeemer who was to be the fulfillment of Jewish expectation and hope. It was due to the strange and unique influence of Judaism and to the circulation of the glowing visions of Israel's prophets among the nations, that there was so widespread an expectation, mentioned by Tacitus, by Suetonius and by Josephus, that from Judea would arise a Ruler whose dominion would be over all. It is now believed that Virgil's conception of the Better Age which was to be inaugurated by the birth of a child was derived from Isaiah's prophecies. And not only did the Jewish Dispersion thus prepare the way for the world's Redeemer in the fullness of the time, but when He had come and suffered and died and risen and ascended, it furnished a valuable auxiliary to the proclamation of the gospel. Wherever the apostles and the first preachers traveled with the good news, they found Jewish communities to whom they offered first the great salvation.

31. THE DISPERSION AN AUXILIARY TO THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL:

The synagogue services lent themselves most effectively to the ministry of Paul and his colleagues, and it was to the synagogue that they first repaired in every city they visited. Even to this day this preservation of "the dispersed of Israel" is one of the marvels of the Divine government of the world, proving the truth of the word of God by one of the earliest prophets: "I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall upon the earth" (Amos 9:9).

LITERATURE.

Schurer, GJV4, III, 1 ff; Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, I, 1-40; Fairweather, Background of the Gospel and From the Exile to the Advent; Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Diaspora"; Sayce and Cowley, Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan; Oestcrley and Box, Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.

T. Nicol.

DISPERSION OF NATIONS

See BABEL; DISPERSION; TABLE OF NATIONS.

DISPOSITION

<dis-po-zish'-un> [διαταγαί, *diatagai*]): Only in Acts 7:53, "received the law by the disposition of angels," where it bears the meaning of "administration"; the Revised Version (British and American) "as it was ordained by angels."

DISPUTATION

<dis-pu-ta'-shun>: In Acts 15:2, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "questioning" for the King James Version "disputation" (Greek *suzetesis*). In Romans 14:1, the King James Version "doubtful disputations" becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) "decision of scruples" (Greek *diakriseis dialogismon*, literally, "discussions of doubts"). The Greek in neither case implies what the word "dispute" has come to mean in modern English, but rather "to discuss" or "argue."

DISTAFF

<dis'-taf> ([Ël P, *pelekh*]): This word occurs once in Proverbs 31:19; "spindle" is found in the same passage. In the Revised Version (British and American) the meanings of the two words have been exchanged.

See SPINNING.

DISTIL

<dis-til'>: Only found twice in the English Bible (Deuteronomy 32:2; Job 36:27), in both cases in its original meaning of "to fall in drops," as dew or rain (derived through French from Latin de, "down," stillo, "to

drop"). It does not occur in its later technical sense, for the process we call distilllation was not known in ancient times.

DISTINCTLY

<dis-tinkt'-li>: Only ¹⁶⁸⁰⁸Nehemiah 8:8, "They read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly." Probably the better rendering is the Revised Version, margin "with an interpretation," i.e. translating into Aramaic. The Hebrew word is a participle of the verb *parash* = "to make distinct." The corresponding Aramaic word occurs in ¹⁵⁰⁴⁸Ezra 4:18 = "plainly" the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), better "translated" the Revised Version, margin.

DITCH

<dich>: The word is used indiscriminately in the King James Version to represent at least three different ideas: a conduit or trench (¹²⁸⁰¹2 Kings 3:16); a reservoir or cistern; or simply a pit or hole in the ground. In the Revised Version (British and American) this distinction is observed more carefully. Compare ¹⁸⁰⁸¹Job 9:31; ¹⁹⁰⁷⁵Psalm 7:15 ("pit"), and ²³²²¹Isaiah 22:11 ("reservoir"), the former meaning a pit or any similar place of destruction or corruption; the latter a reservoir or cistern of water. The New Testament usage (⁴⁰⁵¹⁴Matthew 15:14 the King James Version) corresponds somewhat with the former. See also ¹²⁸⁰¹2 Kings 3:16 ("trenches").

DIVERS; DIVERSE; DIVERSITIES

<di'-verz>, *<di-vurs'>*, *<di-vur'-si-tiz>*: "Divers" meaning "various," "different in kind," is now obsolete and used only as a synonym of "several," i.e. more than one. The distinction between "divers" and "diverse" in the King James Version seems to be that the former is the wider term, the latter being restricted to the meaning of "different in kind," while "divers" is also used to express difference of number. the Revised Version (British and American) retains "diverse" in all instances but changes "divers" nearly everywhere, except where it has the meaning "several." Compare ⁴¹²⁴⁷Matthew 24:7; ⁴²¹¹¹Luke 21:11; ⁵⁸⁹¹⁰Hebrews 9:10, and others. It is hard to understand why the Revised Version (British and American) retains "divers" as a translation of [ποικίλος, *poikilos*], in ⁴⁰⁰²⁴Matthew 4:24 ⁴¹⁰³⁴Mark 1:34, et al., because *poikilos* certainly cannot have the meaning "several" but "different in kind," and the idea expressed in these passages is not that some of the people had several diseases but

that different people had different kinds of diseases. The same is true in ⁅5839⁆Hebrews 13:9 where "divers" does not refer to number but to various kinds of teaching. ⁅5004⁆Hebrews 2:4 and ⁅5002⁆James 1:2 rightly change the reading of the King James Version "divers" to "manifold."

In other passages the Revised Version (British and American) changes "divers" to "diverse," and thus renders the idea of the original text "different in kind." Compare ⁅5513⁆Deuteronomy 25:13 f; ⁅2000⁆Proverbs 20:10,23. Other passages are changed the better to render the original text: ⁅6209⁆Deuteronomy 22:9, "two kinds of seed"; ⁅0650⁆Judges 5:30, "dyed"; ⁅4301⁆2 Chronicles 30:11, "certain men"; ⁅4008⁆Mark 8:3 and ⁅4409⁆Acts 19:9, "some." the King James Version reads. in all these passages "divers." the Revised Version (British and American) changes the King James Version ⁅5010⁆Hebrews 1:1 "at sundry times and in divers manners," an expression often found in Old English, to "by divers portions and in divers manners." "Diversities" is found twice as translation of [διαίρεσις, *diairesis*], literally, "distribution" (⁅4604⁆1 Corinthians 12:4 ff), but the Revised Version (British and American) changes the King James Version, ⁅4628⁆1 Corinthians 12:28, "diversities" to "divers kinds," as translation of [γένη, *gene*], "kinds."

A. L. Breslich

DIVES

<di'-vez>.

See LAZARUS.

DIVIDE

<di-vid'>: It is difficult to decide whether [[g″ r; *ragha`*] (⁅1862⁆Job 26:12; ⁅2515⁆Isaiah 51:15; ⁅2435⁆Jeremiah 31:35) should be rendered "to stir up" or "to still." The Hebrew has both meanings. Some render "He causes the sea to tremble." the Revised Version (British and American) reads "to stir" in text and "to still" in margin, while the King James Version has "to divide" in all three cases. ⁅4513⁆2 Chronicles 35:13, "carried them quickly" (the King James Version "divided them speedily"). Since [ql ″ j ; *cholaq*], may mean either "to distribute" or "to be smooth," ⁅2802⁆Hosea 10:2 reads "their heart is divided" in the text, but offers "smooth" in margin (the King James Version "divided"). The Greek [ὀρθοτομέω, *orthotomeo*], means "to cut straight," hence, the more literal translation of ⁅5015⁆2 Timothy 2:15,

"handling aright the word of truth" (note "holding a straight course in the way of truth" or "rightly dividing the word of truth"; the King James Version "rightly dividing").

A. L. Breslich

DIVINATION

<div-i-na'-shun>:

1. DEFINITION:

Divination is the act of obtaining secret knowledge, especially that which relates to the future, by means within the reach almost exclusively of special classes of men.

2. KINDS OF DIVINATION:

Of this there are two main species:

(1) artificial,

(2) inspirational, or, as it was called in ancient times (Cicero, Lord Bacon, etc.), natural divination. Artificial divination depends on the skill of the agent in reading and in interpreting certain signs called omens. *See AUGURY*. In inspirational or natural divination the agent is professedly under the immediate influence of some spirit or god who enables the diviner to see the future, etc., and to utter oracles embodying what he sees. Among the Romans artificial divination prevailed almost exclusively, the other having vogue largely among the Greeks, a proof surely of the more spiritual trend of the Greek mind. Yet that great Roman, Cicero, in his memorable treatise on Divination, says he agrees with those who take cognizance of these two distinct kinds of divination. As examples of inspirational divination he instances men dreaming or in a state of ecstasy (Deuteronomy Divinatione, i. 18). But though Cicero arranges diviners according to their pretentions, he does not believe in any superhuman communication. Thus he explains dreams on psychological principles much as modern psychologists would (op. cit. ii.63 ff). As a matter of fact Cicero was an atheist, or at least an agnostic.

The Latin word divinatio was confined almost exclusively to divination by outward signs, though its etymology (deus, "god") suggests that it denoted

originally the other kind — that due to the inspiration of superhuman beings. Chrysippus (died at Athens 207 BC), though himself a Greek philosopher, defines the word in a way which would have commanded the approval of nearly every Roman, including Cicero himself who gives it. "Divination," Cicero makes him say (op. cit. ii.63), is "a power in man which foresees and explains those signs which the gods throw in his way." The Greeks were, on the other hand, a more imaginative and emotional people, and with them inspirational divination held much the larger place. The Greek ([μάντις, *mantis*]) bears a close resemblance to the Old Testament prophet, for both claimed to be inspired from without and to be superhumanly informed. The Greek term for divination (*he*) *mantike* (= *he mantike techne*) has reference to the work of the *mantis*, and it hardly ever means divination of the lower sort — that by means of signs.

3. FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTION IN DIVINATION:

Underlying all methods of divination there lay the belief that certain superhuman spiritual beings (gods, spirits) possess the secret knowledge desired by men, and that, on certain conditions,, they are willing to impart it.

(1) The word "divination" itself, from deus, "god," or divus, "pertaining to god," carries with it the notion that the information obtained came from deity. Similarly the Greek *mantike* implies that the message comes to the *mantis* from gods or spirits by way of inspiration.

(2) Astrology, or astromancy, is but one form of divination and it rests upon the ultimate belief that the heavenly bodies are deities controlling the destinies of men and revealing the future to those who have eyes to see. According to the Weltanschauung or conception of the universe advocated by Hugo Winckler, Alfred Jeremias (see The Old Testament in the Light of the East) and others, terrestrial events are but shadows of the celestial realities (compare Plato's doctrine of ideas). These latter represented the mind of the gods (*see ASTROLOGY* secs. 1,2).

(3) On hepatoscopy, or divining from the liver, see below, 6, (2), (c).

(4) It can be proved that among the ancient peoples (Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, etc.) the view prevailed that not only oracles but also omens of all kinds are given to men by the gods and express the minds of these gods.

4. LEGITIMATE AND ILLEGITIMATE DIVINATION:

Among the ancient Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks and Romans the diviner stood in the service of the state and was officially consulted before wars and other great enterprises were undertaken. But among these and other ancient peoples certain classes of diviners were prohibited by the government from exercising their calling, probably because they were supposed to be in league with tile gods of other and hostile nations. The gods of a people were in the beliefs of the time the protectors of their people and therefore the foes of the foes of their proteges. It is on this account that witchcraft has been so largely condemned and punished (*see WITCHCRAFT*). Necromancy is uniformly forbidden in the Old Testament (see Leviticus 19:31; Deuteronomy 18:11; Isaiah 8:19; 19:3), probably on account of its connection with ancestor worship. But among other ancient peoples it was allowed and largely practiced. Note that the Hebrew words translated (Deuteronomy 18:11) "consulter with a familiar spirit" and "wizards" denote alike such persons as seek oracles from the spirits of the dead (see the present writer's Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews, 85 ff). The early Fathers believed that in the divination of heathenism we have the work of Satan who wished to discredit the true religion by producing phenomena among pagan races very similar to the prophetical marvels of the chosen people. This of course rests on a view of the Old Testament prophet which makes him a "predicter" and little if anything more.

See PROPHECY.

5. THE BIBLE AND DIVINATION:

The attitude of the Bible toward divination is on the whole distinctly hostile and is fairly represented by Deuteronomy 18:10 f, where the prophet of Yahweh is contrasted with diviners of all kinds as the only authorized medium of supernatural revelation. Yet note the following:

(1) Balaam (Numbers 22 through 24) was a heathen diviner whose words of blessing and of cursing were believed to have magical force, and when his services are enlisted in the cause of Yahwism, so that, instead of cursing he blessed Israel, there is not a syllable of disapproval in the narrative.

(2) In Isaiah 3:2 diviners are ranked with judges, warriors and prophets as pillars of the state. They are associated with prophets and seers in

[2770]Jeremiah 27:9; 29:8; [2528]Ezekiel 22:28 (compare 13:6-9; 12:24). It is true that the prophets and diviners mentioned in these passages use utter falsehoods, saying peace where there is none; all the same the men called prophets and diviners are classed together as similar functionaries. Pure Yahwism in its very basal principle is and must ever have been antagonistic to divination of every kind, though inspirational divination has resemblances to prophetism and even affinities with it. Why then does the Bible appear to speak with two voices, generally prohibiting but at times countenancing various forms of divination? In the actual religion of the Old Testament we have a syncretism in which, though Yahwism forms the substructure, there are constituents from the religions of the native aborigines and the nations around. The underlying thought in all forms of divination is that by employing certain means men are able to obtain knowledge otherwise beyond their reach. The religion of Israel made Yahweh the source of that knowledge and the prophet the medium through which it came to men. We have an analogous example of syncretism resulting in the union of opposite elements in ancient Zarathustraism (Zoroastrianism) which, though in its central principle inconsistent with divination by omens, yet took on from the native Turanian cults of Persia certain forms of divination, especially that by lot (see Lenormant, Lamentations Divination, 22 ff). Nor should it be forgotten that the Bible is a library and not a book, and where so many writers, living at widely separated times, have been at work it is natural to look for diversity of teaching, though no one can deny that in fundamental matters Bible authors are wonderfully consistent.

6. MODES OF DIVINATION MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE:

For modes of divination in vogue among the ancient Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, etc., see the relevant works and dictionary articles. The species of divination spoken of in the Bible may be arranged under two heads:

(1) those apparently sanctioned, and

(2) those condemned in the Bible.

Those Approved and Those Condemned:

(1) **Methods of Divination Tacitly or Expressly Sanctioned in the Bible.**

(a) The following are instances of inspirational divination:

(i) The case of Balaam has already been cited. He was a Moabite and therefore a heathen soothsayer. His word of blessing or of curse is so potent that whether he blesses or curses his word secures its own realization. So far is his vocation from being censured that it is actually called into the service of Yahweh (see Numbers 22 through 24).

(ii) To dreams the Bible assigns an important place as a legitimate means of revealing the future. Such dreams are of two kinds:

(aa) Involuntary or such as come unsought. Even these are regarded as sent for guidance in human affairs. The bulk of the dreams spoken of in the Bible belong to this class: see ⟨0208⟩Genesis 20:3,1 (Abimelech); 28:2 f; 31:10-14 (Jacob); 37:5-9 (Joseph; *see ASTRONOMY*, II, 6); 40:5-21 (Pharaoh's butler and baker); 41:1-35 (Pharaoh); ⟨0709⟩Judges 7:9-14 (Gideon and an unnamed man); ⟨2017⟩Daniel 1:17 (Daniel had understanding of dreams); ⟨2001⟩Daniel 2:1-49 (Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its interpretation by Daniel); ⟨4012⟩Matthew 1:20; 2:13 f,19 f (Joseph, husband of Mary the virgin); 27:19; see also ⟨2425⟩Jeremiah 23:25 ff, where the lawfulness of prophetic dreams is assumed (compare 23:32, where "lying dreams" imply genuine ones). In the document usually ascribed by modern critics to the Elohist (E), dreams bulk largely as the above examples serve to show. Among the Babylonians belief in the significance of dreams gave rise to a science (oneiromancy) so elaborate that only special interpreters called seers (singular, baru) were considered able to explain them (see Lenormant, op. cit., 143, for examples).

(bb) The other species of dreams consists of such as are induced by what is called "incubation," i.e. by sleeping in a sacred place where the god of the place is believed to reveal his secrets to the sleeper. Herodotus (iv.172) says that the Nasamonians, an Egyptian tribe, used to practice divination by sleeping in the graves of their ancestors. The dreams which then came to them were understood to be revelations of their deified ancestors. See Herod. i.181 for another instance of incubation in Nineveh. We have a reference to this custom in ⟨2304⟩Isaiah 65:4 ("that sit among the graves"), where Yahweh enters into judgment with the Jews for their sin in yielding

to this superstition. Solomon's dream (⟨1005⟩1 Kings 3:5-15) came to him at the high place of Gibeon.

See also DREAM, DREAMER.

(b) But the Bible appears in some places to give its approval to some kinds of artificial or (as it may be called) ominal divination.

(i) Sortliege or divination by lot. The use of the lot as a means of ascertaining the will of Deity is referred to at least without expressed censure, and, as the present writer thinks, with tacit approval, in many parts of the Bible. It was by lot that Aaron decided which of the two goats was to be for Yahweh and which for Azazel (⟨3167⟩Leviticus 16:7-10). It was by lot that the land of Canaan was divided after the conquest (⟨0256⟩Numbers 26:56 ff; Joshua 18; 19). For other Biblical instances see ⟨0674⟩Joshua 7:14 (Achan found out by lot); ⟨3064⟩1 Chronicles 6:54 ff; 24:5 ff; 25:8 f; 26:13 f; Est 3:7 ("They cast Pur, that is, the lot"; see Century Bible in the place cited.); ⟨1604⟩Nehemiah 10:34; 11:1; Jon 1:7 ("The lot fell upon Jonah"); ⟨4275⟩Matthew 27:35; ⟨4026⟩Acts 1:26. In the *URIM AND THUMMIM* (which see), as explained by modern scholars, the same principle is applied, for these two words, though etymologically still obscure, stand for two objects (pebbles?), one denoting yes or its equivalent, and the other number Whichever the high priest took from his ephod was believed to be the answer to the question asked. In all cases it is taken for granted that the lot cast was an expression and indication of the Divine will.

See AUGURY, IV, 3.

(ii) Hydromancy, or divination by water. In ⟨0445⟩Genesis 44:5 Joseph is represented as practicing this kind of divination and not a word of disapproval is expressed.

See AUGURY, IV, 2.

(iii) We read in the Old Testament of other signs or omens which are implicitly approved of, thus ⟨0766⟩Judges 6:36-40 (Gideon's fleece); ⟨0948⟩1 Samuel 14:8-13 (Jonathan decides whether or not he is to attack the Philistines by the words which he may happen to hear them speak).

(2) **Modes of Divination Condemned.**

The following methods of divination are explicitly or implicitly condemned in the Old Testament:

(a) Astromancy (= Astrology).

See ASTROLOGY.

(b) Rhabdomancy, or the use of the divining rod, referred to apparently in [2042]Hosea 4:12 (which may be paraphrased: "My people ask counsel of a bit of wood, and the rod made thereof answers their questions"); [2087]Ezekiel 8:17 ("They put a rod (EV "the branch") to their nose").

(c) By an examination of the liver of animals; see [2621]Ezekiel 21:21. This mode of divining, hepatoscopy, as it is has been called, was very widespread among the Babylonians, Greeks, Romans, etc., of the ancient world, and it is still in vogue in Borneo, Burma and Uganda. We have no evidence that it was practiced among the Israelites, for in the above passage it is the king of Babylon (Nebuchadnezzar) who is said to have "looked in the liver."
Opinions differ as to how the state of the liver could act as an omen. Jastrow says the liver was considered to be the seat of life, and that where the liver of the animal sacrificed (generally a sheep) was accepted, it took on the character of the deity to whom it was offered. The soul of the animal as seen in the liver became then a reflector of the soul of the god (see EB, XX, 102 f). On the other hand, Alfred Jeremias says that in the view of the ancient Babylonians the lines and forms of the sheep's liver were regarded as reflecting the universe and its history (The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, I, 61). Neither of these explanations is made probable by its advocates.

(d) By teraphim (compare *TERAPHIM*); see [0953]1 Samuel 15:23; [2621]Ezekiel 21:21; [8002]Zechariah 10:2.

(e) Necromancy, or consulting the dead; see [0393]Leviticus 19:31; 20:6; [5181]Deuteronomy 18:11; [2089]Isaiah 8:19; 19:3; see above.

(f) Divination through the sacrifice of children by burning (see [5180]Deuteronomy 18:10). The context makes it almost certain that the words translated "that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire" (EV; but read and render "that burns his son or his daughter in the fire") refer to a mode of obtaining an oracle (compare [1170]2 Kings 3:27). The Phoenicians and Carthaginians sacrificed their children to Kronos in times of grave national danger or calamity (Porphyry Apud Euseb. Praep. Ev. iv.64,4; Diod. Sic. xx.14).

7. TERMS USED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT IN CONNECTION WITH DIVINATION:

These are examined in detail in T. Witton Davies' Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews and Their Neighbors. See also the article "Divination" in Encyclopedia Biblica by the same writer. The following brief notes must suffice here.

(1) [μςq, *kecem*], generally rendered "divination," is a general term for divination of all kinds. In Ezekiel 21:21 **(26)** it stands for divination by arrows while in 1 Samuel 28:8 it is used of divination through the medium of an *'obh* ("familiar spirit"). On the derivation of the word see EB, article "Magic," section 3.

(2) [ˆnœØm, *me`onen*], probably from a Semitic root (compare Arabic `anna) which denotes to emit a hoarse nasal sound such as was customary in reciting the prescribed formula (*see CHARM*). For "oak of the *me`onim*" *see AUGUR'S OAK*. Some say the word means one who divines from the clouds, deriving from [ˆn[; `anan], "a cloud," though nothing in the context suggests this sense, and the same remark applies to the meaning "one who smites with the evil eye," making the term a denominative from `ayin, "eye." The usual rendering in the King James Version is plural "observers of times" and in the Revised Version (British and American) "them that practice augury" (Dt. 18:10,14).

(3) The verb [vj ei *nichesh*], of which [vj ei *lichesh*], is but a variant, is probably a denominative from [vj n; *nachash*], "a serpent" (l and n interchange in Hebrew), denoting "to hiss," "to whisper" (like a serpent), then "to utter divinatory formulas." As it is used for so many kinds of divination, W. R. Smith concludes that it came to be a general term for divine. The participle of this verb is translated "enchanter" in Deuteronomy 18:10, the cognate verb, "to use enchantments" in Leviticus 19:26; 2 Kings 21:6; 2 Chronicles 33:6, and the corresponding noun "enchantment" in Numbers 23:23; 24:1.

(4) [ˆyrzG; *gazerin*], literally, "cutters," i.e. such as kill (in Arab, the cognate verb = "to slaughter") for the purpose of examining the liver or entrails as omens. Perhaps the etymology implies "sacrifice," animals being sacrificed as an appeal to deity. The word occurs only in Daniel (2:27; 4:7 **(4)**; 5:7,11), and is translated "soothsayers." Some think they were

"astrologers," the etymology in that case referring to the dividing of the heavens with a view, by casting the horoscope, to forecasting the future.

(5) [tVa″ , *'ashshaph*] (the King James Version "astrologer," the Revised Version (British and American) "enchanter"), occurs only in Daniel in the Hebrew (1:20; 2:2) and in the Aramaic (2:10; 4:4 **(7)**, etc.) parts of the book. The term is probably taken from the Babylonian and denotes a magician and especially an exorcist rather than a diviner.

(6) [μyaDⅽḰ″ , *kasda'im*], the same word as the Greek ([Χαλδαῖοι, *Chaldaioi*]) (English Verisons, "Chaldeans"), denotes in Daniel (1:4, etc.) where alone it occurs, not the people so designated but a class of astrologers. This usage (common in classical writers) arose after the fall of the Babylonian empire, when the only Chaldeans known were astrologers and soothsayers. See further, MAGIC. For "spirit of divination" (⁽⁴¹⁶¹⁶⁾Acts 16:16) *see PYTHON; PHILIPPI.*

8. DIVINATION AND PROPHECY:

Inspirational divination and Old Testament prophecy have much in common. Both imply the following conditions:

(1) the primitive instinct that, craves for secret knowledge, especially that relating to the future;

(2) the belief that such knowledge is possessed by certain spiritual beings who are willing on certain terms to impart it;

(3) such secret knowledge is imparted generally to special classes of men (rarely women) called diviners or (Bab) seers and prophets.

Many anthropologists (Tylor, Frazer, etc.) and Old Testament scholars (Wellhausen, W. Robertson Smith, etc.) consider prophecy to be but an outgrowth and higher form of divination. The older theologians almost to a man, and a goodly number of moderns, take precisely the opposite view, that divination is a corruption of prophecy. Probably neither view is strictly true. Sometimes in human life we find evidences of progress from lower to higher. Sometimes the process is the very reverse. It is important to take notice of the differences as well as the resemblances between the diviner and the prophet.

(1) The Old Testament prophet believes in a personal God whose spokesman he considers himself to be. When he spoke or wrote it was because he was, at least professedly, inspired and informed by Yahweh. "Thus says Yahweh," was the usual formula with which he introduced his oracles. The Greek and Roman *mantis*, on the other hand, worked himself up to the necessary ecstatic state by music, drugs (intoxicants, etc.), sacrificial smoke and the like. Sometimes it has been thought a sufficient means of divination to swallow the vital portions of birds and beasts of omen. It was believed that by eating the hearts of crows, or moles, or of hawks, men took into their bodies the presaging soul of the creature (Frazer, Golden Bough

(NOTE: Separation, distinction: "I will put a division (the Revised Version, margin "sign of deliverance") between my people and thy people" (Exodus 8:23). The Hebrew word here is *pedhuth* =" ransom," "redemption" (compare Psalm 111:9), but the reading is doubtful. The King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) follow Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate, which render "set a distinction," perhaps on the basis of a different reading from that of our Hebrew text.), II, 355).

(2) The *mantis* practiced his art as a remunerative occupation, charging high fees and refusing in most cases to ply his calling without adequate remuneration. The local oracle shrines (Delphi, Clavis, etc.) were worked for personal and political ends. The Old Testament prophet, on the other hand, claimed to speak as he was bidden by his God. It was with him a matter of conviction as to what lives men ought to live, what state of heart they should cultivate. So far from furthering his own material interests, as he could by saying what kings and other dignitaries wished to hear, he boldly denounced the sins of the time, even when, as often, he had to condemn the conduct of kings and the policy of governments. Look, for example, at Isaiah's fearless condemnation of the conduct of Ahaz in summoning the aid of Assyria (Isaiah 7 ff), and at the scathing words with which Jeremiah censured the doings of the nation's leaders in his day (Jeremiah 9:36, etc.), though both these noble prophets suffered severely for their courage, especially Jeremiah, who stands out as perhaps the finest recorded example of what, in the face of formidable opposition, the religious teacher ought ever to be. Of Micaiah ben Iralab, King Ahab of Israel said, "I hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil." What reward did this prophet have for his fidelity to his conscience

and his God? Imprisonment (^{◁1220▷}1 Kings 22:1-35). Had he pleased the king by predicting a happy, prosperous future that was never to be, he would have been clothed in gorgeous robes and lodged in a very palace.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the references above and the full bibliography prefixed to the present writer's book named above (Magic, etc.), note the following: Bouche-Leclercq, Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquite; E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture 3, I, 78-81; 117-33; II, 155; J. G. Frazer, Golden Bough 2, I, 346; II, 355; III, 342, et passim, and the articles in the principal Bible dictionaries.

T. Witton Davies

DIVINE; DIVINER

<di-vin>, *<di-vin'-er>*.

See *AUGURY; ASTROLOGY; DIVINATION.*

DIVINE NAMES

See *GOD, NAMES OF.*

DIVINE VISITATION

See *PUNISHMENTS.*

DIVISION

<di-vizh'-un>: Used in English Versions of the Bible in the following senses:

(1) A separate body of people

  (a) of the tribal divisions of Israel (^{◁06123▷}Joshua 11:23; 12:7; 18:10);

(b) of sections of a tribe, "the divisions of Reuben" (^{◁07515▷}Judges 5:15,16 the King James Version; but the Revised Version (British and American) rightly substitutes "the watercourses of Reuben"; in ^{◁18017▷}Job 20:17 the same word is rendered "rivers");

(c) of the (late) organization of priests and Levites into classes or families who ministered in the temple in rotation; translated "courses" generally in

the King James Version, and always in the Revised Version (British and American) ([1324]1 Chronicles 24:1; 26:1,12,19; [16136]Nehemiah 11:36; compare [4805]2 Chronicles 35:5). Much prominence is given by the Chronicler to the 24 classes of priests, singers, and doorkeepers, who served in turns in the temple (compare [2016]Luke 1:5,8).

(3) In the New Testament, dissension, disunion, schism ([2125]Luke 12:51; [5167]Romans 16:17; [4608]1 Corinthians 3:3 the King James Version, omitted the Revised Version (British and American); [4010]1 Corinthians 1:10; 11:18; [8050]Galatians 5:20).

D. Miall Edwards

DIVORCE IN OLD TESTAMENT:

<di-vors'>:

1. SUBORDINATE POSITION OF WOMAN:

Woman, among the Hebrews, as among most nations of antiquity, occupied a subordinate position. Though the Hebrew wife and mother was treated with more consideration than her sister in other lands, even in other Semitic countries, her position nevertheless was one of inferiority and subjection. The marriage relation from the standpoint of Hebrew legislation was looked upon very largely as a business affair, a mere question of property. A wife, nevertheless, was, indeed, in most homes in Israel, the husband's "most valued possession." And yet while this is true, the husband was unconditionally and unreservedly the head of the family in all domestic relations. His rights and prerogatives were manifest on every side. Nowhere is this more evident than in the matter of divorce. According to the laws of Moses a husband, under certain circumstances, might divorce his wife; on the other hand, if at all possible, it was certainly very difficult for a wife to put away her husband. Unfortunately a double standard of morality in matters pertaining to the sexes is, at least, as old as Moses (see Exodus 7 through 11).

2. LAW OF DIVORCE: [0540]DEUTERONOMY 24:1-4:

The Old Testament law concerning divorce, apparently quite clear, is recorded most fully in [0540]Deuteronomy 24:1 ff. A perusal of the commentaries will, nevertheless, convince anyone that there are difficulties of interpretation. The careful reader will notice that the renderings of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) differ materially. the King James Version reads in the second part of

[5240]Deuteronomy 24:1: "then let him write a bill," etc., the Revised Version (British and American) has "that he shall write," etc., while the Hebrew original has neither "then" nor "that," but the simple conjunction "and." There is certainly no command in the words of Moses, but, on the other hand, a clear purpose to render the proceeding more difficult in the case of the husband. Moses' aim was "to regulate and thus to mitigate an evil which he could not extirpate." The evident purpose was, as far as possible, to favor the wife, and to protect her against an unceremonious expulsion from her home and children.

3. MARRIAGE A LEGAL CONTRACT:

As already suggested, marriage among the Hebrews, as among most Orientals, was more a legal contract than the result of love or affection. It would be, however, a great mistake to assume that deep love was not often present, for at all times the domestic relations of the Hebrew married couple have compared most favorably with those of any other people, ancient or modern. In its last analysis it was, nevertheless, a business transaction. The husband or his family had, as a rule, to pay a certain dowry to the parents or guardians of the betrothed before the marriage was consummated. A wife thus acquired could easily be regarded as a piece of property, which, without great difficulty, could be disposed of in case the husband, for any reason, were disposed to rid himself of an uncongenial companion and willing to forfeit the [mohar] which he had paid for his wife. The advantage was always with the husband, and yet a wife was not utterly helpless, for she, too, though practically without legal rights, could make herself so intolerably burdensome and hateful in the home that almost any husband would gladly avail himself of his prerogatives and write her a bill of divorcement. Thus, though a wife could not divorce her husband, she could force him to divorce her.

4. DIVORCE APPLICABLE ONLY TO WIVES:

The following words of Professor Israel Abrahams, Cambridge, England, before "the Divorce Commission" (London, November 21, 1910), are to the point: "In all such cases where the wife was concerned as the moving party she could only demand that her husband should divorce her. The divorce was always from first to last, in Jewish law, the husband's act." The common term used in the Bible for divorce is [hVaij ″ WLvi, *shilluach 'ishshah*], "the sending away of a wife" ([5219]Deuteronomy

22:19,29). We never read of "the sending away of a husband." The feminine participle, [hv∥rG, *gerushah*], "the woman thrust out," is the term applied to a divorced woman. The masculine form is not found.

5. PROCESS AND EXCEPTIONS:

The Mosaic law apparently, on the side of the husband, made it as difficult as possible for him to secure a divorce. No man could unceremoniously and capriciously dismiss his wife without the semblance of a trial. In case one became dissatisfied with his wife,

(1) he had to write her a BILL OF DIVORCE (which see) drawn up by some constituted legal authority and in due legal form. In the very nature of the case, such a tribunal would use moral suasion to induce an adjustment; and, failing in this, would see to it that the law in the case, whatever it might be, would be upheld.

(2) Such a bill or decree must be placed in the hand of the divorced wife.

(3) She must be forced to leave the premises of her former husband. Divorce was denied two classes of husbands:

(1) The man who had falsely accused his wife of antenuptial infidelity (⟨05213⟩Deuteronomy 22:13 ff), and

(2) a person who had seduced. a virgin (⟨05228⟩Deuteronomy 22:28 f). In addition, a heavy penalty had to be paid to the father of such damsels.

It is probable that a divorced wife who had not contracted a second marriage or had been guilty of adultery might be reunited to her husband. But in case she had married the second time she was forever barred from returning to her first husband, even if the second husband had divorced her or had died (⟨05240⟩Deuteronomy 24:3 f). Such a law would serve as an obstacle to hasty divorces.
Divorces from the earliest times were common among the Hebrews. All rabbis agree that a separation, though not desirable, was quite lawful. The only source of dispute among them was as to what constituted a valid reason or just cause.

6. GROUNDS OF DIVORCE (DOUBTFUL MEANING OF ⟨05240⟩DEUTERONOMY 24:1):

The language in ⁽⁵²⁴⁰⁾Deuteronomy 24:1 ff has always been in dispute. The Hebrew words, [rbD;tw" rI, `erwath dabhar], on which a correct interpretation depends, are not easy of solution, though many exegetes, influenced possibly by some preconceived notion, pass over them quite flippantly. The phrase troubled the Jewish rabbis of olden times, as it does Jewish and Christian commentators and translators in our day. the King James Version renders the two words, "some uncleanness," and in the margin, "matter of nakedness." The latter, though a literal translation of the Hebrew, is quite unintelligible. the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version both have: "some unseemly thing." Professor Driver translates the same words "some indecency." The German the Revised Version (British and American) (Kautzsch) has "etwas Widerwartiges" ("something repulsive"). We know of no modern version which makes `erwath dabhar the equivalent of fornication or adultery. And, indeed, in the very nature of the case, we are forced to make the words apply to a minor fault or crime, for, by the Mosaic law, the penalty for adultery was death (⁽⁵²²⁰⁾Deuteronomy 22:20 ff). It is, however, a question whether the extreme penalty was ever enforced. It is well known that at, and some time before, the time of our Saviour, there were two schools among the Jewish rabbis, that of Shammai and that of Hillel. Shammai and his followers maintained that 'erwath dabhar signified nothing less than unchastity or adultery, and argued that only this crime justified a man in divorcing his wife. Hillel and his disciples went to the other extreme. They placed great stress upon the words, "if she find no favor in his eyes" immediately preceding `erwath dabhar (⁽⁵²⁴⁰⁾Deuteronomy 24:1), and contended that divorce should be granted for the flimsiest reason: such as the spoiling of a dish either by burning or careless seasoning. Some of the rabbis boldly taught that a man had a perfect right to dismiss his wife, if he found another woman whom he liked better, or who was more beautiful (Mishnah, *GiTTin*, 14 10). Here are some other specifications taken from the same book: "The following women may be divorced: She who violates the Law of Moses, e.g. causes her husband to eat food which has not been tithed. .... She who vows, but does not keep her vows. .... She who goes out on the street with her hair loose, or spins in the street, or converses (flirts) with any man, or is a noisy woman. What is a noisy woman? It is one who speaks in her own house so loud that the neighbors may hear her." It would be easy to extend the list, for the Mishna and rabbinic writings are full of such laws.

From what has been said, it is clear that adultery was not the only valid reason for divorce. Besides, the word adultery had a peculiar significance in Jewish law, which recognized polygamy and concubinage as legitimate. Thus a Hebrew might have two or more wives or concubines, and might have intercourse with a slave or bondwoman, even if married, without being guilty of the crime of adultery (Leviticus 19:20), for adultery, according to Jewish law, was possible only when a man dishonored the "free wife" of a Hebrew (Leviticus 20:10 ff).

Divorcement, Bill of:

This expression, found in Deuteronomy 24:1,3; Isaiah 50:1; Jeremiah 3:8 is the translation of the Hebrew [ttyrK]rpse *cepher kerithuth*]. The two words, literally rendered, signify a document or book of cutting off, i.e. a certificate of divorce given by a husband to a wife, so as to afford her the opportunity or privilege of marrying another man. The Hebrew term is rendered by the Septuagint [βιβλίον ἀποστασίον, *biblion apostasion*]. This is also found in the New Testament (Mark 10:4). Matthew 5:31 has "writing of divorcement" in English Versions of the Bible, but Matthew 19:7 the King James Version has "writing," while the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have "bill." The certificate of divorce is called [fGegeT], plural [ˆyFGi *giTTin*], in the Talmud. There is an entire chapter devoted to the subjects in the Mishna It is not positively known when the custom of writing bills of divorcement commenced, but there are references to such documents in the earliest Hebrew legislation. The fact that Joseph had in mind the putting away of his espoused wife, Mary, without the formality of a bill or at least of a public procedure proves that a decree was not regarded as absolutely necessary (Matthew 1:19). The following was the usual form of a decree:

"On the____day of the week____in the month____in the year____from the beginning of the world, according to the common computation in the province of____I____the son of____by whatever name I may be known, of the town of____with entire consent of mind, and without any constraint, have divorced, dismissed and expelled thee____daughter of____by whatever name thou art called, of the town who hast been my wife hitherto; But now I have dismissed thee____the daughter of____by whatever name thou art called, of the town of____so as to be free at thy own disposal, to marry whomsoever thou pleasest, without hindrance from

anyone, from this day for ever. Thou art therefore free for anyone (who would marry thee). Let this be thy bill of divorce from me, a writing of separation and expulsion, according to the law of Moses and Israel.

____, the son of____, witness

____, the son of____, witness

Spiritual Application.

The Hebrew prophets regarded Yahweh not only as the father and king of the chosen people, and thus entitled to perfect obedience and loyalty on their part, but they conceived of Him as a husband married to Israel. Isaiah, speaking to his nation, says: "For thy Maker is thy husband; Yahweh of hosts is his name" (54:5). Jeremiah too makes use of similar language in the following: "Return, O backsliding children, saith Yahweh; for I am a husband unto you" (3:14). It is perfectly natural that New Testament writers should have regarded Christ's relation to His church under the same figure. Paul in 2 Corinthians says: "I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ" (11:2); see also [40915]Matthew 9:15; [43829]John 3:29; [66907]Revelation 19:7. Any unfaithfulness or sin on the part of Israel was regarded as spiritual adultery, which necessarily broke off the spiritual ties, and divorced the nation from God ([23021]Isaiah 1:21; [26162]Ezekiel 16:22; [66022]Revelation 2:22).

   See also MARRIAGE.

LITERATURE.

Amram, Jewish Law of Divorce according to the Bible and Talmud, London, 1897; Abrahams, Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, London, 1896; Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs, London, 1898; The Mishna, Translated into English, Deuteronomy Sola and Raphall, London, 1843; Benzinger, Hebraische Archdalogie, Freiburg, 1894; Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebraischen Archdologie, 1894.

W. W. Davies

DIVORCE IN NEW TESTAMENT:

[τὸ ἀποστάσιου, *to apostasiou*]): The Scripture doctrine of divorce is very simple. It is contained in [40903]Matthew 19:3-12.

We are not called upon to treat of divorce in the Mosaic legislation
(Deuteronomy 24:1-4). That was passed upon by Jesus in the above
discussion and by Him ruled out of existence in His system of religion.
After Jesus had spoken as above, the Mosaic permission of divorce became
a dead letter. There could not be practice under it among His disciples. So
such Old Testament divorce is now a mere matter of antiquarian curiosity.
It may be of interest in passing to note that the drift of the Mosaic
legislation was restrictive of a freedom of divorce that had been practiced
before its enactment. It put in legal proceedings to bar the personal will of
one of the parties. It recognized marriage as a social institution which
should not be disrupted without reference to the rights of society in it. In
this restrictive character "the law is become our tutor to bring us unto
Christ" (Galatians 3:24). But here, as in numerous other instances,
Christ went behind the enactments to primitive original principles whose
recognition would make the law of none effect, because no practice was to
be permitted under it. Thus the Old Testament is disposed of.

Of course what Jesus said will dominate the New. In fact, Jesus is the only
author in the New Testament who has treated of divorce. It has been
thought that Paul had the subject in hand. But we shall find on
examination, further along, that he did not. We need then look nowhere
but to Matthew 19 for the Scripture doctrine of divorce.

True, we have other reports of what Jesus said (Mark 10:2-12; Luke
16:18). But in Matthew 19 we have the fullest report, containing
everything that is reported elsewhere and one or two important
observations that the other writers have not included. Luke has only one
verse where Matthew has ten. Luke's verse is in no necessary connection
with context. It seems to be a mere memorandum among others of the
spiritual or ethical teachings of Christ. Luke however caught the gist of the
whole teaching about divorce in recording the prohibition to put away one
wife and marry another. The records in Matthew 19 and Mark 10 cover
one and the same occasion. But there is nothing in Mark that is not in
Matthew; and the latter contains nearly a third more of text than the
former. There is nothing, however, essential in Matthew that is not in
Mark, save the clause "except for fornication." That exception will be
treated further along. We seem to be justified then in saying that the total
doctrine of the Scripture pertaining to divorce is contained in Matthew 19.
Attention must be called to the fact that, in the Sermon on the Mount
(Matthew 5:27-32), Jesus treated of divorce, and that in every essential

particular it agrees with the elaboration in Matthew 19. Jesus there as plainly as in the argument with the Pharisees put Moses' permission of divorce under ban; as plainly there declared the putting away of one partner to marry another person to be adultery. This may also be noticed, that the exception to the absolute prohibition is in the text of the Sermon on the Mount.

We have then a summary of the New Testament doctrine of divorce stated by Christ Himself as follows: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery" (Matthew 19:9). This puts Him in line with the ideal of the monogamic, indissoluble family which pervades the whole of the Old Testament.

1. THE FAMILY:

It may be well here to treat of the exception which Christ made in His rule to the indissolubility of marriage. It is very widely maintained in the Christian church that there should be no divorce for any cause whatever. This position is in plain contradiction to Christ's teaching in Matthew 15 and Matthew 19. One of the grounds adduced for this denial of divorce in case a partner is guilty of adultery is that Luke and Mark do not record the exception. It is a difficult matter to invade the psychology of writers who lived nearly two thousand years ago and tell why they did not include something in their text which someone else did in his. Neither Luke nor Mark were personal disciples of the Lord. They wrote second hand. Matthew was a personal disciple of Christ and has twice recorded the exception. It will be a new position in regard to judgment on human evidence when we put the silence of absentees in rank above the twice expressed report of one in all probability present — one known to be a close personal attendant.

This may be said: Matthew's record stands in ancient manuscript authority, Greek and also the Versions. And on this point let it be noted that the testimony of the manuscripts was up before the English and American Revisers, and they have deliberately reaffirmed the text of 1611 and given us the exception in Christ's rule in each place (Matthew 5:32; 19:9). This makes the matter as nearly *res adjudicata* as can be done by human wisdom.

Let us consider the rationality of the exception. That feature has had scant attention from theologians and publicists, yet it will bear the closest

scrutiny. In fact it is a key to much that is explanatory of the basic principle of the family. To begin with, the exception is not on its face an afterthought of some transcriber, but was called out by the very terms of the question of the Pharisees: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" This plainly called for a specification from Jesus of exceptions which he would allow to the rule against divorce. It is fortunate that the Pharisees asked the question in the form they did, for that put on Jesus the necessity of enumerating such exceptions as he would allow. He mentioned one, and but one in reply. That puts the matter of exceptions under the rule in logic: Expressio unius-exclusio alterius. All other pretenses for divorce were deliberately swept aside by Christ — a fact that should be remembered when other causes are sought to be foisted in alongside this one allowed by Christ. The question may come up, Whose insight is likely to be truest?

Why, then, will reason stand by this exception? Because adultery is per se destructive of monogamic family life. Whoever, married, is guilty of adultery has taken another person into family relation. Children may be born to that relation — are born to it. Not to allow divorce in such case is to force an innocent party in marriage to live in a polygamous state. There is the issue stated so plainly that "the wayfaring man need not err therein," and "he who runs may read," and "he who reads may run."

It is the hand of an unerring Master that has made fornication a ground for divorce from the bond of matrimony and limited divorce to that single cause. Whichever way we depart from strict practice under the Savior's direction we land in polygamy. The society that allows by its statutes divorce for any other cause than the one that breaks the monogamic bond, is simply acting in aid of polygamy, consecutive if not contemporaneous.

Advocates of the freedom of divorce speak of the above view as "the ecclesiastical." That is an attempt to use the argument ad invidiam. The church of Christ held and holds its views, not because ecclesiastics taught it, but because Christ taught it, and that in His teaching we have a statement out from the righteousness, wisdom, insight and rationality of the all-wise God.

2. PAUL:

Paul is the only other New Testament author besides Christ who has been supposed to treat of divorce. But a careful examination of Paul's writing

will disclose the fact that he has nowhere discussed the question — for what cause or causes a man might put away his wife, or a woman her husband, with liberty of marriage to another person. If Paul has treated of divorce at all it is in 1 Corinthians 7. But even a careless reading of that chapter will disclose the fact that Paul is not discussing the question for what causes marriage might be disrupted, but the question of manners and morals in the relation. Paul has not modified Christ in any respect. It has been supposed that in 7:15 Paul has allowed divorce to a believing partner who has been deserted by one unbelieving, and so he has been sometimes understood as adding desertion to the exception Christ made as cause for divorce.

But Paul has not said in that verse or anywhere else that a Christian partner deserted by a heathen may be married to someone else. All he said is: "If the unbelieving departeth, let him depart: the brother or the sister is not under bondage (*dedoulotai*) in such cases: but God hath called us in peace." To say that a deserted partner "hath not been enslaved" is not to say that he or she may be remarried. What is meant is easily inferred from the spirit that dominates the whole chapter, and that is that everyone shall accept the situation in which God has called him just as he is. "Be quiet" is a direction that hovers over every situation. If you are married, so remain. If unmarried, so remain. If an unbelieving partner deserts, let him or her desert. So remain. "God hath called us in peace." Nothing can be more beautiful in the morals of the marriage relation than the direction given by Paul in this chapter for the conduct of all parties in marriage in all trials.

Many reasons might be given why Paul could not have given liberty of remarriage, besides the one that he did not in his text; but attention should be called to the fact that such an assumption of authority in divorce would soon have brought him into conflict with the Roman government. Paul's claim that he was a Roman citizen was of some value to himself. Would not some Roman citizen have claimed to scrutinize pretty closely Paul's right to issue a decree of divorce against him because he had "departed" from a wife who had become a Christian? There would be two sides to such divorces. Would not Paul, careful, shrewd, politic as he was, have known that, and have avoided an open rupture with a government that did not tolerate much interference with its laws? That neither Paul nor anyone else ever put such construction upon his language, is evidenced by the fact that there is no record in history of a single case where it was attempted for 400 years after Paul was in his grave, and the Roman Empire had for a

century been Christian. Then we wait 400 years more before we find the suggestion repeated. That no use was ever made of such construction of Paul in the whole era of the adjustment of Christianity with heathenism is good evidence that it was never there to begin with. So we shall pass Paul as having in no respect modified the doctrine of divorce laid down by Christ in Matthew 19.

3. REMEDIES FOR MARRIAGE ILLS:

In all civilized countries the machinery of legislation and law can always be open for removal or relief of troubles in marriage without proceeding to its annulment. If a father is cruel to his children, we do not abolish the parental relation, but punish the father for his cruelty. If he deserts his children, we need not assist him to rear other children whom he can desert in turn, but we can punish him for his desertion. What can be done by law in case of parent and child can be done in case of husband and wife. By putting in absolute divorce (frequently for guilty and innocent alike) we invite the very evils we seek to cure. We make it the interest of a dissatisfied party to create a situation that a court will regard as intolerable, and so he or she may go free.

Then by affording an easy way out of the troubles of married life we are inviting carelessness about entering marriage. We say by divorce statutes to a young woman: "If your husband deserts you, you may have another. If he is cruel, you may have another. If he fails to support you, you may have another. If he is drunken, you may have another. If he is incompatible or makes you unhappy, you may have another" — and yet others beyond these. When an easy road is thus made out of marriage, will there be proper caution about entering into marriage? By just as much as a crevice for relief of the miseries of married life is opened by divorce, by so much the flood gates are opened into those miseries. The more solemnly society is impressed that the door of marriage does not swing outward as well as inward the more of happiness and blessing will it find in the institution.

See FAMILY.

C. Caverno

DI-ZAHAB

<di'-za-hab>, *<diz'-a-hab>* [bhzAyDi, *di-za-habh*]; Septuagint

[Καταχρύσεα, *Katachrusea*], literally, "abounding in gold"): The name occurs in a list apparently intended to fix definitely the situation of the camp of Israel in the plains of Moab (Deuteronomy 1:1). No place in the region has been found with a name suggesting this; and there is no other clue to its identification. Some names in the list are like those of stations earlier in the wanderings. Thinking that one of these may be intended Burckhardt suggested *Mina edh-Dhahab*, a boat harbor between *Ras Mohammad* and `*Aqaba*. Cheyne gets over the difficulty by accepting a suggestion of Sayee that Di-zahab corresponds to Me-zahab (Genesis 36:39); this latter he then transforms into Mitzraim, and identifies it with the North Arabian Mucri (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word). The changes, however, seem greater than can be justified.

W. Ewing

DOCTOR

<dok'-ter>: In Luke 2:46 [διδάσκαλος, *didaskalos*]) "doctor" is equivalent to "teacher," which latter is the translation of the Revised Version (British and American). So in Luke 5:17; Acts 5:34, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "doctors," "doctor," of the law (*nomodidaskalos*).

See EDUCATION; RABBI; SCRIBE.

DOCTRINE

<dok'-trin>: Latin doctrina, from doceo, "to teach," denotes both the act of teaching and that which is taught; now used exclusively in the latter sense.

1. MEANING OF TERMS:

(1) In the Old Testament for

(a) *leqach* "what is received," hence, "the matter taught" (Deuteronomy 32:2; Job 11:4; Proverbs 4:2; Isaiah 29:24, the American Standard Revised Version "instruction");
(b) *she-mu`ah*, "what is heard" (Isaiah 28:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "message," the Revised Version, margin "report");
  (c) *mucar*, "discipline" (Jet 10:8 margin, "The stock is a doctrine (the Revised Version (British and American) "instruction") of vanities," i.e.

"The discipline of unreal gods is wood (is like themselves, destitute of true moral force)" (BDB).

(**2**) In the New Testament for

(**i**) *didaskalia* =

(**a**) "the act of teaching" (⁵⁰⁴¹³1 Timothy 4:13,16; 5:17; ⁵⁵⁸¹⁰2 Timothy 3:10,16), all in the Revised Version (British and American) "teaching";

(**b**) "what is taught" (⁴⁰¹⁵⁹Matthew 15:9; ⁵⁵⁰⁴¹³2 Timothy 4:3). In some passages the meaning is ambiguous as between (a) and (b).
(**ii**) *didache*, always translated "teaching" in the Revised Version (British and American), except in ⁴⁵¹⁶¹⁷Romans 16:17, where "doctrine" is retained in the text and "teaching" inserted in the margin =

(**a**) the act of teaching (⁴¹⁰⁴⁰²Mark 4:2; ⁴⁴²⁴²Acts 2:42, the King James Version "doctrine");

(**b**) what is taught (⁴³⁰⁷¹⁶John 7:16,17; ⁶⁶²¹⁴Revelation 2:14,15,24, the King James Version "doctrine"). In some places the meaning is ambiguous as between (a) and (b) and in ⁴⁰⁷²⁸Matthew 7:28; ⁴¹⁰²²Mark 1:22; ⁴⁴¹³¹²Acts 13:12, the manner, rather than the act or matter of teaching is denoted, namely, with authority and power.

2. CHRIST'S TEACHING INFORMAL:

The meaning of these words in the New Testament varied as the church developed the content of its experience into a system of thought, and came to regard such a system as an integral part of saving faith (compare the development of the meaning of the term "faith"):

(**1**) The doctrines of the Pharisees were a fairly compact and definite body of teaching, a fixed tradition handed down from one generation of teachers to another (⁴⁰¹⁶¹²Matthew 16:12, the King James Version "doctrine"; compare ⁴⁰¹⁵⁹Matthew 15:9; ⁴¹⁰⁰⁷Mark 7:7).
(**2**) In contrast with the Pharisaic system, the teaching of Jesus was unconventional and occasional, discursive and unsystematic; it derived its power from His personality, character and works, more than from His words, so that His contemporaries were astonished at it and recognized it as a new teaching (⁴⁰⁷²⁸Matthew 7:28; 22:33; ⁴¹⁰²²Mark 1:22,27; ⁴²⁰⁴³²Luke 4:32). So we find it in the Synoptic Gospels, and the

more systematic form given to it in the Johannine discourses is undoubtedly the work of the evangelist, who wrote rather to interpret Christ than to record His ipsissima verba (John 20:31).

3. APOSTOLIC DOCTRINES:

The earliest teaching of the apostles consisted essentially of three propositions:

(a) that Jesus was the Christ (Acts 3:18);

(b) that He was risen from the dead (Acts 1:22; 2:24,32); and

(c) that salvation was by faith in His name (Acts 2:38; 3:16). While proclaiming these truths, it was necessary to coordinate them with Hebrew faith, as based upon Old Testament revelation. The method of the earliest reconstruction may be gathered from the speeches of Peter and Stephen (Acts 2:14-36; 5:29-32; 7:2-53). A more thorough reconstruction of the coordination of the Christian facts, not only with Hebrew history, but with universal history, and with a view of the world as a whole, was undertaken by Paul. Both types of doctrine are found in his speeches in Acts, the former type in that delivered at Antioch (13:16-41), and the latter in the speeches delivered at Lystra (14:15-17) and at Athens (17:22-31). The ideas given in outline in these speeches are more fully developed into a doctrinal system, with its center removed from the resurrection to the death of Christ, in the epistles, especially in Galatians, Romans, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians. But as yet it is the theological system of one teacher, and there is no sign of any attempt to impose it by authority on the church as a whole. As a matter of fact the Pauline system never was generally accepted by the church. Compare James and the Apostolic Fathers..

4. BEGINNINGS OF DOGMA:

In the Pastoral and General Epistles a new state of things appears. The repeated emphasis on "sound" or "healthy doctrine" (1 Timothy 1:10; 6:3; 2 Timothy 1:13; 4:3; Titus 1:9; 2:1), "good doctrine" (1 Timothy 4:6) implies that a body of teaching had now emerged which was generally accepted, and which should serve as a standard of orthodoxy. The faith has become a body of truth "once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 1:3). The content of this "sound doctrine" is nowhere

formally given, but it is a probable inference that it corresponded very nearly to the Roman formula that became known as the Apostles' Creed.

See DOGMA.

T. Rees

DOCUS

<do'-kus>.

See DOK.

DODAI

<do'-di>, *<do'-da-i>* (⁰¹³²⁷⁰⁴1 Chronicles 27:4).
See DODO.

DODANIM

<do'-da-nim> ([μynidDo, *dodhanim*], "leaders"): In ⁰¹⁰⁰⁴Genesis 10:4, the son of Javan, the son of Japheth. This would place the Dodanim among the Ioninns. The parallel passage ⁰¹³⁰¹⁰⁷1 Chronicles 1:7, with the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch, has, however, "Rodanim," which is probably the true reading. This identifies the people with the Rhodians (compare on ²⁶⁷¹⁵Ezekiel 27:15 under *DEDAN*).

DODAVAHU

<do-dav'-a-hu> ([Whwdw D, *dodhawahu*], "loved of God"; the King James Version Dodavah): Father of Eliezer of Mareshah, a prophet in the days of Jehoshaphat (⁴⁴⁰⁸⁷2 Chronicles 20:37).

DODO; DODAI

<do'-do>, ([wOwD, *dodho*], [yd″ wD, *dodhay*], "beloved"):

(1) The grandfather of Tola of the tribe of Issachar, one of the judges (⁰⁷¹⁰⁰¹Judges 10:1).
(2) "The Ahohite," father of Eleazar, one of David's heroes, and (⁰¹⁰²³⁰⁹2 Samuel 23:9; ⁰¹³¹¹¹²1 Chronicles 11:12) himself the commander of one of the divisions of the army (⁰¹³²⁷⁰⁴1 Chronicles 27:4).
(3) The Bethlehemite, father of Elhanan, one of David's mighty men (⁰¹⁰²³²⁴2 Samuel 23:24; ⁰¹³¹¹²⁶1 Chronicles 11:26).

DOE

<do>.

See DEER.

DOEG

<do'-eg> ([gaeD, gaDo, *do'-egh*] "anxious," "cared for"): "The Edomite," a servant of Saul, who watched David's intercourse with the priest Ahimelech, then denounced the priest to the king, and later executed his command to slay the priests at Nob. The position he held is described as that of "the mightiest" of Samuel's herdsmen (1 Samuel 21:7 margin). Septuagint reads: "tending the mules." Rabbinical legends speak of him as the greatest scholar of his time. The traditional title of Psalm 52 associates the composition of that Psalms with the events that led to the slaying of the priests (1 Samuel 21:7; 22:9,18,22).

Nathan Isaacs

DOG

[bl K, *kelebh*]; (compare Arabic *kelb*, "dog"); [κύων, *kuon*]; and diminutive [κυνάριον, *kunarion*]): References to the dog, both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, are usually of a contemptuous character. A dog, and especially a dead dog, is used as a figure of insignificance. Goliath says to David (1 Samuel 17:43): "Amos I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves?" David says to Saul (1 Samuel 24:14): "After whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea." Mephibosheth says to David (2 Samuel 9:8): "What is th servant, that thou shouldest look upon such a dead dog as I am?" The same figure is found in the words of Hazael to Elisha (2 Kings 8:13). The meaning, which is obscure in the King James Version, is brought out well in the Revised Version: "But what is thy servant, who is but a dog, that he should do this great thing?" The characteristically oriental interrogative form of these expressions should be noted.

Other passages express by inference the low esteem in which dogs are held. Nothing worse could happen to a person than that his body should be devoured by dogs (1 Kings 14:11; 16:4; 21:19,23, etc.). Job 30:1 says of the youth who deride him that he disdained to set their fathers with the dogs of his flock. In Philippians 3:2 and Revelation 22:15, dogs

are coupled with evil-workers, sorcerers, etc. In [40706]Matthew 7:6 we read: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine."

[18101]Job 30:1 (cited above) refers to the use of dogs to guard flocks; and the comparison of inefficient watchmen with dumb dogs ([23560]Isaiah 56:10) implies that at least some dogs are useful. In the apocryphal Book of Tob, Tobias' dog is his companion on his travels (Tobit 5:16; 11:4; on this see Expository Times, XI, 258; HDB, IV, 989; Geiger, Civilization of E. Iranians, I, 85 ff).

There is further the reference to the greyhound ([20681]Proverbs 30:31 English Versions) as one of the four things which are "stately in their going." But the rendering, "greyhound," rests solely upon inference, and is contrary to the Septuagint and Vulgate, which have respectively *alektor* and *gallus*, i.e. "cock," the King James Version margin "horse." The Hebrew has *zarzir mothnayim*, which the King James Version marginrenders "girt in the loins." the Revised Version, margin has "warhorse," Hebrew "well girt (or, well knit) in the loins." In support of the meaning, "girt," for *zarzir*, there is the word *zer*, which, with *zarzir*, is assigned to the obsolete root *zarar* and the Arabic zirr, "button," from zarr, "to button, "to compress." Further, to render *zarzir* by "cock" logically requires a change in the text, for *mothnayim*, "loins," becomes superlative and inappropriate (see Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Cock"). On the other hand, the Arabic zarzur is a starling (compare Arabic zarzar, "to utter cries," said of birds; *carcar*, "to cry out"; *carcar*, "cockroach," or "cricket"). Also, according to Encyclopedia Biblica (s.v. "Cock"), "the Talmudic *zarzir* .... means some bird (a kind of raven)." If the text stands, there appears to be no better rendering than "girt in the loins," which might fairly be taken to refer to a war horse or to a greyhound. The Persian greyhound would in that case be understood, a hairy race, which, according to the Royal Natural History, is less fleet than the English breed and is used in chasing gazelles and in hunting the wild ass, and which according to Doughty (Arabia Deseria) is kept by the Bedouin. "These dogs are said to be sometimes girdled by their owners to prevent them from over-eating and becoming fat" (L. Fletcher, British Museum (Natural History)).

Domestic dogs have probably been derived from various species of wolves and jackals. In this connection, it is noteworthy that the dogs of certain regions greatly resemble the wolves of those regions. The pariah dogs of Syria and Palestine resemble the jackals, especially in color and in the tail, differing in their greater size and in the shape of muzzle and ears. It is fair

to assume that they are much the same as existed in Bible times. They are in general meek and harmless creatures, and are valuable as scavengers, but disturb the night with their barking. Each quarter of the city has its own pack of dogs, which vigorously resents any invasion of its territory. A dog which for any reason finds itself in foreign territory gets home as quickly as possible, and is lucky if it does not have to run the gauntlet of a pack of vicious foes. The pariah dog is sometimes brought up to be a sheep dog, but the best shepherd dogs are great wolfish creatures, which are usually obtained from Kurdistan.

Alfred Ely Day

DOGMA

<dog'-ma> ([δόγμα, *dogma*], from [δοκέω, *dokeo*], "that which seems," "an opinion," particularly the opinion of a philosopher):

1. AS LAW AND ORDINANCE:

In the decadent period of Greek philosophy, the opinion, or *ipse dixit*, of the master of a philosophical school came to be quoted as authoritative truth; also, the opinion of a sovereign imposed as law upon his subjects: a decree or ordinance of the civil authority. The word never appears in English Versions of the Bible, although it is used 5 times in the Greek New Testament, but with the one exception of Acts 16:4, in a sense widely different from that which ecclesiastical usage has given to it from the 2nd century downward. "Dogma" is used in the New Testament,
(1) of Roman laws: "a decree (Greek *dogma*) from Caesar Augustus" (Luke 2:1); "the decrees of Caesar" (Acts 17:7) = the whole body of Roman law;

(2) of ordinances of religious law: "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" (Ephesians 2:15); "the bond written in ordinances" (Colossians 2:14) = the Mosaic ordinances as expressing the moral law which condemned the sinner, and whose enmity Christ abolished by His death. It is a significant revelation of the spirit of Greek theology that all the Greek commentators understood by ordinances in these two places, the gospel as a body of dogmas which had removed the commandment or bond that was against us (see Lightfoot, Colossians, at the place);

(3) of the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:20), which Paul

and his companions delivered to the Gentilechurches (Acts 16:4). Here we have one element that entered into the later ecclesiastical meaning of the word. These dogmas were decisions on religious matters, imposed by a more or less authoritative council of the church as a condition of admission to its membership.

2. AS FORMULATED TEACHING:

There is however one important difference. These decrees relate to moral and ceremonial matters, but from the 2nd century downward, *dogma* means especially a theological doctrine. In Greek theology "doctrine" and "dogma" meant the same thing. Each had its origin in the opinion of some great teacher; each rested upon revelation and claimed its authority; each meant an exposition of a particular truth of the gospel, and of the whole Christian truth, which the church adopted as the only right exposition. Each word might be used for the teaching of a philosopher, or of a heretic, although for the latter, "heresy" became the regular term. On the one side stood the doctrines or dogmas of the majority or the "Catholic" church, and on the other side, those of the heretics. So long as the "Catholic" ideal of orthodoxy and uniformity of belief held the field, there was no room for the distinction now made between "doctrine," as a scientific and systematic expression of the truth of the Christian religion, and "dogma," as those truths "authoritatively ratified as expressing the belief of the church." This distinction could only arise when men began to think that various expressions of Christian truth could coexist in the church, and is therefore quite modern and even recent. Dogma in this sense denotes the ancient conception of theology as an authoritative system of orthodoxy, and doctrine, the modern conception, outside the dogmatic churches, where theology is regarded as a scientific exposition of truth.

LITERATURE.

Harnack, History of Dogma, I, chapter i; Drummond, Studies in Christian Doctrine, 1-7.

T. Rees

DOK

<dok> ([Δώκ, *Dok*], [Δαγών, *Dagon*]): A small fortress, "little stronghold" near Jericho (1 Macc 16:15), built by Ptolemy, son of Abubus, where he entertained and murdered his father-in-law Simon Maccabeus and

his two sons. Josephus (Ant., XIII, viii, 1; BJ, I, ii, 3) calls the place Dagon and places it above Jericho. The name persists in Ain Duk with its copious springs of excellent water about 4 miles Northwest of Jericho. Some ancient foundations in the neighborhood are possibly those of Ptolemy's fortress, but more probably of a Templars' station which is known to have stood there as late as the end of the 13th century. For its importance in earlier Jewish history, see Smith, HGHL, 250, 251.

J. Hutchinson

DOLEFUL

<dol'-fool> ([j " ap*'oach*], "howling"): The "doleful creatures" referred to in Isaiah 13:21 are probably "jackals," although some have suggested "leopard," or "hyena." The older English Versions of the Bible gives "great owls." The word rendered "doleful lamentation" in Micah 2:4 (*niheyah*) is simply a form of the word ordinarily translated "wailing" (*nehi*). Compare the King James Version margin.

DOLPHIN

<dol'-fin>.

See *BADGES.*

DOMINION

<do-min'-yun>: In Ephesians 1:21; Colossians 1:16 the word so translated ([κυριότης, *kuriotes*]) appears to denote a rank or order of angels. The same word is probably to be so interpreted in Jude 1:8 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "dominion"), and in 2 Peter 2:10 (the King James Version "government," the Revised Version (British and American) "dominion").

See *ANGEL.*

DOOM

<doom>: Occurs only once in the King James Version (2 Esdras 7:43), "The day of doom shall be the end of this time" (the Revised Version (British and American) "the day of judgment"); but the Revised Version (British and American) gives it as the rendering of [hrypk] *tsephirah*], in Ezekiel 7:7,10 (the King James Version "the morning," the Revised

Version, margin "the turn" or "the crowning time"; but the meaning is not yet quite certain); and in ⁴⁰⁴⁹1 Corinthians 4:9 ([ἐπιθανάτιος, *epithanatios*], "as men doomed to death," the King James Version "appointed (originally "approved") unto death"). Our word "doom" is connected with the word "deem," and signifies either the act of judging or (far more often) the sentence itself or the condition resulting therefrom (compare "Deemster" of Isle of Man and Jersey). Generally, but not always, an unfavorable judgment is implied. Compare Dryden, *Coronation of Charles II*, i, 127:

> *"Two kingdoms wait your doom, and, as you choose,*
> *This must receive a crown, or that must lose."*

> *J. R. Van Pelt*

DOOR

<dor>: Most commonly the rendering of Hebrew *pethach*, "doorway," *deleth*, "door" proper (the two distinguished in ⁰¹⁹⁰⁶Genesis 19:6), or of Greek [θύρα, *thura*], which represents both meanings. The door proper was usually of wood, frequently sheeted with metal, sometimes of one slab of stone, as shown in excavations in the Hauran. It turned on pivots (the "hinges" of ²⁰⁶¹⁴Proverbs 26:14) working in sockets above and below, and was provided with a bolt (⁴⁰³¹⁷2 Samuel 13:17) or with lock and key (⁰⁷⁰²³Judges 3:23). The doorway was enclosed by the stone threshold (¹¹⁴⁴⁷1 Kings 14:17), the two doorposts on either side, and the lintel above (⁰²²⁰⁷Exodus 12:7). Doors were frequently two-leaved, and folding ones are mentioned in connection with the temple (¹¹⁰⁶⁴1 Kings 6:34). Where "door" is used in connectio with city gates (¹⁶⁸⁰¹Nehemiah 3:1 ff) it refers to the door proper which swings on its hinges as distinguished from the whole structure. The custom of fastening to the doorposts small cases containing a parchment inscribed with the words of ⁰⁵⁶⁰⁴Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21 had its origin in the command there given.

See also GATE; HOUSE.

Figurative:

(1) Christ is "the door" into the gospel ministry (⁴³⁰⁰¹John 10:1,2,7); ministers must receive their authority from Him, and exercise it in His spirit.
(2) `Through faith in Him also both shepherds and sheep enter into the kingdom of God (⁴³⁰⁰⁹John 10:9), and find all their spiritual needs supplied.'

(3) The figure in [6680]Revelation 3:20 is expressive of Christ's patient, persistent and affectionate appeal to men.

(4) Elsewhere also of opportunity ([40510]Matthew 25:10; [44427]Acts 14:27; [46169]1 Corinthians 16:9; [47212]2 Corinthians 2:12; [66808]Revelation 3:8).
(5) Of freedom and power ([51043]Colossians 4:3).
See also ACHOR; SHEPHERD.

Benjamin Reno Downer

DOORKEEPER

<dor'-kep-er> ([ר [עֵׁ, *sho`er*]): The gates of an oriental city and of the temple courts so closely resembled the door of a house that the same Hebrew word was used for doorkeeper and gatekeeper. It is often translated by the less definite word "porter" (which see).

In the preexilic writings ([10826]2 Samuel 18:26; [12710]2 Kings 7:10,11) reference is made to porters at the gates of the cities Mahanaim and Samaria. In these early writings there is also mention of a small number of "keepers of the threshold" of the temple, whose duties included the gathering of money from the people for temple purposes, and the care of the sacred vessels ([12209]2 Kings 12:9; 22:4; 23:4). They held an honorable position ([12518]2 Kings 25:18), and occupied chambers in the temple ([24504]Jeremiah 35:4). The same term is used to describe officers in the household of the king of Persia (Est 2:21; 6:2).
Differing from these "keepers of the threshold" in some respects are the doorkeepers or porters mentioned in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. These formed a numerous sacred order ([13922]1 Chronicles 9:22; 23:5) from the time of David. Their duties and the words describing them in two passages, "keepers of the thresholds" ([13919]1 Chronicles 9:19) and "porters of the thresholds" ([14204]2 Chronicles 23:4), connect them in some measure with the "keeper of the threshold" referred to above. They guarded the gates of the house of Yahweh ([13923]1 Chronicles 9:23), closing and opening them at the proper times ([13927]1 Chronicles 9:27) and preventing the unclean from entering the sacred enclosure ([14319]2 Chronicles 23:19); they had charge of the sacred vessels and of the free-will offerings ([14314]2 Chronicles 31:14), and dwelt in the chambers about the temple ([13927]1 Chronicles 9:27). They were Levites, and came in from the Levitical villages every seventh day for service in their turn ([13925]1 Chronicles 9:25). Their office was honorable, ranking with the singers, after the priests and Levites ([15122]Ezra

2:42; ⟨13518⟩1 Chronicles 15:18).

In ⟨19840⟩Psalm 84:10, "I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God," the word is not used in its technical sense. the Revised Version, margin gives "stand (the King James Version margin "sit") at the threshold," to an eastern mind a situation of deep humility (compare title of the Psalm and ⟨13919⟩1 Chronicles 9:19).

In the New Testament the order of temple doorkeepers is not referred to. But a doorkeeper ([θυρωρός, *thuroros*]) is mentioned in connection with a private house (⟨41134⟩Mark 13:34), with the high priest's house (⟨43816⟩John 18:16,17), and with sheep-folds (⟨43103⟩John 10:3), a maid serving as doorkeeper in some cases (⟨44213⟩Acts 12:13).

George Rice Hovey

DOORPOST

<dor'-post>.

See *HOUSE.*

DOPHKAH

<dof'-ka> ([hqpD; *dophqah*], "drover"): A desert camp of the Israelites, the first after leaving the wilderness of Sin (⟨04312⟩Numbers 33:12,13).

See *WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.*

DOR; DORA

<dor>, *<do'-ra>* ([raD, *do'r*], [rwD, *dor*], "habitation," "circle"; [Δώρ, *Dor*]; Josephus, [Δώρα, *Dora*]; modern *TanTurah*): A town of the coast of Palestine, South of Carmel (Apion, II, 10; Vita, 8), about 8 miles North of Caesarea. It was occupied in the earliest times by the Canaanites and probably belonged to Phoenicia, tradition saying that it was a Sidonian colony. It furnished an abundance of the shell-fish so valuable for the manufacture of the Tyrian purple, and this would have led the Phoenicians to occupy the site. In the 12th century BC, the region was occupied by the northern people who raided the whole Syrian coast and Egypt. They were driven back by the Egyptians, but renewed the attack, and the weakness of Egypt in the middle of the century enabled them to settle in the coast region South of Carmel; a tribe of them occupied Dor, and others the territory to the limits of the desert of Sinai, and became the Philistine

people so well known by their contests with the Hebrews. Naphoth-dor, "the heights of Dor," may be the slopes of Carmel inland from *TanTurah*. Dor fell within the territory assigned to Manasseh (Joshua 17:11; compare Ant, V, i, 22). It was the seat of a king who possessed other towns on the heights back of the coast. He was one of the allies of Jabin of Hazor in the conflict with Joshua (Joshua 11:2) and was conquered by him (Joshua 12:23), but Dor was not occupied by the Israelites (Joshua 17:11; Judges 1:27).

The inhabitants of Dor were at enmity with the Phoenician towns and it would seem that the Sidonians seized it to obtain its rich supplies of shell-fish, and this probably caused the war of retaliation waged by the Philistines, under the lead of Ashkelon, against Sidon in the middle of the 11th century. Sidon was besieged by land, and the inhabitants were compelled to flee to Tyre. Dor seems to have been occupied by Solomon since he placed one of his purveyors in the town (1 Kings 4:11), and Tiglath-pileser III reduced it and set a governor over it (Rawl., Phoenician., 84). Here Tryphon was besieged by Antiochus, but escaped to Apamea (1 Macc 15:11,13,15; Ant, XIII, vii, 2). It was made free by Pompey, and joined to the province of Syria (XIV, iv, 4). The youths of the place set up a statue of Tiberius in the Jewish synagogue, an outrage that was reported to Publius Petronius by Agrippa, and reparation was made (XIX, vi, 3). It does not seem to have been of much importance in later times, though the fortifications still remaining on the ruined site, from the period of the Middle Ages, show that it was then occupied. It is now only a miserable village nestled in the ruins.

H. Porter

DORCAS

<dor'-kas> ([Δορκάς, *Dorkas*], the Greek equivalent of Aramaic *tabitha*, "a gazelle"): The name was borne by a Christian woman of Joppa. She is called a disciple (*mathetria*: Acts 9:36, the only place in the New Testament where the feminine form is used). She seems to have had some means and also to have been a leader in the Christian community. Dorcas was beloved for the manner in which she used her position and means, for she "was full of good works, and almsdeeds which she did." Among her charities was the clothing of the poor with garments she herself made (Acts 9:39), and by following her example, numerous "Dorcas societies" in the Christian church perpetuate her memory. There is a local

memorial in the "Tabitha School" in Jaffa devoted to the care and education of poor girls.

Her restoration to life by Peter is recorded. At the time of her death Peter was in Lydda where he had healed Aeneas. Being sent for, he went to Joppa, and, by the exercise of the supernatural powers granted to him, "he presented her alive" to the mourning community. In consequence of this miracle "many believed on the Lord" (⟨4092⟩Acts 9:42).

S. F. Hunter

DORYMENES

<do-rim'-e-nez> ([Δορυμένης, *Dorumenes*]): Father of Ptolemy Macron (1 Macc 3:38; 2 Macc 4:45); probably the same man who fought against Antiochus the Great (Polyb. v.61).

DOSITHEUS

<do-sith'-e-us> ([Δοσίθεος, *Dositheos*]):

(1) A captain of Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 12:19-25); along with Sosipater he captured Timotheus after the battle of Carnion, but granted him his life and freedom on the representation that "he had in his power the parents of many of them and the brethren of some," who, if they put him to death, should "be disregarded."

(2) A soldier in the army of Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 12:35); he made a special attack upon Gorgias, governor of Idumaea, the opposing general, and would have taken the "accursed man" prisoner but for the interference of a Thracian horseman.

(3) A Jew, son of Drimylus (3 Macc 1:3) who rescued Ptolemy Philopator from a plot of Theodotus. He afterward proved an apostate from Judaism.

(4) A Levite priest who "in the 4th year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra" carried the translation of the Book of Esther to Alexandria (Additions to Esther 11:1).

J. Hutchison

DOTAEA

<do-te'-a> (the King James Version, incorrectly, Judea; [Δωταία, *Dotaia*]): Another form of the name *DOTHAN* (which see).

DOTE

<dot>: "To dote" means either "to be weakminded" or "to be foolishly fond." In the latter sense it is employed in Ezekiel 23:5 ff; in the former, in Jeremiah 50:36 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "shall become fools"); the King James Version Sirach 25:2 (the Revised Version (British and American) "lacking understanding"), and the King James Version 1 Timothy 6:4 (the Revised Version, margin "to be sick"; the King James Version margin "a fool").

DOTHAIM

<do'-tha-im>: Mentioned in Judith 4:6 and frequently in connection with the invasion of Holofernes. See next article.

DOTHAN

<do'-than> ([ˆyit″ D, *dothayin*], [ˆtDo*dothan*], "two wells," "double feast"; [Δωθάειμ, *Dothaeim*]): A place to the North of Shechem whither Jacob's sons went for pasture for the flocks; where Joseph who followed them was sold to the Ishmaelites, after having been imprisoned in a "pit" (Genesis 37:17 ff). Here in later days the eyes of Elisha's servant were opened to see the mountain "full of horses and chariots of fire," guarding his master from the encircling Syrians (2 Kings 6:13 ff). This is certainly to be identified with Tell Dothan, which lies on the East of the ancient road leading from Gilead across Esdraelon to the seacoast, and thence to Egypt. It is about 5 miles to the Southwest of Jenin. There are some traces of old buildings, two cisterns — Dothayin or Dothayin = "two cisterns" or "pits" — and one copious spring. Excellent pasture is found in the surrounding plain, and on the adjoining slopes.

W. Ewing

DOUBLE

<dub'-'-l> ([hnv; *shanah*], "to repeat," as in counting; [l p″ K; *kaphal*], "to fold over," or "double," as a cloth): A word used quite frequently in

the Old Testament. Jacob ordered his sons to take double money in their hands, i.e. twice the necessary amount (⁰⁴³¹²Genesis 43:12,15). If a thief be caught with a living animal he was to restore double (⁰²²⁰⁴Exodus 22:4); if property be stolen out of the house of one to whom it is entrusted he was to restore double (⁰²²⁰⁷Exodus 22:7,9). The firstborn was to receive a double portion of the inheritance (⁰⁵²¹⁷Deuteronomy 21:17). Likewise also by a beautiful symbol Elisha asked for a double portion of Elijah's spirit to fall upon him (¹²¹¹⁰⁹2 Kings 2:9). Degrees of punishment or sufferings were also expressed by the idea of a doubling (²³⁶¹⁰⁷Isaiah 61:7; ²⁴⁶¹⁸Jeremiah 16:18; 17:18; ³⁸⁹¹²Zechariah 9:12). The use of the second Hebrew form in ¹⁸¹⁰⁶Job 11:6 and 41:13 seems quite confusing in its translation. the King James Version translates it simply "double," but the Revised Version (British and American) gives it its expanded and derived meaning, "manifold in understanding," and "who shall come within his jaws," respectively, "manifold" in the first instance meaning multiplied, and "jaws" doubtless meaning the double row of teeth. The classic phrases in the New Testament are those used by James to represent instability and a wavering disposition, [δίψυχος, dipsuchos], literally, "doubleminded" (⁵⁹¹⁰⁸James 1:8; 4:8).

Walter G. Clippinger

DOUBT

<dout>: This word, found only a score of times in the Bible, translates nevertheless about half as many different Hebrew and Greek originals with a corresponding variety of meanings.

In ⁰¹⁵⁷³³Genesis 37:33 "without doubt" is to be taken in the common sense of "certainly"; in ¹⁸¹²⁰²Job 12:2 in the sarcastic sense of "indeed!" In ²⁷⁰⁵¹²Daniel 5:12,16, it is used as a difficult problem or mystery to be explained, and these are the only cases of its employment in the Old Testament. In the New Testament it is about equally used to translate [διαπορέω, diaporeo], and [διακρίνω, diakrino], and their cognates. The first means "to be without resource," "utterly at a loss," "nonplussed"; and the second, "to judge diversely." For the first, see ⁴³¹³²John 13:22; ⁴⁴⁰²¹²Acts 2:12 the King James Version; ⁴⁴⁰⁵²⁴Acts 5:24 the King James Version; ⁴⁴¹⁰¹⁷Acts 10:17 the King James Version; ⁴⁴²⁵²⁰Acts 25:20 the King James Version; and ⁴⁸⁰⁴²⁰Galatians 4:20 the King James Version. For the second see ⁴⁰²¹²¹Matthew 21:21; ⁴¹¹¹²³Mark 11:23; ⁴⁴¹⁰²⁰Acts 10:20; ⁴⁵¹⁴²³Romans 14:23. The last-named is deserving of particular attention. "He that doubteth is condemned (the

King James Version "damned") if he eat," means that in a case of uncertainty as to one's Christian liberty, it were better to err on the side of restraint. In ⸆Luke 12:29 "to be of doubtful mind" ([μετεωρίζω, *meteorizo*], literally, "to suspend"; see Thayer, under the word), means "to be driven by gusts," or "to fluctuate in mid-air."

Here, as in ⸆Matthew 14:31, "doubt" does not indicate a lack of faith, but rather "a state of qualified faith": its weakness, but not its absence.

In ⸆John 10:24 "doubt" translates [αἴρω ψυχήν, *airo psuchen*], which literally means "to lift up the soul" or "to keep one in suspense"; so the Revised Version (British and American).

See also DISPUTATION.

James M. Gray

DOUGH

<do>.

See BREAD.

DOVE

<duv> ([רwֹֹ, *tor*], [hnwֹֹ, *yonah*]; [περιστερά, *peristera*]; Latin *Zenaedura carolinensis*): A bird of the family *Columbidae*. Doves and pigeons are so closely related as to be spoken and written of as synonymous, yet there is a distinction recognized from the beginning of time. It was especially marked in Palestine, because doves migrated, but pigeons remained in their chosen haunts all the year. Yet doves were the wild birds and were only confined singly or in pairs as caged pets, or in order to be available for sacrifice. Pigeons, without question, were the first domesticated birds, the record of their conquest by man extending if anything further back than ducks, geese and swans. These two were the best known and the most loved of all the myriads of birds of Palestine. Doves were given preference because they remained wild and were more elusive. The thing that escapes us is usually a little more attractive than the thing we have. Their loving natures had been noted, their sleek beautiful plumage, their plump bodies. They were the most precious of anything offered for sacrifice. Their use is always specified in preference to pigeons if only one bird was used; if both, the dove is frequently mentioned first.

Because of their docility when caged, their use in sacrifice, and the religious superstition concerning them, they were allowed to nest unmolested and, according to species, flocked all over Palestine. The turtle-dove nested in gardens and vineyards, and was almost as tame as the pigeons. The palm turtle-dove took its name from its love of homing in palm trees, and sought these afield, and in cities, even building near the temple in Jerusalem. It also selected thorn and other trees. It has a small body, about ten inches in length, covered with bright chestnut-colored feathers, the neck dappled with dark, lustrous feathers. The rock dove swarmed over, through, and among the cliffs of mountains and the fissures of caves and ravines. The collared turtle-dove was the largest of the species. It remained permanently and homed in the forests of Tabor and Gilead, around the Dead Sea, and along the Jordan valley. This bird was darker than the others and took its name from a clearly outlined collar of dark feathers encircling the neck, and was especially sought for caged pets on account of its size and beauty.

In all, the dove is mentioned about fifty times in the Bible. Many of these references are concerning its use in sacrifice and need not all be mentioned. The others are quoted and explained from a scientific standpoint and in accordance with the characteristics and habits of the birds. The first reference to the dove occurs in Genesis 8:8-12, in the history of the flood; then follows its specified use in sacrifice; note of its migratory habits is made, and then in poetry, prophecy, comparison, simile and song, it appears over and over throughout the Bible.

In Genesis 8:8-12, we read, "And he sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters were abated." Noah first sent out a raven, because it was a strong, aggressive bird and would return to its mate. But the raven only flew over the water and returned to perch on the ark. This was not satisfactory, so Noah in looking for a bird better suited to his purpose, bethought him of the most loving and tender bird he knew — the dove. It not only would return to the ark, but would enter and go to the cage of its mate, and if it found green food it would regurgitate a portion for her or its young, or if not nesting he could tell by its droppings if greenery had been eaten and so decide if the waters were going down. And this is precisely what happened. The dove came back, and the watching Noah saw it feed its mate little green olive leaves, for the dove never carries food in the beak, but swallows and then regurgitates it to mate and young. This first reference to birds was made on account of the loving, tender

characteristics of the species; the next, because they were the most loved by the people, and therefore chosen as most suitable to offer as sacrifice (⟨0159⟩Genesis 15:9). In ⟨03014⟩Leviticus 1:14 f, doves are mentioned as sacrifice: "And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off its head, and burn it on the altar; and the blood thereof shall be drained out on the side of the altar." In ⟨03057⟩Leviticus 5:7 the proper preparation of the sacrifice is prescribed. For method of handling sacrifice see 5:8,9,10. In ⟨03126⟩Leviticus 12:6 the law for a sacrifice for a mother is given, and 12:8 of same chapter provides that if she be too poor to offer a lamb, doves or pigeons will suffice. In ⟨03404⟩Leviticus 14:4-8 the reference for the sacrifice of a leper is merely to "birds," because it is understood that they are pigeons and doves, and it contains the specification that if the victim is too poor to afford so elaborate a sacrifice, a smaller one will suffice. The birds are named in 14:22: "Two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, such as he is able to get; and the one shall be a sin-offering, and the other a burnt-offering" (compare ⟨03514⟩Leviticus 15:14,29; ⟨04060⟩Numbers 6:10). When David prayed for the destruction of the treacherous, he used the dove in comparison, and because he says he would "lodge in the wilderness" he indicates that he was thinking of the palm turtle.

"And I said, Oh that I had wings like a dove! Then would I fly away, and be at rest" (⟨19506⟩Psalm 55:6).

In chanting a song of triumph, David used an exquisite thought.

"When ye lie among the sheepfolds, It is as the wings of a dove covered with silver, And her pinions with yellow gold"
(⟨19683⟩Psalm 68:13).

He referred to the rock dove because the metallic luster on its neck would gleam like gold in sunshine, and the soft grayish-white feathers beneath the wings as he would see the bird above him in flight would appear silver-like. By this quotation David meant that in times of peace, when men slept contentedly at home among their folds, their life was as rich with love and as free in peace as the silver wing of the dove that had the gold feathers and was unmolested among the inaccessible caves and cliffs. In ⟨19749⟩Psalm 74:19 the term "turtle-dove" is used to indicate people whom the Almighty is implored to protect: "Oh deliver not the soul of thy turtle-dove unto the wild beast: forget not the life of thy poor for ever."

Solomon uses the dove repeatedly in comparison or as a term of endearment. In Song 1:15; 4:1; 5:12, he compares the eyes of his bride full, tender, beautiful, with those of a dove. In 2:12 he uses the voice of the

dove as an indication of spring. In 2:14 he addresses the bride as a rock dove, In 5:2 is another term of endearment, this time used in the dream of the bride (compare 6:9). [23814]Isaiah 38:14 has reference to the wailing, mournful dove note from which the commonest species take the name "mourning dove." The reference in [23608]Isaiah 60:8 proves that the prophet was not so good an observer, or so correct in his natural history as David, who may have learned from the open. As a boy, David guarded the flocks of his father and watched the creatures around him. When exulting over the glory of the church in the numerous accessions of Gentiles, Isaiah cried, "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" This proves that he confounded pigeons and doves. Doves were wild, mostly migratory, and had no "windows." But the clay cotes of pigeons molded in squares so that one large cote sheltered many pairs in separate homes had the appearance of latticed windows and were used as a basis in estimating a man's wealth. This reference should be changed to read, "and as pigeons to their windows." In [24087]Jeremiah 8:7 the fact is pointed out that doves were migratory; and in 48:28 people are advised to go live in solitary places and be peaceable, loving and faithful, like the rock doves. See also [26716]Ezekiel 7:16: "But those of them that escape shall escape, and shall be on the mountains like doves of the valleys, all of them moaning, every one in his iniquity." This merely means that people should be driven to hide among the caves and valleys where the rock doves lived, and that the sound of their mourning would resemble the cry of the birds. It does not mean, however, that the doves were mourning, for when doves coo and moan and to our ears grow most pitiful in their cries, they are the happiest in the mating season. The veneration cherished for doves in these days is inborn, and no bird is so loved and protected as the dove — hence, it is unusually secure and happy and its mournful cry is the product of our imagination only. The dove is the happiest of birds. [28711]Hosea 7:11 and 11:11 each compares people with doves; the first, because the birds at times appear foolishly trusting; the second, because, while no bird is more confiding, none is more easily frightened. "And Ephraim is like a silly dove, without understanding: they call unto Egypt, they go to Assyria" (7:11). "They shall come trembling as a bird out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria; and I will make them to dwell in their houses, saith Yahweh" (11:11). The reference in [34017]Nahum 2:7 is to the voice of the birds.

New Testament references will be found in a description of the baptism of Jesus ([40316]Matthew 3:16). People are admonished to be "harmless as

doves" (⁴⁰⁰¹⁶Matthew 10:16). "And Jesus entered into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves" (⁴¹²¹²Matthew 21:12). This proves that these birds were a common article of commerce, probably the most used for caged pets, and those customarily employed for sacrifice.

Dove's Dung ([מְיוֹנִים *chari yonim*], Kethibh for [דִּבְיוֹנִים *dibhyonim*]): ¹¹⁶²⁵2 Kings 6:25: "And there was a great famine in Samaria: and, behold, they besieged it, until an ass's head was sold for fourscore pieces of silver, and the fourth part of a kab of dove's dung for five pieces of silver." This seems so repulsive that some commentators have tried to prove the name applied to the edible root of a plant, but the history of sieges records other cases where matter quite as offensive was used to sustain life. The text is probably correct as it stands.

Gene Stratton-Porter

DOWRY

<dou'-ri>: In all Hebrew marriages, the dowry held an important place. The dowry sealed the betrothal. It took several forms. The bridegroom presented gifts to the bride. There was the [מֹהַר *mohar*], "dowry" as distinguished from [מַתָּן *mattan*], "gifts to the members of the family" (compare ⁰¹²²²Genesis 24:22,53; ⁰¹³⁴²Genesis 34:12). The price paid to the father or brothers of the bride was probably a survival of the early custom of purchasing wives (⁰¹³⁴²Genesis 34:12; ⁰²²¹⁷Exodus 22:17; ⁰⁹⁸²⁵1 Samuel 18:25; compare ⁰⁸⁰⁴⁰Ruth 4:10; ²⁸⁰⁰²Hosea 3:2). There was frequently much negotiation and bargaining as to size of dowry (⁰¹³⁴²Genesis 34:12). The dowry would generally be according to the wealth and standing of the bride (compare ⁰⁹⁸²³1 Samuel 18:23). It might consist of money, jewelry or other valuable effects; sometimes, of service rendered, as in the case of Jacob (⁰²⁹¹⁸Genesis 29:18); deeds of valor might be accepted in place of dowry (⁰⁶⁵¹⁶Joshua 15:16; ⁰⁹⁸²⁵1 Samuel 18:25; ⁰⁷⁰¹²Judges 1:12). Occasionally a bride received a dowry from her father; sometimes in the shape of land (⁰⁷⁰¹⁵Judges 1:15), and of cities (¹¹⁰¹⁶1 Kings 9:16). In later Jewish history a written marriage contract definitely arranged for the nature and size of the dowry.

Edward Bagby Pollard

DOXOLOGY

<dok-sol'-o-ji> ([δοξολογία, *doxologia*], "a praising," "giving glory"): A hymn or liturgical formula expressive of praise to God, as the *Gloria in Excelsis* (an expansion of Luke 2:14), sometimes called the Greater Doxology, and the Gloria Patri ("Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end, Amen") also known as the Lesser Doxology.

The clause, "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be," was probably added to the original simple formula to emphasize the church's dissent from the Arian conception of Christ.

The term is applied in particular to the concluding paragraph of the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:13 margin, "For thine is the kingdom," etc.; compare 1 Chronicles 29:11, and *see LORD'S PRAYER*). To the same general class belong Psalm 41:13; 72:18 f; 89:52; Romans 16:27; Ephesians 2:20; 1 Timothy 1:17; Jude 1:25; Revelation 5:13 f; 19:1-3, and the modern stanza beginning "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow."

M. O. Evans

DRACHMA; DRAM

<drak'-ma>, ([δραχμή, *drachme*]): The word is used in the Septuagint as the rendering of [[q″ B, *beqa`*], "half-shekel," which must refer to the light standard for the shekel, as its weight was about 62 grains. In the New Testament the word occurs only in Luke 15:8,9, where it is rendered "a piece of silver" (m "drachma"). It was commonly taken as equivalent to the Roman denarius, though not strictly so.

DRAGON

<drag'-un> ([ˆyNiT″ , *tannin*], plural [µyNiT″ , *tannim*], [twNOT″ , *tannoth*]; [δράκων, *drakon*]):

Tannin and the plural *tanninim* occur 14 t, and in English Versions of the Bible are variously rendered "dragon," "whale," "serpent" or "sea-monster"; but Lamentations 4:3, the King James Version "sea-monster," the King James Version margin"sea calves," the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals." *Tannim* occurs 12 times, and is rendered "dragons," the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals," except in

Ezekiel 29:3, where the King James Version has "dragon" (the American Standard Revised Version "monster"), and in Ezekiel 32:2, where the King James Version has "whale" and the English Revised Version and the King James Version margin"dragon" (the American Standard Revised Version "monster"). *Tannoth* occurs once, in Malachi 1:3, where it is rendered "dragons," the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals." *Drakon* occurs 12 times in Revelation 12; 13; 16; and 20, where it is uniformly rendered "dragon." (Compare Arabic tinnin, the constellation, Draco.) *Tannoth* Septuagint [δώματα, *domata*], "dwellings") is a feminine plural form as if from *tannah*, but it suits the context to give it the same meaning as *tannim*.

In Exodus 7:9,10,12, *tannin* is used of the serpents which were produced from Aaron's rod and the rods of the Egyptian magicians, whereas in Exodus 4:3 and 7:15, for the serpent produced from Aaron's rod, we find *nachash*, the ordinary word for serpent. In two passages we find "whale," the Revised Version (British and American) "sea-monster"; Genesis 1:21: "And God created the great sea-monsters, and every living creature that moveth"; Job 7:12: "Amos I a sea, or a sea-monster, that thou settest a watch over me?" Other passages (the English Revised Version and the King James Version) are Deuteronomy 32:33: "Their wine is the poison of dragons (the American Standard Revised Version "serpents"), and the cruel venom of asps"; Nehemiah 2:13: "And I went out by night by the valley gate, even toward the dragon's (the American Standard Revised Version "jackal's") well" (the King James Version "dragon well"); Psalm 91:13: "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the serpent (the King James Version "dragon") shalt thou trample under foot "; Psalm 148:7: "Praise Yahweh from the earth, ye sea-monsters (the King James Version "dragons"), and all deeps"; Jeremiah 51:34: "Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon hath devoured me, ... like a monster" (the King James Version "dragon"). Here also two *tannim* passages; Ezekiel 29:3: "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh: Behold, I am against thee, Pharaoh king of Egypt, the great monster (the King James Version "dragon") that lieth in the midst of his rivers, that hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself"; and Ezekiel 32:2: "Son of man, take up a lamentation over Pharaoh king of Egypt, and say unto him, Thou wast likened unto a young lion of the nations: yet art thou as a monster (the English Revised Version "dragon," the King James Version "whale") in the seas; and thou didst break forth with thy rivers and troubledst the waters with thy feet, and

fouledst their rivers."

The foregoing passages offer no especial difficulties in the interpretation of the word *tannin*. All may fairly be understood to refer to a serpent or sea-monster or some imaginary creature, without invoking any ancient myths for their elucidation. The same may be said of the passages in Revelation. A dragon is taken as the personification of Satan, as of Pharaoh in the passages in Ezekiel. It is of course true that ancient myths may more or less distantly underlie some of these dragon and serpent references, and such myths may be demonstrated to throw additional light in certain cases, but at least the passages in question are intelligible without recourse to the myths. This however is not equally true of all the *tannin* passages. In [19742]Psalm 74:12 we read: "Yet God is my King of old, working salvation in the midst of the earth. Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the sea-monsters (the King James Version "dragons") in the waters." Compare [23201]Isaiah 27:1; 51:9 f.

The three passages just cited seem to denote each some particular act, and are referred by Canon Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Dragon") to the old Babylonian myth of the conflict of Marduk and Tiamat in the Assyrian creation-legend (thus Gunkel, etc.). Indeed he refers to that myth not only these passages, but also [24613]Jeremiah 5:34; [26903]Ezekiel 29:3-6; 32:2-8 and [18712]Job 7:12, which have been cited above. In translating the last two passages, Canon Cheyne uses the definite article, "the dragon," instead of "a" as in the Revised Version (British and American), which makes a great difference in the meaning. In [19704]Psalm 87:4, it is clear that Rahab is a country, i.e. Egypt. [23307]Isaiah 30:7 is to the same point. In [25109]Isaiah 51:9,10, "that didst cut Rahab in pieces" and "that didst pierce the monster" (the King James Version "dragon"), are two coordinate expressions of one idea, which is apparently the defeat of the Egyptians, as appears in the reference to the passage of the Red Sea. In [23201]Isaiah 27:1, "leviathan the swift serpent" and "leviathan the crooked serpent" and "the monster (the King James Version and the English Revised Version "dragon") that is in the sea" have been identified with Babylon, Persia and Egypt (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Dragon," 4). It is more probable that the first two expressions are coordinate, and amount to "leviathan the swift and crooked serpent," and that the verse may therefore refer to Babylonia and Egypt. [19742]Psalm 74:12-15 is more in line with the idea of the article in EB, but it is nevertheless susceptible of an explanation similar to that of the other two passages. *Tannim*, "dragons" (the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals")

occurs in [18029]Job 30:29; [19419]Psalm 44:19; [23132]Isaiah 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; [24091]Jeremiah 9:11; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; *tannoth*, "dragons" (the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals") is found in [39003]Malachi 1:3. In all these passages, "jackal" suits the context better than "dragon," "sea-monster" or "serpent." An exception to the rendering of "dragon" or "serpent" or "sea-monster" for *tannin* is found in [25043]Lamentations 4:3: "Even the jackals draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones." the King James Version has "seamonster," the King James Version margin"sea calves." A mammal is indicated, and the Revised Version (British and American) apparently assumes that *tannin* is an error for *tannim*. Two other exceptions are in [26293]Ezekiel 29:3 and 32:2, where English Versions of the Bible renders *tannim* by "dragon," since in these two passages "jackal" obviously will not suit.

See JACKAL.

On the constellational dragons or snakes, *see ASTRONOMY*, II, 1-5.

Alfred Ely Day

DRAGON, BEL AND THE

See BEL AND THE DRAGON.

DRAGON, RED

See REVELATION, BOOK OF.

DRAGON WELL

([16213]Nehemiah 2:13 the King James Version).
See JACKAL'S WELL.

DRAM

See DRACHMA; MONEY.

DRAMA MIMIC

<dra'-ma mim'-ik>.

See GAMES.

DRAUGHT

<draft> ([ἀφεδρών, *aphedron*]; ⁴⁰⁵¹⁷Matthew 15:17; ⁴¹⁰⁷⁹Mark 7:19): "Closet," "sink" or "privy" (Rheims), literally, "place for sitting apart" (compare ¹²⁰²⁷2 Kings 10:27, "draught-house," and Mishna "water-house"). According to the Mishna, Jehu turned the temple of Baal in Samaria into public *latrines*, "waterhouses." Mark adds here (⁴¹⁰⁷⁹Mark 7:19) that by this saying Jesus cleansed all articles of food, i.e., declared them to be clean.

DRAWER, OF WATER

<dro'-er>, ([μyim″ ba℧ʋ,*sho'ebh mayim*], from [ba″ ∨; *sha'abh*], "to bale up" water): In Syria and Palestine, outside of Mt. Lebanon and the Anti-Lebanon, the springs of water are scarce and the inhabitants of these less favored places have always depended upon wells and cisterns for their water supply. This necessitates some device for drawing the water. In the case of a cistern or shallow well, an earthenware water jar or a bucket made of tanned goats' skin is lowered into the water by a rope and then raised by pulling up the rope hand over hand (probably the ancient method), or by running the rope over a crude pulley fixed directly over the cistern or well. In the case of deep wells, the rope, attached to a larger bucket, is run over a pulley so that the water may be raised by the drawers walking away from the well as they pull the rope. Frequently animals are hitched to the rope to do the pulling.

In some districts where the water level is not too deep, a flight of steps leading down to the water's edge is constructed in addition to the opening vertically above the water. Such a well is pointed out near Haran in Mesopotamia as the one from which Rebekah drew water for Abraham's servant. In ⁰¹²⁴⁶Genesis 24:16 we read that Rebekah "went down to the fountain, and filled her pitcher, and came up."

The deep grooves in their curbs, worn by the ropes as the water was being raised, attest to the antiquity of many of the wells of Palestine and Syria. Any one of the hundreds of grooves around a single well was many years in being formed. The fact that the present method of drawing water from these wells is not making these grooves, shows that they are the work of former times.

The drawing of water was considered the work of women or of men unfit for other service (⁰¹²⁴¹Genesis 24:11,13,13; ⁰⁹⁰⁹¹1 Samuel 9:11; ⁴³⁰⁴⁷John

4:7). In Syria, today, a girl servant willingly goes to draw the daily supply of water, but seldom is it possible to persuade a boy or man to perform this service. When the well or fountain is at a distance, or much water is needed, tanned skins or earthen jars are filled and transported on the backs of men or donkeys.

Water drawing was usually done at evening time (⟨01241⟩Genesis 24:11), and this custom has remained unchanged. There is no sight more interesting than the daily concourse at a Syrian water source. It is bound to remind one of the Bible stories where the setting is a wellside (Genesis 24; John 4).

The service of water drawing was associated, in early times, with that of hewer of wood (⟨05291⟩Deuteronomy 29:11). Joshua made the Gibeonites hewers of wood and drawers of water in exchange for their lives (⟨06092⟩Joshua 9:21,23,17). The inhabitants of Nineveh were exhorted to draw water and fill the cisterns of their fortresses in preparation for a siege (⟨34814⟩Nahum 3:14).

Figurative: Water drawing is mentioned in the metaphor of ⟨23123⟩Isaiah 12:3, "Ye draw water out of the wells of salvation."

James A. Patch

DREAM; DREAMER

<drem>, *<drem'-er>* ([μwֹֹj }*chalom*], [μl j ֶ*chelem*]; [ὄναρ, *onar*]): In all time dreams and their interpretation have been the occasion of much curious and speculative inquiry. Because of the mystery by which they have been enshrouded, and growing out of a natural curiosity to know the future, much significance has been attached to them by people especially of the lower stages of culture. Even the cultured are not without a superstitious awe and dread of dreams, attaching to them different interpretations according to local color and custom.

Naturally enough, as with all other normal and natural phenomena for which men could assign no scientific and rational explanation, they would be looked upon with a certain degree of superstitious fear.

> *"Dreams, Which are the children of an idle brain,*
> *Begot of nothing but vain fantasy,*
> *Which is as thin of substance as the air*
> *And more inconstant than the wind."*
> *— Shakespeare.*

1. PHYSIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL GROUND:

While a fully satisfactory theory of dreams has not yet been established and while it is hardly possible that there will ever be a satisfactory explanation for each individual dream, yet through the rapid discoveries of physiological psychology in the recent decade or more, much new light is thrown on the subject. With the contribution modern psychology has made to our knowledge of the association of ideas through the connected relation of certain cortical centers and areas, it has come to be pretty well established that the excitation of certain bodily organs or surfaces will stimulate certain brain areas. Conversely the stimulation of certain cortical areas will produce a response in certain bodily regions over which these centers or areas preside. Connecting thought processes are therefore dependent upon the proper correlation of ideas through what are known physiologically as the association centers. If then it comes to pass that, as occurs in dreams, only fragmentary ideas or loosely connected trains of thought occur, and if, as frequently happens, there is momentary connection, but little connection with normal waking experience, it will easily be seen that the excitation of certain centers will awaken certain trains of thought which are but poorly related to the balance of one's thinking processes. Much is being said about the dissociation of ideas and the disturbance of personality of which dreams are one of several forms. Others are hallucinations, trances, visions, etc. Dreams are abnormal and sometimes pathological. Sleep is a normal experience. Perfect and natural sleep should be without dreams of any conscious occurrence. Perhaps psychologically there can be no such thing as perfectly dreamless sleep. Such a condition would probably be death itself. Nature doubtless has her silent vigils, keeping watch in the chambers of the soul during the deepest sleep. The only difference is that they do not come to the threshold of consciousness. Thus, dreams are to the sleeping state what visions and hallucinations are to the waking state, and like them have their ground in a distorted image-making function. While the source of the materials and the excitant may not be the same in each case, yet functionally they are the same.

The stimuli of dreams may be of two kinds. First, they may be physical and objective, or they may be due to suggestions and the association of ideas. They may be due to some physical disorder, such as imperfect digestion or circulation, improper ventilation or heating, or an uncomfortable position. Since by the very nature of the case dreams do not occur in a conscious

state, the real cause cannot easily be discoverable and then only after the subject is entirely awakened through the effects of it. They may also be due to the association of ideas. Suggestion plays a large part. The vividness and recency of a conscious impression during the waking state may be thrown up from the subconscious region during the sleeping hours. The usual distorted aspect of dreams is doubtless due to the uncoupling of groups of ideas through the uncoupling of the cortical association areas, some of them being less susceptible than others to the existing stimulus.

The materials of dreams need not be recent; they may have been furnished by the conscious processes a long time before, but are brought to the threshold only by means of some train of ideas during a semi-conscious state. It is interesting to note that while time and space seem quite real in dreams, the amount covered in a single dream may occupy but a moment of time for the dreamer.

2. HISTORY OF BELIEF IN DREAMS:

Dreams have always played an important part in the literature and religion of all peoples. They have furnished mythologies; they have been the sources of systems of necromancy; they have become both the source and the explanation of otherwise inexplicable acts of Providence. Growing out of them we have a theory of nightmares and demonology. They have become the working material of the prophet both Biblical and pagan. Medieval civilization is not without its lasting effects of dreams, and modern civilization still clings with something of reverence to the unsolved mystery of certain dreams. While we have almost emerged from anything like a slavish adherence to a superstitious belief in dreams, we must still admit the possibility of the profound significance of dreams in the impressions they make upon the subject.

3. DREAMS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

The Bible, contrary to a notion perhaps too commonly held, attaches relatively little religious significance to dreams. Occasionally, however, reference is made to communications from God through dreams (Genesis 20:6; 1 Kings 3:5; Matthew 1:20; 2:12,13,19,22). It recognizes their human relations more frequently. In the Old Testament literature, dreams play but little part except in the books of Genesis and Daniel, in which there are abundant references to them. For their moral

bearings the most important ones perhaps are those referred to in ⟨0375⟩Genesis 37:5-10. An uncritical attitude will give to them a lifeless and mechanical interpretation. A sympathetic and rational explanation gives them beauty, naturalness and significance. Joseph was the youngest and most beloved son of Jacob. He was just in the prime of adolescence, the very period of day dreaming. He was perhaps inordinately ambitious. This was doubtless heightened by the attentions of a doting father. The most natural dream would be that suggested by his usual waking state, which was one of ambition and perhaps unhealthy rivalry (*see ASTRONOMY*, II, 6). The source of Pharaoh's dreams and his solicitude are likewise capable of interpretation on somewhat natural grounds (⟨0407⟩Genesis 41:7-32). The significance of them was given by Joseph.

Another illustration of the psychological exposition preceding is the dream of Solomon (⟨1005⟩1 Kings 3:5,11-15). In this narrative, after Solomon had done what pleased Yahweh and had offered a most humble prayer on an occasion which to him was a great crisis and at the same time a moment of great ecstasy in his life, he doubtless experiences a feeling of sweet peace in consequence of it. His sleep would naturally be somewhat disturbed by the excitement of the day. The dream was suggested by the associations and naturally enough was the approving voice of Yahweh.

Dreaming and the prophetic function seem to have been closely associated (⟨0530⟩Deuteronomy 13:1,3,1). Whether from a coldly mechanical and superstitious, a miraculous, or a perfectly natural point of view, this relation is consistent. The prophet must be a seer, a man of visions and ideals. As such he would be subject, as in his waking states, so in his sleeping states, to extraordinary experiences. The remarkable dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, who stands out as an exceptional example, afford an illustration of what may be styled a disturbed personality (⟨2708⟩Daniel 2:3-45; 4:5-19). The effort made by the magicians, the enchanters, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers, according to the best skill of the Orientals, was unavailing. Daniel, whether by extraordinary intellectual insight or by Divine communication, was able by his interpretation and its moral to set before the king a powerful lesson.

The New Testament gives still less place and importance to dreams than the Old Testament. There are only six references and one citation to dreams or dreamers. It is significant that all these references are by Mt, and still more significant that Jesus nowhere refers to dreams, evidently attaching little if any importance to them. The references in Matthew are confined entirely to warnings and announcements (⟨4002⟩Matthew 1:20;

2:12,13,19,22; 27:19). Once a citation (⟨44217⟩Acts 2:17) is used for illustrative purposes (compare ⟨29028⟩Joel 2:28).

See also AUGURY, IV, 5; DIVINATION, VI, 1, l(b); MAGIC; REVELATION.

Whether God communicates directly or indirectly by dreams is still unsettled. With our present knowledge of spirit communication it would not seem unreasonable to assume that He may reveal Himself directly; and yet on the other hand the safest and perhaps surest explanation for our own day and experience is that in dream states the mind is more impressionable and responsive to natural causes through which God speaks and operates. That dreams have been and are valuable means of shaping men's thoughts and careers cannot be denied, and as such, have played an important part in the social and moral life of individuals and of society. A valuable modern illustration of this is the dream of Adoniram Judson Gordon (see How Christ Came to Church), through the influence of which his entire religious life and that of his church were completely transformed.

LITERATURE.

Judd, Psychology; Cutten, The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity; Ladd, Philosophy of Knowledge; Baldwin, Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology; Ellis, The World of Dreams (Houghton, Mifflin Co.).

Walter G. Clippinger

DREDGE

<drej>: A mixture of oats and barley (⟨18246⟩Job 24:6 the King James Version margin; the King James Version "corn"; the Revised Version (British and American) "provender"). The Hebrew word is [l yl B] *belil*], usually "mixed grain," ZDMG, XLVIII, 236: grain not ground and boiled in water. Compare ⟨18065⟩Job 6:5; ⟨23024⟩Isaiah 30:24.

DREGS

<dregs>: The "sediments," "lees," "grounds of liquor"; only in plural. In the King James Version it stands for:

(1) Hebrew *qubba`ath*, "bowl," "chalice," found only in ⟨23517⟩Isaiah 51:17,22: "the dregs of the cup of trembling"; "the dregs of the cup of my fury." the Revised Version (British and American) correctly changes

"dregs" into "bowl."

(2) Hebrew *shemarim*, "sediments" or "dregs," especially lees of wine. "The dregs thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring (the American Standard Revised Version "drain") them out and drink them" (Psalm 75:8), i.e. God gives to the wicked the cup of wrathful judgment, which they must drink to the last drop.

DRESS

In the Hebrew and Greek there is a wonderful wealth of terminology having to do with the general subject of dress among the ancient Orientals. This is reflected in the numerous synonyms for "dress" to be found in English Versions of the Bible, "apparel," "attire," "clothes," "raiment," "garments," etc. But the words used in the originals are often greatly obscured through the inconsistent variations of the translators. Besides there are few indications even in the original Hebrew or Greek of the exact shape or specific materials of the various articles of dress named, and so their identification is made doubly difficult. In dealing with the subject, therefore, the most reliable sources of information, apart from the meaning of the terms used in characterization, are certain well-known facts about the costumes and dress-customs of the orthodox Jews, and others about the forms of dress worn today by the people of simple life and primitive habits in modern Palestine. Thanks to the ultraconservatism and unchanging usages of the nearer East, this is no mean help. In the endeavor to discover, distinguish and deal with the various oriental garments, then, we will consider:

1. MEANING OF TERMS:

There was originally a sharp distinction between classical and oriental costume, but this was palpably lessened under the cosmopolitanism of the Roman Empire. This of course had its effect both in the modification of the fashions of the day and upon the words used for articles of clothing in the New Testament.

(1) The terms most used for clothes in general were, in the Old Testament, *cadhin*, *simlah*, *salmah*, and in the New Testament *himation* (Matthew 21:7; 24:18; 26:65; Luke 8:27) and *enduma* (Matthew 22:11 f; compare 7:15), plural, though the oldest and most widely distributed article of human apparel was probably the "loin-cloth" (Hebrew *'ezor*), entirely different from "girdle" (Greek *zone*). Biblical references for clothes are

nearly all to the costume of the males, owing doubtless to the fact that the garments ordinarily used indoors were worn alike by men and women. **(2)** The three normal body garments, the ones most mentioned in the Scriptures, are *cadjin*, a rather long "under garment" provided with sleeves; *kethoneth* (Greek *chiton*), a long-sleeved tunic worn over the *cadhin*, likewise a shirt with sleeves (see Masterman, DCG, article "Dress"); and *simlah* (Greek *himation*), the cloak of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), used in the plural for "garments" in general; and the "girdle" (Greek *zone*; Arabic zunnar). The "headdress" (two types are now in use, the "turban" and the "kufiyeh") is never definitely named in the Bible, though we know it was the universal custom among ancient Orientals to cover the head.

(3) The *simlah* (Greek *himation*) signifies an "outer garment" (see below), a "mantle," or "cloak" (see lexicons). A kindred word in the Greek *himatismos*, (translated "raiment" in [2929]Luke 9:29, "garments" in [4735]Matthew 27:35, and "vesture" in [5924]John 19:24) stands in antithesis to *himation*. The Greek *chiton*, Hebrew *kethoneth*, the "under garment," is translated "coat" in [4050]Matthew 5:40, "clothes" in [1463]Mark 14:63. The Hebrew word *me`il*, Greek *stole*, Latin stola, stands for a variety of garment used only by men of rank or of the priestly order, rendered the Revised Version (British and American) "robe." It stands for the long garments of the scribes rendered "long robes" ([4738]Mark 12:38; [2066]Luke 20:46) and "best robe" in the story of the Prodigal Son ([2152]Luke 15:22). (For difference between *me`il* and *simlah*, see Kennedy, one-vol HDB, 197.) Oriental influences led to the adoption of the long tunic in Rome, and in Cicero's time it was a mark of effeminacy. It came to be known in its white form as tunica alba, or "white tunic," afterward in English "alb."

Other New Testament terms are [πορφύραν, *porphuran*], the "purple" ([2169]Luke 16:19); the purple robe of Jesus is called *himation* in [3192]John 19:2; lention, "the towel" with which Jesus girded himself (13:4,5); then othonion, "linen cloth" ([2412]Luke 24:12; [3190]John 19:40); sindon, "linen cloth" ([4279]Matthew 27:59); and bussos, "fine linen" ([2169]Luke 16:19). The primitive "aprons" of [0107]Genesis 3:7, made of "sewed fig-leaves," were quite different from the "aprons" brought to the apostles in [4912]Acts 19:12. The latter were of a species known among the Romans as semicinctium, a short "waist-cloth" worn especially by slaves (Rich, Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiq.).

2. THE MATERIALS:

Anthropology, Scripture and archaeology all witness to the use by primitive man of skins of animals as dress material (Genesis 3:21, "coats of skin"; compare Hebrews 11:37, "went about in sheepskins, in goatskins").

Even today the traveler will occasionally see in Palestine a shepherd clad in "a coat of skin." Then, as now, goat's hair and camel's hair supplied the materials for the coarser fabrics of the poor. John the Baptist had his raiment, enduma, of camel's hair (literally, "of camel's hairs," Matthew 3:4). This was a coarse cloth made by weaving camel's hairs. There is no evidence that coats of camel's skin, like those made of goat's skin or sheep's skin have ever been worn in the East, as imagined by painters (see Meyer, Bleek, Weiss and Broadus; but compare HDB, article "Camel"). The favorite materials, however, in Palestine, as throughout the Orient, in ancient times, were wool (see Proverbs 27:26, "The lambs are for thy clothing") and flax (see Proverbs 31:13, where it is said of the ideal woman of King Lemuel, "She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands"). The finest quality of ancient "linen" seems to have been the product of Egypt (*see LINEN*). The "silk" of Proverbs 31:22 the King James Version is really "fine linen," as in the Revised Version (British and American). The first certain mention of "silk" in the Bible, it is now conceded, is in Revelation 18:12, as the word rendered "silk" in Ezekiel 16:10,13 is of doubtful meaning.

3. THE OUTER GARMENTS:

(1) We may well begin here with the familiar saying of Jesus for a basal distinction: "If any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat (Greek *chiton*), let him have thy cloak (*himation*) also" (Matthew 5:40). Here the "coat" (Hebrew *kethoneth*) was the ordinary "inner garment" worn by the Jew of the day, in which he did the work of the day (see Matthew 24:18; Mark 13:16). It resembled the Roman "tunic," corresponding most nearly to our "long shirt," reaching below the knees always, and, in case it was designed for dress occasions, reaching almost to the ground. Sometimes "two coats" were worn (Luke 3:11; compare Matthew 10:10; Mark 6:9), but in general only one. It was this garment of Jesus that is said by John (19:23) to have been "without seam, woven from the top throughout."

(2) The word *himation*, here rendered "cloak," denotes the well-known "outer garment" of the Jews (see ⁴⁰⁹²⁰Matthew 9:20,21; 14:36; 21:7,8; but compare also 9:16; 17:2; 24:18; 26:65; 27:31,35). It appears in some cases to have been a loose robe, but in most others, certainly, it was a large square piece of cloth, like a modern shawl, which could be wrapped around the person, with more or less taste and comfort. Now these two, with the "girdle" (a necessary and almost universal article of oriental dress), were commonly all the garments worn by the ordinary man of the Orient. The "outer garment" was frequently used by the poor and by the traveler as his only covering at night, just as shawls are used among us now.

(3) The common Hebrew name for this "outer garment" in the Old Testament is as above, *simlah* or *salmah*. In most cases it was of "wool," though sometimes of "linen," and was as a rule certainly the counterpart of the *himation* of the Greek (this is its name throughout the New Testament). It answered, too, to the pallium of the Romans. It belonged, like them, not to the endumata, or garments "put on," but to the periblemata, or garments "wrapped, around" the body. It was concerning this "cloak" that the Law of Moses provided that, if it were taken in pawn, it should be returned before sunset — "for that is his only covering, it is his raiment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep? .... for I am gracious" (⁰²²²⁷Exodus 22:27). The Jewish tribunals would naturally, therefore, allow the "inner garment" to be taken by legal process, rather than the outer one (⁴⁰⁶⁰Matthew 5:40; ⁴⁰⁶⁹Luke 6:29); but Jesus virtually teaches that rather than have difficulty or indulge animosity one would better yield one's rights in this, as in other matters; compare ⁴⁰⁶⁷1 Corinthians 6:7. Some identify the *simlah* of the ancient Hebrews with modern aba, the coarse blouse or overcoat worn today by the Syrian peasant (Nowack, Benzinger, Mackie in HDB); but the distinction between these two garments of the Jews, so clearly made in the New Testament, seems to confirm the conclusion otherwise reached, that this Jewish "outer garment" closely resembled, if it was not identical with, the *himation* of the Greeks (see Jew Encyclopedia, article "Cloke" and 1-vol HDB, "Dress," 197; but compare Masterman, DCG, article "Dress," 499, and Dearmer, DCG, article "Cloke"). In no respect has the variety of renderings in our English Versions of the Bible done more to conceal from English readers the meaning of the original than in the case of this word *simlah*. For instance it is the "garment" with which Noah's nakedness was covered (⁰¹⁰²³Genesis 9:23); the "clothes" in which the Hebrews bound up, their kneading-

troughs (⸢⸤Exodus 12:34); the "garment" of Gideon in ⸢⸤Judges 8:25; the "raiment" of Ruth (3:3); just as the *himation* of the New Testament is the "cloak" of ⸢⸤Matthew 5:40, the "clothes" of ⸢⸤Matthew 24:18 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "cloak"), the "garment" (⸢⸤Mark 13:16 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "cloak").

4. THE UNDER GARMENTS:

(1) In considering the under garments, contrary to the impression made by English Versions of the Bible, we must begin with the "loin-cloth" (Hebrew *'ezor*), which unlike the "girdle" (*see GIRDLE*), was always worn next to the skin. The figurative use made of it in ⸢⸤Isaiah 11:5, and ⸢⸤Jeremiah 13:11, e.g. will be lost unless this is remembered. Often it was the only "under garment," as with certain of the prophets (Elijah, ⸢⸤2 Kings 1:8; compare John the Baptist, ⸢⸤Matthew 3:4; Isaiah, 20:2, and Jeremiah, 13:1 ff). In later times it was displaced among the Hebrews by the "shirt" or "tunic" (*see TUNIC*). The universal "sign of mourning" was the girding of the waist with an *'ezor* or "hair-cloth" (English Versions, "sack-cloth"). A "loincloth" of "linen" was worn by the priests of early times and bore the special name of *'ephodh* (⸢⸤1 Samuel 2:18; compare ⸢⸤2 Samuel 6:14 ff).

(2) The ordinary "under garment," later worn by all classes — certain special occasions and individuals being exceptions — was the "shirt" (Hebrew *kethoneth*) which, as we have seen, reappears as *chiton* in Greek, and tunica in Latin It is uniformly rendered "coat" in English Versions of the Bible, except that the Revised Version, margin has "tunic" in ⸢⸤John 19:23. The well-known piece of Assyrian sculpture, representing the siege and capture of Lachish by Sennacherib, shows the Jewish captives, male and female, dressed in a moderately tight garment, fitting close to the neck (compare ⸢⸤Job 30:18) and reaching almost to the ankles; which must represent the *kethoneth*, or *kuttoneth* of the period, as worn in towns at least. Probably the *kuttoneth* of the peasantry was both looser and shorter, resembling more the modern kamis of the Syrian fellah (compare Latin camisa, and English "chemise").

(3) As regards sleeves, they are not expressly mentioned in the Old Testament, but the Lachish tunics mentioned above have short sleeves, reaching half-way to the elbows. This probably represents the prevailing type of sleeve among the Hebrews of the earlier period. An early Egyptian

picture of a group of Semitic traders (circa 2000 BC) shows a colored tunic without sleeves, which, fastened on the left shoulder, left the right bare. Another variety of sleeves, restricted to the upper and wealthy classes, had long and wide sleeves reaching to the ground. This was the tunic worn by Tamar, the royal princess (⟨10318⟩2 Samuel 13:18, "A garment of divers colors upon her; for with such robes were the king's daughters that were virgins appareled"), "the tunic of (i.e. reaching to) palms and soles" worn by Joseph, familiarly known as the "coat of many colors" (⟨01578⟩Genesis 37:3), a rendering which represents now an abandoned tradition (compare Kennedy, HDB). The long white linen tunic, which was the chief garment of the ordinary Jewish priest of the later period, had sleeves, which, for special reasons, were tied to the arms (compare Josephus, Ant., III, vii, 2).

(4) Ultimately it became usual, even with the people of the lower ranks, to wear an under "tunic," or "real shirt" (Josephus, Ant., XVII, vi, 7; Mishna, passim, where it is called *chaluq*). In this case the upper tunic, the *kuttoneth* proper, would be removed at night (compare Song 5:3, "I have put off my garment").

The material for the tunic might be either

> **(1)** woven on the loom in two pieces, and afterward put together without cutting (compare Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiq., article "Tunica"), or

(2) the garment might be woven whole on a special loom, "without seam," i.e. so as to require no sewing, as we know from the description given in ⟨43923⟩John 19:23, and from other sources, was the *chiton* worn by our Lord just before His crucifixion. The garments intended by the Hebrew (⟨27021⟩Daniel 3:21-27), rendered "coats" the King James Version, have not been certainly made out. The King James Version margin has "mantles" the English Revised Version "hosen" the American Standard Revised Version "breeches" (*see HOSEN*). For "coat of mail" (⟨09705⟩1 Samuel 17:5) *see ARMOR*.

5. THE HEADDRESS:

When the Hebrews first emerged into view, they seem to have had no covering for the head except on special demand, as in case of war, when a leather-helmet was worn (*see ARMOR*). Ordinarily, as with the fellah of Palestine today, a rope or cord served as a fillet (compare ⟨11022⟩1 Kings

20:32, and Virgil, Aeneid (Dryden), iv.213: "A golden fillet binds his awful brows"). Such "fillets" may be seen surviving in the representation of Syrians on the monuments of Egypt. Naturally, in the course of time, exposure to the Syrian sun in the tropical summer time would compel recourse to some such covering as the modern kufiyeh, which lets in the breeze, but protects in a graceful, easy way, the head, the neck and the shoulders. The headgear of Ben-hadad's tribute carriers (see above) resembles the Phrygian cap.

The head covering, however, which is best attested, at least for the upper ranks of both sexes, is the turban (Hebrew *tsaniph*, from a root meaning to "wind round"). It is the ladies' "hood" of ²⁰²³Isaiah 3:23, the Revised Version (British and American) "turban"; the "royal diadem" of ²⁵⁰³Isaiah 62:3, and the "mitre" of ³⁸⁰⁵Zechariah 3:5, the Revised Version, margin "turban" or "diadem." Ezekiel's description of a lady's headdress: "I bound thee with attire of fine linen" (²⁶⁶⁰Ezekiel 16:10 margin), points to a turban. For the egg-shaped turban of the priests *see BONNET* (the Revised Version (British and American) "head-tires"). The hats of ²⁷²¹Daniel 3:21 (the Revised Version (British and American) "mantles") are thought by some to have been the conical Babylonian headdress seen on the monuments. According to 2 Macc 4:12 the Revised Version (British and American) the young Jewish nobles were compelled by Antiochus Epiphanes to wear the *petasos*, the low, broad-brimmed hat associated with Hermes. Other forms of headdress were in use in New Testament times, as we learn from the Mishna, as well as from the New Testament, e.g. the suddar ([σουδάριον, *soudarion*]) from Latin sudarium (a cloth for wiping off perspiration, sudor) which is probably the "napkin" of ⁴³¹⁴John 11:44; 20:7, although there it appears as a kerchief, or covering, for the head. The female captives from Lachish (see above) wear over their tunics an upper garment, which covers the forehead and falls down over the shoulders to the ankles. Whether this is the garment intended by the Hebrew in ⁰⁸³⁵Ruth 3:15, rendered "vail" by the King James Version and "mantle" by the Revised Version (British and American), and "kerchiefs for the head" (²⁶³⁸Ezekiel 13:18 the Revised Version (British and American)), we cannot say. The "veil" with which Rebekah and Tamar "covered themselves" (⁰¹⁴⁶Genesis 24:65; 38:14) was most likely a large "mantle" in which the whole body could be wrapped, like the *cadhin* (see above). But it seems impossible to draw a clear distinction between "mantle" and "veil" in the Old Testament (Kennedy). The case of

Moses (⟨02353⟩Exodus 34:33) gives us the only express mention of a "face-veil."

6. FOOTGEAR:

The ancient Hebrews, like Orientals in general, went barefoot within doors. Out of doors they usually wore sandals, less frequently shoes. The simplest form of sandal then, as now, consisted of a sole of untanned leather, bound to the foot by a leather thong, the shoe-latchet of ⟨01423⟩Genesis 14:23 and the latchet of ⟨41007⟩Mark 1:7, etc. In the obelisk of Shalmaneser, however, Jehu's attendants are distinguished by shoes completely covering the feet, from the Assyrians, who are represented as wearing sandals fitted with a heel-cap. Ladies of Ezekiel's day wore shoes of "sealskin" (⟨26160⟩Ezekiel 16:10 the Revised Version (British and American)). The soldiers' "laced boot" may be intended in ⟨23905⟩Isaiah 9:5 (the Revised Version (British and American), margin). Then, as now, on entering the house of a friend, or a sacred precinct (⟨00305⟩Exodus 3:5; ⟨06515⟩Joshua 5:15), or in case of mourning (⟨10150⟩2 Samuel 15:30), the sandals, or shoes, were removed. The priests performed their offices in the Temple in bare feet (compare the modern requirement on entering a mosque).

7. THE DRESS OF JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES:

In general we may say that the clothes worn by Christ and His disciples were of the simplest and least sumptuous kinds. A special interest must attach even to the clothes that Jesus wore. These consisted, it seems quite certain, not of just five separate articles (see Edersheim, LTJM, I, 625), but of six. In His day it had become customary to wear a linen shirt (*chaluq*) beneath the tunic (see above). That our Lord wore such a "shirt" seems clear from the mention of the laying aside of the upper garments (*himatia*, plural), i.e. the "mantle" and the "tunic," before washing His disciples' feet (⟨43304⟩John 13:4). The tunic proper worn by Him, as we have seen, was "woven without seam" throughout, and was of the kind, therefore, that fitted closely about the neck, and had short sleeves. Above the tunic would naturally be the linen girdle, wound several times about the waist. On His feet were leather sandals (⟨40311⟩Matthew 3:11). His upper garment was of the customary sort and shape, probably of white woolen cloth, as is suggested by the details of the account of the Transfiguration (⟨41903⟩Mark 9:3), with the four prescribed "tassels" at the corners. As to His headdress, we have no description of it, but we may set it down as certain that no Jewish teacher

of that day would appear in public with the head uncovered. He probably wore the customary white linen "napkin" (sudarium), wound round the head as a turban, with the ends of it falling down over the neck. The dress of His disciples was, probably, not materially different.

In conclusion it may be said that, although the dress of even orthodox Jews today is as various as their lands of residence and their languages, yet there are two garments worn by them the world over, the *Tallith* and the *'arba` kanephoth* (see DCG, article "Dress," col. 1). Jews who affect special sanctity, especially those living in the Holy Land, still wear the Tallith all day, as was the common custom in Christ's time. As the earliest mention of the *'arba` kanephoth* is in 1350 AD, it is clear that it cannot have existed in New Testament times.

LITERATURE.

Nowack's and Benzinger's Hebrew Archaologie; Tristram, Eastern Customs in Bible Lands; Rich, Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiq.; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 625, and elsewhere; articles on "Dress," "Clothing," "Costumes," etc., HDB, DCG, Jew Encyclopedia (by Noldeke) in Encyclopedia Biblica (by Abrahams and Cook); Masterman, "Dress and Personal Adornment in Mod. Palestine," in Biblical World, 1902, etc.

George B. Eager

DRINK

See FOOD; DRINK, STRONG.

DRINK OFFERING

See SACRIFICE IN OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT.

DRINK, STRONG

([רכוֽשׁekar]; [σίκερα, *sikera*]; from [רכ״שׁ; *shakhar*], "to be or become drunk"; probably from the same root as sugar, saccharine): With the exception of Numbers 28:7, "strong drink" is always coupled with "wine." The two terms are commonly used as mutually exclusive, and as together exhaustive of all kinds of intoxicants.

Originally *shekhar* seems to have been a general term for intoxicating

drinks of all kinds, without reference to the material out of which they were made; and in that sense, it would include wine. Reminiscences of this older usage may be found in ⁅0207⁆Numbers 28:7 (where *shekhar* is clearly equivalent to wine, as may be seen by comparing it with 28:14, and with ⁅0290⁆Exodus 29:40, where the material of the drink offering is expressly designated "wine").

When the Hebrews were living a nomadic life, before their settlement in Canaan, the grape-wine was practically unknown to them, and there would be no need of a special term to describe it. But when they settled down to an agricultural life, and came to cultivate the vine, it would become necessary to distinguish it from the older kinds of intoxicants; hence, the borrowed word *yayin* ("wine") was applied to the former, while the latter would be classed together under the old term *shekhar*, which would then come to mean all intoxicating beverages other than wine (⁅0309⁆Leviticus 10:9; ⁅0063⁆Numbers 6:3; ⁅0526⁆Deuteronomy 14:26; ⁅2000⁆Proverbs 20:1; ⁅2349⁆Isaiah 24:9). The exact nature of these drinks is not clearly indicated in the Bible itself. The only fermented beverage other than grape-wine specifically named is pomegranate-wine (Song 8:2: "the juice of my pomegranate," the Revised Version, margin "sweet wine of my pomegranate"); but we may infer that other kinds of *shekhar* besides that obtained from pomegranates were in use, such as drinks made from dates, honey, raisins, barley, apples, etc. Probably Jerome (circa 400 AD) was near the mark when he wrote, "*Sikera* in the Hebrew tongue means every kind of drink which can intoxicate, whether made from grain or from the juice of apples, or when honeycombs are boiled down into a sweet and strange drink, or the fruit of palm oppressed into liquor, and when water is colored and thickened from boiled herbs" (Ep. ad Nepotianum). Thus *shekhar* is a comprehensive term for all kinds of fermented drinks, excluding wine.

Probably the most common sort of *shekhar* used in Biblical times was palm or date-wine. This is not actually mentioned in the Bible, and we do not meet with its Hebrew name *yen temarim* ("wine of dates") until the Talmudic period. But it is frequently referred to in the Assyrian-Babylonian contract tablets (cuneiform), and from this and other evidence we infer that it was very well known among the ancient Semitic peoples. Moreover, it is known that the palm tree flourished abundantly in Biblical lands, and the presumption is therefore very strong that wine made of the juice of dates was a common beverage. It must not be supposed, however, that the term *shekhar* refers exclusively to date-wine. It rather designates all intoxicating

liquors other than grape-wine, while in few cases it probably includes even wine.

There can be no doubt that *shekhar* was intoxicating. This is proved

(1) from the etymology of the word, it being derived from *shakhar*, "to be or become drunk" (⟨01921⟩Genesis 9:21; ⟨23909⟩Isaiah 29:9; ⟨24527⟩Jeremiah 25:27, etc.); compare the word for drunkard (*shikkar*), and for drunkenness (*shikkaron*) from the same root;

(2) from descriptions of its effects: e.g. Isaiah graphically describes the stupefying effect of *shekhar* on those who drink it excessively (28:7,8). Hannah defended herself against the charge of being drunk by saying, "I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink," i.e. neither wine nor any other intoxicating liquor (⟨09015⟩1 Samuel 1:15). The attempt made to prove that it was simply the unfermented juice of certain fruits is quite without foundation. Its immoderate use is strongly condemned (⟨23511⟩Isaiah 5:11,12; ⟨20001⟩Proverbs 20:1; *see DRUNKENNESS*). It was forbidden to ministering priests (⟨03009⟩Leviticus 10:9), and to Nazirites (⟨04003⟩Numbers 6:3; ⟨07304⟩Judges 13:4,7,14; compare ⟨42015⟩Luke 1:15), but was used in the sacrificial meal as drink offering (⟨04807⟩Numbers 28:7), and could be bought with the tithe-money and consumed by the worshipper in the temple (⟨05426⟩Deuteronomy 14:26). It is commended to the weak and perishing as a means of deadening their pain; but not to princes, lest it might lead them to pervert justice (⟨20104⟩Proverbs 31:4-7).

D. Miall Edwards

DROMEDARY

<drum'-e-da-ri>, *<drom'-e-da-ri>*.

See CAMEL.

DROP, DROPPING

"To drop" expresses a "distilling" or "dripping" of a fluid (⟨07504⟩Judges 5:4; ⟨20050⟩Proverbs 3:20; Song 5:5,13; ⟨29818⟩Joel 3:18; ⟨30913⟩Amos 9:13; compare ⟨09426⟩1 Samuel 14:26, "the honey dropped" (margin "a stream of honey")); ⟨18922⟩Job 29:22 and ⟨23508⟩Isaiah 45:8 read "distil" (the King James Version "drop"). The continuous "droppings" of rain through a leaking roof (roofs were usually made of clay in Palestine, and always liable to cracks and leakage) on a "very rainy day" is compared to a contentious wife

(^{20913}Proverbs 19:13; 27:15); "What is described is the irritating, unceasing, sound of the fall, drop after drop, of water through the chinks in the roof" (Plumptre, in the place cited); compare also the King James Version ^{21018}Ecclesiastes 10:18 (the Revised Version (British and American) "leaketh").

DROPSY

<*drop'-si*> ([ὑδρωπικός, *hudropikos*], "a man afflicted with *hudrops* or dropsy"): Both forms of this disease occur in Palestine, that in which the limbs and body are distended with water called anasarca, depending generally on cardiac or renal disease, and the form confined to the abdomen, usually the result of liver infection. The latter is the commoner, as liver disease is a frequent result of recurrent attacks of malarial fever. The man was evidently able to move about, as he had entered into the Pharisee's house (^{2142}Luke 14:2).

DROSS

<*dros*> ([gySi *sigh*]): The refuse of smelting of precious metal (^{20504}Proverbs 25:4; 26:23); used figuratively of what is base or worthless (^{23022}Isaiah 1:22,25; ^{26218}Ezekiel 22:18,19; ^{19B919}Psalm 119:119).

DROUGHT

<*drout*>.

See FAMINE.

DROVE

<*drov*>.

See CATTLE.

DROWNING

<*droun'-ing*>.

See PUNISHMENTS.

DRUM

<drum> ([τύμπανον, *tumpanon*]): This was the Hebrew *toph*, "tabret" or "timbrel," a hand-drum, consisting of a ring of wood or metal covered with a tightly drawn skin, with small pieces of metal hung around the rim, like a tambourine. It was raised in the one hand and struck with the other, usually by women, but sometimes also by men, at festivities and on occasions of rejoicing. See 1 Macc 9:39, the Revised Version (British and American) "timbrels."

DRUNKENNESS

<drunk'-'-n-nes> ([hwr; *raweh*], [ˆwθKvi *shikkaron*], [ytv] *shethi*]; [μέθη, *methe*]):

I. ITS PREVALANCE.

The Bible affords ample proof that excessive drinking of intoxicants was a common vice among the Hebrews, as among other ancient peoples. This is evident not only from individual cases of intoxication, as Noah (Genesis 9:21), Lot (Genesis 19:33,15), Nabal (1 Samuel 25:36), Uriah made drunk by David (2 Samuel 11:13), Amnon (2 Samuel 13:28), Elah, king of Israel (1 Kings 16:9), Benhadad, king of Syria, and his confederates (1 Kings 20:16), Holofernes (Judith 13:2), etc., but also from frequent references to drunkenness as a great social evil. Thus, Amos proclaims judgment on the voluptuous and dissolute rulers of Samaria "that drink wine in (large) bowls" (Amos 6:6), and the wealthy ladies who press their husbands to join them in a carousal (4:1); he also complains that this form of self-indulgence was practiced even at the expense of the poor and under the guise of religion, at the sacrificial meals (2:8; see also Isaiah 5:11,12,22; 28:1-8; 56:11 f). Its prevalence is also reflected in many passages in the New Testament (e.g. Matthew 24:49; Luke 21:34; Acts 2:13,15; Ephesians 5:18; 1 Thessalonians 5:7). Paul complains that at Corinth even the love-feast of the Christian church which immediately preceded the celebration of the Eucharist, was sometimes the scene of excessive drinking (1 Corinthians 11:21). It must, however, be noted that it is almost invariably the well-to-do who are charged with this vice in the Bible. There is no evidence to prove that it prevailed to any considerable extent among the common people. Intoxicants were then an expensive luxury, beyond the reach of the poorer classes.

See DRINK, STRONG.

II. ITS SYMPTOMS AND EFFECTS.

These are most vividly portrayed:

(1) some of its physical symptoms (¹⁸¹²²⁵Job 12:25; ^{19A727}Psalm 107:27; ²⁰²³²⁹Proverbs 23:29; ²³¹⁹¹⁴Isaiah 19:14; 28:8; 29:9; ²⁴²⁵¹⁶Jeremiah 25:16);
(2) its mental effects: exhilaration (⁰¹⁴³³⁴Genesis 43:34), jollity and mirth (1 Esdras 3:20), forgetfulness (1 Esdras 3:20), loss of understanding and balance of judgment (²³²⁸⁰⁷Isaiah 28:7; ²⁸⁰⁴¹¹Hosea 4:11);
(3) its effects on man's happiness and prosperity: its immediate effect is to make one oblivious of his misery; but ultimately it "biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder," and leads to woe and sorrow (²⁰²³²⁹Proverbs 23:29-32) and to poverty (²⁰²³²¹Proverbs 23:21; compare 21:17; Ecclesiasticus 19:1); hence, wine is called a "mocker" deceiving the unwise (²⁰²⁰⁰¹Proverbs 20:1);
(4) its moral and spiritual effects: it leads to a maladministration of justice (²⁰³¹⁰⁵Proverbs 31:5; ²³⁰⁵²³Isaiah 5:23), provokes anger and a contentious, brawling spirit (²⁰²⁰⁰¹Proverbs 20:1; 23:29; 1 Esdras 3:22; Ecclesiasticus 31:26,29 f), and conduces to a profligate life (⁴⁹⁵⁰¹⁸Ephesians 5:18; "riot," literally, profligacy). It is allied with gambling and licentiousness (²⁹⁰³⁰³Joel 3:3), and indecency (⁰¹⁰⁹²¹Genesis 9:21 f). Above all, it deadens the spiritual sensibilities, produces a callous indifference to religious influences and destroys all serious thought (²³⁰⁵¹²Isaiah 5:12).

III. ATTITUDE OF THE BIBLE TO THE DRINK QUESTION.

Intemperance is condemned in uncompromising terms by the Old Testament and the New Testament, as well as by the semi-canonical writings. While total abstinence is not prescribed as a formal and universal rule, broad principles are laid down, especially in the New Testament, which point in that direction.

1. In the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament, intemperance is most repugnant to the stern ethical rigorism of the prophets, as well as to the more utilitarian sense of propriety of the "wisdom" writers. As might be expected, the national conscience was but gradually quickened to the evil of immoderate drinking. In the narratives of primitive times, excessive indulgence, or at least indulgence to the point of exhilaration, is mentioned without censure as a

natural thing, especially on festive occasions (as in ⟨04534⟩Genesis 43:34 the Revised Version, margin). But a conscience more sensitive to the sinfulness of overindulgence was gradually developed, and is reflected in the denunciations of the prophets and the warning of the wise men (compare references under I and II, especially ⟨23511⟩Isaiah 5:11 f,22; 28:1-8; ⟨20239⟩Proverbs 23:29-33). Nowhere is the principle of total abstinence inculcated as a rule applicable to all. In particular cases it was recognized as a duty. Priests while on duty in the sanctuary were to abstain from wine and strong drink (⟨03109⟩Leviticus 10:9; compare ⟨26421⟩Ezekiel 44:21). Nazirites were to abstain from all intoxicants during the period of their vows (⟨04063⟩Numbers 6:3 f; compare ⟨30212⟩Amos 2:12), yet not on account of the intoxicating qualities of wine, but because they represented the simplicity of the older pastoral life, as against the Canaanite civilization which the vine symbolized (W. R. Smith, Prophets of Israel, 84 f). So also the Rechabites abstained from wine (⟨24506⟩Jeremiah 35:6,8,14) and social conveniences, because they regarded the nomadic life as more conducive to Yahweh-worship than agricultural and town life, with its temptations to Baal-worship. In Daniel and his comrades we have another instance of voluntary abstinence (⟨27008⟩Daniel 1:8-16). These, however, are isolated instances. Throughout the Old Testament the use of wine appears as practically universal, and its value is recognized as a cheering beverage (⟨07013⟩Judges 9:13; ⟨19A415⟩Psalm 104:15; ⟨20307⟩Proverbs 31:7), which enables the sick to forget their pains (⟨20306⟩Proverbs 31:6). Moderation, however, is strongly inculcated and there are frequent warnings against the temptation and perils of the cup.

2. Deutero-Canonical and Extra-Canonical Writings:

In Apocrypha, we have the attitude of prudence and common sense, but the prophetic note of stern denunciation is wanting. The path of wisdom is the golden mean. "Wine is as good as life to men, if thou drink it in its measure; .... wine drunk in season and to satisfy is joy of heart, and gladness of soul: wine drunk largely is bitterness of soul, with provocation and conflict" (Ecclesiasticus 31:27-30 the Revised Version (British and American)). A vivid picture of the effects of wine-drinking is given in 1 Esdras. 3:18-24. Stronger teaching on the subject is given in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. The use of wine is permitted to him who can use it temperately, but abstinence is enjoined as the wiser course (Testament to the Twelve Patriarchs, ⟨070116⟩Judges 1:16:3).

3. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament, intemperance is treated as a grave sin. Only once, indeed, does our Lord explicitly condemn drunkenness (Luke 21:34), though it is implicitly condemned in other passages (Matthew 24:49 = Luke 12:45). The meagerness of the references in our Lord's teaching is probably due to the fact already mentioned, that it was chiefly prevalent among the wealthy, and not among the poorer classes to whom our Lord mainly ministered. The references in Paul's writings are very numerous (Galatians 5:21; Ephesians 5:18, et al.). Temperance and sobriety in all things are everywhere insisted on (e.g. Acts 24:25; Galatians 5:23; 2 Peter 1:6). A bishop and those holding honorable position in the church should not be addicted to wine (1 Timothy 3:2 f; Titus 1:7 f; 2:2 f). Yet Jesus and His apostles were not ascetics, and the New Testament gives no rough-and-ready prohibition of strong drink on principle. In contrast with John the Baptist, who was a Nazirite from birth (Luke 1:15), Jesus was called by His enemies a "wine-bibber" (Matthew 11:19). He took part in festivities in which wine was drunk (John 2:10). There are indications that He regarded wine as a source of innocent enjoyment (Luke 5:38 f; 17:8). To insist on a distinction between intoxicating and unfermented wine is a case of unjustifiable special pleading. It must be borne in mind that the drink question is far more complex and acute in modern than in Biblical times, and that the conditions of the modern world have given rise to problems which were not within the horizon of New Testament writers. The habit of excessive drinking has spread enormously among the common people, owing largely to the cheapening of alcoholic drinks. The fact that the evil exists today in greater proportions may call for a drastic remedy and a special crusade. But rather than defend total abstinence by a false or forced exegesis, it were better to admit that the principle is not formally laid down in the New Testament, while maintaining that there are broad principles enunciated, which in view of modern conditions should lead to voluntary abstinence from all intoxicants. Such principles may be found, e.g. in our Lord's teaching in Matthew 16:24 f; Mark 9:42 f, and in the great Pauline passages — Romans 14:13-21; 1 Corinthians 8:8-13.

IV. DRUNKENNESS IN METAPHOR.

Drunkenness very frequently supplies Biblical writers with striking metaphors and similes. Thus, it symbolizes intellectual or spiritual

perplexity ([^18125]Job 12:25; [^23194]Isaiah 19:14; [^24219]Jeremiah 23:9), bewilderment and helplessness under calamity ([^24313]Jeremiah 13:13; [^26233]Ezekiel 23:33). It furnishes a figure for the movements of sailors on board ship in a storm ([^19A727]Psalm 107:27), and for the convulsions of the earth on the day of Yahweh ([^23240]Isaiah 24:20). Yahweh's "cup of staggering" is a symbol of affliction, the fury of the Lord causing stupor and confusion ([^25117]Isaiah 51:17-23; compare [^25606]Isaiah 63:6; [^24515]Jeremiah 25:15 ff; [^26233]Ezekiel 23:33; [^19708]Psalm 75:8). The sword and the arrow are said to be sodden with drink like a drunkard with wine ([^15242]Deuteronomy 32:42; [^24610]Jeremiah 46:10). In the Apocalypse, Babylon (i.e. Rome) is portrayed under the figure of a "great harlot" who makes kings "drunken with the wine of her fornication"; and who is herself "drunken with the blood of the saints, and ... of the martyrs of Jesus" ([^66702]Revelation 17:2,6).

D. Miall Edwards

DRUSILLA

<droo-sil'-a> ([Δρούσιλλα, *Drousilla*], or [Δρουσίλλα, *Drousilla*]): Wife of Felix, a Jewess, who along with her husband "heard (Paul) concerning the faith in Christ Jesus" during Paul's detention in Caesarea ([^40224]Acts 24:24). Beta text gives the rendering "Drusilla the wife of Felix, a Jewess, asked to see Paul and to hear the word." The fact that Drusilla was a Jewess explains her curiosity, but Paul, who was probably acquainted with the past history of her and Felix, refused to satisfy their request in the way they desired, and preached to them instead concerning righteousness and self-restraint and the final judgment. At this "Felix was terrified" ([^40225]Acts 24:25). Beta text states that Paul's being left in bonds on the retirement of Felix was due to the desire of the latter to please Drusilla (compare [^40227]Acts 24:27). Probably this explanation, besides that of the accepted text, was true also, as Drusilla, who was a member of the ruling house, saw in Paul an enemy of its power, and hated him for his condemnation of her own private sins.

The chief other source of information regarding Drusilla is Josephus Drusilla was the youngest of the three daughters of Agrippa I, her sisters being Bernice and Mariamne. She was born about 36 AD and was married when 14 years old to Azizus, king of Emeza. Shortly afterward she was induced to desert her husband by Felix, who employed a Cyprian sorcerer, Simon by name, to carry out his purpose. She was also influenced to take this step by the cruelty of Azizus and the hatred of Bernice who was

jealous of her beauty. Her marriage with Felix took place about 54 AD and by him she had one son, Agrippa, who perished under Titus in an eruption of Mt. Vesuvius. The mention by Josephus of "the woman" who perished along with Agrippa (Ant., XX, vii, 2) refers probably not to his mother Drusilla but to his wife.

C. M. Kerr

DUALISM

<*du'-al-iz'-m*>.

See *PHILOSOPHY.*

DUE

<*du*>.

See *DUTY.*

DUKE

<*duk*>: The rendering in the King James Version in [01615]Genesis 36:15 ff; [02515]Exodus 15:15, and [13051]1 Chronicles 1:51 ff of [tWLa″, *'alluph*] (the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version, margin "chief"), and in [06132]Joshua 13:21 of *necikhim* ("dukes," the Revised Version (British and American) "princes"). It occurs also, as the rendering of *strategos*, in 1 Macc 10:65 (the Revised Version (British and American) "captain"). Elsewhere *necikhim* is translated "princes" or "principal men." The fact that with two exceptions the term is applied in English Versions of the Bible only to the chiefs of Edom has led to the impression that in the family of Esau the chiefs bore a special and hereditary title. But *'alluph* was a general term for tribal chief or prince (compare [38097]Zechariah 9:7; 12:5,6; the Revised Version (British and American) "chieftains," the King James Version "governors").

Moreover, at the time the King James Version was made the word "duke" was not used as a title in England: the term had the same general force as dux, the word employed in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) So Sir T. Elyot (died 1546) speaks of "Hannibal, duke of Carthage" (The Governor, II, 233); Shakespeare, Henry V, III, 2, 20, "Be merciful, great duke, to men of mould" (compare Midsummer Night's Dream, I, 1, 21); Sylvester (1591) Du Bartas, "The great Duke, that (in dreadful aw)

(Upon Mt. Horeb learn'd th' eternal law." In a still earlier age Wycliff uses the word of the Messiah (⁴⁰¹⁶Matthew 2:6); and in Select Works, III, 137, "Jesus Christ, duke of oure batel."

Yet in all probability the Hebrew word was more specific than "chief" or "duke" in the broad sense. For if *'alluph* is derived from *'eleph*, "thousand," "tribe," the term would mean the leader of a clan, a "chiliarch" (compare Septuagint, ³⁸⁰⁷Zechariah 9:7; 12:5,6). the American Standard Revised Version has eliminated the word "duke."

See CHIEF.

J. R. Van Pelt

DULCIMER

<dul'-si-mer>.

See MUSIC under Nebhel *and* Sumphonia.

DUMAH

<du'-ma> ([hmⅡD, *dumah*], "silence"): This word occurs in the Old Testament with the following significations:

(1) the land of silence or death, the grave (¹⁹⁴¹⁷Psalm 94:17; 115:17);
   (2) a town in the highlands of Judah between Hebron and Beersheba, now ed-Daume (⁰⁶¹⁵²Joshua 15:52);

(3) an emblematical designation of Edom in the obscure oracle (²³²¹¹¹Isaiah 21:11,12);
   (4) an Ishmaelite tribe in Arabia (⁰¹²⁵¹⁴Genesis 25:14; ¹³⁰¹³⁰1 Chronicles 1:30). According to the Arabic geographies this son of Ishmael rounded the town of Dumat-el-Jandal, the stone-built Dumah, so called to distinguish it from another Dumah near the Euphrates. The former now bears the name of the *Jauf* ("belly"), being a depression situated half-way between the head of the Persian Gulf and the head of the gulf of Akaba. Its people in the time of Mohammed were Christians of the tribe of Kelb. It contained a great well from which the palms and crops were irrigated. It has often been visited by European travelers in recent times. See Jour. Royal Geog. Soc., XXIV (1854), 138-58; W. G. Palgrave, Central and Eastern Arabia, chapter ii. It is possible that the oracle in Isaiah (number 3 above) concerns this place.

Thomas Hunter Weir

DUMB

<dum> ([מ ׳ ם; *'alam*], [מֵלֶם *'illem*], literally, "tied in the tongue"; [κωφός, *kophos*]): Used either as expressing the physical condition of speechlessness, generally associated with deafness, or figuratively as meaning the silence produced by the weight of God's judgments ([19902]Psalm 39:2-9; [27015]Daniel 10:15) or the oppression of external calamity ([19813]Psalm 38:13). As an adjective it is used to characterize inefficient teachers destitute of spirituality ("dumb dogs," [23610]Isaiah 56:10). The speechlessness of Saul's companions ([44907]Acts 9:7) was due to fright; that of the man without the wedding garment was because he had no excuse to give ([40212]Matthew 22:12). Idols are called mute, because helpless and voiceless ([35218]Habakkuk 2:18,19; [46122]1 Corinthians 12:2). The dumbness of the sheep before the shearer is a token of submission ([23507]Isaiah 53:7; [44082]Acts 8:32).

Temporary dumbness was inflicted as a sign upon Ezekiel (3:26; 24:27; 33:22) and as a punishment for unbelief upon Zacharias ([42022]Luke 1:22). There are several cases recorded of our Lord's healing the dumb ([40150]Matthew 15:30; [41037]Mark 7:37; [42114]Luke 11:14, etc.). Dumbness is often associated with imbecility and was therefore regarded as due to demoniac possession ([40932]Matthew 9:32; 12:22). The evangelists therefore describe the healing of these as effected by the casting out of demons. This is especially noted in the case of the epileptic boy ([41017]Mark 9:17). The deaf man with the impediment in his speech ([41032]Mark 7:32) is said to have been cured by loosening the string of his tongue. This does not necessarily mean that he was tongue-tied, which is a condition causing lisping, not stammering; he was probably one of those deaf persons who produce babbling, incoherent and meaningless sounds. I saw in the asylum in Jerusalem a child born blind and deaf, who though dumb, produced inarticulate noises.

In an old 14th-century psalter "dumb" is used as a verb in Psalm 39: "I doumbed and meked and was ful stille."

Alexander Macalister

DUNG; DUNG GATE

<dung> ([twֹפֹשׁ ׳ , *'ashpoth*], [ˆmֹדֹ*domen*], [vrP, *peresh*];

[σκύβαλον, *skubalon*], etc.): Nine different words occurring in the Hebrew have been translated "dung" in the Old Testament. The word used to designate one of the gates of Jerusalem (*'ashpoth*, ⁴⁶²¹³Nehemiah 2:13; 3:14) is more general than the others and may mean any kind of refuse. The gate was probably so named because outside it was the general dump heap of the city. Visitors in recent years riding outside the city walls of Jerusalem, on their way to the Mt. of Olives or Jericho, may have witnessed such a dump against the wall, which has existed for generations. The first mention made of dung is in connection with sacrificial rites. The sacred law required that the dung, along with what parts of the animal were not burned on the altar, should be burned outside the camp (⁰²⁹¹⁴Exodus 29:14; ⁰³⁰⁴¹¹Leviticus 4:11; 8:17; 16:27; ⁰⁴⁹⁰⁵Numbers 19:5). The fertilizing value of dung was appreciated by the cultivator, as is indicated by ⁴²¹³⁰⁸Luke 13:8 and possibly ¹⁹⁸³¹⁰Psalm 83:10 and ²³⁵¹⁰Isaiah 25:10.

Dung was also used as a fuel. ²⁶⁰⁴¹²Ezekiel 4:12,15 will be understood when it is known that the dung of animals is a common fuel throughout Palestine and Syria, where other fuel is scarce. During the summer, villagers gather the manure of their cattle, horses or camels, mix it with straw, make it into cakes and dry it for use as fuel for cooking, especially in the winter when wood or charcoal or straw are not procurable. It burns slowly like peat and meets the needs of the kitchen. In Mesopotamia the writer saw it being used with forced draft to fire a steam boiler. There was no idea of uncleanness in Ezekiel's mind, associated with the use of animal dung as fuel (²⁶⁰⁴¹⁵Ezekiel 4:15).

Figuratively: Dung was frequently used figuratively to express the idea

(a) of worthlessness, especially a perishable article for which no one cares (¹¹⁴¹⁰1 Kings 14:10; ¹²⁶²⁵2 Kings 6:25; 9:37; ¹⁸²⁰⁷Job 20:7; ¹⁹⁸³¹⁰Psalm 83:10; ²⁴⁰⁸²Jeremiah 8:2; 9:22; 16:4; 25:33; ³⁶⁰¹⁷Zephaniah 1:17; ⁵⁰⁸⁰⁸Philippians 3:8 (the American Standard Revised Version "refuse")). Dunghill was used in the same way (⁰⁹²⁰⁸1 Samuel 2:8; ¹⁵⁰⁶¹¹Ezra 6:11; ¹⁹⁸³⁰⁷Psalm 113:7; ²³⁵¹⁰Isaiah 25:10; ²⁷⁰¹⁵Daniel 2:5; 3:29; ⁴²¹⁴³⁵Luke 14:35; ²⁹⁰⁴⁵Lamentations 4:5);
(b) as an expression of disgust (¹²¹⁸²⁷2 Kings 18:27; ²³³⁶¹²Isaiah 36:12);
(c) of rebuke (³⁹⁰¹⁸Malachi 2:3).

James A. Patch

DUNGEON

<*dun'-jun*>.

See PRISON.

DUNGHILL

<*dung'-hil*> ([tPvˌa″ , *'ashpoth*], ^{⁰⁹⁰⁰⁸}1 Samuel 2:8, [hnˌmedjˌn″ , *madhmenah*], etc., with other words; [κοπρία, *kopria*], ^{⁴²⁴³⁵}Luke 14:35): Dung heap, or place of refuse. To sit upon a dunghill (^{⁰⁹⁰⁰⁸}1 Samuel 2:8; ^{⁰⁹³⁰⁷}Psalm 113:7; ^{²⁹⁰⁴⁵}Lamentations 4:5) is significant of the lowest and most wretched condition. To turn a house into a dunghill (^{²⁷⁰¹⁵}Daniel 2:5; 3:29), or be flung upon a dunghill (^{⁴²⁴³⁵}Luke 14:35), marks the extreme of ignominy.

See also DUNG.

DURA

<*du'-ra*> ([arˌWD, *dura'*]): The name of the plain on which Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, set up the great golden image which all his subjects were ordered to worship (^{²⁷⁰⁸⁰¹}Daniel 3:1). Oppert placed it to the Southeast of Babylon, near a small river and mounds bearing the name of Douair or Duair, where, also, was what seemed to be the base of a great statue (Exped. scientifique en Mesopotamie, I, 238 f). Others have believed that name to indicate a portion of the actual site of Babylon within the great wall (duru) of the city — perhaps the rampart designated dur Su-anna, "the rampart (of the city) Lofty-defense," a name of Babylon. The fact that the plain was within the city of Babylon precludes an identification with the city Duru, which seems to have lain in the neighborhood of Erech (Hommel, Grundriss, 264, note 5). It is noteworthy that the Septuagint substitutes [Δεειρά, *Deeira*], for Dura, suggesting that the Greek translators identified it with the Babylonian Deru, a city which apparently lay toward the Elamite border. It seems to have been called also Dur-ili, "god's rampart." That it was at some distance is supported by the list WAI, IV, 36 [38], where Duru, Tutul and Gudua (Cuthah), intervene between *Deru* or *Dur-ili* and *Tindir* (Babylon). "The plain of the dur" or "rampart" within Babylon would therefore seem to be the best rendering.

T. G. Pinches

DURE

<*dur*> ([πρόσκαιρος, *proskairos*]): Used for "endure" (which see), the King James Version ⁴⁰³²¹Matthew 13:21 (the Revised Version (British and American) "endureth").

DUST

<*dust*> ([רפֽ; `*aphar*]; [κονιορτός, *koniortos*], [χοῦς, *chous*]): Small particles of earth. The word has several figurative and symbolic meanings:

(1) Dust being the material out of which God is said to have formed man (⁰¹⁰⁰⁷Genesis 2:7), it became a symbol of man's frailty (^{19A314}Psalm 103:14, "For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust"; compare ⁰¹⁸²⁷Genesis 18:27; ¹⁸⁰⁴⁹Job 4:19, etc.), and of his mortality (⁰¹⁶¹⁹Genesis 3:19, Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return"; compare ¹⁸⁴¹⁵Job 34:15; ^{19A29}Psalm 104:29; ²¹⁰³⁰Ecclesiastes 3:20; 12:7, etc.) Hence, it is used figuratively for the grave (¹⁹²¹⁵Psalm 22:15,29; 30:9; ²⁷¹²²Daniel 12:2).
(2) Such actions as to lie in the dust, to lick the dust, to sprinkle dust on the head, are symbols expressive of deep humiliation, abasement or lamentation (e.g. ¹⁸²¹²Job 2:12; 42:6, ¹⁹⁷²⁹Psalm 72:9; ²³²¹⁰Isaiah 2:10; 47:1; 49:23; ²⁵²¹⁰Lamentations 2:10; 3:29; ²⁶⁷³⁰Ezekiel 27:30; ³³⁷¹⁷Micah 7:17; ⁶⁶¹⁸⁹Revelation 18:19). Hence, such expressions as "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust," i.e. out of their state of lowliness (⁰⁹⁰⁰⁸1 Samuel 2:8; ^{19B307}Psalm 113:7).
(3) Throwing dust was an act expressive of execration. Thus, Shimei "cursed" David and "threw stones at him, and cast dust," literally, "dusted (him) with dust" (¹⁰¹⁶³2 Samuel 16:13). So the crowd which Paul addressed at Jerusalem manifested their wrath against him by tossing about their garments and casting dust into the air (⁴⁴²²³Acts 22:23).
(4) Shaking the dust off one's feet against anyone (⁴⁰⁰¹⁴Matthew 10:14; ⁴¹⁰⁶¹Mark 6:11; ⁴²⁹⁰⁵Luke 9:5; 10:11; ⁴⁴¹⁵¹Acts 13:51) is symbolic of renunciation, as we would say "washing one's hands of him," an intimation that all further intercourse was at an end. It was practiced by the Pharisees on passing from Gentileto Jewish soil, it being a rabbinical doctrine that the dust of a heathen land defiles.
(5) It is also used figuratively for an innumerable multitude (e.g. ⁰¹³¹⁶Genesis 13:16; 28:14; ¹⁸⁷¹⁶Job 27:16; ¹⁹⁸²⁷Psalm 78:27).
  (6) The expression "Yahweh will make the rain of thy land powder and dust" (⁰⁵⁸²⁴Deuteronomy 28:24) means the dust in consequence of the

drought shall fall down instead of rain on the dry ground. In Judea and vicinity during a sirocco, the air becomes filled with sand and dust, which are blown down by the wind with great violence.

D. Miall Edwards

DUTY

<du'-ti> ([רבָד; *dabhar*]; [ὀφείλω, *opheilo*]): The word duty occurs only three times in the Old Testament and twice in the New Testament. In the Old Testament it is the translation of *dabhar*, which, meaning originally "speech," or "word," came to denote any particular "matter" that had to be attended to. In the two places where it is rendered "duty" ([14814]2 Chronicles 8:14; [15804]Ezra 3:4) the reference is to the performance of the Temple services — praise and sacrifice — and it is probably from these passages that the phrase "taking duty" in church services is derived. In other passages we have different words employed to denote the priests' dues: the King James Version [03013]Leviticus 10:13,14, *hok* ("statutory portion"); [05808]Deuteronomy 18:3, *mishpat* ("judgment"). In [20827]Proverbs 3:27, we have a reference to duty in the moral sense, "Withhold not good from them to whom it is due," *ba`-al* (i.e. as in the King James Version margin, "from the owners thereof"). In [02110]Exodus 21:10 we have the "duty of marriage" (`*onah*), that which was due to the wife.

In the New Testament "duty" is expressed by *opheilo*, "to owe," "to be due." In [42710]Luke 17:10, we have "Say, ... we have done that which it was our duty to do," and in [45527]Romans 15:27 the King James Version, it is said of the Gentiles with reference to the Jewish Christians, "Their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things," the American Standard Revised Version "they owe it." In [40834]Matthew 18:34 we have "till he should pay all that was due" (*opheilo*, "owing"), and in [46703]1 Corinthians 7:3 the King James Version, "Render unto the wife due (*opheile*) benevolence," the American Standard Revised Version "her due."

See also ETHICS.

W. L. Walker

DWARF

<dworf>: The rendering in English Versions of the Bible of the Hebrew word [qD″, *dak*], "thin," "small," in [03120]Leviticus 21:20, where a list is given of physical failings which forbade man of the seed of Aaron to

officiate at the altar, though he might partake of the sacrificial gifts. The precise meaning of the Hebrew word here is uncertain; elsewhere it is used of the lean kine (⁰⁴⁰³Genesis 41:3) and blasted ears (verse 23) of Pharaoh's dream; of the grains of manna (⁰²¹⁶⁴Exodus 16:14), of the still, small voice (¹¹¹⁹²1 Kings 19:12), of dust (²³⁹⁰⁵Isaiah 29:5), etc. Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) suggest defective eyes; but "withered" would perhaps best express the meaning.

See PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

F. K. Farr

DWELL

<*dwel*>:

(1) In the Old Testament "dwell" is a translation of 9 words, of which by far the most frequent is [בשׁ״י; *yashabh*], "to sit down," translated "dwell" over 400 times (⁰⁰⁴²⁰Genesis 4:20; ⁰⁶²⁰⁴Joshua 20:4; ¹³¹⁷⁰1 Chronicles 17:1,4,5, etc.); also very frequently "sit," and sometimes "abide," "inhabit," "remain." Another word often rendered "dwell" is [ˆk״v; *shakhan*] or [ˆkv; *shakhen*] ("to settle down"), from which is derived the rabbinic word [hnykvֹ] *shekhinah*] (literally, "that which dwells"), the light on the mercy-seat which symbolized the Divine presence (⁰²⁵⁰⁸Exodus 25:8, etc.). In order to avoid appearing to localize the Divine Being, wherever God is said to "dwell" in a place, the Targum renders that He "causes His Shekinah to dwell" there.

(2) In the New Testament "dwell" most frequently stands for [οἰκέω, *oikeo*], or one of its compounds; also [σκηνόω, *skenoo*], and (chiefly in the Johannine writings) [μένω, *meno*], which, however, is always translated "abide" in the Revised Version (British and American), and generally in the King James Version. Mention may be made of the mystical significance of the word in some New Testament passages, of the indwelling of the Father or of the Godhead in Christ (⁴³¹⁴¹⁰John 14:10; ⁵¹⁰¹⁹Colossians 1:19; 2:9), of the believer in Christ (⁴³⁰⁶⁵⁶John 6:56 the King James Version; ⁴⁹⁸¹⁷Ephesians 3:17), and in God (⁶²⁰⁴¹⁵1 John 4:15 the King James Version; compare ³⁹⁰⁰¹Psalm 90:1; 91:1), and of the Holy Spirit or God in the believer (⁴³¹⁴¹⁷John 14:17; the King James Version ⁶²⁰⁵²⁴1 John 3:24; 4:15 f).

D. Miall Edwards

DYE; DYEING

<di>, *<di'-ing>* ([µDam] *me'oddam*], [6Wmj ; *hamuc*], [l Wbf] *tebhul*], [[b″ x, *cebha`*]): Four different Hebrew words have been translated "dyed": the King James Version

(a) *me'-oddam*, found in ^{⟨0255⟩}Exodus 25:5; 26:14; 35:7; 36:19; 39:34;

(b) *hamuts* (the Revised Version, margin "crimsoned") (^{⟨2560⟩}Isaiah 63:1);

(c) *tebhul* (^{⟨2635⟩}Ezekiel 23:15). *Tebhul* is probably more correctly rendered "flowing turban" as in the Revised Version (British and American) of the above verses (Brown-Driver-Briggs' Hebrew Lexicon);

(d) gebha`, "dyed" is so translated in the American Standard Revised Version of ^{⟨0705⟩}Judges 5:30 (BDB); compare Arabic sabagh. The above references and other color words mentioned elsewhere (*see COLOR*) indicate that the Israelites were acquainted with dyed stuffs, even if they themselves did not do the dyeing. An analysis of the various Biblical references shows but four colors which were produced on cloth by dyeing, namely, purple, blue (violet), crimson and scarlet. Of these, purple is the one best known because of the many historical references to it. It was the symbol of royalty and luxury. Because of its high price, due to the expensive method of obtaining it, only royalty and the rich could afford purple attire. One writer tells us that the dyestuff was worth its weight in silver. Probably it was because of its scarcity, and because it was one of the very limited number of dyes known, rather than for any remarkable beauty of color, that the purple was so much sought after. If Pliny's estimate is to be accredited, then "in the dye the smell of it was offensive and the color itself was harsh, of a greenish hue and strongly resembling that of the sea when in a tempestuous state."

1. Purple and Blue:

The purple and blue dyes were extracted from shellfish. The exact process used by the ancients is still a question in spite of the attempts of early writers to describe it. Tyre and Sidon were noted as the suppliers of these colors, hence, the name "Tyrian purple." The inhabitants of these cities were at first simply dealers in the purple (^{⟨2620⟩}Ezekiel 27:7,24), but they afterward became the manufacturers, as the heaps of the emptied shells of the Murex trunculus, which still exist in the vicinity of these cities, testify.

The pigment was secreted by a gland in the lining of the stomach. The shell was punctured and the fish removed in order to secure the dye. The juice, at first whitish, changed on exposure to yellowish or greenish and finally to red, amethyst or purple, according to the treatment. A modified color was obtained by first dipping the textile in a cochineal bath and then in the purple, Tyrian purple was considered most valuable when it was "exactly the color of clotted blood and of a blackish hue" (Pliny). See also *LYDIA; THYATIRA*. Besides the shellfish above mentioned, several other species are noted by different writers, namely, Murex branderis, Murex erinaceus, Murex buccinum (purpura haemastoma). This latter species is still used by the dwellers on the shores where it is found. Various species of the murex are found today at Haifa (Syria), about the Greek isles and on the North coast of Africa. The purple color has been produced from them by modern chemists, but it is of historical interest only, in the light of the discovery of modern artificial dyes with which it could not compete commercially. Two words have been used in the Hebrew Bible to describe the colors from shellfish:

(a) *'argaman* (Greek *porphura*). This has been translated "purple";

(b) *tekheleth* which was probably a shade of violet, but has been translated "blue" in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American).

2. Crimson and Scarlet:

As indicated elsewhere (***See COLORS***), three Hebrew words have been rendered crimson or scarlet:

(a) *karmil* (compare Arabic kirmiz and English "carmine"),

(b) *tola'*, and

(c) *shani*. We know nothing further about the method of producing these colors than that they were both obtained from the kermes insect which feeds on a species of live oak growing in Southern Europe and Turkey in Asia. The modern dyer can obtain several shades from the cochineal insect by varying the mordants or assistants used with the dye. Pliny mentions the same fact as being known by the ancient Egyptians. Some of the Syrian dyers still use the kermes, commonly called dud ("worms"), although most of them hove resorted to the

artificial European dyes which they indiscriminately call dud frangy ("foreign worms").

The "rams' skins dyed red" mentioned in Exodus are still made in Syria. After the ram's skin has been tanned in sumac, it is laid out on a table and a solution of the dye, made by boiling dud in water, is rubbed on. After the dye is dry, the skin is rubbed with oil and finally polished. No native product is more characteristic of the country than the slippers, Bedouin shoes, and other leather articles made from "rams' skins dyed red" (*see* TANNER).

3. Other Dyes Probably Known:

Other dyes probably known were:

(1) Madder.

In ^{⟨07001⟩}Judges 10:1, we read that "after Abimelech there arose to save Israel Tola the son of Puah." These were probably names of clans. In the Hebrew they are also color words. *Tola`* is the scarlet dye and *pu'ah*, if, as is probable, it is the same as the Arabic fuwah, means "madder." This would add another dyestuff. Until the discovery of alizarin, which is artificial madder, the growing of fuwah was one of the industries of Cyprus and Syria. It was exported to Europe and was also used locally for producing "Turkey red" on cotton and for dyeing dull reds on wool for rug making (*see THYATIRA*). It was the custom near Damascus for a father to plant new madder field for each son that was born. The field began to yield in time to support the boy and later become his inheritance. Madder is mentioned in the Talmud and by early Latin writers. A Saracenic helmet and a shield of similar origin, in the possession of the writer, are lined with madder-dyed cotton.

(2) Indigo.

Another dye has been discovered among the Egyptian mummy cloths, namely, indigo. Indigo blue was used in weaving to form the borders of the cloths. This pigment was probably imported from India.

(3) Yellows and Browns. Yellows and browns of doubtful origin have also been found in the Egyptian tombs.

The Jews acquired from the Phoenicians the secret of dyeing, and later held the monopoly in this trade in some districts. A Jewish guild of purple dyers

is mentioned on a tombstone in Hieropolis. In the 12th century AD Jews were still dyers and glass workers at Tyre. Akhissar, a Jewish stronghold in Asia Minor, was famous as a dyeing city.

See also ATTIRE; DYED.

LITERATURE.

See "Crafts" especially in Wilkinson, Perrot and Chipiez, Jew Encyclopedia, and HDB.

James A. Patch

DYSENTERY

<dis'-en-ter-i> ([δυσεντερία, *dusenteria*): In [4208]Acts 28:8 the Revised Version (British and American) uses this word in place of the phrase "bloody flux" of the King James Version to describe the disease by which the father of Publius was affected in Malta at the time of Paul's shipwreck. The acute form of this disease is often attended with high temperature, hence, Luke speaks of it as "fever and dysentery" (*puretois kai dusenteria*). The disease is still occasionally epidemic in Malta where there have been several bad outbreaks among the garrison in the last century, and it has proved to be an intractable and fatal disease there. It is due to parasitic microbe, the Bacillus dysenteriae. In [4219]2 Chronicles 21:19 there is reference to an epidemic of a similar nature in the days of Jehoram. The malady, as predicted by Elisha, attacked the king and assumed a chronic form in the course of which portions of the intestine sloughed. This condition sometimes occurs in the amoebic form of dysentery, cases of which sometimes last over two years.

Alexander Macalister

E

EAGLE

<e'-g'-l> ([רׄשׄ, *nesher*]; [ἀετός, *aetos*]; Latin *aquila*): A bird of the genus aquila of the family *falconidae*. The Hebrew *nesher*, meaning "to tear with the beak," is almost invariably translated "eagle," throughout the Bible; yet many of the most important references compel the admission that the bird to which they applied was a vulture. There were many large birds and carrion eaters flocking over Palestine, attracted by the offal from animals slaughtered for tribal feasts and continuous sacrifice. The eagle family could not be separated from the vultures by their habit of feeding, for they ate the offal from slaughter as well as the vultures. One distinction always holds good. Eagles never flock. They select the tallest trees of the forest, the topmost crag of the mountain, and pairs live in solitude, hunting and feeding singly, whenever possible carrying their prey to the nest so that the young may gain strength and experience by tearing at it and feeding themselves. The vultures are friendly, and collect and feed in flocks. So wherever it is recorded that a "flock came down on a carcass," there may have been an eagle or two in it, but the body of it were vultures. Because they came in such close contact with birds of prey, the natives came nearer dividing them into families than any birds. Of perhaps a half-dozen, they recognized three eagles, they knew three vultures, four or five falcons, and several kites; but almost every Biblical reference is translated "eagle," no matter how evident the text makes it that the bird was a vulture. For example, [3010]Micah 1:16: "Make thee bald, and cut off thy hair for the children of thy delight: enlarge thy baldness as the eagle (m "vulture"); for they are gone into captivity from thee." This is a reference to the custom of shaving the head when in mourning, but as Palestine knew no bald eagle, the text could refer only to the bare head and neck of the griffon vulture. The eagles were, when hunger-driven, birds of prey; the vultures, carrion feeders only. There was a golden eagle (the osprey of the King James Version), not very common, distinguished by its tan-colored head; the imperial eagle, more numerous and easily identified by a dark head and white shoulders; a spotted eagle; a tawny eagle, much more common and readily distinguished by its plumage; and the short-toed eagle, most

common of all and especially a bird of prey, as also a small hooded eagle so similar to a vulture that it was easily mistaken for one, save that it was very bold about taking its own food.

The first Biblical reference to the eagle referred to the right bird. ⁽⁰²⁹⁰⁴⁾Exodus 19:4: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself." This "bare you on eagles' wings" must not be interpreted to mean that an eagle ever carried anything on its back. It merely means that by strength of powerful wing it could carry quite a load with its feet and frequently was seen doing this. Vultures never carried anything; they feasted and regurgitated what they had eaten to their young. The second reference is found in ⁽⁰³¹¹³⁾Leviticus 11:13 and repeated in ⁽⁰⁵¹⁴²⁾Deuteronomy 14:12, the lists of abominations. It would seem peculiar that Moses would find it necessary to include eagles in this list until it is known that Arab mountaineers were eating these birds at that time. The next falls in ⁽⁰⁵²⁸⁴⁹⁾Deuteronomy 28:49: "Yahweh will bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand." This also refers to the true eagle and points out that its power of sustained flight, and the speed it could attain when hastening to its hunger-clamoring young, had been observed. The next reference is in ⁽⁰⁵³²¹¹⁾Deuteronomy 32:11:

> "As an eagle that stirreth up her nest, That fluttereth over her young, He spread abroad his wings, he took them, He bare them on his pinions."

This is good natural history at last. Former versions made these lines read as if the eagle carried its young on its wings, a thing wholly incompatible with flight in any bird. Samuel's record of the lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan is a wonderful poetic outburst and contains reference to this homing flight of the eagle (⁽¹⁰⁰¹²³⁾2 Samuel 1:23). In ⁽¹⁸⁰⁹²⁶⁾Job 9:26 the arrow-like downward plunge of the hunger-driven eagle is used in comparison with the flight of time. In Job 39, which contains more good natural history than any other chapter of the Bible, will be found everything concerning the eagle anyone need know:

"Is it at thy command that the eagle mounteth up, And maketh her nest on high? On the cliff she dwelleth, and maketh her home, Upon the point of the cliff, and the stronghold. From thence she spieth out the prey; Her eyes behold it afar off. Her young ones also suck up blood: And where the slain are, there is she" (⁽¹⁸³⁹²⁷⁾Job 39:27-30).

[19A35]Psalm 103:5 is a reference to the long life of the eagle. The bird has been known to live to an astonishing age in captivity; under natural conditions, the age it attains can only be guessed.

> "Who satisfieth thy desire with good things, So that thy youth is renewed like the eagle."

[20235]Proverbs 23:5 compares the flight of wealth with that of an eagle; 30:17 touches on the fact that the eye of prey is the first place attacked in eating, probably because it is the most vulnerable point and so is frequently fed to the young.

[20019]Proverbs 30:19: "The way of an eagle in the air; The way of a serpent upon a rock: The way of a ship in the midst of the sea; And the way of a man with a maiden."

This reference to the eagle is to that wonderful power of flight that enables a bird to hang as if frozen in the sky, for long periods appearing to our sight immovable, or to sail and soar directly into the eye of the sun, seeming to rejoice in its strength of flight and to exult in the security and freedom of the upper air.

The word "way" is here improperly translated. To the average mind it always means a road, a path. In this instance it should be translated:

The characteristics of an eagle in the air; The habit of a serpent upon the rock; The path of a ship in the midst of the sea; And the manner of a man with a maid.

Each of these lines stood a separate marvel to Agur, and had no connection with the others (but compare The Wisdom of Solomon 5:10,11, and *see* WAY).

[23431]Isaiah 40:31 is another flight reference. [24916]Jeremiah 49:16 refers to the inaccessible heights at which the eagle loves to build and rear its young. [24922]Jeremiah 49:22 refers to the eagle's power of flight. [26010]Ezekiel 1:10 recounts a vision of the prophet in which strange living creatures had faces resembling eagles. The same book (17:3) contains the parable of the eagle: "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh: A great eagle with great wings and long pinions, full of feathers, which had divers colors, came unto Lebanon, and took the top of the cedar." [28001]Hosea 8:1 is another flight reference. Obad 1:4 is almost identical with [24916]Jeremiah 49:16. The next reference is that of Micah, and really refers to the griffon vulture ([30101]Micah 1:16). In [35108]Habakkuk 1:8 the reference is to swift flight. [41928]Matthew 24:28

undoubtedly refers to vultures. In Revelation 4:7 the eagle is used as a symbol of strength. In Revelation 8:13 the bird is represented as speaking: "And I saw, and I heard an eagle (the King James Version "angel"), flying in mid heaven, saying with a great voice, Woe, woe, woe, for them that dwell on the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, who are yet to sound." The eagle makes its last appearance in the vision of the woman and the dragon (Revelation 12:14).

Gene Stratton-Porter

EANES

<e'-a-nez> (1 Esdras 9:21): the Revised Version (British and American) *MANES* (which see), the Revised Version, margin "Harim."

EAR

<er> ([ˆzaɒ'ozen]; [οὖς, *ous*], [ὠτίον, *otion*], the latter word (literally, "earlet") in all the Gospels only used of the ear of the high priest's servant, which was cut off by Peter: Matthew 26:51; Mark 14:47; Luke 22:51 (not 22:50); John 18:10,26):

(1) The physical organ of hearing which was considered of peculiar importance as the chief instrument by which man receives information and commandments. For this reason the ear of the priest had to be specially sanctified, the tip of the right ear being touched with sacrificial blood at the consecration (Leviticus 8:23). Similarly the ear of the cleansed leper had to be rededicated to the service of God by blood and oil (Leviticus 14:14,17,25,28). The ear-lobe of a servant, who preferred to remain with the family of his master rather than become free in the seventh year, was to be publicly bored or pierced with an awl in token of perpetual servitude (Exodus 21:6). It has been suggested that Psalm 40:6 should be interpreted in this sense, but this is not probable (see below). The cutting off of the ears and noses of captives was an atrocious custom of war frequently alluded to in oriental literature, (Ezekiel 23:25). The phrase "to open the ear," which originally means the uncovering of the ear by partially removing the turban, so as to permit a clearer hearing, is used in the sense of revealing a secret or of giving important (private) information (1 Samuel 9:15; 20:2,12,13; 2 Samuel 7:27; 1 Chronicles 17:25; also Psalm 40:6), and the New Testament promises similarly that

"things which eye saw not, and ear heard not" are to be revealed by the reconciled God to the heart that in gladsome surrender has come to Him to be taught by His spirit (⟨46109⟩1 Corinthians 2:9).

(2) The inner ear, the organ of spiritual perception. If the ear listens, the heart willingly submits, but often the spiritual ear is "hardened" (⟨23610⟩Isaiah 6:10; ⟨38711⟩Zechariah 7:11; ⟨40315⟩Matthew 13:15; ⟨44827⟩Acts 28:27), or "heavy" (⟨23610⟩Isaiah 6:10; also ⟨05904⟩Deuteronomy 29:4), either by self-seeking obstinacy or by the judgment of an insulted God. Such unwilling hearers are compared to the "deaf adder .... which hearkeneth not to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely" (⟨19804⟩Psalm 58:4,5; compare also ⟨20213⟩Proverbs 21:13; 28:9; ⟨44057⟩Acts 7:57). The expression "He that hath ears to hear let him hear" is frequent in the Synoptic Gospels, occurring 7 or 8 times: ⟨40115⟩Matthew 11:15; 13:9,43; ⟨41009⟩Mark 4:9,23 (7:16 the Revised Version (British and American) omits); ⟨42008⟩Luke 8:8; 14:35, and while not found in the Fourth Gospel, it occurs seven times in Revelation 2 and 3. "Itching ears," on the other hand, are those that have become tired of the sound of oft-repeated truth and that long for new though deceitful teaching (⟨55403⟩2 Timothy 4:3). Ears may "tingle" at startling news, especially of disaster (⟨09311⟩1 Samuel 3:11; ⟨12212⟩2 Kings 21:12; ⟨24903⟩Jeremiah 19:3).

(3) God's ears are often mentioned in the anthropopathic style of Scripture, signifying the ability of God to receive the petitions of His people, for "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear?" (⟨19409⟩Psalm 94:9; also ⟨19017⟩Psalm 10:17; 34:15; 130:2; ⟨23901⟩Isaiah 59:1; ⟨60312⟩1 Peter 3:12). But God also hears the murmurings of the wicked against Him (⟨04110⟩Numbers 11:1; ⟨12928⟩2 Kings 19:28; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:10; ⟨59504⟩James 5:4); still it lies in His power to refuse to hear (⟨26818⟩Ezekiel 8:18; ⟨25308⟩Lamentations 3:8; compare also ⟨25856⟩Lamentations 3:56).

H. L. E. Luering

EARING

<er'-ing> ([ＶＹＲＪ ; *harish*]): The Hebrew word is twice translated "earing" in the King James Version (⟨04506⟩Genesis 45:6; ⟨02321⟩Exodus 34:21). The Revised Version (British and American) rendering is "plowing": "There shall be neither plowing nor harvest." See also ⟨05204⟩Deuteronomy 21:4; ⟨09812⟩1 Samuel 8:12; ⟨23024⟩Isaiah 30:24.

EARLY

<ur'-li> ([ὄρθρος, *orthros*], and related words; [πρωΐ, *proi*]): The word

generally refers to the day, and means the hour of dawn or soon after (⁰¹⁹¹²Genesis 19:2; ¹⁴⁶¹⁵2 Chronicles 36:15; ²⁰⁶⁰⁴Hosea 6:4; ⁴²⁴²²Luke 24:22). Sometimes it refers to the beginning of the season, e.g. the early rain (¹⁹⁸⁰⁶Psalm 84:6; ⁵⁹⁵⁰⁷James 5:7; *see* RAIN). It may also have the sense of "speedily" (¹⁹⁴⁶⁵Psalm 46:5). The early morning is frequently commended as the hour for prayer. See examples of Jesus (⁴¹⁰³⁵Mark 1:35; ⁴²¹³⁸Luke 21:38; ⁴³⁸⁰²John 8:2); also Abraham (⁰¹⁹²⁷Genesis 19:27), Jacob (⁰²⁸¹⁸Genesis 28:18), Gideon (⁰⁷⁰⁶⁸Judges 6:38), Samuel (⁰⁹¹⁵²1 Samuel 15:12), David (⁰⁹⁷²⁰1 Samuel 17:20).

G. H. Gerberding

EARNEST

<ur'-nest> ([ἀρῥαβών, *arrhabon*]): Found three times in the New Testament: The "earnest of our inheritance" (⁴⁹⁰¹⁴Ephesians 1:14); "the earnest of the Spirit" (⁴⁷⁰²²2 Corinthians 1:22; 5:5). It has an equivalent in Hebrew `erabhon (found in ⁰¹⁸¹⁷Genesis 38:17,18,20), in Latin arrabo, French arrhes and the Old English arles. The term is mercantile and comes originally from the Phoenicians. Its general meaning is that of a pledge or token given as the assurance of the fulfillment of a bargain or promise. It also carries with it the idea of forfeit, such as is now common in land deals, only from the obverse side. In other words, the one promising to convey property, wages or blessing binds the promise with an advance gift or pledge partaking of the quality of the benefit to be bestowed. If the agreement be about wages, then a part of the wages is advanced; if it be about land, then a clod given to the purchaser or beneficiary may stand as the pledge of final and complete conveyance of the property.

Figurative: In the spiritual sense, as used in the passages above named, the reference is to the work of the Spirit of God in our hearts being a token and pledge of a perfect redemption and a heavenly inheritance. There is more than the idea of security in the word as used, for it clearly implies the continuity and identity of the blessing.

C. E. Schenk

EARRING

<er'-ring>: An ornamental pendant of some kind hanging from the ears has been worn by both sexes in oriental lands from the earliest times. Among the Greeks and Romans, as with western peoples in general, its use was confined to females. The ears in the statue of the Medicean Venus are

pierced and probably were originally ornamented with earrings. It is clear, however, that among the Hebrews and related oriental peoples earrings were worn by both sexes. Abraham's servant "put the earring upon (Rebekah's) face, and the bracelets upon her hands" (^{<01247>}Genesis 24:47 the King James Version), in accordance with custom, evidently, but it is implied that it was customary for men also to wear earrings, in that the relatives and friends of Job "every one (gave him) an earring of gold" (^{<18211>}Job 42:11 the King James Version). Such ornaments were usually made of gold, finely wrought, and often set with precious stones, as archaeology has shown. Such jewels were worn in ancient times for protective as well as for decorative purposes. the Revised Version (British and American) renders "amulets" for the King James Version "earrings" in ^{<20820>}Isaiah 3:20, the Hebrew word (*lechashim*) being elsewhere associated with serpent-charming; but the earrings of ^{<01504>}Genesis 35:4, also, were more than mere ornaments, so the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) may both be right in their renderings here (Kennedy). The influence of Egypt, where amulets of various kinds were worn by men and gods, by the living and the dead, is shown by recent excavations at Gezer, Taanach and Megiddo.

See AMULET; ORNAMENT.

George. B. Eager

EARTH

<*urth*> ([hmda} *'adhamah*], [6ra, *'erets*], [rp[; *'aphar*]; [γῆ, *ge*], [οἰκουμένη, *oikoumene*]): In a hilly limestone country like Palestine, the small amount of iron oxide in the rocks tends to be oxidized, and thereby to give a prevailing reddish color to the soil. This is especially the case on relatively barren hills where there is little organic matter present to prevent reddening and give a more blackish tinge.

'Adhamah (compare *'adham*, "a man," and Adam) is from *'adham*, "to be red," and is used in the senses: "earth" (^{<02024>}Exodus 20:24), "land" (^{<19A55>}Psalm 105:35), a "land" or country (^{<23142>}Isaiah 14:2), "ground" (^{<00411>}Genesis 4:11), "the earth" (^{<01704>}Genesis 7:4).
The word most in use is *'erets*, undoubtedly from a most ancient root occurring in many languages, as English "earth," German Erde, Arabic *'ard*. It is used in most of the senses of *'adhamah*, but less as "soil" and more as "the earth" as a part of the universe; frequently with shamayim,

"heavens," as in [01001]Genesis 1:1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

`Aphar* and its root word and derivatives are closely paralleled in the Arabic, and refer mainly to "dust" or "dry earth" (compare Arabic `afir, "to be of the color of dust"; `afar "dust"; ya`fur, "a gazelle"; Hebrew `opher*, "a gazelle"). Compare [01027]Genesis 2:7: "Yahweh God formed man of the dust of the ground"; [18212]Job 2:12: ".... sprinkled dust upon their heads"; [19A29]Psalm 104:29: ".... they die, and return to their dust"; [01827]Genesis 18:27: "dust and ashes."

In the Septuagint and New Testament, *ge* is used in nearly all cases, *oikoumene* being used a few times for the "habitable earth," as in [42226]Luke 21:26 the King James Version.

See further ANTHROPOLOGY; ASTRONOMY; EVOLUTION; WORLD.

Alfred Ely Day

EARTH, CIRCLE OF THE

See ASTRONOMY, III, 1, 3.

EARTH, CORNERS OF THE

The "corners" or "ends" of the earth are its "wings" (*kanephoth ha-'arets*), i.e. its borders or extremities. The word in general means a wing, because the wing of a bird is used as a covering for its young, and from this meaning it acquires that of the extremity of anything stretched out. It is thus used in [05212]Deuteronomy 22:12: "Thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four borders (wings) of thy vesture, wherewith thou coverest thyself." It thus also means the coasts or boundaries of the land surface of the earth; its extremities. It is translated "corners" in [23112]Isaiah 11:12; "ends" in [18703]Job 37:3 and 38:13. The "four corners" of the earth ([23112]Isaiah 11:12) or "land" ([26702]Ezekiel 7:2) are therefore simply the extremities of the land in the four cardinal directions.

See also ASTRONOMY, III, 3.

E. W. Maunder

EARTH, ENDS OF THE

See EARTH, CORNERS OF THE.

EARTH, PILLARS OF THE

See ASTRONOMY, III, 2.

EARTH, THE NEW

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, IX; HEAVENS, NEW.

EARTH, VAULT, OF THE

<volt>: In one passage God is said to have "founded his vault (*'aghuddah*) upon the earth" (³⁰⁹⁰⁶Amos 9:6). It is not quite certain whether this dome or vault refers to the earth itself, or to the heavens arched above it. The latter is the usual interpretation, but in either case the reference is rather to the strength of the structure than to its form; the word implying something that is firmly bound together and hence, an arch or dome because of its stability.

See also ASTRONOMY, III, 2.

EARTHEN, VESSELS

<urth'-'-n>, ([חֶרֶשׂ , *cheres*], [יֵצֶר, *yetser*]; [ὀστράκινος, *ostrakinos*]): These vessels were heat-resisting and were used for cooking and for boiling clothes (⁰³⁶⁵⁸Leviticus 6:28; 11:33; 14:5,50). They were probably non-porous and took the place of the kidri or ma'ajin used in Syria today. A traveler in the interior of Palestine may still meet with the hospitality showed to David (¹⁰⁷²⁸2 Samuel 17:28). The generous natives brought not only gifts of food but the necessary vessels in which to cook it. An earthen vessel was used to preserve a land deed (²⁴²¹⁴Jeremiah 32:14). Figurative: In ²⁴⁹⁰¹Jeremiah 19:1 breaking of an earthen vessel was symbolical of the destruction of Jerusalem. These vessels were also used to symbolize the commonness (²⁵⁰⁰²Lamentations 4:2) and frailness of our bodies (⁴⁷⁰⁰⁷2 Corinthians 4:7).

See POTTERY.

James A. Patch

EARTHLY

<urth'-li> ([ἐπίγειος, *epigeios*], "existing upon the earth," "terrestrial," from [ἐπί, *epi*], "upon" and [γῆ, *ge*], "earth"; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) terrenus): Of or pertaining to the earth, or to the present state of existence. The word *epigeios* is not found in Septuagint, but occurs in classical Greek from Plato down. In Plutarch Mor. 566 D, it occurs in the remarkable phrase, "that which is earthly of the soul." Its meaning is primarily merely local ("being on the earth"). The word *ge* ("earth") has not in itself an ethical significance, and does not carry a suggestion of moral taint, such as the word *kosmos* ("world") has, especially in the Johannine writings, and *sarx* ("flesh"), especially in Paul. It does, however, suggest a certain limitation or frailty; and in some passages, the context gives the adjective *epigeios* an ethical color, though in the New Testament the purely local meaning is never lost sight of. It is translated "earthly" in the following passages:

(1) [4082]John 3:12, "if I told you earthly things," i.e. things which are realized on earth, things within the circle of human observation, truths of subjective experience (e.g. the new birth); in contrast to "heavenly things," the objective truths which, as not directly realizable in human experience, must be revealed from above (the mysteries of the Divine purpose and plans). Clearly "earthly" here implies no moral contrast to the heavenly or spiritual.

(2) [4701]2 Corinthians 5:1, "the earthly house of our tabernacle," i.e. the body with which we are clothed on earth, in contrast to the spiritual resurrection-body, "which is from heaven" (verse 2). Here again the word has a merely local, not an ethical, significance.

(3) [5089]Philippians 3:19, "whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things," i.e. whose thoughts rest on earth, on the pleasures of life here below.

(4) [5085]James 3:15, "This wisdom is not a wisdom that cometh down from above, but is earthly," i.e. it is on the plane of life on earth, merely human, incapable of ascending to the level of Divine wisdom. In the last two passages, the literal local meaning is still evident, but the word shades off into the moral and suggests that which is opposed to the spiritual in character. The same word is translated "terrestrial" in [4650]1 Corinthians 15:40, and "things in (the Revised Version (British and

American) "on") earth" in ⁵ᴰ²⁹⁰Philippians 2:10 the King James Version has "earthly" in ⁴⁰⁶³John 3:31, where it translates *ek tes ges* = literally, "out of the earth," the reference being to the character and mission of the Baptist as partaking of the limitations of his earthly (human) origin, in contrast to the Messiah "that cometh from heaven." The the King James Version rendering is somewhat misleading, for it introduces a confusion with the "earthly" of ⁴⁰⁶²John 3:12(see Westcott in the place cited.). The Revised Version (British and American) rightly renders "of the earth."

"Earthly" is to be distinguished from "earthy" = made of earth or clay (*choikos*, from *chous*, "earth dug out," ⁴⁶¹⁵⁷1 Corinthians 15:47 ff).

D. Miall Edwards

EARTHQUAKE

<urth'-kwak> ([∨[ͭ ″ , *ra`ash*]; [σεισμός, *seismos*]):

1. Earthquakes in Palestine:

The last earthquake which worked any damage in Palestine and Syria occurred in 1837, and destroyed the village of Safed, near Mt. Hermon, and was felt even all the way to Hebron. Since that time a few feeble shocks have been felt but no damage was done. The region is just on the edge of the great earthquake circle whose center is in Armenia, and is liable to earthquakes. The large number of references in the Bible to earthquakes, and the evident fear in the minds of the people of those times, would seem to indicate that they were more frequent in Bible times than recently.

2. Causes of Earthquakes:

There are three main causes of earthquakes:

(1) **Earthslips.**

In the slow process of cooling, the crust of the earth tends to wrinkle and fold as it contracts. This causes a stress to be set up in the strata composing the crust. If the strata are too rigid to bend there must come after a time a break or fault. The shock caused by the break, which is usually several miles below the surface of the earth, is an earthquake, and it spreads in the form of earth waves from the break as center. Seismographs

in all parts of the world are now adjusted to receive the waves even though the origin is on the opposite side of the earth.

(2) **Explosion of Steam or Gases under the Surface.**

Some earthquakes, especially those underneath the sea, are thought to be caused by water seeping through the soil and rocks and finding its way to the heated masses below. Steam is formed and if there is no escape for it, an explosion takes place whose force is felt on the surface.

(3) **Volcanic.**

As earthquakes are of common occurrence in volcanic regions it seems likely that there is some connection between the two, but the relation has not been fully traced. It may be that the second cause is the origin of both the volcano and earthquake.

See further, DELUGE OF NOAH.

3. Earthquakes in Jerusalem:

Many destructive earthquakes have been recorded in the history of Syria, but they have been mostly in the north, in the region of Aleppo. Jerusalem itself has seldom been affected by earthquakes. The Hauran beyond the Jordan is covered with volcanic remains and signs of violent shocks, and the cities on the coast have suffered much, but Jerusalem on the higher ground between has usually escaped with little destruction.

4. Earthquakes in Scripture:

A number of earthquakes are mentioned in the Scriptures:

(1) At Mount Sinai (Exodus 19:18);

(2) Korah and companions destroyed in fissure and sinking ground (Numbers 16:31; Ant, IV, iii, 3);

(3) in the Philistine camp in the days of Saul (1 Samuel 14:15);

(4) after Elijah's flight (1 Kings 19:11);

(5) in the reign of Uzziah, between 790 and 740 BC (Amos 1:1); Zechariah 14:5 probably refers to the same (Ant., IX, x, 4);
(6) at Christ's death (Matthew 27:51-54);

(7) at Christ's resurrection (Matthew 28:2);

(8) at Philippi when Paul and Silas were freed from prison (Acts 16:26). Most of these shocks seem to have been slight and caused little loss of life. Josephus mentions one in the reign of Herod, "such as had not happened at any other time, which was very destructive to men and cattle" (Ant., XV, v, 2). Professor G. A. Smith in his recent work on Jerusalem is of the opinion that earthquakes were sufficiently frequent and strong to account for the appearance and disappearance of Nehemiah's Fountain (Jerus, I, 74). The Hebrew *ra`ash* is commonly used to mean a great noise. Large earthquakes are sometimes accompanied by a rumbling noise, but as a rule they come silently and without warning.

5. Symbolic Use:

In the Scriptures earthquakes are mentioned as tokens of God's power (Job 9:6) and of His presence and anger (Psalm 68:8; 18:7; Isaiah 13:13): "She shall be visited of Yahweh of hosts .... with earthquake, and great noise" (Isaiah 29:6); also as a sign of Christ's "coming, and of the end of the world" (Matthew 24:3-7). See also Revelation 11:13,19; 16:18.

LITERATURE.

Milne, Earthquakes (Inter. Scient. series); Plumptre, Biblical Studies, 136; Dutton, Earthquakes.

Alfred H. Joy

EASE

<ez> ([ˆnaɣ″ , *sha'anan*], [ˆna}ɣ″ , *shal'anan*], chiefly, "at ease"): Used 19 times in the Old Testament and once in the New Testament, most frequently meaning tranquillity, security or comfort of mind; in an ethical sense, indicating carelessness or indifference with reference to one's moral or religious interests. The prophet Jeremiah used the phrase as an indication of national or tribal indifference: "Moab hath been at ease from his youth" (Jeremiah 48:11); "I am very sore displeased with the nations that are at ease" (Zechariah 1:15). Frequent allusions are made also by various prophets to individuals or groups of individuals, as "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion" (Amos 6:1); "Rise up, ye women that are at ease" (Isaiah 32:9), and "Tremble, ye women that are at ease"

(²³³²¹Isaiah 32:11).

The word in another form is used also in a verbal sense and to apply to physical ease and comfort, as "My couch shall ease my complaint" (¹⁸⁰⁷³Job 7:13; compare especially ¹⁴⁰⁰⁴2 Chronicles 10:4,9). Simple mental tranquillity or peace of mind is also expressed by it (²⁴⁶²⁷Jeremiah 46:27). The single instance of its use in the New Testament is illustrative of its figurative but most common usage in the Old Testament, where it refers to moral indifference in the parable of the Rich Fool: "Soul .... take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry" (⁴²¹²⁹Luke 12:19).

Walter G. Clippinger

EAST, CHILDREN OF THE

<est>, ([j rzmi, *mizrach*], [μdq, *qedhem*], [μdqe*qedhem*], and other derivatives of the same root; [ἀνατολή, *anatole*]): *Mizrach* is the equivalent of the Arabic meshriq, "the orient" or "place of sunrise." In the same way *ma`arabh*, "west," corresponds to the Arabic maghrib, and both *mizrach* and *ma`arabh* occur in ^{19A312}Psalm 103:12: "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us." *Qadham*, "to precede" (whence *qedhem*, "east"), and its derivatives correspond closely to the Arabic *qadham*, except that the Arabic derivatives do not include the signification "east." In the majority of cases "east" and other words of direction require no explanation, but the expressions "the children of the east" (*bene qedhem*), "the land of the children of the east" (*'erets bene qedhem*), and "the east country" (*'erets qedhem*), belong to a different category. In the story of Gideon (⁰⁷⁰⁶³Judges 6:3,13; 7:12; 8:10), we find several times the expression "the Midianites and the Amalekites and the children of the east." In ⁰⁷⁰²⁴Judges 8:24 it is said of the same host: "For they "Go up to Kedar, and destroy the children of the east. Their tents and had golden earrings, because they were Ishmaelites." In ²⁴⁹²⁸Jeremiah 49:28,29: "Go up to Kedar, and destroy the children of the east. Their tents and their flocks shall they take." In ⁰¹²⁰⁶Genesis 25:6: "But unto the sons of the concubines, that Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts; and he sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward, unto the east country." Now Ishmael is the son of Abraham and Hagar, Midian of Abraham and Keturah, Kedar the son of Ishmael, and Amalek the grandson of Esau, dwelling in Edom. It is evident that we have to do with the Syrian desert and in a general way with Arabia, especially its northern part, and with peoples like the modern Bedouin who

kept camels and dwelt in tents, "houses of hair" (buyut sha`r), as they are called by the Arabs of today.

A striking passage is ^{◁0290▷}Genesis 29:1: "Then Jacob went on his journey, and came to the land of the children of the east." As one journeys eastward through the country East of the Jordan he traverses first a region of towns and villages with fields of grain, and then the wide desert where the Bedouin wander with their herds. The line is a sharp one. Within a very few hours he passes from the settled part where the rain, though scanty, is sufficient to bring the grain to maturity, to the bare desert.

Job was "the greatest of all the children of the east" (^{◁8010▷}Job 1:3). These desert people had a name for wisdom as we see from ^{◁1080▷}1 Kings 4:30, "Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east, and all the wisdom of Egypt"; and from ^{◁4000▷}Matthew 2:1: "Now when Jesus was born .... Wisemen from the east came."

Alfred Ely Day

EAST COUNTRY

<kun'-tri> ([j rzⅰ̇mi6ra, *'erets mizrach*]): Lit. "country of the sunrise" over against the "country of the sunset" (^{◁8807▷}Zechariah 8:7). The two together form a poetical expression indicating the whole earth.

EAST GATE

See GATE, THE EAST.

EAST (EASTERN), SEA

<es'-tern> (^{◁8408▷}Zechariah 14:8).
See DEAD SEA.

EAST WIND

See WIND.

EASTER

<es'-ter> ([πάσχα, *pascha*], from Aramaic [aj sP″ , *paccha'*] and Hebrew [j s″ P, *pecach*], the Passover festival): The English word comes from the Anglo-Saxon Eastre or Estera, a Teutonic goddess to whom sacrifice was offered in April, so the name was transferred to the paschal

feast. The word does not properly occur in Scripture, although the King James Version has it in ⁜Acts 12:4 where it stands for Passover, as it is rightly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). There is no trace of Easter celebration in the New Testament, though some would see an intimation of it in ⁜1 Corinthians 5:7. The Jewish Christians in the early church continued to celebrate the Passover, regarding Christ as the true paschal lamb, and this naturally passed over into a commemoration of the death and resurrection of our Lord, or an Easter feast. This was preceded by a fast, which was considered by one party as ending at the hour of the crucifixion, i.e. at 3 o'clock on Friday, by another as continuing until the hour of the resurrection before dawn on Easter morning. Differences arose as to the time of the Easter celebration, the Jewish Christians naturally fixing it at the time of the Passover feast which was regulated by the paschal moon. According to this reckoning it began on the evening of the 14th day of the moon of the month of *Nican* without regard to the day of the week, while the GentileChristians identified it with the first day of the week, i.e. the Sunday of the resurrection, irrespective of the day of the month. This latter practice finally prevailed in the church, and those who followed the other reckoning were stigmatized as heretics. But differences arose as to the proper Sunday for the Easter celebration which led to long and bitter controversies. The Council of Nice, 325 AD, decreed that it should be on Sunday, but did not fix the particular Sunday. It was left to the bishop of Alexandria to determine, since that city was regarded as the authority in astronomical matters and he was to communicate the result of his determination to the other bishops. But this was not satisfactory, especially to the western churches, and a definite rule for the determination of Easter was needed. By some it was kept as early as March 21, and by others as late as April 25, and others followed dates between. The rule was finally adopted, in the 7th century, to celebrate Easter on the Sunday following the 14th day of the calendar moon which comes on, or after, the vernal equinox which was fixed for March 21. This is not always the astronomical moon, but near enough for practical purposes, and is determined without astronomical calculation by certain intricate rules adopted by ecclesiastical authority. These rules involve the Dominical Letters, or the first seven of the alphabet, representing the days of the week, A standing for the first day of the year and the one on which Sunday falls being called the Dominical for that year. There are also involved the Golden Numbers and the Epacts, the first being the numbers from 1 to 19, the cycle of the moon when its phases recur on the same days of the year,

the first of the cycle being that in which the new moon falls on January 1. The Epacts indicate the moon's age at the beginning of each year. Easter was thus fixed by these rules, but another difficulty arose when the Gregorian calendar was adopted in 1582, the difference between it and the Julian being then 10 days. This of course affected the determination of Easter, and its celebration by the Greek church, which has never admitted the Gregorian calendar, occurs usually at a different time from that followed by the western churches. This difference may be as much as five weeks and it may occur as late as April 30, while in the West it cannot occur later than April 25 nor earlier than March 22. Occasionally the two come together but this is rare, since the difference between the two calendars is now 13 days. The Easter feast has been and still is regarded as the greatest in the Christian church, since it commemorates the most important event in the life of its Founder.

H. Porter

EBAL; OBAL

<e'-bal> ([l by[ẹ`*ebhal*], "bare") or ([l bw□, `*obhal*]):

(1) A people and region of Joktanite, Arabia. See Dillmann, Genesis, and Glaser, *Skizze*, II, 426. The latter form of the name is that given in [01008]Genesis 10:28, the former in [13022]1 Chronicles 1:22 and in the Sam text of [01008]Genesis 10:28.

(2) A son of Shobal, son of Seir, the Horite ([01623]Genesis 36:23; [13040]1 Chronicles 1:40).

EBAL, MOUNT

<e'-bal>, ([l by[er·h″ , *har `ebhal*]; [Γαιβάλ, *Gaibal*]): Rises North of the vale of Shechem, over against Mt. Gerizim on the South. The mountain (Arabic *el-Iclamiyeh*) reaches a height of 1,402 ft. above the floor of the valley, and 3,077 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean. The Samaritans feign that Gerizim is the higher; but it is more than 200 ft. lower than Ebal. These two mountains overhang the pass through which runs the main artery of intercourse between East and West, the city of Nablus lying in the throat of the valley to the West. The ancient Shechem probably stood farther to the East. The lower slopes of Ebal as one ascends from Nablus are covered with gardens and orchards, the copious streams from the fountains under Gerizim washing its foot, and spreading fertility and

beauty. The vine, the fig and the olive grow luxuriantly. Higher up we scramble over rough rocky terraces, where grow only the ubiquitous thistles and prickly shrubs.

From the broad summit a view of surpassing interest and beauty rewards the climber's toil. Westward beyond the hills and the plain of Sharon with its coast line of yellow sand running from Jaffa to Carmel, stretch the blue waters of the Mediterranean. From Carmel to Gilboa, Little Hermon and Tabor, roll the fruitful breadths of Esdraelon: the uplands of Galilee, with Nazareth showing on the brow above the plain, rise away to the buttresses of Lebanon in the North. From the snowy peak of Hermon the eye ranges over the Jaulan and Mount Gilead to the Mountain of Bashan in the East, with the steep eastern wall of the Jordan valley in the foreground. The land of Moab is visible beyond the Dead Sea; and the heights around Jerusalem close the view on the South.

Round this splendid mountain, seen from afar on all sides, religious associations have gathered from old time. The Moslem Weley on the top — the usual white-domed sanctuary — where it is said the head of the Baptist is buried, is doubtless the modern representative of some ancient seat of worship. The ruins of a church show that Christians also came under the spell of the hill.

The slopes of Ebal toward Gerizim played their part in that memorable scene, when, having conquered the central region of Palestine, Joshua led the people hither, erected an altar of unhewn stones, wrote upon the stones — either engraving on the stone itself, or impressing on plaster placed there for the purpose — a copy of the law, and then, as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded, placed half the tribes on the slope of Gerizim, and half on those of Ebal, and the ark with the priests and Levites in the center. Then with dramatic responses from the two divisions of the people, the blessings and the cursings of the law were read (^{⟨0680⟩}Joshua 8:30 ff; compare ^{⟨0571⟩}Deuteronomy 27:11 ff). In all the future, therefore, this mountain, towering aloft in the very heart of the land, would remind beholders far and near of their people's covenant with God. It has sometimes been questioned if the reading of the law could be heard by the people in the way described. The formation of the sides of the valley at the narrowest part, and the acoustics, which have been tested more than once, leave no reasonable doubt as to the possibility.

The importance of the mountain from a military point of view is illustrated by the ruins of a massive fortress found on the summit.

W. Ewing

EBED

<e'-bed> ([db[, `ebhedh], "servant"):

(1) Father of Gaal, who rebelled against Abimelech ([07926]Judges 9:26-35).

(2) A companion of Ezra in his return ([5806]Ezra 8:6) = Obeth (1 Esdras 8:32).

EBED-MELECH

<e-bed-me'-lek>, *<eb-ed-me'-lek>* ([Ël mAdb[, `ebhedh-mekekh], "servant of the king" or "of (god) Melek"): An Ethiopian eunuch in the service of King Zedekiah, who interceded with the king for the prophet Jeremiah and rescued him from the dungeon into which he had been cast to die ([2807]Jeremiah 38:7-13). For this, the word of Yahweh through Jeremiah promised Ebed-meleeh that his life should be spared in the fall of Jerusalem ([24915]Jeremiah 39:15-18).

EBEN-BOHAN

See BOHAN.

EBEN-EZEL

See EZEL.

EBEN-EZER

<eb-en-e'-zer> ([rz[h;ˆba, *'ebhen ha-`ezer*], "stone of the help"; [Ἀβενέζερ, *Abenezer*]):

(1) Here Israel was defeated by the Philistines, 4,000 men falling in the battle ([0901]1 Samuel 4:1 ff). It appears also to have been the scene of the disaster when the ark of God was captured ([0903]1 Samuel 4:3 ff). The place is not identified. It was over against Aphek; but this site is also unknown (compare [06218]Joshua 12:18). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it between Jerusalem and Ascalon, in the neighborhood of Beth-shemesh. Conder suggests Deir Aban, fully 2 miles East of `Ain Shems (PEF, III, 24).

(2) A stone set up by Samuel to perpetuate the memory of the signal victory granted to Israel over the Philistines in answer to his prayer (⁰⁹⁷¹²1 Samuel 7:12). It stood between Mizpeh and Shen. The latter is probably identical with `Ain Sinia, North of Bethel. This defines the district in which it may be found; but no identification is yet possible.

W. Ewing

EBER

<e'-ber> ([rb[e`*ebher*]; [″Εβερ, *Eber*], in Gen; [᾽Ωβήδ, *Obed*], in Ch):

(1) Occurs in the genealogies (⁰¹¹⁰²¹Genesis 10:21,25; 11:14 ff) as the great-grandson of Shem and father of Peleg and Joktan. The word means "the other side," "across," and the form "Hebrew," which is derived from it, is intended to denote the people or tribe who came "from the other, side of the river" (i.e. the Euphrates), from Haran (⁰¹¹¹³¹Genesis 11:31), whence Abraham and his dependents migrated to Canaan.

(2) A Gadite (¹³⁰⁵¹³1 Chronicles 5:13).

(3)

(4) Two Benjamites (¹³³⁸²1 Chronicles 8:12,22).

(5) The head of a priestly family (¹⁶¹²²⁰Nehemiah 12:20).

A. C. Grant

EBEZ

<e'-bez> ([6ba, *'ebhets*], meaning unknown; [᾽Ρέβες, *Rhebes*]; the King James Version Abez): One of the 16 cities in Issachar (⁰⁶¹⁹²⁰Joshua 19:20). The name seems to be cognate to that of the judge Ibzan (⁰⁷¹²¹⁸Judges 12:8-10). All else concerning it is conjecture.

EBIASAPH

<e-bi'-a-saf>: A descendant of Kohath the son of Levi (¹³⁰⁶⁵¹1 Chronicles 6:37).

See ABIASAPH.

EBIONISM; EBIONITES

<e'-bi-o-niz'-m>, *<e'-bio-nits>* ([Ἐβιωναῖοι, *Ebionaioi*], from [אֶבְיוֹנִים, *'ebhyonim*], "poor people"):

GENERAL STATEMENT:

The Ebionites were a sect of heretics frequently mentioned by the early Fathers. In regard to their opinions, as in regard to those of most early heretical sects, there is the difficulty that to a large extent we are dependent for our information on their opponents. These opponents were not generally very careful to apprehend exactly the views of those whose opinions they undertook to refute. It adds to the difficulty in the present case that there is a dubiety as to the persons designated by the title. Sometimes, it is admitted, the name was used to designate all Jewish Christians irrespective of their opinions; at other times it denotes a sect akin to the Gnostics, who ascribed a purely human origin to our Lord. There are, however, certain works, the Clementine writings, which from statements of the Fathers may be assumed to represent the views of this sect, but as these represent views to some extent divergent, it is difficult to decide which is the truly Ebionitic. There are also certain apocalyptic books which present affinities with Ebionism. The quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews — the only gospel the Ebionites received — likewise afford means of appreciating their views. This gospel has come down to us only in isolated quotations, for the accuracy of which we have no guarantee. Finally, it has to be borne in mind that no sect can persist through centuries of changing circumstances, and not in turn undergo change.

I. ORIGIN OF THE NAME.

1. The Poor Ones:

Tertullian and Epiphanius assume the sect to have received its name from a certain Ebion or Hebion. Others of the Fathers, without affirming it, use language which seems to imply the belief in a person called Ebion. This, however, is generally now regarded as a mistake. No trace of the existence of such a person is to be found. The sect in question seems to have assumed the name Ebionites, "the poor ones," from the first Beatitude (Matthew 5:3), claiming to be the continuation into the new

dispensation of the "poor and needy" of the Psalms, e.g. 69:33; 70:5; 74:21.

It has been mooted that the sect may have had a leader who assumed the title "the poor man." Besides that we have no trace of his existence, the name would almost certainly have been treated as an Aramaic word and put in the status emphaticus as Ebiona, which in Greek would have become Ebionas.

2. Origin of the Name:

The ordinary view of the origin of the name has the advantage of analogy in its favor. The pre-Reformation Protestants of the 12th and 13th centuries in France called themselves "the poor men" (of Lyons). The fact that the apostle James in his Epistle implies a natural union between poverty and piety (2:5), "Did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith ....?" would confirm the Jewish Christians in their use of the name.

Some have been inclined to press unduly a play on the name in which some of the Fathers indulge, as if the poor views of this sect as to the person of Christ had led to their receiving this name from without.

II. AUTHORITIES FOR THE OPINIONS OF THE EBIONITES.

1. Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus:

As indicated above, the main authorities for these are Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus. The characteristics of the Ebionites noted by them were, first, the negative one that they did not, like the other Gnostics, distinguish between the Supreme God and the Creator of the world — the demiurge — who was identified with the God of the Jews. With them Yahweh was the Supreme God — the God of Israel and the Creator of the heavens and the earth. The second characteristic, also negative, was that they denied the supernatural birth of our Lord. He was the son of Joseph and Mary in the ordinary sense of the word. The third was that they, along with the Cerinthians and Carpocratians, affirmed that a Divine power came down on Jesus at His baptism — the reward of His perfect holiness. According to one form of theory, the Holy Ghost was the eternal Son of God. Another view was that the power which descended upon Him was the Divine wisdom, the Logos. By the influence of this Divine power He performed miracles and taught with superhuman wisdom. But this Divine influence

deserted Jesus on the Cross, hence, the cry of being forsaken ([4076]Matthew 27:46). The Divine power, however, raised Him from the dead and caused Him to ascend on high. Hippolytus brings the Ebionites into close connection with the Elkasaites and with a certain Alcibiades, whose views he had to combat in Rome. The last claimed to found his views on a work of Elkasai.

2. Origen and Jerome:

From two other sources we derive further information: Origen and Jerome both notify the fact that the Ebionites translated `*almah* "young woman" (it is rendered "virgin" in our the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). This translation, so far as the mere word is concerned, is indubitably correct. There is another point in which both afford us information. The first says (Contra Celsum, v.61) that there are two classes of Ebionites, one of which denies the miraculous conception and birth of our Lord, the other of which affirms it. Jerome, in his letter to Augustine, not only asserts the same thing but calls the one class, those affirming the miraculous birth, Nazareans, and the other Ebionites. Origen in his second book against Celsus speaks as if the only distinction between the Ebionites and other Christians was their obedience to the Mosaic law, and by their example rebuts the assertion that the Jews in becoming Christians deserted the law of their fathers. Another feature of Ebionism presented to us by Jerome (In Jesaiam, lxvi.24) is their chiliastic view — the personal reign of our Lord for 1,000 years as the Jewish Messiah.

3. Epiphanius' Description:

The writer who gives the most voluminous account of the Ebionites — "Ebionaeans" as he calls them — is Epiphanius. With him it is at once heresy No. X and heresy No. XXX. Before discussing the Ebionites he takes up the closely related sect of the Nazareans as heresy No. XXIX. He had already in a more compendious way considered a similarly named sect, numbering it No. XVIII. It, however, is Jewish while this is Christian. The Jewish sect is distinguished by eating no animal food and offering no sacrifices. They have thus an affinity with the Essenes. They have a peculiarity that, while they honored the patriarchs, they rejected the Pentateuch which related their history. These Nazareans dwelt East of the Jordan in Gilead and Bashan. Heresy No. XXIX is the Christian Nazareans. This name had been at first applied to all Christians. Epiphanius identifies

them with the Essenes and declares their distinguishing peculiarity to be the retention of circumcision and the ceremonial law. They use the Gospel of Matthew but without the genealogies. As Heresy No. XXX he proceeds to consider the Ebionites. Ebion, Epiphanius assumes to have been a man, and calls him a "polymorphic portent," and asserts that he was connected with the Samaritans, the Essenes, the Cerinthians and Carpocratians, yet desired to be regarded a Christian. The heresy originated after the flight of the church to Pella. They denied the miraculous birth of our Lord, but maintained that a Divine influence came down upon Him at His baptism. This Divine wisdom had inspired, and in a sense dwelt, in all the patriarchs. In some sense the body of Jesus was regarded as that of Adam revived. This body was crucified and rose again. They receive only the Gospel of Matthew in the form the Cerinthians use it, i.e. the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Epiphanius gives some account of this gospel and its defects. They use also other books; one which he especially describes, The Journeyings of Peter, appears to be in the main identical with the Clementine Homilies. He connects the Ebionites, as does Hippolytus, with Elkasai; from him they learned that the heavenly Christ was 96 miles high and 24 broad, and that the Holy Ghost had a female form of similar dimensions, only invisible. Although he connects the Ebionites with the Essenes he mentions that, unlike the Essenes of Josephus and Philo, the Ebionites not only permitted but enjoined matrimony on young men. Epiphanius adds as an especial enormity that the Ebionites permit second, third and even seventh marriages. Although they enjoin marriage they have a low opinion of women, crediting Eve with originating heathenism, in this agreeing with the Essenian opinion of the sex. Mysteriously Epiphanius represents, the Ebionites as not only rejecting the prophets in a body but deriding them. He also mentions the rejection of Paul by the Ebionites. It is exceedingly difficult to form a clear, self-consistent view of the doctrines of the Ebionites from the statements of Epiphanius, yet there are points in which his information is of value.

4. Justin Martyr:

Though Justin Martyr does not name the Ebionites in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew (47), he mentions two classes of Jewish Christians:

(a) those who not only themselves observe the law but would compel the Gentilebelievers also to be circumcised and keep the whole law, and will hold no communion with those who refuse to become Jews;

(b) those who, observing the Mosaic law themselves, enter into communion with uncircumcised Gentilebelievers. The former appear to be an early form of Ebionites. It is to be noted that Justin does not ascribe to them any doctrinal divergence from the orthodox views. In the following chapter he mentions some that denied the divinity of our Lord, but these were Gentiles (*hemeterougenous*) "of our race."

III. LITERATURE OF THE EBIONITES.

One thing of importance we do owe to Epiphanius — the indication of the literature produced by the Ebionites, from which we may get their views at first hand. This includes the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Clementines (Homilies and Recognitions); to which we would add the Ascension of Isaiah and the Odes of Solomon. It may be remarked that this literature appears to represent the opinion of different classes of the Ebionites. We shall merely consider here the bearing these works have on the Ebionites.

1. The Gospel According to the Hebrews:

The Gospel according to the Hebrews we know only through quotations. We can have no certainty that these quotations are accurate. The quotations may have been interpolated, and further the book from which the quotations have been made has probably passed through several recensions. The discussion of the question of the relation of this book to the canonical Gospel of Matthew is considered elsewhere (*see APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS*). One thing is clear, there were at least two recensions of this gospel, one nearer and the other farther from the canonical Gospel; the former, the Nazarean, differed only by omitting the genealogy from the First Gospel of the Canon. The other was more strictly Ebionite and omitted all mention of the miraculous birth. The Ebionite recension began, as Epiphanius tells us, abruptly with the calling of the Apostles. The assertion of Epiphanius that the Ebionites rejected the prophets is supported by a quotation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Jerome (Adv. Pelag., iii.2): "In the prophets, after they were anointed by the Spirit, sin was found." The change from akridas ("locusts") to egkridas (literally, "cakes of honey and oil"; compare Exodus 16:31; Numbers 11:8) in the account of the food of John may be due to the avoidance of animal food attributed to this sect. One passage, which appears to be a denunciation of wealth in itself, is an addition of a second

rich man to the story of the young ruler of the synagogue. A singular verse, quoted from this gospel both by Origen and Jerome, deserves special notice for several reasons: "My mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by one of my hairs and bore me to the great mountain Tabor." The designation of the Holy Ghost as "my mother" is unexampled. It implies a materialistic view of the doctrine of the Trinity after the form of a human family. It is a note of geographical ignorance to call Tabor a "great" mountain. It is only some 2,000 ft. high and behind it are the mountains of the hill country of Galilee rising up to 4,000 ft. in Jebel Jermuk, and behind that the white top of Hermon, 10,000 ft. It is difficult to understand anyone resident in Palestine calling Tabor a "great" mountain. Rising from the plain of Esdraelon it is prominent, but with the higher mountains behind it, it could not even seem great. In a quotation by Jerome (Adv. Pelag., iii.2) our Lord declares Himself unwilling to be baptized by John as unconscious of sin. This suits the representation of Ebionite views which we find in Irenaeus that it was His sinlessness that made Jesus capable of receiving the Holy Ghost.

2. *The Clementines:*

The Clementine literature attributed by Epiphanius to the Ebionites is a more important source of information for their opinions. It has come down to us complete in three or four forms, the Homilies, the Recognitions, and two Epitomes which, however, differ less than the two larger works. They all seem to be recensions of an earlier work which has disappeared. The foundation of all of these is a species of religious novel on which are grafted sermons of Peter and his discussions with Simon Magus. Clement, a young Roman orphan of rank in search of a religion, meets Barnabas, who tells him of Christ, describing Him as the "Son of God," and says that He had appeared in Judea. To learn more about Jesus, Clement proceeds to Caesarea, where he meets Peter. He thereafter accompanies Peter to the various places whither the apostle pursues Simon Magus, and in course of his journeyings he meets and recognizes his father, his brother and his mother; hence, the title Recognitions. It is in the discourses of Peter that the Ebionism appears. Its theology is fundamentally Jewish and Essenian. That it is Judaizing is evidenced by the covert hostility to the apostle Paul. There are elements that are not those of orthodox Judaism. The Messiah is coequal, or nearly so, with the devil; in other words, the position is a modification of Parseeism (Hom., III, 5). If the discourse of Barnabas is excluded, our Lord is always called the "prophet" (Hom.), the "Teacher" (Recog.). He is never asserted nor assumed to be Divine. Nothing is said of

His miraculous birth. At the same time in the Recognitions He is regarded
as not merely man. It is said He "assumed a Jewish body" (Recog, I, 60).
This agrees with what Epiphanius says of the Ebionite idea that it was as
the body of Adam that the Christ appeared. The apostle Peter, who is
represented as the model Christian, eats only herbs and practices frequent
ablutions, quite in the manner of the Essenes. In his discourses Peter
declares that the true prophet "quenches the fire of altars and represses
war." These are Essenian peculiarities, but he "sanctions marriage," against
Essenism as we find it in Philo and Josephus The phrase implies an
opposition to some who not only did not sanction, but forbade, marriage
(Hom., III, 26).

3. Apocalyptic Literature:

If the ignoring of the work and apostleship of Paul be regarded as the
criterion of the Judaizers, that is to say, the Ebionites, then in apocalyptic
literature we find works from which we can draw information as to views.
The Ascension of Isaiah was one of the earliest of these books to be
recovered in modern times. The writer refers to the martyrdom of Peter in
Rome, but makes no mention of Paul (IV, 3). The description of elders and
shepherds hating one another (III, 29), "lawless elders and unjust
shepherds who will ravage their sheep" (III, 24), seems a view of the
church's state as it appeared to a Judaizer when the Pauline view was
prevailing. Notwithstanding this not only is the Divine dignity maintained,
but the doctrine of the Trinity, "They all glorified the Father of all and His
beloved Son and the Holy Spirit" (VIII, 18), is affirmed. As to the person
of Christ, He descended through the successive heavens to the earth to be
born (IX, 13; X, 8-31). The virginity of Mary is affirmed (X, 12), and the
child is born without pain, miraculously (XI, 8-14). A similar view of the
birth of Christ is to be found in the Odes of Solomon (XIX, 7).

IV. HISTORY OF EBIONISM.

1. Ebionites and Essenes:

All authorities combine in asserting a close connection between the
Ebionites and the Essenes. At first sight there are serious points of
difference, principally these, the Ebionites enjoined marriage, while the
Essenes, if we may believe Philo and Josephus, forbade it. This forbiddal,
however, appears to have been true only of the Coenobites of Engedi.
Moreover, some of the Judaizers, that is Ebionites, are charged with

forbidding to marry (⁵⁰⁰⁸1 Timothy 4:3). The Essenes in all their varieties seem to have come over to Christianity on the fall of the Jewish state and the retreat of the church to Pella. When they joined the believers in their exile the Parsee elements began a ferment in the church and Ebionism was one of the products. This probably is the meaning of the statement that Ebion began to teach his doctrines at Pella. If we may judge from the statements of Scripture and from the earliest of the noncanonical apocalypses, the Ebionites were not at first heretical in their Christology. Only they maintained the universal obligation of the ceremonial law, holding that believers of Gentiledescent could be received into the church only if they were first circumcised. The keen dialectic of Paul forced them from this position. The abrogation of the Law was closely connected in Paul's reasonings with the Divinity of our Lord; consequently some of them may have felt that they could maintain their views more easily by denying His supreme Divinity and the reality of the incarnation. The phenomena of His life rendered it impossible for anyone to declare Him to be merely man. Hence, the complex notion of a Divine influence — an eon, coming down upon Him. If, however, His birth were miraculous, then the supreme greatness of Moses would be impugned, consequently they were led to deny the virgin birth.

Not till Theodotus appeared was the purely humanitarian view of our Lord's person maintained. All the Hebrew Christians, however, did not pursue the above course. A large section remained at each general stage, and to the end one portion, the Nazareans, maintained their orthodox doctrinal position, and at the same time obeyed the requirements of the Law. The dualism which is found in the Clementines is an endeavor to explain the power of evil in the world and the function of Satan. The Clementines confirm the statement of the Fathers that the Ebionites used only the Gospel of Mark, for there are more quotations from Matthew than from all the other books of the New Testament put together: These quotations are, however, all from chapters after the 3rd chapter. There are, it is to be noted, several unmistakable quotations from the Fourth Gospel. In the Clementines as noticed above there is an avoidance of attributing Divinity to our Lord. He is the Teacher, the Prophet; only in the discourse ascribed to Barnabas is He called the Son of God. This, we are aware, is the reverse of the ordinarily received idea of the historic succession of beliefs. It is thought that, beginning with the belief in the purely ordinary nature of our Lord's birth, these Jewish believers gradually added feature after feature until He was regarded as a Divine person, the Divine Logos

made flesh by miraculous conception and birth. The abstract possibility of such being the course of events is not denied, but we do say that what evidence we have tends in the direction we have taken. There are elements kindred to Ebionism in the Epistle of James, the prominence given to the poor, the little prominence given to the Divinity of Our Lord or to the doctrines of grace all tend in that direction. Yet there is no developed Ebionism; the Divinity of Christ, if not stated in terms, is implied. Schwegler, followed in more recent times by Dr. Campbell of Dundee, finds a strong Ebionite bias in the Gospel of Luke, in which certainly there is no lessening of our Lord's supreme Divinity. All that it amounts to is a prominence given to the poor. The identification of the poor with the righteous has not come down to us as a tenet of the Ebionites; it has been ascribed to them from their name. As already stated in the Ascension of Isaiah, the Divinity of the Messiah is strongly asserted. The farther down the stream of history we go more and more clearly do the Ebionite features appear, till by the time when Alcibiades, the follower of Elkasai, appeared in Rome, we have something widely removed from the Ebionism of the Clementines, far as that is from the simple position occupied by the Nazareans.

2. Organization of Ebionites:

The Jewish Christians appear to have formed an organization of their own, separate from the church Catholic. The places where they assembled they did not call *ekklesiai*, "churches," but sunagogai, "synagogues." If we may believe the Clementine Homilies they had evolved a complete episcopal system for themselves. We, however, must not think that every variation of faith had a separate organization for itself. Strict Jewish ceremonial allowed no Jew to eat with any other not a Jew. The "love-feasts" of the early church implied this eating in common. If GentileChristians were present, the Ebionites could not join, hence, the need of a separate church. All Jewish Christians who reverenced the law could meet together and partake of the "love-feast," whatever their belief as to the person of Christ. In short, Ebionism was a thing of individuals, whose opinion ran through the whole gamut of faith, from the Nazareans, who differed from the orthodox simply in remaining Jews, to those whose Judaism alone prevented them from becoming followers of Theodotus of Byzantium, and who therefore sank back into pure Judaism.

V. EVIDENCE FROM EBIONISM FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

1. Christology of the Early Church:

In dealing with this branch of our subject we have to consider that the tendency of those who in the early days wrote against heresy was to exaggerate the difference between the heretics and the orthodox. On the other hand we have to consider the psychological difficulty involved in a person recognizing that anyone whom he daily met, whom he saw eating and sleeping like other men, was more than man, was Divine. This difficulty, great to all, was doubly so to the Jew. Yet again we have to consider what the origin of Christian theology was. It was an attempt to give a reasoned and systematic explanation of the phenomenon of Jesus Christ. Christ's character, His deeds and His claims had to be explained. The orthodox explanation which gradually became more definite as time rolled on was that He was the second person of the Trinity become incarnate, and the purpose of this incarnation that He might save many from their sins. This purpose He accomplished by dying on the cross and rising again. The primitive church owed its theology to Paul and John. Repugnant as much of this was to the Jews, yet the Ebionites, earnest, prejudiced Jews as they were, could not affirm in the presence of the facts of His career that Jesus was merely a man. They had to imagine a Divine influence coming down upon Him at His baptism, setting Him apart from all others. We have no trace of this at first: it stands at the end of a process of degradation of the ideal concerning the person of Christ. It was only when the effect of His personality had somewhat faded that men began to doubt His Divinity. The division of the personality seems to emerge at the same time. The earlier Ebionites, like the rest of the 1st-century believers, regarded Christ as one person; only later do they reach the notion of a heavenly eon separate from Jesus. The Ebionites seem to have held under varying forms a doctrine of the Trinity, and their holding it is an evidence that the church at large held it, not of course in that definiteness it assumed later, but essentially.

2. Paulinism of the Early Church:

To some extent the same may be said in regard to the Pauline doctrine of redemption. It is to be observed that both writers, he of the Homilies as well as the writer of the Recognitions, dislike and ignore Paul, even if they

do not attempt to pillory him under the image of Simon Magus, as many have thought that they do. What, however, is also to be observed, is that they do not venture to denounce him by name. Paul and his teachings must have been, in the early part of the 2nd century, held in such deep reverence that no one could hope to destroy them by direct assault; the only hope was a flank attack. This reverence for Paul implies the reception of all he taught. All the specially Pauline doctrines of original sin, of redemption through the sacrificial death of Christ, and all the cognate ideas must have been held strongly by the early church or the Ebionites would have denounced Paul in the Clementines by name. Schwegler would argue that Justin Martyr was an Ebionite because he neither mentions nor quotes Paul. To this it may be answered that as the emperors to whom he addressed his apologies were heathens, and Trypho, with whom he had his dialogue, was a Jew, he naturally did not name one whose authority would be valueless to those he was addressing. He is equally silent as to Peter, James and John. If he does not quote Paul there are several indubitable echoes of his phrases and his thoughts.

In the face of the recent discoveries made in Egypt one cannot despair of manuscripts turning up which may throw needed light on this heresy. Were the Gospel according to the Hebrews to be found, or a manuscript of Hegesippus, we should be in a better position to decide a number of questions.

LITERATURE.

Contemporary writers on Ebionites: Irenaeus; Tertullian; Hippolytus; Origen; Eusebius, III, 27; Epiphanius; Jerome; Justin Martyr (Trypho, 47, 48) refers to the Ebionites without naming them.

Ebionite writings: Clementine Homilies; Clementine Recognitions; Clementine Epitomes; Asc Isa; Odes of Solomon.

Modern church historians: Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church; Schrock, Kirchengeschichte; Walch, Historic der Ketzereien, I, 95-124; Baur, Kirchengeschichte, I, 172-74, and Dogmengeschichte, 140-61, and Christliche Gnosis; Schwegler, Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, 17-198; Ritschl, Altkatholische Kirche, 107-271; Matter, Gnosticisme, III, 11-28; Harnack, History of Dogma, 1-89 ff; Reuss, Hist. de la Theologie, I, 115-25; Donaldson, Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council, I, 39

ff; Mansel, Gnostic Heresies, 123-26; Helgenfeld, Ketzergeschichte, 421-46, and Clementines.

Articles in theological dictionaries: Smith and Wace; RE, 1st, 2nd and 3rd eds; Jewish Encyclopedia;Holtzman u. Zopffel; Lightfoot, Galatians, Disc. III; Colin Campbell, Studies in Luke.

J. E. H. Thomson

EBIONITES, GOSPEL OF THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; EBIONISM.

EBONY

<eb'-o-ni> ([μynbḥ; *hobhnim*] (pl. only), vocalization uncertain; compare Arabic abnus): Mentioned (Ezekiel 27:15) along with ivory as merchandise of Tyre brought by the men of Dedan. This is the heavy, black, heart-wood of various species of *Diospyros*, natives of Southern India and Ceylon; the best kind is obtained from D. *ebenum*. The sap-wood, being white and valueless, is cut away, but the trunks are sufficiently large to leave blocks of heart-wood 2 ft. in diameter and 10 or more ft. long. Ebony was used by the ancient Egyptians, Greeks and Romans, as well as the Phoenicians, for various purposes; it was frequently inlaid with ivory. In Europe it has been a favorite for cabinet-making down to recent times.

E. W. G. Masterman

EBRON

<e'-brun> ([ˆrbῙ, `*ebhron*]; the King James Version wrongly, Hebron): A town in the territory of Asher (Joshua 19:28). Probably we should read here Abdon, as in Joshua 21:30; 1 Chronicles 6:74, the substitution of the Hebrew letter resh ("r") for the Hebrew letter daleth ("d") being a common copyist's error.

See ABDON.

EBRONAH

<e-bro'-na>: In the King James Version (Numbers 33:34,35) for *ABRONAH*, which see.

ECANUS

<e-ka'-nus>: the Revised Version (British and American) *ETHANUS* (which see).

ECBATANA

<ek-bat'-a-na> (Ezra 6:2 margin).
    See ACHMETHA.

ECCE HOMO

<ek'-se ho'-mo> ([Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, *idou ho anthropos*], "Behold, the man!" John 19:5): Pilate's statement regarding Jesus during His trial. While the significance of this statement is somewhat debatable, yet there is little doubt, as judged from his attitude and statement immediately following, that Pilate was endeavoring to appeal to the accusers' sympathies and to point out to them the manly qualities of Jesus. The ordinary punctuation which places an exclamation point after "Behold" and a period after "the man" is evidently incorrect if the grammatical structure in the Greek is to be observed, which gives to the second and third words the nominative form, and which therefore admits of a mild exclamation, and therefore of the emphasis upon "the man." Some, however, hold the contrary view and maintain that the utterance was made in a spirit of contempt and ridicule, as much as to say, "Behold here a mere man." See especially on this view Marcus Dods in Expositor's Greek Testament. It would seem, however, that the former of the two views would be sustained by the chief facts in the case.

Walter G. Clippinger

ECCLESIASTES, THE PREACHER

<e-kle-zi-as'-tez>, or ([קֹהֶלֶת *qoheleth*]; [Ἐκκλησιαστής, *Ekklesiastes*], perhaps "member of assembly"; see below):

1. STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK:

Reading this book one soon becomes aware that it is a discussion of certain difficult problems of human life. It begins with a title Ecclesiastes (1:1), followed by a preface (1:2-11). It has a formal conclusion (12:8-13). Between the preface and the conclusion the body of the book is made up of

materials of two kinds — first a series of "I" sections, sections uttered in the 1st person singular, a record of a personal experience; and second, an alternating series of gnomic sections, sections made up of proverbs (say 4:5,6,9-12; 5:1-12; 7:1-14,16-22; 8:1-8; 9:7-10; 10:1-4; 10:8 through 12:7). These may be called the "thou" sections, as most of them have the pronoun of the 2nd person singular. The idea of the vanity of all things characterizes the record of experience, but it also appears in the "thou" sections (e.g. 9:9). On the other hand the proverb element is not wholly lacking in the "I" sections (e.g. 4:1-3).

2. THE CONTENTS:

In the preface the speaker lays down the proposition that all things are unreal, and that the results of human effort are illusive Ecclesiastes (1:2,3). Human generations, day and night, the wind, the streams, are alike the repetition of an unending round (1:4-7). The same holds in regard to all human study and thinking (1:8-11). The speaker shows familiarity with the phenomena which we think of as those of natural law, of the persistence of force, but he thinks of them in the main as monotonously limiting human experience. Nothing is new. All effort of Nature or of man is the doing again of something which has already been done.

After the preface the speaker introduces himself, and recounts his experiences. At the outset he had a noble ambition for wisdom and discipline, but all he attained to was unreality and perplexity of mind ([21012]Ecclesiastes 1:12-18). This is equally the meaning of the text, whether we translate "vanity and vexation of spirit" or "vanity and a striving after wind," ("emptiness, and struggling for breath"), though the first of these two translations is the better grounded.
Finding no adequate satisfaction in the pursuits of the scholar and thinker, taken by themselves, he seeks to combine these with the pursuit of agreeable sensations — alike those which come from luxury and those which come from activity and enterprise and achievement Ecclesiastes (2:1-12). No one could be in better shape than he for making this experiment, but again he only attains to unreality and perplexity of spirit. He says to himself that at least it is in itself profitable to be a wise man rather than a fool, but his comfort is impaired by the fact that both alike are mortal (2:13-17). He finds little reassurance in the idea of laboring for the benefit of posterity; posterity is often not worthy (2:18-21). One may toil unremittingly, but what is the use (2:22,23)?

He does not find himself helped by bringing God into the problem. `It is no good for a man that he should eat and drink and make his soul see good in his toil' Ecclesiastes (2:24-26, as most naturally translated), even if he thinks of it as the gift of God; for how can one be sure that the gift of God is anything but luck? He sees, however, that it is not just to dismiss thus lightly the idea of God as a factor in the problem. It is true that there is a time for everything, and that everything is "beautiful in its time." It is also true that ideas of infinity are in men's minds, ideas which they can neither get rid of nor fully comprehend (3:1-18). Here are tokens of God, who has established an infinite order. If we understood His ways better, that might unravel our perplexities. And if God is, immortality may be, and the solution of our problems may lie in that direction. For a moment it looks as if the speaker were coming out into the light, but doubt resumes its hold upon him. He asks himself, "Who knoweth?" and he settles back into the darkness. He has previously decided that for a man to "eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good" is not worth while; and now he reaches the conclusion that, unsatisfactory as this is, there is nothing better (3:19-22).

And so the record of experiences continues, hopeful passages alternating with pessimistic passages. After a while the agnosticism and pessimism recede somewhat, and the hopeful passages become more positive. Even though "the poor man's wisdom is despised," the speaker says, "the words of the wise heard in quiet are better than the cry of him that ruleth among fools" Ecclesiastes (9:17). He says "Surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God" (8:12), no matter how strongly appearances may indicate the contrary.

The gnomic sections are mostly free from agnosticism and pessimism. The book as a whole sums itself up in the conclusion, "Fear God, and keep his commandments" (⁻²¹²²¹³⁾Ecclesiastes 12:13).
Of course the agnostic and pessimistic utterances in Ecclesiastes are to be regarded as the presentation of one side of an argument. Disconnect them and they are no part of the moral and religious teaching of the book, except in an indirect way. At no point should we be justified in thinking of the author as really doubting in regard to God or moral obligation. He delineates for us a soul in the toils of mental and spiritual conflict. It is a delineation which may serve for warning, and which is in other ways wholesomely instructive; and in the outcome of it, it is full of encouragement.

In some passages the speaker in Ecclesiastes has in mind the solution of the problems of life which we are accustomed to call Epicurean (e.g. 5:18-20; 7:16,17; 8:15; but not 2:24) — the solution which consists in avoiding extremes, and in getting from life as many agreeable sensations as possible; but it is not correct to say that he advocates this philosophy. He rather presents it as an alternative.

His conclusion is the important part of his reasoning. All things are vanity. Everything passes away. Yet (he says) it is better to read and use good words than bad words. Therefore because the Great Teacher is wise, he ever teaches the people knowledge, and in so doing he ever seeks good words, acceptable words, upright words, words of truth. "The words of the wise are as goads; and as nails well fastened" ("clinched at the back") (12:11). Such are the words of all the great masters. So (he ends) my son, be warned! There are many books in this world. Choose good ones. And his conclusion is: Reverence the Mighty Spirit. Keep to good principles. That is the whole duty of man. For everything at last becomes clear; and "good" stands out clearly from "evil."

3. COMPOSITE AUTHORSHIP?:

We have noticed that our book has "I" sections and "thou" sections. Certainly these are structural marks, but as such they are capable of being interpreted in various ways. Partitional hypotheses can easily be formed, and perhaps there is no great objection to them; but there are no phenomena which cannot be accounted for by the hypothesis that we have here just the work of one author, who sometimes quotes proverbial utterances, either his own or those of other men. As proving the integrity of the book three points present themselves. First, in some cases (e.g. [21074]Ecclesiastes 7:14b-16) the experience matter and the gnomic matter are closely combined in sense and in grammatical construction. Second, it is possible to interpret all the gnomic sections as a part of the continuous argument. Third, if we so interpret them the book is a unit, the argument moving forward continuously out of the speculative into the practical, and out of the darkness into the light.

4. QOHELETH:

The speaker in Ecclesiastes calls himself [Qoheleth] (1:1,2,12 and other places), rendered "the Preacher" in the English Versions. The word does not occur elsewhere, although it is from a stem that is in common use.

Apparently it has been coined for a purpose by the author of Ecclesiastes. In form it is a feminine participle, though it denotes a man. This is best explained as a case of the using of an abstract expression for a concrete, as when in English we say "Your Honor," "Your Majesty." The other words of the stem are used of people gathering in assemblies, and the current explanation is to the effect that Qoheleth is a person who draws an audience whom he may address. To this there are two objections: First, the participle is intransitive; its natural implication is that of a person who participates in an assembly, not of one who causes the participants to assemble. Second, the assembly distinctively indicated by the words of this stem is the official assembly for the transaction of public business. Worked out on this basis Qoheleth seems to mean citizenship, or concretely, a citizen — a citizen of such respectability that he is entitled to participate in public assemblies. It is in the character of citizen-king that the speaker in Ecclesiastes relates his experiences and presents his ideas.

This word for "assembly" and its cognates are in the Greek often translated by *ekklesia* and its cognates (e.g. ⟨05040⟩Deuteronomy 4:10; 9:10; ⟨07202⟩Judges 20:2; 21:5,8). So we are not surprised to find *Qoheleth* rendered by the Greek *Ekklesiastes*, and this Latinized into Ecclesiastes.

5. "KING IN JERUSALEM":

The speaker in Ecclesiastes speaks not only in the character of Qoheleth, but in that of "the son of David, king in Jerus" (1:1). So far as this clause is concerned the king in question might be either Solomon or any other king of the dynasty, or might be a composite or an ideal king. He is represented (1:12 through 2:11) as "king over Israel," and as distinguished for wisdom, for his luxuries, for his great enterprises in building and in business. These marks fit Solomon better than any other king of the dynasty, unless possibly Uzziah. Possibly it is not absurd to apply to Solomon even the phrase "all that were before me over Jerusalem," or "in Jerus" (1:16; 2:7,9; compare ⟨13925⟩1 Chronicles 29:25; ⟨11082⟩1 Kings 3:12; ⟨14012⟩2 Chronicles 1:12). It is safer, however, to use an alternative statement. The speaker in Ecclesiastes is either Solomon or some other actual or composite or ideal king of the dynasty of David.

6. DATE AND AUTHORSHIP:

If it were agreed that Solomon is the citizen king who, in Ecclesiastes, is represented as speaking, that would not be the same thing as agreeing that

Solomon is the author of the book. No one thinks that Sir Galahad is the author of Tennyson's poem of that name. Qoheleth the king is the character into whose mouth the author of Ecclesiastes puts the utterances which he wishes to present, but it does not follow that the author is himself Qoheleth.

The statement is often made that Jewish tradition attributes the writing of Ecclesiastes to Solomon; but can anyone cite any relatively early tradition to this effect? Is this alleged tradition anything else than the confusing of the author with the character whom he has sketched? The well-known classic tradition in Babha' Bathra' attributes Ecclesiastes to "Hezekiah and his company," not to Solomon. And the tradition which is represented by the order in which the books occur in the Hebrew Bibles seems to place it still later. Concerning this tradition two facts are to be noted: First, it classes Ecclesiastes with the 5 miscellaneous books (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther) known as the five meghilloth, the five Rolls. Second, in the count of books which makes the number 22 or 24 it classes Ecclesiastes as one of the last 5 books (Ecclesiastes, Esther, Dan, Ezra-Nehemiah, 1 and 2 Chronicles). That the men who made this arrangement regarded the books of this group as the latest in the Bible is a natural inference.

7. LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES:

This agrees with the internal marks which constitute the principal evidence we have on this point. The grammatical character and the vocabulary of Ecclesiastes are exceptionally peculiar, and they strongly indicate that the book was written in the same literary period with these other latest books of the Old Testament. The true date is not much earlier or later than 400 BC (*see CHRONICLES*), though many place it a century or a century and a half later. Details concerning these phenomena may be found in Driver's Introduction or other Introductions, or in commentaries. Only a few of the points will be given here, with barely enough illustrative instances to render the points intelligible.

In Ecclesiastes the syntax of the verb is peculiar. The imperfect with waw consecutive, the ordinary Hebrew narrative tense, occurs — for example, "And I applied my heart" (1:17) — but it is rare. The narrator habitually uses the perfect with waw (e.g. 1:13; 2:11,12,14,15 bis. 17). In any English book we should find it very noticeable if the author were in the habit of

using the progressive form of the verb instead of the ordinary form — if instead of saying "And I applied my heart" he should say "And I was applying my heart," "And I was looking on all the works," "And I was turning" (1:13; 2:11,12), and so on. Another marked peculiarity is the frequent repeating of the pronoun along with the verb: `I said in my heart, even I'; `And I was hating, even I, all my labor' (2:1,18 and continually). The use of the pronoun as copula is abnormally common in Ecclesiastes as compared with other parts of the Hebrew Bible (e.g. 4:2). The abbreviated form of the relative pronoun is much used instead of the full form, and in both forms the pronoun is used disproportionately often as a conjunction. In these and many similar phenomena the Hebrew language of Ecclesiastes is affiliated with that of the later times.

The vocabulary presents phenomena that have the same bearing. Words of the stem *taqan* appear in Ecclesiastes (1:15; 7:13; 12:9) and in the Aramaic of Daniel (4:36), and not elsewhere in the Bible; they are frequent in the Talmud Words of the stem *zaman* (3 1) are used only in Ecclesiastes, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, Esther. Words of the stem *shalaT*, the stem whence comes our word "sultan," are frequent in Ecclesiastes — words which are used elsewhere only in the avowedly post-exilian books and in ⁰⁴⁰⁶Genesis 42:6, though a different word of this stem appears in the history of the time of David. Only in Ecclesiastes and Esther are found the verb *kasher*, "to be correct" (whence the modern Jewish *kosher*) and its derivative *kishron*. The Persian word *pardec*, "park" (²⁰⁰⁵Ecclesiastes 2:5), occurs elsewhere only in Nehemiah and Canticles, and the Persian word pithgam, "official decision" or "record" (²⁰⁸¹Ecclesiastes 8:11), only in Est 1:20, and in the Aramaic parts of Ezra and Daniel. Ecclesiastes also abounds in late words formed from earlier stems — for example, *cekhel* and *cikheluth*, "folly" (²¹⁰⁶Ecclesiastes 10:6; 2:3, et al.); or *medhinah*, "province" (²⁰⁵⁸Ecclesiastes 5:8), frequent in the latest books, but elsewhere found only in one passage in 1 Kings (20:14,15,17,19). Especially common are new derivatives that end in "-n," for example, *yithron*, "profit"; `*inyan*, "travail"; *checron*, "that which is missing"; *ra`yon*, "vexation" (²⁰⁰³Ecclesiastes 1:3,13,15,17 and often). To these add instances of old words used in new meanings, and the various other groups of phenomena that are usual in such cases. No parts of the book are free from them. The arguments for a later date than that which has been assigned are inconclusive. The Hebrew language of Ecclesiastes is more like the language of the Talmuds than is that of the Chronicler or Daniel or even

Esther; but if one infers that Ecclesiastes is therefore later than the others the inference will prove to be in various ways embarrassing. The differences are better accounted for by the fact that Ecclesiastes belongs to a different type of literature from the others.

8. CERTAIN INCONCLUSIVE ARGUMENTS:

Various passages have local color in Ecclesiastes (e.g. 11:1), or make the impression of being allusions to specific events (e.g. 4:13-16; 6:2,3; 9:13-18), but the difficulty lies in locating the events. Dr. Kleinert argues plausibly for the writing of the book in Egypt in the time of the Ptolemies, but other equally probable hypotheses might be devised.

It is alleged that Ecclesiastes copies from Ecclesiasticus, but it is more probable that the latter copied from the former. It is alleged that the Wisdom disputes Ecclesiastes; if it does, that does not prove that the two are contemporary. It is alleged that the writer is familiar with the philosophy of Epicurus, and therefore must have lived later than Epicurus, who died 270 BC, or even later than Lucretius of the 1st century BC. If there were proof that this was a case of borrowing, Epicurus or Lucretius might have been the borrowers; but there is no such proof; the selfishness which constitutes the nucleus of Epicureanism has exhibited itself in human literature from the beginning. The strong resemblances between Ecclesiastes and Omar Khayyam have no weight to prove that the Hebrew author was later than the Persian Ecclesiastes presents a perfectly distinct doctrine of immortality, whether it affirms the doctrine or not; but that proves a relatively early date for the doctrine, rather than a late date for Ecclesiastes. At every point the marks of Ecclesiastes are those of the Persian period, not of the Greek.

9. CANONICITY:

In the early Christian centuries, as in all the centuries since, there have been disputes concerning the canonicity of Ecclesiastes. It was not questioned that Ecclesiastes belonged to the canon as traditionally handed down. No question of admitting it to the canon was raised. But it was challenged because of the agnostic quality of some of its contents, and, every time, on close examination, the challenge was decided in its favor.

LITERATURE.

There are volumes on Ecclesiastes in all the great commentaries, and treatments of it in the volumes on Introduction. A few of the many separate commentaries are those of Moses Stuart, Andover, 1864; H. Gratz, Leipzig, 1871; G. Wildeboer, Tubingen, 1898; E. H. Plumptre, Cambridge, 1881. Other works are those of J. F. Genung, Ecclesiastes, and Omar Khayyam, 1901, Words of Koheleth, 1904, and The Hebrew Literature of Wisdom in the Light of Today, 1906; C. H. H. Wright, Book of Koheleth, 1883; S. Schiffer, Das Buch Coheleth nach Talmud und Midrasch, 1885; A. H. McNeile. Introduction to Ecclesiastes, New York, 1904.

Willis J. Beecher

ECCLESIASTICUS

<e-kle-zi-as'-ti-kus>.

See *SIRACH.*

ECLIPSE

<e-klips'>.

See *ASTRONOMY.*

ED

([d[e'*edh*], "witness"): The name of the altar erected by the trans-Jordanic tribes upon finally taking possession of Gilead (⁽⁰⁶²¹⁰⁾Joshua 22:10,11,34); probably East of the Jordan opposite Jericho. But neither the Massoretic Text nor the Septuagint contained the word. Both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), however, insert the word on the authority of a few manuscripts. It has been suggested that it is the final `*edh* in *Gal`edh*, the name given by Laban and Jacob to the memorial heap of stones erected by them in the vicinity (⁽⁰¹³¹⁴⁷⁾Genesis 31:47,48). According to the Massoretic Text, the name of the altar is the entire sentence: "It is a witness between us that Yahweh is God." The opposition of the ten tribes to the erection of this altar was on the score that it was built after the pattern of the great altar of burnt offering (⁽⁰⁶²¹¹⁾Joshua 22:11,29), which was a horned altar forbidden in

ordinary lay sacrifice. There is in it, therefore, no indication of a general opposition to lay sacrifices on altars of earth or unhewn stone (see Wiener, EPC, 198).

George Frederick Weight

EDAR

<e'-dar>.

See *EDER.*

EDDIAS

<ed-i'-as>.

See *IEDDIAS.*

EDDINUS

<ed'-i-nus> ([Ἐδδεινοῦς, *Eddeinous*], Codex Alexandrinus, [Ἐδδινοῦς, *Eddinous*]): One of the "holy singers" at Josiah's Passover (1 Esdras 1:15). the King James Version reads here Jeduthun, the corresponding name in the parallel passage (2 Chronicles 35:15).

EDEN

<e'-d'-n> ([עֵדֶן *edhen*], "delight"; [Ἔδεμ, *Edem*]):

(1) The land in which "Yahweh God planted a garden," where upon his creation "he put the man whom he had formed" (Genesis 2:8). In the Assyrian inscriptions idinu (Accadian, edin) means "plain" and it is from this that the Biblical word is probably derived. Following are the references to Eden in the Bible, aside from those in Genesis 2 and 3: Genesis 4:16; Isaiah 51:3; Ezekiel 28:13; 31:9,16,18; 36:35; Joel 2:3. The Garden of Eden is said to be "eastward, in Eden" Genesis (2:8); where the vegetation was luxurious (2:9) and the fig tree indigenous (3:7), and where it was watered by irrigation. All kinds of animals, including cattle, beasts of the field and birds, were found there (2:19,20). Moreover, the climate was such that clothing was not needed for warmth. It is not surprising, therefore, that the plural of the word has the meaning "delights," and that Eden has been supposed to mean the land of delights, and that the word

became a synonym for Paradise.

The location of Eden is in part to be determined from the description already given. It must be where there is a climate adapted to the production of fruit trees and of animals capable of domestication, and in general to the existence of man in his primitive condition. In particular, its location is supposed to be determined by the statements regarding the rivers coursing through it and surrounding it. There is a river (nahar) (⟨01210⟩Genesis 2:10) which was parted and became four heads (*ro'shim*), a word which (⟨07816⟩Judges 8:16; ⟨18017⟩Job 1:17) designates main detachments into which an army is divided, and therefore would more properly signify branches than heads, permitting Josephus and others to interpret the river as referring to the ocean, which by the Greeks was spoken of as the river (*okeanos*) surrounding the world. According to Josephus, the Ganges, the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Nile are the four rivers, being but branches of this one river. Moreover, it is contended by some, with much show of reason, that the word *perath* translated Euphrates is a more general term, signifying "the broad" or "deep" river, and so may here refer to some other stream than the Euphrates, possibly to a river in some other region whose name is perpetuated in the present Euphrates, as "the Thames" of New England perpetuates the memory of the Thames of Old England. In ancient times there was a river Phrath in Persia, and perhaps two. It is doubtful whether the phrase "eastward, in Eden" refers to the position with reference to the writer or simply with reference to Eden itself. So far as that phrase is concerned, therefore, speculation is left free to range over the whole earth, and this it has done.

1. CENTRAL ASIA:

Columbus when passing the mouth of the Orinoco surmised that its waters came down from the Garden of Eden. It is fair to say, however, that he supposed himself to be upon the East coast of Asia. The traditions of its location somewhere in Central Asia are numerous and persistent. Naturalists have, with Quatrefages, pretty generally fixed upon the portion of Central Asia stretching East from the Pamir, often referred to as the roof of the world, and from which flow four great rivers — the Indus, the Tarim, the Sur Daria (Jaxartes), and the Ainu Daria (Oxus) — as the original cradle of mankind. This conclusion has been arrived at from the fact that at the present time the three fundamental types of the races of mankind are grouped about this region. The Negro races are, indeed, in general far removed from the location, but still fragments of them both

pure and mixed are found in various localities both in the interior and on the seashore and adjacent islands where they would naturally radiate from this center, while the yellow and the white races here meet at the present time in close contact. In the words of Quatrefages, "No other region of the globe presents a similar union of extreme human types distributed round a common center" (The Human Species, 176).

Philology, also, points to this same conclusion. On the East are the monosyllabic languages, on the North the polysyllabic or agglutinative languages, and on the West and South the inflectional or Aryan languages, of which the Sanskrit is an example, being closely allied to nearly all the languages of Europe. Moreover, it is to this center that we trace the origin of nearly all our domesticated plants and animals. Naturally, therefore, the same high authority writes, "There we are inclined to say the first human beings appeared and multiplied till the populations overflowed as from a bowl and spread themselves in waves in every direction" (ibid., 177). With this conclusion, as already said, a large number of most eminent authorities agree. But it should be noted that if, as we believe, there was a universal destruction of antediluvian man, the center of dispersion had in view by these naturalists and archaeologists would be that from the time of Noah, and so would not refer to the Eden from which Adam and Eve were driven. The same may be said of Haeckel's theory that man originated in a submerged continent within the area of the Indian Ocean.

2. THE NORTH POLE:

Dr. William F. Warren has with prodigious learning attempted to show that the original Eden was at the North Pole, a theory which has too many considerations in its support to be cast aside unceremoniously, for it certainly is true that in preglacial times a warm climate surrounded the North Pole in all the lands which have been explored. In Northern Greenland and in Spitzbergen abundant remains of fossil plants show that during the middle of the Tertiary period the whole circumpolar region was characterized by a climate similar to that prevailing at the present time in Southern Europe, Japan, and the southern United States (see Asa Gray's lectures on "Forest Geography and Archaeology" in the American Journal of Science, CXVI, 85-94, 183-96, and Wright, Ice Age in North America, 5th edition, chapter xvii). But as the latest discoveries have shown that there is no land within several hundred miles of the North Pole, Dr. Warren's theory, if maintained at all, will have to be modified so as to

place Eden at a considerable distance from the actual pole. Furthermore, his theory would involve the existence of "Tertiary man," and thus extend his chronology to an incredible extent, even though with Professor Green (*see ANTEDILUVIANS*) we are permitted to consider the genealogical table of Genesis 5 as sufficiently elastic to accommodate itself to any facts which may be discovered.

3. ARMENIA:

Much also can be said in favor of identifying Eden with Armenia, for it is here that the Tigris and Euphrates have their origin, while two others, the Aras (Araxes) emptying into the Caspian Sea and the Choruk (thought by some to be the Phasis) emptying into the Black Sea, would represent the Gihon and the Pishon. Havilah would then be identified with Colchis, famous for its golden sands. But Cush is difficult to find in that region; while these four rivers could by no possibility be regarded as branches of one parent stream.

4. BABYLONIA:

Two theories locate Eden in the Euphrates valley. Of these the first would place it near the head of the Persian Gulf where the Tigris and Euphrates after their junction form the Shatt el-'Arab which bifurcates into the eastern and the western arm before reaching the Gulf. Calvin considered the Pishon to be the eastern arm and the Gihon the western arm. Other more recent authorities modify theory by supposing that Gihon and Pishon are represented by the Karum and the Kerkhah rivers which come into the Shatt el-'Arab from the east. The most plausible objection to this theory is that the Biblical account represents all these branches as down stream from the main river, whereas this theory supposes that two of them at least are up stream. This objection has been ingeniously met by calling attention to the fact that 2,000 years before Christ the Persian Gulf extended up as far as Eridu, 100 miles above the present mouth of the river, and that the Tigris and the Euphrates then entered the head of the Gulf through separate channels, the enormous amount of silt brought down by the streams having converted so much of the valley into dry land. In consequence of the tides which extend up to the head of the Gulf, the current of all these streams would be turned up stream periodically, and so account for the Biblical statement. In this case the river ([nahar]) would be represented by the Persian Gulf itself, which was indeed called by the

Babylonians nar marratum, "the bitter river." This theory is further supported by the fact that according to the cuneiform inscriptions Eridu was reputed to have in its neighborhood a garden, "a holy place," in which there grew a sacred palm tree. This "tree of life" appears frequently upon the inscriptions with two guardian spirits standing on either side.

The other theory, advocated with great ability by Friedrich Delitzsch, places Eden just above the site of ancient Babylon, where the Tigris and Euphrates approach to within a short distance of one another and where the country is intersected by numerous irrigating streams which put off from the Euphrates and flow into the Tigris, whose level is here considerably lower than that of the Euphrates — the situation being somewhat such as it is at New Orleans where the Mississippi River puts off numerous streams which empty into Lake Pontchartrain. Delitzsch supposes the Shatt el-Nil, which flows eastward into the Tigris, to be the Gihon, and the Pallacopas, flowing on the West side of the Euphrates through a region producing gold, to be the Pishon. The chief difficulties attending this theory pertain to the identification of the Pishon with the Pallacopas, and the location of Havilah on its banks. There is difficulty, also, in all these theories in the identification of Cush (Ethiopia), later associated with the country from which the Nile emerges, thus giving countenance to the belief of Josephus and many others that that river represented the Gihon. If we are compelled to choose between these theories it would seem that the one which locates Eden near the head of the Persian Gulf combines the greater number of probabilities of every kind.

(2) A Levite of the time of Hezekiah ([4492] 2 Chronicles 29:12; 31:15).

LITERATURE.

Dawson Modern Science in Bible Lands; Friedrich Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? (1881); Sayce, HCM, 95 ff; Hommel, Anc. Hebrew Tradition, 314; William F. Warren, Paradise Found, 1885.

George Frederick Wright

EDEN, CHILDREN OF

See CHILDREN OF EDEN.

EDEN, HOUSE OF

See AVEN; BETH-EDEN; CHILDREN OF EDEN.

EDER (1)

<e'-der> ([רדע *e'edher*], "flock"):

(1) One of the "uttermost cities" of Judah in the Negeb ("South") near the border of Edom (⁶¹⁵²Joshua 15:21), possibly *Kh. el `Adar*, 5 miles South of Gaza, but probably this is too far west.

(2) *Eder* (the King James Version Edar) or better Migdal Eder, [רדע לדגמ *mighdal `edher*], "the tower of the flock"; [Γάδερ, *Gader*]. After Rachel died and was buried "in the way to Ephrath (the same is Bethlehem) .... Israel journeyed, and spread his tent beyond the tower of Eder" (⁰¹⁵¹⁹Genesis 35:19,21). In ⁰¹⁵²⁷Genesis 35:27 he is described as proceeding to Hebron. This "tower of the flock," which may have been only a tower and no town, must therefore be looked for between Bethlehem and Hebron. Jerome says that it was one Roman mile from Bethlehem. In the Septuagint, however, 35:16 and 21 are transposed, which suggests that there may have been a tradition that Migdal Eder was between Bethel and Bethlehem. There must have been many such towers for guarding flocks against robbers. Compare "tower of the watchman" (¹²⁸⁰⁸2 Kings 18:8, etc.). The phrase "Migdal Eder" occurs in ³³⁴⁰⁸Micah 4:8 where Jerusalem is compared to such a tower.

E. W. G. Masterman

EDER (2)

<e'-der> ([רדע *e`edher*], "flock").

(1) A Merarite Levite in the days of David (¹³²²³1 Chronicles 23:23; 24:30); son of Mushi.

(2) A Benjamite (¹³⁸¹⁵1 Chronicles 8:15, the King James Version "Ader").

EDES

<e'-dez>: the Revised Version (British and American) EDOS (which see).

EDGE

<ej>: Very frequently occurs in the phrase "the edge of the sword" (⁰⁶⁰²⁸Joshua 10:28, et al.) from the Hebrew [hP, *peh*], "lip," or [hpv; *saphah*], "lip." ⁰²⁸⁰⁷Exodus 28:7 and 39:4 read "ends," from [hxq; *qatsah*], "end" (the King James Version "edge"), and ⁰⁶³²⁷Joshua 13:27 has "uttermost part" for the same Hebrew word (the King James Version "edge"). In ²⁸¹²⁹Jeremiah 31:29 and ²⁶⁸⁰²Ezekiel 18:2, "The children's teeth are set on edge" ([hhq; *qahah*], "to be blunt"), i.e. set hard one against another.

EDIFICATION; EDIFY

<ed-i-fi-ka'-shun>, *<ed'-i-fi>*: The Greek words [οἰκοδομέω, *oikodomeo*], "to build," [οἰκοδομή, *oikodome*], "the act of building," are used both literally and figuratively in the New Testament; "edify," "edifying," "edification," are the translation of the King James Version in some 20 passages, all in the figurative sense of the promotion of growth in Christian character. the Revised Version (British and American) in ⁴⁷⁰⁰⁸2 Corinthians 10:8; 13:10; ⁴⁹⁰⁴²Ephesians 4:12,16; ⁵⁰⁵¹¹1 Thessalonians 5:11 renders "build up," "building up," making the force of the figure clearer to the English reader. In ⁵⁴⁰¹⁰⁴1 Timothy 1:4 the Greek text followed by the Revised Version (British and American) has [οἰκονομία, *oikonomia*], "dispensation," instead of [οἰκοδομία, *oikodomia*], "edifying" (the King James Version).

F. K. Farr

EDNA

<ed'-na> ([Ἔδνα, *Edna*]): Wife of Raguel and mother of Sarah who married Tobias (Tobit 7:2, etc.; 10:12; 11:1). "Edna" in Hebrew means "pleasure" and corresponds to Latin *Anna*.

EDOM; EDOMITES

<e'-dum>, *<e'-dum-its>* [μda] *'edhom*], "red"; [Ἐδώμ, *Edom*]):

1. BOUNDARIES:

The boundaries of Edom may be traced with some approach to accuracy. On the East of the `*Arabah* the northern border ran from the Dead Sea,

and was marked by *Wady el-Kurachi*, or *Wady el-Chasa*. On the East it marched with the desert. The southern border ran by Elath and Ezion-geber (Deuteronomy 2:8). On the West of the `Arabah the north boundary of Edom is determined by the south border of Israel, as indicated in Numbers 34:3 f: a line running from the Salt Sea southward of the Ascent of Akrabbim to Zin and Kadesh-barnea. This last, we are told, lay in the "uttermost" of the border of Edom (Numbers 20:16). The line may be generally indicated by the course of Wady el-Fiqrah. How much of the uplands West of the `Arabah southward to the Gulf of `Aqaba was included in Edom it is impossible to say.

2. CHARACTER AND FEATURES:

The land thus indicated varies greatly in character and features. South of the Dead Sea in the bottom of the valley we have first the stretch of salt marsh land called es-Sebkha; then, beyond the line of white cliffs that crosses the valley diagonally from Northwest to Southeast, a broad depression strewn with stones and sandhills, the debris of an old sea bottom, rises gradually, and 60 miles to the South reaches a height of about 700 ft. above the level of the Red Sea, 2,000 ft. above that of the Dead Sea. From this point it sinks until it reaches the shore of the Gulf of `Aqaba, 45 miles farther South. The whole depression is known today as *Wady el-`Arabah* (compare Hebrew *ha-`arabhah*, Deuteronomy 2:8 the Revised Version (British and American), etc.). On either side the mountains rise steeply from the valley, their edges carved into many fantastic shapes by the deep wadys that break down from the interior (*see* ARABAH). The northern part of the plateau on the West forms the spacious grazing ground of the `Azdzimeh* Arabs. The mountains rise to a height of from about 1,500 ft. to a little over 2,000 ft. This district was traversed by the ancient caravan road to South Palestine; and along the eastern side traces of the former civilization are still to be seen. The desert region to the South is higher, reaching to as much as 2,600 ft. The mountain range East of the `Arabah is generally higher in the South than in the North. Jebel Harun beside Petra, is 4,780 ft. above sea-level; while East of `Aqaba, Jebel el-Chisma may be as much as 5,900 ft. in height. Limestone, porphyry and Nubian sandstone are the prevailing formation; but volcanic rocks are also found. The range consists mainly of rough rocky heights with many almost inaccessible peaks separated by deep gorges. But there are also breadths of fertile land where wheat, grapes, figs, pomegranates and olives are grown to advantage. The northern

district is known today by the name el-Jebal, corresponding to the ancient Gebal. Seir is the name applied to the eastern range in ⁰¹³⁶⁸Genesis 36:8; ⁰⁵⁰⁰¹Deuteronomy 2:1,5; ⁴⁴⁰²³2 Chronicles 20:23. It is also called Edom, and the Mount of Esau (Obidiah 1:8 f). Seir, however, is used for the western highlands in ⁰⁵³⁰²Deuteronomy 33:2. This seems to be its meaning also in ⁰⁷⁰⁵⁴Judges 5:4, where it appears as the equivalent of "the field of Edom." With this same phrase, however, in ⁰¹³⁰⁶Genesis 32:3 it may more fitly apply to the eastern range.

See illustration under DESERT.

3. ORIGIN OF NAME:

The name Edom, "red," may have been derived from the red sandstone cliffs characteristic of the country. It was applied to Esau because of the color of his skin (⁰¹²⁵²⁵Genesis 25:25), or from the color of the pottage for which he sold his birthright (⁰¹²⁵⁰Genesis 25:30). In ⁰¹³⁶⁸Genesis 36:8 Esau is equated with Edom as dwelling in Mt. Seir; and he is described as the father of Edom (36:9, Hebrew). The name however is probably much older. It may be traced in the records of the Twelfth Dynasty in Egypt. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Brit Mus No. 64) Udumu, or Edom, is named; and in Assyrian inscriptions the name Udumu occurs of a city and of a country. The latter may have been named from the former: this again may have been derived from a deity, Edom, who may be traced in such a name as Obed-edom (¹⁰⁰⁶¹⁰2 Samuel 6:10).

4. HISTORY:

The children of Esau are said to have "destroyed" the Horites who dwelt in Seir before them (⁰¹⁴⁰⁶Genesis 14:6; ⁰⁵⁰²²Deuteronomy 2:22). This only means that the Horites were subdued. Esau married the daughter of Anah, a Horite (⁰¹³⁶⁰Genesis 36:20 — in verse 2 he is called a Hivite); and the lists in this chapter show that the races intermingled. The Horite government was in the hands of "dukes" (⁰¹³⁶⁹Genesis 36:29 f, the Revised Version (British and American) "chiefs"). They were succeeded by dukes of the house of Esau (⁰¹³⁶⁴⁰Genesis 36:40 ff). This form of government gave way to that of an elective monarchy (⁰¹³⁶³¹Genesis 36:31 ff); and this had existed some time before Israel left the wilderness. The then reigning king would not permit Israel to pass through the land (⁰²⁰¹⁴Numbers 20:14 ff; 21:4). Israel was forbidden to "abhor an Edomite," on the ground that he was a brother; and children of the third generation might enter the assembly of

the Lord (⟨05237⟩Deuteronomy 23:7 f). War with Edom was out of the question.

Some thirty years after the Exodus, Ramses III "smote the people of Seir." The Israelites could not have been far off. We first hear of war between Israel and Edom under Saul (⟨09147⟩1 Samuel 14:47). David prosecuted the war with terrific energy, slaying 18,000 Edomites (so read instead of "Syrians") in the Valley of Salt (⟨10083⟩2 Samuel 8:13 f) ; Joab remaining for six months in the country, which was garrisoned by Israelites, "until he had cut off every male in Edom" (⟨11115⟩1 Kings 11:15 f). Hadad of the blood royal of Edom escaped to Egypt, and later became a source of trouble to Solomon (⟨11114⟩1 Kings 11:14 ff,25). The conquest of Edom opened to Israel the ports of the Red Sea, whence the expeditions of Solomon and Jehoshaphat set out. In Jehoshaphat's time the king is called a "deputy" (⟨11247⟩1 Kings 22:47). Its king acknowledged the supremacy of Judah (⟨12801⟩2 Kings 3:9, etc.). Under Jehoram son of Jehoshaphat, Edom revolted. Jehoram defeated them at Zair, but was unable to quell the rebellion (⟨12820⟩2 Kings 8:20 ff). Amaziah invaded the country, slew 10,000 in the Valley of Salt, and took Sela which he named Joktheel (⟨12407⟩2 Kings 14:7). Uzziah restored the Edomite port of Elath (⟨12422⟩2 Kings 14:22). In the Syrian war Rezin regained Elath for Syria, and cast out the Jews. It was then permanently occupied by Syrians — here also probably we should read Edomites (⟨12606⟩2 Kings 16:6). From the cuneiform inscriptions we learn that when Tiglath-pileser subdued Rezin, among the kings from whom he received homage at Damascus was Qaus-malaka of Edom (736 BC). Later Malik-ram paid homage to Sennacherib. To Ezarhaddon also they were compelled to render service. They gave what help they could to Nebuchadnezzar, and exulted in the destruction of Jerusalem, stirring the bitterest indignation in the hearts of the Jews (⟨25021⟩Lamentations 4:21; ⟨26512⟩Ezekiel 25:12; 35:3 ff; Obidiah 1:10 ff). The Edomites pressed into the now empty lands in the South of Judah. In 300 BC Mt. Seir with its capital Petra fell into the hands of the Nabateans.

5. IDUMAEA AND THE IDUMEANS:

West of the `Arabah the country they occupied came to be known by the Greek name *Idumaea*, and the people as Idumeans. Hebron, their chief city, was taken by Judas Maccabeus in 165 BC (1 Macc 4:29,61; 5:65). In 126 BC the country was subdued by John Hyrcanus, who compelled the people to become Jews and to submit to circumcision. Antipater, governor of Idumaea, was made procurator of Judea, Samaria and Galilee by Julius

Caesar. He paved the way to the throne for his son Herod the Great. With the fall of Judah under the Romans, Idumaea disappears from history.

The names of several Edomite deities are known: Hadad, Qaus, Koze, and, possibly, Edom; but of the religion of Edom we are without information. The language differed little from Hebrew.

W. Ewing

EDOS

<e'-dos> ([ʾΗδαΐς, *Edais*]; the King James Version Edes): One who agreed to put away his foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:35); called Iddo, the King James Version "Jadan," in <15108>Ezra 10:43.

EDREI

<ed'-re-i> ([y[רdֶa, *'edhre`i*]; [ʾΕδράειν, *Edra-ein*]):

(1) One of the cities of Og, not far from Ashtaroth, where the power of his kingdom received its deathblow from the invading Israelites (<06204>Joshua 12:4; <04213>Numbers 21:33 ff, etc.). It seems to mark the western limit of Bashan as against Salecah on the East (<05810>Deuteronomy 3:10). It was given to Machir, son of Manasseh (<06331>Joshua 13:31). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 24 Roman miles from Bostra. The most probable identification is with Der`ah, a town of between 4,000 and 5,000 inhabitants, on the southern lip of Wady Zeideh, about 29 miles as the crow flies East of the Sea of Galilee. It is the center of an exceedingly fruitful district. The accumulated rubbish in the town covers many remains of antiquity. It is, however, chiefly remarkable for the extraordinary subterranean city, as yet only partially explored, cut in the rock under the town. This is certainly very ancient, and was doubtless used by the inhabitants as a refuge in times of stress and peril. For a description see Schumacher, Across the Jordan, 121 ff.
(2) A place not identified, between Kedesh and En-hazor (<06987>Joshua 19:37).

W. Ewing

EDUCATION

<ed-u-ka'-shun>:

I. EDUCATION DEFINED.

By education we understand the sum total of those processes whereby society transmits from one generation to the next its accumulated social, intellectual and religious experience and heritage. In part these processes are informal and incidental, arising from participation in certain forms of social life and activity which exist on their own account and not for the sake of their educative influence upon the rising generation. The more formal educative processes are designed

(1) to give the immature members of society a mastery over the symbols and technique of civilization, including language (reading and writing), the arts, the sciences, and religion, and

(2) to enlarge the fund of individual and community knowledge beyond the measure furnished by the direct activities of the immediate environment (compare Dewey, article on "Education" in Monroe's CE; compare Butler, ME).

Religious education among ancient and modern peoples alike reveals clearly this twofold aspect of all education. On its informal side it consists in the transmission of religious ideas and experience by means of the reciprocal processes of imitation and example; each generation, by actually participating in the religious activities and ceremonies of the social group, imbibing as it were the spirit and ideals of the preceding generation as these are modified by the particular economic and industrial conditions under which the entire process takes place. Formal religious education begins with the conscious and systematic effort on the part of the mature members of a social group (tribe, nation, or religious fellowship) to initiate the immature members by means of solemn rites and ceremonies, or patient training, or both, into the mysteries and high privileges of their own religious fellowship and experience. As regards both the content and form of this instruction, these will in every case be determined by the type and stage of civilization reflected in the life, occupations, habits and customs of the people. Among primitive races educational method is simpler and the content of formal instruction less differentiated than on higher culture levels (Ames, PRE). All education is at first religious in the sense that religious motives and ideas predominate in the educational efforts of all primitive peoples. The degree to which religion continues preeminent in the educational system of a progressive nation depends upon the vitality of its

religion and upon the measure of efficiency and success with which from the first that religion is instilled into the very bone and sinew of each succeeding generation. Here lies the explanation of the religious-educational character of Hebrew national life, and here, too, the secret of Israel's incomparable influence upon the religious and educational development of the world. The religion of Israel was a vital religion and it was a teaching religion (Kent, GTJC).

II. EDUCATION IN EARLY ISRAEL.

In their social and national development the Hebrews passed through several clearly marked cultural stages which it is important to note in connection with their educational history. At the earliest point at which the Old Testament gives us any knowledge of them, they, like their ancestors, were nomads and shepherds. Their chief interest centered in the flocks and herds from which they gained a livelihood, and in the simple, useful arts that seem gradually to have become hereditary in certain families. With the settlement of the Hebrew tribes in Palestine and their closer contact with Canaanitish culture, a more established agricultural life with resulting changes in social and religious institutions gradually superseded the nomadic stage of culture. A permanent dwelling-place made possible, as the continual warfare of gradual conquest made necessary, a closer federation of the tribes, which ultimately resulted in the establishment of the monarchy under David (W. R. Smith, RS; Davidson, HE).

1. Nomadic and Agricultural Periods:

In these earliest cultural periods, both the nomadic and the agricultural, there was no distinct separation between the spheres of religion and ordinary life. The relation of the people to Yahweh was conceived by them in simple fashion as involving on their part the obligation of filial obedience and loyalty, and on Yahweh's part reciprocal parental care over them as His people. The family was the social unit and its head the person in whom centered also religious authority and leadership, The tribal head or patriarch in turn combined in himself the functions which later were differentiated into those of priest and prophet and king. Education was a matter of purely domestic interest and concern. The home was the only school and the parents the only teachers. But there was real instruction, all of which, moreover, was given in a spirit of devout religious earnestness and of reverence for the common religious ceremonies and beliefs, no

matter whether the subject of instruction was the simple task of husbandry or of some useful art, or whether it was the sacred history and traditions of the tribe, or the actual performance of its religious rites. According to Josephus (Ant., IV, viii, 12) Moses himself had commanded, "All boys shall learn the most important parts of the law since such knowledge is most valuable and the source of happiness"; and again he commanded (Apion, II, 25) to teach them the rudiments of learning (reading and writing) together with the laws and deeds of the ancestors, in order that they might not transgress or seem ignorant of the laws of their ancestors, but rather emulate their example. Certain it is that the earliest legislation, including the Decalogue, emphasized parental authority and their claim on the reverence of their children: "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which Yahweh thy God giveth thee" (Exodus 20:12); "And he that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death. And he that curseth his father or his mother, shall surely be put to death" (Exodus 21:15,17); while every father was exhorted to explain to his son the origin and significance of the great Passover ceremony with its feast of unleavened bread: "And thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying, It is because of that which Yahweh did for me when I came forth out of Egypt" (Exodus 13:8).

2. The Monarchical Period:

The period of conquest and settlement developed leaders who not only led the allied tribes in battle, but served as judges between their people, and were active in the maintenance of the ancestral religion. In time, sufficient cooperation was obtained to make possible the organization of strong intertribal leagues and, finally, the kingship. "This increasing political unification," says Ames, "was accompanied by a religious consciousness which became ultimately the most remarkable product of the national development" (Ames, PRE, 174 f). The establishment of the kingdom and the beginnings of city and commercial life were accompanied by more radical cultural changes, including the differentiation of religious from other social institutions, the organization of the priesthood, and the rise and development of prophecy. Elijah, the Tishbite, Amos, the herdsman from Tekoa, Isaiah, the son of Amoz, were all champions of a simple faith and ancient religious ideals as over against the worldly-wise diplomacy and sensuous idolatry of the surrounding nations. Under the monarchy also a new religious symbolism developed. Yahweh was thought of as a king in whose hands actually lay the supreme guidance of the state: "Accordingly

the organization of the state included provision for consulting His will and obtaining His direction in all weighty matters" (W. R. Smith, RS, 30). Under the teaching of the prophets the ideal of personal and civic righteousness was moved to the very forefront of Hebrew religious thought, while the prophetic ideal of the future was that of a time when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Yahweh, as the waters cover the sea" (Isaiah 11:9), when all "from the least of them unto the greatest of them" shall know him (Jeremiah 31:34). Concerning the so-called "schools of the prophets" which, in the days of Elijah, existed at Bethel, Jericho and Gilgal (2 Kings 2:3,1; 4:38 f), and probably in other places, it should be noted that these were associations or brotherhoods established for the purpose of mutual edification rather than education. The Bible does not use the word "schools" to designate these fraternities. Nevertheless, we cannot conceive of the element of religious training as being entirely absent.

3. Deuteronomic Legislation:

Shortly before the Babylonian captivity King Josiah gave official recognition and sanction to the teachings of the prophets, while the Deuteronomic legislation of the same period strongly emphasized the responsibility of parents for the religious and moral instruction and training of their children. Concerning the words of the law Israel is admonished: "Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up" (Deuteronomy 6:7; 11:19). For the benefit of children as well as adults the law was to be written "upon the door-posts" and "gates" (Deuteronomy 6:9; 11:20), and "very plainly" upon "great stones" set up for this purpose upon the hilltops and beside the altars (Deuteronomy 27:1-8). From the Deuteronomic period forward, religious training to the Jew became the synonym of education, while the word *Torah*, which originally denoted simply "Law" (Exodus 24:12; Leviticus 7:1; 26:46), came to mean "religious instruction or teaching," in which sense it is used in Deuteronomy 4:44; 5:1, "This is the law which Moses set before the children of Israel: .... Hear, O Israel, the statutes and the ordinances which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and observe to do them"; and in Proverbs 6:23,

"For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light;
And reproofs of instruction are the way of life."

(Compare ¹⁹⁹⁰⁸Psalm 19:8; ^{2080b}Proverbs 3:1; 4:2.)
4. Reading and Writing:

With the development and reorganization of the ritual, priests and Levites, as the guardians of the law, were the principal instructors of the people, while parents remained in charge of the training of the children. In families of the aristocracy the place of the parents was sometimes taken by tutors, as appears from the case of the infant Solomon, whose training stems to have been entrusted to the prophet Nathan (¹⁰¹²⁵2 Samuel 12:25). There is no way of determining to what extent the common people were able to read and write. Our judgment that these rudiments of formal education in the modern sense were not restricted to the higher classes is based upon such passages as ²³²⁹¹Isaiah 29:11,12, which distinguishes between the man who "is learned" (literally, "knoweth letters") and the one who is "not learned," and ²³¹⁰⁹Isaiah 10:19, referring to the ability of a child "to write," taken together with such facts as that the literary prophets Amos and Micah sprang from the ranks of the common people, and that "the workman who excavated the tunnel from the Virgin's Spring to the Pool of Siloam carved in the rock the manner of their work" (Kennedy in HDB). It should be added that the later Jewish tradition reflected in the Talmud, Targum and Midrash, and which represents both public, elementary and college education as highly developed even in patriarchal times, is generally regarded as altogether untrustworthy.

III. EDUCATION IN LATER ISRAEL.

The national disaster that befell the Hebrew people in the downfall of Jerusalem and the Babylonian captivity was not without its compensating, purifying and stimulating influence upon the religious and educational development of the nation. Under the pressure of adverse external circumstances the only source of comfort for the exiled people was in the law and covenant of Yahweh, while the shattering of all hope of immediate national greatness turned the thought and attention of the religious leaders away from the present toward the future. Two types of Messianic expectation characterized the religious development of the exilic period. The first is the priestly, material hope of return and restoration reflected in the prophecies of Ezekiel. The exiled tribes are to return again to Jerusalem; the temple is to be restored, its ritual and worship purified and exalted, the priestly ordinance and service elaborated. The second is the spiritualized and idealized Messianic expectation of the Second Isaiah,

based on teachings of the earlier prophets. For the greatest of Hebrew prophets Yahweh is the only God, and the God of all nations as well as of Israel. For him Israel is Yahweh's servant, His instrument for revealing Himself to other nations, who, when they witness the redemption of Yahweh's suffering Servant, will bow down to Yahweh and acknowledge His rule. "Thus the trials of the nation lead to a comprehensive universalism within which the suffering Israel gains an elevated and ennobling explanation" (Ames, PRE, 185). In the prophetic vision of Ezekiel we must seek the inspiration for the later development of Jewish ritual, as well as the basis of those eschatological hopes and expectations which find their fuller expression in the apocalypse of Daniel and the kindred literature of the later centuries. The prophecies of the Isaiahs and the Messianic hope which these kindled in the hearts of the faithful prepared the way for the teachings of Jesus concerning a Divine spiritual kingdom, based upon the personal, ethical character of the individual and the mutual, spiritual fellowship of believers.

1. Educational Significance of the Prophets:

The educational significance of the prophetic writings of this as of the preceding periods is that the prophets themselves were the real religious leaders and representative men (Kulturtrager) of the nation. In advance of their age they were the heralds of Divine truth; the watchmen on the mountain tops whose clear insight into the future detected the significant elements in the social and religious conditions and tendencies about them, and whose keen intellect and lofty faith grasped the eternal principles which are the basis of all individual and national integrity and worth. These truths and principles they impressed upon the consciousness of their own and succeeding generations, thereby giving to future teachers of their race the essence of their message, and preparing the way for the larger and fuller interpretation of religion and life contained in the teachings of Jesus. The immediate influence of their teaching is explained in part by the variety and effectiveness of their teaching method, their marvelous simplicity and directness of speech, their dramatic emphasis upon essentials and their intelligent appreciation of social conditions and problems about them.

2. The Book of the Law:

The immediate bond of union, as well as the textbook and program of religious instruction, during the period of the captivity and subsequently,

was the Book of the Law, which the exiles carried with them to Babylon. When in 458 BC a company of exiles returned to Palestine, they along with their poorer brethren who had not been carried away, restored the Jewish community at Jerusalem, and under the suzerainty of Persia, founded a new nationalism, based, even more than had been the earlier monarchy, upon the theocratic conception of Israel's relation to Yahweh. During this period it was that writings of poets, lawgivers, prophets and sages were brought together into one sacred collection of scrolls, known later as the Old Testament canon, of which the *Torah* (the law) was educationally the most significant. The recognized teachers of this period included, in addition to the priests and Levites, the "wise men," or "sages" and the "scribes" or copherim (literally, "those learned in Scriptures").

3. Wise Men or Sages:

Whether or not the sages and scribes of the later post-exilic times are to be regarded as one and the same class, as an increasing number of scholars are inclined to believe, or thought of as distinct classes, the wise men clearly antedate, not only the *copherim* but in all probability all forms of book learning as well. Suggestions of their existence and function are met with in earliest times both in Israel and among other nations of the East. As illustrations of their appearance in preexilic Old Testament history may be cited the references in [1040] 2 Samuel 14:1-20; [1052] 1 Kings 4:32; [2390] Isaiah 29:10. It is no lesser personage than King Solomon who, both by his contemporaries and later generations as well, was regarded as the greatest representative of this earlier group of teachers who uttered their wisdom in the form of clever, epigrammatic proverbs and shrewd sayings. The climax of Wisdom-teaching belongs, however, to the later post-exilic period. Of the wise men of this later day an excellent description is preserved for us in the Book of Ecclesiasticus (39:3,4,8,10; compare 1:1-11):

> *"He seeks out the hidden meaning of proverbs,*
> *And is conversant with the subtleties of parables,*
> *He serves among great men,*
> *And appears before him who rules;*
> *He travels through the land of strange nations;*
> *For he hath tried good things and evil among men.*

. . . .

> *He shows forth the instruction which he has been taught,*
> *And glories in the law of the covenant of the Lord.*

. . . .

Nations shall declare his wisdom,
And the congregation shall tell out his praise."

4. The Book of Proverbs:

Of the pedagogic experience, wisdom and learning of these sages, the Book of Proverbs forms the Biblical repository. Aside from the *Torah* it is thus the oldest handbook of education. The wise men conceive of life itself as a discipline. Parents are the natural instructors of their children:

"My son, hear the instruction of thy father, And forsake not the law of thy mother." — Proverbs 1:8.

(Compare 4:1-4 ff; 6:20; 13:1.) The substance of such parental teaching is to be the `fear of Yahweh' which "is the beginning of wisdom"; and fidelity in the performance of this parental obligation has the promise of success:

"Train up a child in the way he should go, And even when he is old he will not depart from it." — Proverbs 22:6.

In their training of children, parents are to observe sternness, not hesitating to apply the rod of correction, when needed (compare Proverbs 23:13,14), yet doing so with discretion, since wise reproof is better than "a hundred stripes" (Proverbs 17:10). Following the home training there is provision for further instruction at the hands of professional teachers for all who would really obtain unto "wisdom" and who can afford the time and expense of such special training. The teachers are none other than the wise men or sages whose words "heard in quiet" (Ecclesiastes 9:17) are "as goads, and as nails well fastened" (Ecclesiastes 12:11). Their precepts teach diligence Proverbs (6:6-11), chastity (7:5), charity (14:21), truthfulness (17:7) and temperance (21:17; 23:20,21,29-35); for the aim of all Wisdom-teaching is none other than

"To give prudence to the simple, To the young man knowledge and discretion: That the wise man may hear, and increase in learning; And that the man of understanding may attain unto sound counsels." — Proverbs 1:4,5.

5. Scribes and Levites:

The copherim or "men of book learning" were editors and interpreters as well as scribes or copyists of ancient and current writings. As a class they did not become prominent until the wise men, as such, stepped into the background, nor until the exigencies of the situation demanded more

teachers and teaching than the ranks of priests and Levites, charged with increasing ritualistic duties, could supply. Ezra was both a priest and a *copher* (⟨15711⟩Ezra 7:11; ⟨16801⟩Nehemiah 8:1 f), concerning whom we read that he "set his heart to seek the law of Yahweh, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and ordinances" (⟨15710⟩Ezra 7:10). Likewise the Levites often appear as teachers of the law, and we must think of the development of sopherism (scribism) as a distinct profession as proceeding very gradually. The same is true of the characteristic Jewish religious-educational institution, the synagogue, the origin and development of which fell within this same general period (compare *SYNAGOGUE*). The pupils of the *copherim* were the Pharisees (*perushim* or "separatists") who during the Maccabean period came to be distinguished from the priestly party or Sadducees.

6. Greek and Roman Influences:

The conquest of Persia by Alexander (332 BC) marks the rise of Greek influence in Palestine. Alexander himself visited Palestine and perhaps Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant, X, i, 8), befriended the Jews and granted to them the privilege of seir-government, and the maintenance of their own social and religious customs, both at home and in Alexandria, the new center of Greek learning, in the founding of which many Jews participated (*see ALEXANDRIA*). During the succeeding dynasty of the Ptolemies, Greek ideas and Greek culture penetrated to the very heart of Judaism at Jerusalem, and threatened the overthrow of Jewish social and religious institutions. The Maccabean revolt under Antiochus Epiphanes (174-164 BC) and the reestablishment of a purified temple ritual during the early part of the Maccabean period (161-63 BC) were the natural reaction against the attempt of the Seleucids forcibly to substitute the Greek gymnasium and theater for the Jewish synagogue and temple (Felten, NZ, I, 83 f; compare 1 Macc 1, 3, 9, 13 and 2 Macc 4-10). The end of the Maccabean period found Phariseeism and strict Jewish orthodoxy in the ascendancy with such Hellenic tendencies as had found permanent lodgment in Judaism reflected in the agnosticism of the aristocratic Sadducees. The establishment of Roman authority in Palestine (63 BC) introduced a new determining element into the environmental conditions under which Judaism was to attain its final distinguishing characteristics. The genius of the Romans was practical, legalistic and institutional. As organizers and administrators they were preeminent. But their religion never inspired to any exalted view of life, and education to them meant always merely a preparation for life's

practical duties. Hence, the influence of Roman authority upon Judaism was favorable to the development of a narrow individualistic Phariseeism, rather than to the fostering of Greek idealism and universalism. With the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans a little more than a century later (70 AD) and the cessation of the temple worship, the Sadducees as a class disappeared from Judaism, which has ever since been represented by the Pharisees devoted to the study of the law. Outside of Jerusalem and Palestine, meanwhile, the Jewish communities at Alexandria and elsewhere were much more hospitable to Greek culture and learning, at the same time exerting a reciprocal, modifying influence upon Greek thought. It was, however, through its influence upon early Christian theology and education that the Hellenistic philosophy of the Alexandrian school left its deeper impress upon the substance and method of later Christian education.

IV. EDUCATION IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.

Elementary schools: Jewish education in the time of Christ was of the orthodox traditional type and in the hands of scribes, Pharisees and learned rabbis. The home was still the chief institution for the dispensation of elementary instruction, although synagogues, with attached schools for the young were to be found in every important Jewish community. Public elementary schools, other than those connected with the synagogues were of slower growth and do not seem to have been common until, some time after Joshua ben Gamala, high priest from 63-65 AD, ordered that teachers be appointed in every province and city to instruct children having attained the age of 6-7 years. In the synagogue schools the *chazzan*, or attendant, not infrequently served as schoolmaster (compare *SCHOOL; SCHOOLMASTER*).

1. Subject Matter of Instruction:

As in earlier times the *Torah*, connoting now the sacred Old Testament writings as a whole, though with emphasis still upon the law, furnished the subject-matter of instruction. To this were added, in the secondary schools (colleges) of the rabbis, the illustrative and parabolical rabbinical interpretation of the law (the *haggadhah*) and its application to daily life in the form of concise precept or rule of conduct (the *halakhah*). Together the *haggadhah* and *halakhah* furnish the content of the Talmud (or Talmuds), as the voluminous collections of orthodox Jewish teachings of later centuries came to be known.

2. Method and Aims:

As regards teaching method the scribes and rabbis of New Testament times did not improve much upon the practice of the copherim and sages of earlier centuries. Memorization, the exact reproduction by the pupil of the master's teaching, rather than general knowledge or culture, was the main objective. Since the voice of prophecy had become silent and the canon of revealed truth was considered closed, the intellectual mastery and interpretation of this sacred revelation of the past was the only aim that education on its intellectual side could have. On its practical side it sought, as formerly, the inculcation of habits of strict ritualistic observance, obedience to the letter of the law as a condition of association and fellowship with the selected company of true Israelites to which scribes and Pharisees considered themselves to belong. The success with which the teachings of the scribes and rabbis were accompanied is an evidence of their devotion to their work, and more still of the psychological insight manifested by them in utilizing every subtle means and method for securing and holding the attention of their pupils, and making their memories the trained and obedient servants of an educational ideal. The defects in their work were largely the defects in that ideal. Their theory and philosophy of education were narrow. "Their eyes were turned too much to the past rather than the present and future." They failed to distinguish clearly the gold from the dross in their inherited teachings, or to adapt these to the vital urgent needs of the common people. In its struggle against foreign cults and foreign culture, Judaism had encased itself in a shell of stereotyped orthodoxy, the attempt to adapt which to new conditions and to a constantly changing social order resulted in an insincere and shallow casuistry of which the fantastic conglomerate mass of Talmudic wisdom of the 4th and 6th centuries is the lasting memorial.

3. Valuable Results of Jewish Education:

Nevertheless, "Jewish education, though defective both in matter and in method, and tending to fetter rather than to free the mind, achieved four valuable results:

(1) it developed a taste for close, critical study;

(2) it sharpened the wits, even to the point of perversity;

(3) it encouraged a reverence for law and produced desirable social conduct; and

(4) it formed a powerful bond of union among the Jewish people." To these four points of excellence enumerated by Davidson (Historia Ecclesiastica, 80) must be added a fifth which, briefly stated, is this:

(5) Jewish education by its consistent teaching of lofty monotheism, and its emphasis, sometimes incidental add sometimes outstanding, upon righteousness and holiness of life as a condition of participation in a future Messianic kingdom, prepared the way for the Christian view of God and the world, set forth in its original distinctness of outline and incomparable simplicity in the teachings of Jesus.

4. The Preeminence of Jesus as a Teacher:

Jesus was more than a teacher; but He was a teacher first. To His contemporaries he appeared as a Jewish rabbi of exceptional influence and popularity. He used the teaching methods of the rabbis; gathered about Him, as did they, a group of chosen disciples (learners) whom He trained and taught more explicitly with a view to perpetuating through them His own influence and work. His followers called Him Rabbi and Master, and the scribes and Pharisees conceded His popularity and power. He taught, as did the rabbis of His time, in the temple courts, in the synagogue, in private, and on the public highway as the exigencies of the case demanded. His textbook, so far as He used any, was the same as theirs; His form of speech (parable and connected discourse), manner of life and methods of instruction were theirs. Yet into His message and method He put a new note of authority that challenged attention and inspired confidence. Breaking with the traditions of the past He substituted for devotion to the letter of the law an interest in men, with boundless sympathy for their misfortune, abiding faith in their worth and high destiny and earnest solicitude for their regeneration and perfection. To say that Jesus was the world's greatest and foremost example as a teacher is to state a fact borne out by every inquiry, test and comparison that modern educational science can apply to the work and influence of its great creative geniuses of the past. Where His contemporaries and even His own followers saw only "as in a glass, darkly," He saw clearly; and His view of God and the world, of human life and human destiny, has come down through the ages as a Divine revelation vouchsafed the world in Him. Viewed from the

intellectual side, it was the life philosophy of Jesus that made His teachings imperishable; esthetically it was the compassionate tenderness and solicitude of His message that drew the multitudes to Him; judged from the standpoint of will, it was the example of His life, its purpose, its purity, its helpfulness, that caused men to follow Him; and tested by its immediate and lasting social influence, it was the doctrine, the ideal and example of the human brotherliness and Divine sonship, that made Jesus the pattern of the great teachers of mankind in every age and generation. With a keen, penetrating insight into the ultimate meaning of life, He reached out, as it were, over the conflicting opinions of men and the mingling social and cultural currents of His time backward to the fundamental truths uttered by the ancient prophets of His race and forward to the ultimate goal of the race. Then with simple directness of speech He addressed Himself to the consciences and wills of men, setting before them the ideal of the higher life, and with infinite patience sought to lift them to the plane of fellowship with Himself in thought and action.

5. *Educational Work of the Early Disciples:*

It remained for the disciples of Jesus to perpetuate His teaching ministry and to organize the new forces making for human betterment. In this work, which was distinctly religious-educational in character, some found a field of labor among their own Jewish kinsmen, and others, like Paul, among the needy Gentiles (Galatians 1:16; 2:7; 1 Timothy 2:7). As regards a division of labor in the apostolic church, we read of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers (1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11). The apostles were the itinerant leaders and missionaries of the entire church. Their work was largely that of teaching, Paul insisting on calling himself a teacher as well as an apostle (2 Timothy 1:11; 1 Corinthians 4:17). The prophets were men with a special message like that of Agabus (Acts 21:10,11). The evangelists were itinerant preachers, as was Philip (Acts 8:40), while the pastors, also called bishops, had permanent charge of individual churches. The professional teachers included both laymen and those ordained by the laying on of hands. Their work was regarded with highest honor in the church and community. In contrast with the itinerant church officers, apostles and evangelists, they, like the pastors, resided permanently in local communities. With this class the author of the Epistle of James identifies himself, and there can be little doubt that the epistle which he wrote reflects both the content and form of the instruction which these earliest Christian teachers gave to their pupils.

Before the close of the 1st century the religious educational work of the church had been organized into a more systematic form, out of which there developed gradually the catechumenate of the early post-apostolic period (*see CATECHIST*). In the Didache, or Teachings of the Apostles, there has been reserved for us a textbook of religious instruction from this earlier period (Kent, GTJC). Necessarily, the entire missionary and evangelistic work of the apostolic church was educational in character, and throughout this earliest period of church history we must think of the work of apostles, evangelists and pastors, as well as that of professional teachers, as including a certain amount of systematic religious instruction.

   See further PEDAGOGY; SCHOOL; TEACHER; TUTOR.

LITERATURE.

Ames, Psychology of Religious Experience, chapter x; Box, article "Education," in Encyclopedia Biblica; Butler, The Meaning of Education; Davidson, History of Education; Dewey, article "Education," in Monroe's Cyclopedia of Education; Edersheim, "The Upbringing of Jewish Children," in SJSL, and Life and Times of Jesus, I, 225 f; Fairweather, Background of the Gospels; Felten, "Schriftgelehrten, Synagogen u. Schulen," in Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, I; Ginsburg, article "Education," in Kitto's Biblical Cyclopedia; Hiegemoser u. Bock, Quellenbuch u. Uberblick d. Geschichte d. Padagogik; Katzer, articles "Jesus als Lehrer" and "Judenchristenturn," in Rein's Encyklopadisches Handbuch d. Padagogik; Kennedy, article "Education," in HDB, I; Kohler and Gudemann, article "Education" in Jew Encyclopedia, V; Kent, Great Teachers of Judaism and Christianity and Makers and Teachers of Judaism; Laurie, Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education; Lewit, Darstellung d. theoretischen u. praktischen Padagogik im jud. Altertume; Oehler, article "Padagogik d. Alten Testaments," in Schmid's Encyclopadie d. Gesammten Erziehungs-u. Unterrichtswesen; Schurer, "Schriftgelehrsamkeit, Schule u. Synagoge," in Geschichte d. jud. Volkes (ed 1907); W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites; Straussburger, Geschichte d. Unterrichts bei d. Israeliten; von Rohden, article "Katechetik" in Rein's EHP.

H. H. Meyer

EDUTH

<e'-duth> ([tWd[e`*edhuth*], "testimony," a technical term for the Ten Commandments or for the Law): In Psalm 60 title, "set to Shushan Eduth" (literally, "a lily (is) the testimony"); 80 title, "set to Shoshannim Eduth" (literally, "lilies (is) the testimony"). The Hebrew words appear to be intended to designate a melody by the first few words ordinarily associated with it.

See PSALMS.

EFFECT; EFFECTUAL

<e-fekt'>, *<e-fek'-tu-al>*: In the Old Testament, the Revised Version (British and American) renders "fulfilment" for "effect" in Ezekiel 12:23 (Hebrew *dabhar*, "matter"); and in Jeremiah 48:30 "His boastings have wrought nothing" for the vaguer "His lies shall not so effect" of the King James Version. In the King James Version of the New Testament, "make of none effect" occurs repeatedly: as the translation of Greek *akuroo*, "render void" (Matthew 15:6; Mark 7:13); of *katargeo*, "annul" (Romans 3:3 (the King James Version "make without effect"); Romans 4:14; Galatians 3:17); and of *kenoo*, "make empty" (1 Corinthians 1:17). the Revised Version (British and American) renders "make of none effect" in Romans 3:3; Galatians 3:17; "make void" in the other cases, with no apparent reason for the lack of uniformity. Greek *energeo* is the opposite in meaning of *katargeo* above. Its derivative energes, "effective," is rendered "effectual" by English Versions of the Bible in 1 Corinthians 16:9; Philem 1:6. the Revised Version (British and American) dispenses with "effectual," "effectually," in the other cases where the King James Version has used these words as auxiliary in the translation of *energeo* or of *energeia*, "working" (2 Corinthians 1:6; Galatians 2:8; Ephesians 3:7; 4:16; 1 Thessalonians 2:13; James 5:16).

F. K. Farr

EGG

([hxyBe*betsah*]; [ὠόν, *oon*]; Latin *ovum*): An oval or spheroid body produced by birds, fishes and reptiles, from which their young emerge when incubated or naturally developed. The fertile egg of a bird consists of

the yolk, a small disk from which the embryo develops, the albuminous white, and a calcareous shell. The most ancient records prove that eggs have been used as an article of diet ever since the use of the flesh of fowl began. Chickens were unknown in Palestine in the days of Job, so that his query concerning the taste of the white of an egg might have referred to those of pigeons, ducks, eggs taken from the nests of geese or swans, game birds or ostriches. "Can that which hath no savor be eaten without salt? Or is there any taste in the white of an egg?" (⟨18066⟩Job 6:6, the Revised Version, margin "the juice of purslain"). In ⟨21112⟩Luke 11:12 there is every possibility that the egg of our common domestic fowl is referred to as "chickens" (which see) had been imported and were numerous in Palestine at that time. "Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?" The reference in ⟨28905⟩Isaiah 59:5 is to the egg of a serpent, and is figurative of the schemes of evil men: "They hatch adders' eggs, and weave the spider's web: he that eateth of their eggs dieth; and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper."

Gene Stratton-Porter

EGLAH

<eg'-la> ([hl gֶ[, `eghlah], "heifer"): Wife of David and mother of Ithream (⟨10815⟩2 Samuel 3:5 parallel ⟨13808⟩1 Chronicles 3:3).

EGLAIM

<eg'-la-im> ([μyl " gֶ*a*, `eghlayim]; [Ἀγαλείμ, *Agaleim*]): A place named in ⟨23508⟩Isaiah 15:8, possibly in the South of Moab. Eusebius (Onomasticon) identifies it with Agallim, a village 8 Roman miles South of Areopolis. It cannot now be identified.

EGLATH-SHELISHIYAH

<eg'-lath-shel-i-shi'-ya> ([hֽYׂvl iv]tl " g[, `eghlath shelishiyah]): Found in ⟨23505⟩Isaiah 15:5; ⟨24834⟩Jeremiah 48:34 (Hebrew) in oracles against Moab. the King James Version translates "an heifer of three years old"; the Revised Version (British and American) takes it as the name of a place, but the American Revised Version, margin has "a heifer three years old," according to Septuagint. In the former case strong and unconquered cities, Zoar and Horonaim, are compared to the heifer not yet broken to the yoke. Such use of "heifer" is not infrequent (compare ⟨24460⟩Jeremiah 46:20; ⟨28011⟩Hosea 10:11, etc.). The majority of scholars, however, take it as a

place-name. Some would read "the third Eglath," as if there were three towns of that name. No probable identification has been suggested.

W. Ewing

EGLON (1)

<eg'-lon> ([ˆwOgⅠ, `eghlon*], "circle"): A king of Moab in the period of the Judges who, in alliance with Ammon and Amalek, overcame Israel and made Jericho his capital, presumably driven across the Jordan by the turmoil in his own kingdom which at that time was probably being used as a battle ground by Edom and the desert tribes (compare ⁰¹⁶⁶⁵Genesis 36:35). After 18 years of servitude the children of Israel were delivered by Ehud the Benjamite, who like so many other Benjamites (compare ⁰⁷⁰¹⁶Judges 20:16) was left-handed. Under the pretext of carrying a present to the tyrant, he secured a private interview and assassinated him with a two-edged sword which he had carried concealed on his right side (^{0761P}Judges 3:19-22). Ehud made his escape, rallied the children of Israel about him and returned to conquer the Moabites (⁰⁷⁰³⁰Judges 3:30).

Ella Davis Isaacs

EGLON (2)

<eg'-lon> ([ˆwOgⅠ, `eghlon*]; [᾽Οδολλάμ, *Odollam*]): A royal Canaanite city whose king joined the league headed by Adonizedek of Jerusalem against the Gibeonites, which suffered overwhelming defeat at the hands of Joshua (Joshua 10). Joshua passed from Libnah to Lachish, and from Lachish to Eglon on his way to Hebron (10:31 ff). It was in the Shephelah of Judah (15:39). The name seems to be preserved in that of Khirbet `Ajlan, about 10 miles West of Beit Jibrin. Professor Petrie, however, thinks that the site of Tell Nejileh better suits the requirements. While Khirbet `Ajlan is a comparatively modern site, the city at Tell Nejileh must have been contemporary with that at Tell el-Chesy (Lachish). It lies fully three miles Southeast of Tell el-Chesy.

W. Ewing

EGYPT

<e'-jipt>:

Egypt ([μyi " ×ini, *mitsrayim*]; [ἡ Αἴγυπτος, *he Aiguptos*]): Usually supposed to represent the dual of [Mitsrayim], referring to "the two lands," as the Egyptians called their country. This dualism, however, has been denied by some.

I. THE COUNTRY.

1. The Basis of the Land:

Though Egypt is one of the earliest countries in recorded history, and as regards its continuous civilization, yet it is a late country in its geological history and in its occupation by a settled population. The whole land up to Silsileh is a thick mass of Eocene limestone, with later marls over that in the lower districts. It has been elevated on the East, up to the mountains of igneous rocks many thousand feet high toward the Red Sea. It has been depressed on the West, down to the Fayum and the oases below sea-level. This strain resulted in a deep fault from North to South for some hundreds of miles up from the Mediterranean. This fault left its eastern side about 200 ft. above its western, and into it the drainage of the plateau poured, widening it out so as to form the Nile valley, as the permanent drain of Northeast Africa. The access of water to the rift seems to have caused the basalt outflows, which are seen as black columnar basalt South of the Fayum, and brown massive basalt at Khankah, North of Cairo.

2. The Nile Valley:

The gouging out of the Nile valley by rainfall must have continued when the land was 300 ft. higher than at present, as is shown by the immense fails of strata into collapsed caverns which were far below the present Nile level. Then, after the excavations of the valley, it has been submerged to 500 ft. lower than at present, as is shown by the rolled gravel beds and deposits on the tops of the water-worn cliffs, and the filling up of the tributary valleys — as at Thebes — by deep deposits, through which the subsequent stream beds have been scoured out. The land still had the Nile source 30 ft. higher than it is now within the human period, as seen by the worked flints in high gravel beds above the Nile plain. The distribution of land and water was very different from that at present when the land was only 100 ft. lower than now. Such a change would make the valley an estuary up to South of the Fayum, would submerge much of the western desert, and would unite the Gulf of Suez and the Mediterranean. Such

differences would entirely alter the conditions of animal life by sea and land. And as the human period began when the water was considerably higher, the conditions of climate and of life must have greatly changed in the earlier ages of man's occupation.

3. Earliest Human Remains:

The earliest human remains belonging to the present condition of the country are large paleolithic flints found in the side valleys at the present level of the Nile. As these are perfectly fresh, and not rolled or altered, they show that paleolithic man lived in Egypt under the present conditions. The close of this paleolithic age of hunters, and the beginning of a settled population of cultivators, cannot have been before the drying up of the climate, which by depriving the Nile of tributary streams enfeebled it so that its mud was deposited and formed a basis for agriculture. From the known rate of deposit, and depth of mud soil, this change took place about 10,000 years ago. As the recorded history of the country extends 7,500 years, and we know of two prehistoric ages before that, it is pretty well fixed that the disappearance of paleolithic man, and the beginning of the continuous civilization must have been about 9,000 to 10,000 years ago. For the continuation of this subject see the section on "History" below.

4. Climate:

The climate of Egypt is unique in the world. So far as solar heat determines it, the condition is tropical; for, though just North of the tropic which lies at the boundary of Egypt and Nubia, the cloudless condition fully compensates for higher latitude. So far as temperature of the air is concerned, the climate is temperate, the mean heat of the winter months being 52 degree and of the summer about 80 degree, much the same as Italy. This is due to the steady prevalence of north winds, which maintain fit conditions for active, strenuous work. The rainlessness and dry air give the same facility of living that is found in deserts, where shelter is only needed for temperature and not for wet; while the inundation provides abundant moisture for the richest crops.

5. Conditions of Life:

The primitive condition — only recently changed — of the crops being all raised during five cool months from November to April, and the inundation covering the land during all the hot weather, left the population free from

labor during the enervating season, and only required their energies when work was possible under favorable conditions. At the same time it gave a great opportunity for monumental work, as any amount of labor could be drawn upon without the smallest reduction in the produce of the country. The great structures which covered the land gave training and organization to the people, without being any drain upon the welfare of the country. The inundation covering the plain also provided the easiest transport for great masses from the quarries at the time when labor was abundant. Thus the climatic conditions were all in favor of a great civilization, and aided its production of monuments. The whole mass of the country being of limestone, and much of it of the finest quality, provided material for construction at every point. In the south, sandstone and granite were also at hand upon the great waterway.

6. The Nile:

The Nile is the great factor which makes life possible in Northeast Africa, and without it Egypt would only be a desolate corner of the Sahara. The union of two essentially different streams takes place at Kharrum. The White or light Nile comes from the great plains of the Sudan, while the Blue or dark Nile descends from the mountains of Abyssinia. The Sudan Nile from Gondokoro is filtered by the lakes and the sudd vegetation, so that it carries little mud; the Abyssinian Nile, by its rapid course, brings down all the soil which is deposited in Egypt, and which forms the basis for cultivation. The Sudan Nile rises only 6 ft. from April to November; while the Abyssinian Nile rises 26 ft. from April to August. The latter makes the rise of the inundation, while the Sudan Nile maintains the level into the winter. In Egypt itself the unchecked Nile at Aswan rises 25 ft. from the end of May to the beginning of September; while at Cairo, where modified by the irrigation system, it rises 16 ft. from May to the end of September. It was usually drained off the land by the beginning of November, and cultivation was begun. The whole cultivable land of Egypt is but the dried-up bed of the great river, which fills its ancient limits during a third of the year. The time taken by a flush of water to come down the Nile is about 15 days from 400 miles above Khartum to Aswan, and about 6 days from Aswan to Cairo, or 80 to 90 miles a day, which shows a flow of 3 to 3 1/2 miles an hour when in flood.

7. The Fauna:

The fauna has undergone great changes during the human period. At the close of the prehistoric age there are represented the giraffe, elephant, wild ox, lion, leopard, stag, long-necked gazelle and great dogs, none of which are found in the historic period. During historic times various kinds of antelopes have been exterminated, the hippopotamus was driven out of the Delta during Roman times, and the crocodile was cleared out of Upper Egypt and Nubia in the last century. Cranes and other birds shown on early sculptures are now unknown in the country. The animals still surviving are the wolf, jackal, hyena, dogs, ichneumon, jerboa, rats, mice, lizards (up to 4 ft. long) and snakes, besides a great variety of birds, admirably figured by Whymper, Birds of Egypt. Of tamed animals, the ox, sheep, goat and donkey are ancient; the cat and horse were brought in about 2000 BC, the camel was not commonly known till 200 AD, and the buffalo was brought to Egypt and Italy in the Middle Ages.

8. The Flora:

The cultivated plants of Egypt were numerous. In ancient times we find the maize (durrah), wheat, barley and lentil; the vine, currant, date palm, dum palm, fig, olive and pomegranate; the onion, garlic, cucumber, melon and radish; the sont acacia, sycamore and tamarisk; the flax, henna and clover; and for ornament, the lotus, convolvulus and many others. The extension of commerce brought in by the Greek period, the bean, pea, sesame, lupin, helbeh, colocasia and sugar-cane; also the peach, walnut, castor-oil and pear. In the Roman and Arabic ages came in the chick pea, oats, rice, cotton, orange and lemon. In recent times have come the cactus, aloe, tomato, Indian corn, lebbek acacia and beetroot. Many European flowering and ornamental plants were also used in Egypt by the Greeks, and brought in later by the Arabs.

9. The Prehistoric Races:

The original race in Egypt seems to have been of the steatopygous type now only found in South Africa. Figures of this race are known in the caves of France, in Malta, and later in Somaliland. As this race was still known in Egypt at the beginning of the neolithic civilization, and is there represented only by female figures in the graves, it seems that it was being exterminated by the newcomers and only the women were kept as slaves.

The neolithic race of Egypt was apparently of the Libyan stock. There seems to have been a single type of the Amorites in Syria, the prehistoric Egyptians and the Libyans; this race had a high, well-filled head, long nose slightly aquiline, and short beard; the profile was upright and not prognathous, the hair was wavy brown. It was a better type than the present south Europeans, of a very capable and intelligent appearance. From the objects found, and the religious legends, it seems that this race was subdued by an eastern, and probably Arabian race, in the prehistoric age.

II. THE HISTORY.

The founders of the dynastic history were very different, having a profile with nose and forehead in one straight line, and rather thick, but well-formed lips. Historically the indications point to their coming from about Somali land by water, and crossing into Egypt by the Koptos road from the Red Sea. The IInd Dynasty gave place to some new blood, probably of Sudany origin. In the VIth and VIIth Dynasties foreigners poured in apparently from the North, perhaps from Crete, judging by their foreign products. The XVth and XVIth Dynasties were Hyksos, or Semitic "princes of the desert" from the East. The XVIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties were Berber in origin. The XIXth Dynasty was largely Semitic from Syria. The XXIId Dynasty was headed by an eastern adventurer Sheshenq, or Shusinak, "the man of Susa." The XXVth Dynasty was Ethiopian. The XXVIth Dynasty was Libyan. The Greeks then poured into the Delta and the Fayum, and Hellenized Egypt. The Roman made but little change in the population; but during his rule the Arab began to enter the eastern side, and by 641 AD the Arab conquest swept the land, and brought in a large part — perhaps the majority — of the ancestors of the present inhabitants. After 3 centuries the Tunisians—the old Libyans — conquered Egypt again. The later administrations by Syrians, Circassians, Turks and others probably made no change in the general population. The economic changes of the past century have brought in Greeks, Italians and other foreigners to the large towns; but all these only amount to an eightieth of the population. The Coptics are the descendants of the very mixed Egyptians of Roman age, kept separate from the Arab invaders by their Christianity. They are mainly in Upper Egypt, where some villages are entirely Coptic, and are distinguished by their superior cleanliness, regularity, and the freedom of the women from unwholesome seclusion. The Coptics, though only a

fifteenth of the population, have always had a large share of official posts, owing to their intelligence and ability being above that of the Muslim.

1. 1st and 2d Ages: Prehistoric:

In dealing with the history, we here follow the dating which was believed

and followed by the Egyptians themselves. All the monumental remains agree with this, so far as they can check it; and the various arbitrary reductions that have been made on some periods are solely due to some critics preferring their internal sense to all the external facts. For the details involved in the chronology, see Historical Studies, II (British School of Archaeology in Egypt). The general outline of the periods is given here, and the detailed view of the connection with Old Testament history is treated in later sections.

1st Age.

The prehistoric age begins probably about 8000 BC, as soon as there was a sufficient amount of Nile deposit to attract a settled population. The desert river valley of Egypt was probably one of the latest haunts of steatopygous Paleolithic man of the Bushman type. So soon as there was an opening for a pastoral or agricultural people, he was forced away by settlers from Libya. These settlers were clad in goatskins, and made a small amount of pottery by hand; they knew also of small quantities of copper, but mainly used flint, of which they gradually developed the finest working known in any age. They rapidly advanced in civilization. Their pottery of red polished ware was decorated with white clay patterns, exactly like the pottery still made in the mountains of Algeria. The forms of it were very varied and exquisitely regular, although made without the wheel. Their hardstone vases are finer than any of those of the historic ages. They adopted spinning, weaving and woodwork.

2nd Age.

Upon these people came in others probably from the East, who brought in the use of the Arab face-veil, the belief in amulets, and the Persian lapis lazuli. Most of the previous forms of pottery disappear, and nearly all the productions are greatly altered. Copper became common, while gold, silver and lead were also known. Heliopolis was probably a center of rule.

2. 3d Age: Ist and IId Dynasties:

About 5900 BC a new people came in with the elements of the art of writing, and a strong political ability of organization. Before 5800 BC they had established kings at Abydos in Upper Egypt, and for 3 centuries they gradually increased their power. On the carved slates which they have left, the standards of the allied tribes are represented; the earliest in style shows the standard of Koptos, the next has a standard as far North as Hermopolis, and the latest bears the standard of Letopolis, and shows the conquest of the Fayum, or perhaps one of the coast lakes. This last is of the first king of the Ist Dynasty, Mena.

The conquest of all Egypt is marked by the beginning of the series of numbered dynasties beginning with Mena, at about 5550 BC. The civilization rapidly advanced. The art was at its best under the third king, Zer, and thence steadily declined. Writing was still ideographic under Mena, but became more syllabic and phonetic toward the end of the dynasty. The work in hardstone was at its height in the vases of the early part of the Ist Dynasty, when an immense variety of beautiful stones appear. It greatly fell off on reaching the IId Dynasty. The tombs were all of timber, built in large pits in the ground.

3. 4th Age: IIIrd through VIth Dynasties:

The IInd Dynasty fell about 5000 BC, and a new power rapidly raised the art from an almost barbarous state to its highest triumphs by about 4750 BC, when the pyramid building was started. Khufu, the builder of the Great Pyramid in the IVth Dynasty, was one of the greatest rulers of Egypt. He organized the administration on lines which lasted for ages. He reformed the religious system, abolishing the endowments, and substituting models for the sacrifice of animals. He trained the largest body of skilled labor that ever appeared, for the building of his pyramid, the greatest and most accurate structure that the world has ever seen. The statuary of this age is more lifelike than that of any later age. The later reigns show steady decay in the character of work, with less dignity and more superficiality in the article

4. 5th Age: VIIth through XIVth Dynasties:

By about 4050 BC, the decline of Egypt allowed of fresh people pressing in from the North, probably connected with Crete. There are few traces of

these invaders; a curious class of barbaric buttons used as seals are their commonest remains. Probably the so-called "Hyksos sphinxes" and statues are of these people, and belong to the time of their attaining power in Egypt. By 3600 BC, the art developed into the great ages of the XIth to the XIIth Dynasties which lasted about 2 centuries. The work is more scholastic and less natural than before; but it is very beautiful and of splendid accuracy. The exquisite jewelry of Dahshur is of this age. After some centuries of decay this civilization passed away.

5. 6th Age: XVth through XXIVth Dynasties:

The Semitic tribes had long been filtering into Egypt, and Babylonian Semites even ruled the land until the great migration of the Hyksos took place about 2700 BC. These tribes were ruled by kings entitled "princes of the desert," like the Semitic Absha, or Abishai, shown in the tomb of Beni-hasan, as coming to settle in Egypt. By 1700 BC the Berbers who had adopted the Egyptian civilization pressed down from the South, and ejected the Hyksos rule. This opened the most flourishing period of Egyptian history, the XVIIIth Dynasty, 1587-1328 BC. The profusion of painted tombs at Thebes, which were copied and popularized by Gardner Wilkinson, has made the life of this period very familiar to us. The immense temples of Karnak and of Luqsor, and the finest of the Tombs of the Kings have impressed us with the royal magnificence of this age. The names of Thothmes I and III, of the great queen Hatshepsut, of the magnificent Amenhotep III, and of the monotheist reformer Akchenaton are among those best known in the history. Their foreign connections we shall notice later.

The XIXth and XXth Dynasties were a period of continual degradation from the XVIIIth. Even in the best work of the 6th Age there is hardly ever the real solidity and perfection which is seen in that of the 4th or 5th Ages. But under the Ramessides cheap effects and showy imitations were the regular system. The great Rameses II was a great advertiser, but inferior in power to half a dozen kings of the previous dynasty. In the XXth Dynasty one of the royal daughters married the high priest of Amen at Thebes; and on the unexpected death of the young Rameses V, the throne reverted to his uncle Rameses VI, whose daughter then became the heiress, and her descendants, the high priests of Amen, became the rightful rulers. This priestly rule at Thebes; beginning in 1102 BC, was balanced by a purely secular rule of the north at Tanis (Zoan). These lasted until the rise of

Sheshenq I (Shishak) in 952 BC, the founder of the XXIId Dynasty. His successors gradually decayed till the fall of the XXIIIrd Dynasty in 721 BC. The Ethiopian XXVIth Dynasty then held Egypt as a province of Ethiopia, down to 664 BC.

6. 7th Age: XXVth Dynasty to Roman Times:

It is hard to say when the next age began — perhaps with the Ethiopians; but it rose to importance with the XXVIth Dynasty under Psamtek (Psammitichos I), 664-610 BC, and continued under the well-known names of Necoh, Hophra and Amasis until overthrown by the Persians in 525 BC. From 405 to 342 the Egyptians were independent; then the Persians again crushed them, and in 332 they fell into the hands of the Macedonians by the conquest of Alexander.

The Macedonian Age of the Ptolemies was one of the richest and most brilliant at its start, but soon faded under bad rulers till it fell hopelessly to pieces and succumbed to the Roman subjection in 30 BC. From that time Egypt was ground by taxation, and steadily impoverished. By 300 AD it was too poor to keep even a copper currency in circulation, and barter became general. Public monuments entirely ceased to be erected, and Decius in 250 AD is the last ruler whose name was written in the old hieroglyphs, which were thenceforward totally forgotten. After three more centuries of increasing degradation and misery, the Arab invasion burst upon the land, and a few thousand men rode through it and cleared out the remaining effete garrisons of the empire in 641 AD.

7. 8th Age: Arabic:

The Arab invasion found the country exhausted and helpless; repeated waves of tribes poured in, and for a generation or two there was no chance of a settlement. Gradually the majority of the inhabitants were pressed into Islam, and by about 800 AD a strong government was established from Bagdad, and Egypt rapidly advanced. In place of being the most impoverished country it became the richest land of the Mediterranean. The great period of medieval Egypt was under the guidance of the Mesopotamian civilization, 800-969 AD. The Tunisian dominion of the Fatimites, 969-1171, was less successful. Occasionally strong rulers arose, such as Salah-ed-Din (Saladin), but the age of the Mamalukes, 1250-1577, was one of steady decline. Under the Turkish dominion, 1517, Egypt was split up into many half-independent counties, whose rulers began by

yielding tribute, but relapsed into ignoring the Caliphate and living in continual internal feuds. In 1771 Aly Bey, a slave, succeeded in conquering Syria. The French and British quarrel left Muhamed Aly to rise supreme, and to guide Egypt for over 40 years. Again Egypt conquered Syria, 1831-39, but was compelled by Europe to retreat. The opening of the Suez Canal (1869) necessarily led to the subjection of Egypt to European direction.

8. Early Foreign Connections:

The foreign connections of Egypt have been brought to light only during the last 20 years. In place of supposing that Egypt was isolated until the Greek conquest, we now see that it was in the closest commercial relation with the rest of the world throughout its history. We have already noted the influences which entered by conquest. During the periods of high civilization in Egypt, foreign connections came into notice by exploration and by trade. The lazuli of Persia was imported in the prehistoric age, as well as the emery of Smyrna. In the Ist Dynasty, Egypt conquered and held Sinai for the sake of the turquoise mines. In the IIIrd Dynasty, large fleets of ships were built, some as much as 160 ft. long; and the presence of much pottery imported from Crete and the north, even before this, points to a Mediterranean trade. In the Vth Dynasty, King Unas had relations with Syria. From the XIIth Dynasty comes the detailed account of the life of an Egyptian in Palestine (Sanehat); and Cretan pottery of this age is found traded into Egypt.

III. THE OLD TESTAMENT CONNECTIONS.

1. Semitic Connections:

The Hyksos invasion unified the rule of Syria and Egypt, and Syrian pottery is often found in Egypt of this age. The return of the wave, when Egypt drove out the Hyksos, and conquered Syria out to the Euphrates, was the greatest expansion of Egypt. Tahutmes I set up his statue on the Euphrates, and all Syria was in his hands. Tahutmes III repeatedly raided Syria, bringing back plunder and captives year by year throughout most of his reign. The number of Syrian artists and of Syrian women brought into Egypt largely changed the style of art and the standard of beauty. Amenhotep III held all Syria in peace, and recorded his triumphs at the Euphrates on the walls of the temple of Soleb far up in Nubia. His monotheist son, Amenhotep IV, took the name of Akhenaton, "the glory of

the sun's disc," and established the worship of the radiant sun as the Aton, or Adon of Syria. The cuneiform letters from Tell el-Amarna place all this age before us in detail. There are some from the kings of the Amorites and Hittites, from Naharain and even Babylonia, to the great suzerain Amenhotep III. There is also the long series describing the gradual loss of Syria under Akhenaton, as written by the governors and chiefs, of the various towns. The main letters are summarized in the Students' History of Egypt, II, and full abstracts of all the letters are in Syria and Egypt, arranged in historical order.

Pal was reconquered by Seti I and his son Rameses II, but they only held about a third of the extent which formerly belonged to Amenhotep III. Merenptah, son of Rameses, also raided Southern Palestine. After that; it was left alone till the raid of Sheshenq in 933 BC. The only considerable assertion of Egyptian power was in Necoh's two raids up to the Euphrates, in 609 and 605 BC. But Egypt generally held the desert and a few minor points along the south border of Palestine. The Ptolemies seldom possessed more than that, their aspirations in Syria not lasting as permanent conquests. They were more successful in holding Cyprus.

2. Abramic Times:

We now come to the specific connections of Egypt with the Old Testament. The movement of the family of Abram from Ur in the south of Mesopotamia up to Haran in the north (<01113>Genesis 11:31) and thence down Syria into Egypt (<01205>Genesis 12:5,10) was like that of the earlier Semitic "princes of the desert," when they entered Egypt as the Hyksos kings about 2600 BC. Their earlier dominion was the XVth Dynasty of Egypt, and that was followed by another movement, the XVIth Dynasty, about 2250 BC, which was the date of the migration of Terah from Ur. Thus the Abramic family took part in the second Hyksos movement. The cause of these tribal movements has been partly explained by Mr. Huntington's researches on the recurrence of dry periods in Asia (Royal Geogr. Soc., May 26, 1910: The Pulse of Asia). Such lack of rain forces the desert peoples on to the cultivated lands, and then later famines are recorded. The dry age which pushed the Arab tribes on to the Mediterranean in 640 AD was succeeded by famines in Egypt during 6 centuries So as soon as Abram moved into Syria a famine pushed him on to Egypt (<01210>Genesis 12:10). To this succeeded other famines in Canaan (<02601>Genesis 26:1), and later in both Canaan and Egypt (<04156>Genesis 41:56;

43:1; 47:13). The migration of Abram was thus conditioned by the general dry period, which forced the second Hyksos movement of which it was a part. The culture of the Hyksos was entirely nomadic, and agrees in all that we can trace with the patriarchal culture pictured in Gen.

3. Circumcision:

Circumcision was a very ancient mutilation in Egypt, and is still kept up there by both Muslim and Christian. It was first adopted by Abram for Ishmael, the son of the Egyptian Hagar (Genesis 16:3; 17:23), before Isaac was promised. Hagar married Ishmael to an Egyptian (Genesis 21:21), so that the Ishmaelites, or Hagarenes, of Gilead and Moab were three-quarters Egyptian.

At Gerar, in the south of Palestine, Egyptian was the prevailing race and language, as the general of Abimelech was Phichol, the Egyptian name Pa-khal, "the Syrian," showing that the Gerarites were not Syrians.

4. Joseph:

The history of Joseph rising to importance as a capable slave is perfectly natural in Egypt at that time, and equally so in later periods down to our own days. That this occurred during the Hyksos period is shown by the title given to Joseph — Abrekh, (*'abhrekh*) (Genesis 41:43) which is Abarakhu, the high Babylonian title. The names Zaphnath-paaneah, Asenath, and Potipherah have been variously equated in Egyptian, Naville seeing forms of the XVIIIth Dynasty in them, but Spiegelberg, with more probability, seeing types of names of the XXIInd Dynasty or later. The names are most likely an expansion of the original document; but there is not a single feature or incident in the relations of Joseph to the Egyptians which is at all improbable from the history and civilization that we know.

See JOSEPH.

5. Descent into Egypt:

The descent into Egypt and sojourn there are what might be expected of any Semitic tribe at this time. The allocation in Goshen (Genesis 47:27) was the most suitable, as that was on the eastern border of the Delta, at the mouth of the Wady Tumilat, and was a district isolated from the general Egyptian population. The whole of Goshen is not more than 100 square miles, being bounded by the deserts, and by the large Egyptian city of Budastis on the West. The accounts of the embalming for 40 days and

mourning for 70 days (Genesis 50:3), and putting in a coffin (Genesis 50:26) are exact. The 70 days' mourning existed both in the Ist Dynasty and in the XXth.

6. The Oppression:

The oppression in Egypt began with a new king that knew not Joseph. This can hardly be other than the rise of the Berber conquerors who took the Delta from the Hyksos at the beginning of the XVIIIth Dynasty, 1582 BC, and expelled the Hyksos into Syria. It could not be later than this, as the period of oppression in Egypt is stated at 4 centuries (Genesis 15:13; Acts 7:6), and the Exodus cannot be later than about 1220 BC, which leaves 360 years for the oppression. Also this length of oppression bars any much earlier date for the Exodus. The 360 years of oppression from 430 of the total sojourn in Egypt, leaves 70 years of freedom there. As Joseph died at 110 (Genesis 50:26), this implies that he was over 40 when his family came into Egypt, which would be quite consistent with the history.

7. The Historic Position:

The store cities Pithom and Raamses are the sites Tell el-Maskhuta and Tell Rotab in the Wady Tumilat, both built by Rameses II as frontier defenses. It is evident then that the serving with rigor was under that king, probably in the earlier part of his long reign of 67 years (1300-1234 BC), when he was actively campaigning in Palestine. This is shown in the narrative, for Moses was not yet born when the rigor began (Exodus 1; 2:2), and he grew up, slew an Egyptian, and then lived long in Midian before the king of Egypt died (Exodus 2:23), perhaps 40 or 50 years after the rigorous servitude began, for he is represented as being 80 at the time of the Exodus (Deuteronomy 34:7). These numbers are probably not precise, but as a whole they agree well enough with Egyptian history. After the king died, Moses returned to Egypt, and began moving to get his kin away to the eastern deserts, with which he had been well acquainted in his exile from Egypt. A harsher servitude ensues, which might be expected from the more vigorous reign of Merenptah, after the slackness of the old age of Rameses. The campaign of Merenptah against Israel and other people in Palestine would not make him any less severe in his treatment of Semites in Egypt.

8. The Plagues:

The plagues are in the order of usual seasonal troubles in Egypt, from the red unwholesome Nile in June, through the frogs, insects, hail and rain,

locusts, and sandstorms in March. The death of the firstborn was in April at the Passover.

9. Date of the Exodus:

The date of the Exodus is indicated as being about 1200 BC, by the 4 centuries of oppression, and by the names of the land and the city of Rameses (<01704>Genesis 47:4; compare <00011>Exodus 1:11). The historical limit is that the Egyptians were incessantly raiding Palestine down to 1194 BC, and then abandoned it till the invasion of Shishak. As there is no trace of these Egyptian invasions during all the ups and downs of the age of the Judges, it seems impossible to suppose the Israelites entered Canaan till after 1194 BC. The setting back of the Exodus much earlier has arisen from taking three simultaneous histories of the Judges as consecutive, as we shall notice farther on. The facts stated above, and the length of all three lines of the priestly genealogies, agree completely with the Egyptian history in putting the Exodus at about 1220 BC, and the entry into Canaan about 1180 BC.

10. Route of the Exodus:

The route of the Exodus was first a concentration at Raamses or Tell Rotab, in the Wady Tumliat, followed by a march to Succoth, a general name for the region of Bedawy booths; from there to Etham in the edge of the wilderness, about the modern Nefisheh. Thence they turned and encamped before Pi-hahiroth, the Egyptian Pa-qaheret, a Serapeum. Thus turning South to the West of the Red Sea (which then extended up to Tell el-Maskhuta), they had a Migdol tower behind them and Baal-zephon opposite to them. They were thus "entangled in the land." Then the strong east wind bared the shallows, and made it possible to cross the gulf and reach the opposite shore. They then went "three days in the wilderness," the three days' route without water to Marah, the bitter spring of Hawara, and immediately beyond reached Elim, which accords entirely with the Wady Gharandel. Thence they encamped by the Red Sea. All of this account exactly agrees with the traditional route down the West of the Sinaitic peninsula; it will not agree with any other route, and there is no reason to look for any different location of the march.

See EXODUS, I.

11. Numbers of the Exodus:

The numbers of the Israelites have long been a difficulty. On the one hand are the census lists (Numbers 1; 2 and 26), with their summaries of 600,000 men besides children and a mixed multitude (⟨12:37⟩Exodus 12:37,38; 38:26; ⟨00:46⟩Numbers 1:46; 11:21). On the other hand there are the exact statements of there being 22,273 firstborn, that is, fathers of families (⟨0:43⟩Numbers 3:43), and that 40,000 armed men entered Canaan with Joshua (⟨06:13⟩Joshua 4:13), also the 35,000 who fought at Ai (⟨08:03⟩Joshua 8:3,12), and the 32,000 who fought against Midian (⟨07:03⟩Judges 7:3). Besides these, there are the general considerations that only 5,000 to 10,000 people could live in Goshen, that the Amalekites with whom the Israelites were equally matched (⟨17:11⟩Exodus 17:11) could not have exceeded about 5,000 in Sinai, that Moses judged all disputes, and that two midwives attended all the Israelite births, which would be 140 a day on a population of 600,000. Evidently, the statements of numbers are contradictory, and the external evidence is all in accord with lesser numbers. Proposals to reduce arbitrarily the larger numbers have been frequent; but there is one likely line of misunderstanding that may have originated the increase. In the census lists of the tribes, most of the hundreds in the numbers are 400 or 500, others are near those, and there are none whatever on 000, 100, 800 or 900. Evidently, the hundreds are independent of the thousands. Now in writing the statements, such as "Reuben, 46,500," the original list would be 46 *'eleph*, 5 hundred people, and *'eleph* means either "thousands" or else "groups" or "families." Hence, a census of 46 tents, 500 people, would be ambiguous, and a later compiler might well take it as 46,500. In this way the whole census of 598 tents, 5,550 people, would be misread as 603,550 people. The checks on this are, that the number per tent should be reasonable in all cases, that the hundreds should not fluctuate more than the tents between the first and last census, and that the total should correspond to the known populations of Goshen and of Sinai; these requirements all agree with this reading of the lists. The ulterior details beyond the Egyptian period are dealt with in Egypt and Israel, 45, 55.

   See *EXODUS, IV.*

12. Israel in Canaan:

Two points need notice here as incidentally bearing on the Egyptian connections:

(1) the Israelites in Palestine before the Exodus, indicated by Merenptah triumphing over them there before 1230 BC, and the raids during the Egyptian residence (^{◁13/721▷}1 Chronicles 7:21);

(2) the triple history of the Judges, west, north, and east, each totaling to 120 years, in accord with the length of the four priestly genealogies (^{◁13/604▷}1 Chronicles 6:4-8,22-28,33-35,39-43,14-47), and showing that the dates are about 1220 BC the Exodus, 1180 BC the entry to Canaan, 1150 BC the beginning of Judges, 1030 BC Saul (Egypt and Israel, 52-58).

13. Hadad:

The connections with the monarchy soon begin. David and Joab attacked Edom (^{◁10/814▷}2 Samuel 8:14), and Hadad, the young king, was carried off by his servants to Egypt for safety. The Pharaoh who received and supported him must have been Siamen, the king of Zoan, which city was then an independent capital apart from the priest kings of Thebes (^{◁11/1115▷}1 Kings 11:15-22). Hadad was married to the Egyptian queen's sister when he grew up, probably in the reign of Pasebkhanu II.

14. Pharaoh's Daughter:

The Pharaoh whose daughter was married to Solomon must have been the same Pasebkhanu; he reigned from 987-952 BC, and the marriage was about 970 in the middle of the reign. Another daughter of Pasebkhanu was Karamat, who was the wife of Shishak. Thus Solomon and Shishak married two sisters, and their aunt was queen of Edom. This throws light on the politics of the kingdoms. Probably Solomon had some child by Pharaoh's daughter, and the Egyptians would expect that to be the heir. Shishak's invasion, on the death of Solomon, was perhaps based upon the right of a nephew to the throne of Judah.

15. Shishak:

The invasion of Shishak (Egyptian, Sheshenq) took place probably at the end of his reign. His troops were Lubim (Libyans), Sukkim (men of Succoth, the east border) and Kushim (Ethiopians). The account of the war is on the side of the great fore-court at Karnak, which shows long lists of places in Judah, agreeing with the subjugation recorded in ^{◁11/1425▷}1 Kings 14:25,26, and ^{◁44/1202▷}2 Chronicles 12:2-4.

16. Zerakh:

Zerakh, or Usarkon, was the next king of Egypt, the son of Karamat,

Solomon's sister-in-law. He invaded Judah unsuccessfully in 903 BC (⟨4449⟩2 Chronicles 14:9) with an army of Libyans and Sudanis (⟨4468⟩2 Chronicles 16:8). A statue of the Nile, dedicated by him, and naming his descent from Karamat and Pasebkhanu, is in the British Museum.

17. The Ethiopians:

After a couple of centuries the Ethiopian kings intervened. Shabaka was appointed viceroy of Egypt by his father Piankhy, and is described by the Assyrians as Sibe, commander-in-chief of Muzri, and by the Hebrews as Sua or So, king of Egypt (⟨12704⟩2 Kings 17:4). Tirhakah next appears as a viceroy, and Hezekiah was warned against trusting to him (⟨12909⟩2 Kings 19:9). These two kings touch on Jewish history during their vice-royalties, before their full reigns began. Necoh next touches on Judah in his raid to Carchemish in 609 BC, when he slew Josiah for opposing him (⟨12929⟩2 Kings 23:29,30; ⟨4850⟩2 Chronicles 35:20-24).

18. Tahpanhes:

After the taking of Jerusalem, for fear of vengeance for the insurrection of Ishmael (⟨12525⟩2 Kings 25:25,26; Jeremiah 40; 41; 42), the remnant of the Jews fled to the frontier fortress of Egypt, Tahpanhes, Tehaphnehes, Greek Daphnae, modern Defenneh, about 10 miles West of the present Suez Canal (⟨24807⟩Jeremiah 43:7-13). The brick pavement in front of the entrance to the fortress there, in which Jeremiah hid the stones, has been uncovered and the fortress completely planned. It was occupied by Greeks, who there brought Greek words and things into contact with the traveling Jews for a couple of generations before the fall of Jerusalem.

19. Hophra:

The prophecy that Hophra would be delivered to them that sought his life (⟨24480⟩Jeremiah 44:30) was fulfilled, as he was kept captive by his successor, Amasis, for 3 years, and after a brief attempt at liberty, he was strangled.

20. The Jews at Syene:

The account of the Jews settled in Egypt (Jeremiah 44) is singularly illustrated by the Aramaic Jewish papyri found at Syene (Aswan). These show the use of Aramaic and of oaths by Yahu, as stated of 5 cities in Egypt (⟨231918⟩Isaiah 19:18). The colony at Syene was well-to-do, though not rich; they were householders who possessed all their property by regular title-deeds, who executed marriage settlements, and were fully used to litigation, having in deeds of sale a clause that no other deed could be

valid. The temple of Yahu filled the space between two roads, and faced upon 3 houses, implying a building about 60 or 70 ft. wide. It was built of hewn stone, with stone columns, 7 gates, and a cedar roof. It was destroyed in 410, after lasting from before Cambyses in 525 BC, and a petition for rebuilding it was granted in 407.

21. *The New Jerusalem of Oniah:*

The most flourishing period of the Jews in Egypt was when Oniah IV, the son of the rightful high priest Oniah, was driven from Jerusalem by the abolition of Jewish worship and ordinances under Antiochus. In 170 BC he fled to Egypt, and there established a new Jerusalem with a temple and sacrifices as being the only way to maintain the Jewish worship. Oniah IV was a valiant man, general to queen Cleopatra I; and he offered to form the Jewish community into a frontier guard on the East of Egypt, hating the Syrians to the uttermost, if the Jews might form their own community. They so dominated the eastern Delta that troops of Caesar could not pass from Syria to Alexandria without their assent. The new Jerusalem was 20 miles North of Cairo, a site now known as Tell el-Yehudiyeh. The great mound of the temple still remains there, with the Passover ovens beneath it, and part of the massive stone fortifications on the front of it. This remained a stronghold of free Judaism until after Titus took Jerusalem; and it was only when the Zealots tried to make it a center of insurrection, that at last it was closed and fell into decay. Josephus is the original authority for this history (see Egypt and Israel, 97-110).

22 *The Egyptian Jew:*

The Jew in Egypt followed a very different development from the Babylonian Jew, and this Egyptian type largely influenced Christianity. In the colony at Syene a woman named "Trust Yahweh" had no objection to swearing by the Egyptian goddess Seti when making an Egyptian contract; and in [24415]Jeremiah 44:15-19, the Jews boasted of their heathen worship in Egypt. Oniah had no scruple in establishing a temple and sacrifices apart from Jerusalem, without any of the particularism of the Maccabean zealots. Philo at Alexandria labored all his life for the union of Jewish thought with Greek philosophy. The Hermetic books show how, from 500 to 200 BC, religious thought was developing under eclectic influence of Egyptian Jewish, Persian, Indian and Greek beliefs, and producing the tenets about the second God, the Eternal Son, who was the Logos, and the types of Conversion, as the Divine Ray, the New Birth, and the Baptism. Later the

Wisdom literature of Alexandria, 200-100 BC, provided the basis of thought and simile on which the Pauline Epistles were built. The great wrench in the history of the church came when it escaped from the Babylonian-Jewish formalism of the Captivity, which ruled at Jerusalem, and grew into the wider range of ideas of the Alexandrian Jews. These ideas had been preserved in Egypt from the days of the monarchy, and had developed a great body of religious thought and phraseology from their eclectic connections. The relations of Christianity with Egypt are outside our scope, but some of them will be found in Egypt and Israel, 124-41.

23. Cities and Places Alphabetically:

The Egyptian cities, places and peoples named in the Old Testament may briefly be noted. AVEN ([25017]Ezekiel 30:17) or ON ([04145]Genesis 41:45) is the 'An of Egyptian, the Greek Heliopolis, now Matarieh, 7 miles North of Cairo. It was the seat of prehistoric government, the royal emblems were kept there as the sacred relics of the temple, and its high priest was "the great seer," one of the greatest of the religious officials. The schools of Heliopolis were celebrated, and it seems to have always been a center of learning. The site is now marked by the great enclosure of the temple, and one obelisk of Senusert (XIIth Dynasty). It was here that the Egyptian kings had at their installation to come and bathe in the lake in which the sun bathes daily, the 'Ainesh-Shems, or "Lake of the Sun" of the Arabs, connected with the fresh spring here which Christian tradition attributes to the visit of the Virgin and Child. The great sycamore tree here is the successor of that under which the Virgin is said to have rested.

BAAL-ZEPHON was a shrine on the eastern site of the head of the Red Sea, a few miles South of Ismailiyeh; no trace is now known of it ([02142]Exodus 14:2). CUSHIM or Ethiopians were a part of the Egyptian army of Shishak and of Usarkon ([14120]2 Chronicles 12:3; 16:8). The army was in 4 brigades, that of Ptah of Memphis, central Egypt; that of Amen of Thebes, Southern Egypt and Ethiopia; that of Set of the eastern frontier (Sukkim); and that of Ra, Heliopolis and the Delta.

COSHEN was a fertile district at the west end of the Wady Tumilat, 40 to 50 miles Northeast of Cairo. It was bounded by the deserts on the North and Southeast, and by the Egyptian city of Bubastis on the West. Its area was not over 100 square miles; it formerly supported 4,000 Bedouin and now about 12,000 cultivators.

LUBIM, the Libyans who formed part of the Egyptian army as light-armed archers, from very early times.

MIGDOL is the name of any tower, familiar also as Magdala. It was applied to some watchtower on the West of the Red Sea, probably on the high land above the Serapeum.

No is Thebes, in Assyrian Nia, from the Egyptian Nu, "the city." This was the capital of the XIIth Dynasty, and of the XVIIth-XXIst Dynasties. Owing to the buildings being of sandstone, which is not of much use for reworking, they have largely remained since the desolation of the city under Ptolemy X. The principal divisions of the site are:

(1) Karnak, with the temple of the XIIth Dynasty, built over by all the successive kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty, and enlarged by Seti I and Rameses II, and by Shishak, Tirhakah, and the Ptolemies. The whole temple of Amon and its subsidiary temples form the largest mass of ruins that is known.

(2) Luqsor, the temple to commemorate the divine birth of Amenhotep III (1440 BC), added to by Rameses II.

(3) The funerary temples, bordering the western shore, of the kings of the XVIIIth to XXth Dynasties. These have mostly been destroyed, by the unscrupulous quarrying done by each king on the work of his predecessors; the only temple in fair condition is that of Rameses III, which is left because no later king required its material for building.

(4) The great cemetery, ranging from the splendid rock halls of the Tombs of the Kings, covered with paintings, down to the humblest graves. For any detailed account see either Baedeker's or Murray's Guides, or Weigall's Guide to Antiquities.

NOPH, the Egyptian Men-nofer, Greek Memphis, now Mitraheny, 12 miles South of Cairo. This was the capital from the foundation at the beginning of the dynasties. Thebes and Alexandria shared its importance, but it was the seat of government down to the Arab invasion. In Roman times it was as large as London North of the Thames. The outlying parts are now all buried by the rise of the soil, but more than a mile length of ruins yet remains, which are now being regularly worked over by the British School. The heart of the city is the great metropolitan temple of Ptah, nearly all of which is now under 10 feet of soil, and under water most of the year. This is being excavated in sections, as it is all private property. At the north end of the ruins is the palace mound, on which has been cleared the palace of

Apries (Hophra). Other temples have been located, as well as the foreign quarter containing early Greek pottery and the temple of Proteus named by Herodotus (see Memphis, I, II, III).

PATHROS is the usual name for Upper Egypt in the prophets. It is the Egyptian Pa-ta-res, "the south land."

PIBESETH is the Egyptian Pa-Bast, Greek Bubastis, at the eastern side of the Delta, the city of the cat-headed goddess Bast. The ruins are still large, and the temple site has been excavated, producing sculptures from the IVth Dynasty onward.

PITHOM is the Egyptian Pa-Tum, the city of the Sun-god Tum or Atmu, who was worshipped on the East of the Delta. The site has remains of the fortress of Rameses II, built by the Israelites, and is now known as Tell el-Maskhuta, 11 miles West of Ismailia.

RAAMSES is the other city built by the Israelites, now Tell Rotab, 20 miles West of Ismailia. A wailed camp existed here from early times, and the temple of Rameses was built on the top of the older ruins. A large part of the temple front is now at Philadelphia, excavated by the British School.

SIN is the Greek Pelusium, Assyrian Siinu, Arabic Tineh, now some desolate mounds at the extreme East coast of Egypt.

SUCCOTH was the district of "booths," the eastern part of the Wady Tumilat. It was written in Egyptian Thuku and abbreviated to Thu in which form it appears as a Roman name. The people of Succoth were Sukkim, named in the army of Shishak ([44128]2 Chronicles 12:3).

SYENE, Hebrew [~Seweneh], modern Aswan, the southern border town of Egypt at the Cataract. The greater part of the old town was on the island of Elephantine. There the Jewish papyri were found, and that was probably the Jewish settlement with the temple of Yahu. The town on the eastern bank — the present Aswan — was of less importance.

TAHPANHES, TEHAPHNEHES, Greek Daphnae, Arabic Tell Defeneh. This was the first station on the Syrian road which touched the Nile canals, about 10 miles West of Kantara on the Suez Canal. It seems to have been founded by Psammetichus about 664 BC, to hold his Greek mercenaries. The fort, built by him, abounded in Greek pottery, and was finally desolated about 566 BC, as described by Herodotus. The fort and camp

have been excavated; and the pavement described by Jeremiah (chapter 43), as opposite to the entrance, has been identified.

ZOAN, Greek Tanis, Arabic San, is about 26 miles from the Suez Canal, and slightly more from the coast. The ruins of the temple are surrounded by the wall of Pasebkhanu, 80 ft. thick of brickwork, and a ring of town ruins rises high around it. The temple was built in the VIth Dynasty, adorned with many statues in the XIIth and XIIIth Dynasties, and under Rameses II had many large granite obelisks and statues, especially one colossus of the king in red granite about 90 ft. high. It is probable that the Pharaoh lived here at the time of the Exodus.

IV. THE CIVILIZATION.

1. Language:

We now turn to some outline of the civilization of the Egyptians. The language had primitive relations with the Semitic and the Libyan. Perhaps one common stock has separated into three languages — Semitic, Egyptian, and Libyan. But though some basal words and grammar are in common, all the bulk of the words of daily life were entirely different in the three, and no one could be said to be derived from the other. Egyptian so far as we can see, is a separate language without any connection as close as that between the Indo-European group. From its proximity to Syria, Semitic loan words were often introduced, and became common in the XVIIIth Dynasty and fashionable in the XIXth. The language continually altered, and decayed in the later periods until Coptic is as different from it as Italian is from Latin.

2. Writing:

The writing was at first ideographic, using a symbol for each word. Gradually, signs were used phonetically; but the symbol, or some emblem of the idea of the word, continued to be added to it, now called a determinative. From syllabic signs purely alphabetic signs were produced by clipping and decay, so that by 1000 to 500 BC the writing was almost alphabetic. After that it became modified by the influence of the short Greek alphabet, until by 200 AD it was expressed in Greek letters with a few extra signs. The actual signs used were elaborate pictures of the objects in the early times, and even down to the later periods very detailed signs were carved for monumental purposes. But as early as the Ist

Dynasty a very much simplified current hand had been started, and during the pyramid period this became hardly recognizable from the original forms. Later on this current hand, or hieratic, is a study by itself and was written much more fully than the hieroglyphs on monuments, as its forms were so corrupt that an ample spelling was needed to identify the word. By about 800 BC begins a much shortened set of signs, still more remote from their origins, known as demotic, which continued as the popular writing till Roman times. On public decrees the hieroglyphic and demotic are both given, showing that a knowledge of one was useless for reading the other, and that they were separate studies.

3. Literature:

The literature begins during the pyramid period, before 4000 BC, with biographies and collections of maxims for conduct; these show well-regulated society, and would benefit any modern community in which they were followed. In the XIIth Dynasty tales appear, occupied with magic and foreign travel and wonders. A long poem in praise of the king shows very regular versification and system, of the type of Psalm 136, the refrain differing in each stanza and being probably repeated in chorus, while the independent lines were sung by the leader. In the XVIIIth Dynasty, tales of character begin to develop and show much skill, long annals were recorded, and in the XIXth Dynasty there is an elaborate battle poem describing the valor of Rameses II. At about 700 BC there is a considerable tale which describes the quarrels of the rival chiefs, and the great fight regulated like a tournament by which the differences were settled. Such are the principal literary works apart from business documents.

4. Four Views of Future Life:

The religion of Egypt is an enormous subject, and that by which Egypt is perhaps most known. Here we can only give an outline of the growth and subdivisions of it. There never was any one religion in Egypt during historic times. There were at least four religions, all incompatible, and all believed in at once in varying degrees. The different religions can best be seen apart by their incongruity regarding the future life.

(1) The dead wandered about the cemetery seeking food, and were partly fed by the goddess in the sycamore tree. They therefore needed to have plates of food and jars of water in the tomb, and provided perpetually by

their descendants in front of the doorway to the grave. The deceased is represented as looking out over this doorway in one case. Here came in the great principle of substitution. For the food, substitute its image which cannot decay, and the carved table of offerings results. For the farmstead of animals, substitute its carved image on the walls and the animal sculptures result. For the life of the family, substitute their carved figures doing all that was wanted, sacrificing and serving, and the family sculptures result. For the house, substitute a model upon the grave, and the pottery soul-houses appear with their furniture and provisions. For the servants, put their figures doing household work, and their service is eternal. For the master himself, put the most lifelike image that can be made, and his soul will occupy that as a restful home fitted for it. This principle is still believed in. Funeral offerings of food are still put even in Muslim graves, and a woman will visit a grave, and, removing a tile, will talk through a hole to her dead husband.

(2) The dead went to the kingdom of Osiris, to which only the good were admitted, while the evil were rejected, and consumed either by monsters or by fire. This heavenly kingdom was a complete duplicate of the earthly life. They planted and reaped, sported and played. And as the Egyptian felicity consisted in making others work for them, so each man was provided with a retinue of serfs to cultivate the land for him. These ushabti figures in later times usually number 400, and often 1 in 10 of them is clad as an overseer. A special chapter of the Book of the Dead is to be recited to animate them, and this, more or less abbreviated, is often inscribed upon the figures.

(3) The dead joined the company of the immortal gods, who float on the heavenly ocean in the boat of the sun. With them they have to face the terrors of the hours of the night when the sun goes through the underworld. Long charms and directions are needed for safety in this passage, and these form a large part of the funerary tests, especially on the Tombs of the Kings in the XVIIIth-XXIst Dynasties. To reach the boat of the sun a boat must be provided in the tomb, with its sailors and sails and oars. Such are frequent from the VIth-XIIIth Dynasties.

(4) The dead were carried off by the Hathor cow, or a bull, to wait for a bodily resurrection. In order to preserve the body for some life after the present age, each part must be protected by an appropriate amulet; hence, dozens of different amulets were placed on the body, especially from about 600-400 BC.

Now it will be seen that each of these beliefs contradicts the other three, and they represent, therefore, different religious origins.

5. *Four Groups of Gods:*

The mythology is similarly diverse, and was unified by uniting analogous gods. Hence, when we see the compounds such as Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, or Amen-Ra or Osiris-Khentamenti, it is clear that each god of the compound belongs to a different religion, like Pallas-Athene or Zeus-Labrandeus, in Greek compounds. So far as we can at present see, the gods linked with each of the beliefs about the soul are as follows:

(1) **The Soul in the Tombs and Cemetery.**

With this belief belong the animal gods, which form the earliest stratum of the religion; also Sokar the god of "Silence," and Mert Sokar, the "Lover of Silence," as the gods of the dead. With this was allied a belief in the soul sometimes going to the west, and hence, Khent-amenti, a jackal-headed god, "he who is in the west," became the god of the dead.

(2) **The Soul in the Heavenly Kingdom.**

Osiris is the lord of this kingdom, Isis his sister-wife, Horus their son, Nebhat (Nephthys) the sister of Isis, and Set her husband. Set also was regarded as coequal with Horus. This whole mythology results probably from the fusion of tribes who were originally monotheistic, and who each worshipped one of these deities. It is certain that the later parts of this mythology are tribal history, regarded as the victories and defeats of the gods whom the tribes worshipped.

(3) **The Soul in the Sun-Boat.**

Ra was the Sun-god, and in other forms worshipped as Khepera and Atmu. The other cosmic gods of the same group are Nut, the heaven, and her husband Geb, the earth; Shu, space, and his sister Tefnut. Anher the Sky-god belongs to Upper Egypt.

(4) **The Mummy with Amulets, Preserved for a Future Life.**

Probably to this group belong the gods of principles, Hathor the female principle; Min the male principle; Ptah the architect and creator of the universe; his spouse Maat, abstract truth and justice.

6. Foreign Gods:

Foreign gods frequently appear also in Egypt, mostly from Syria. Two importations were of great effect. Aton the radiant energy of the sun, the Adon or "lord," Adonai, Adonis, was introduced as a sole deity by Akhenaton 1380 BC, and all other gods were proscribed. This was a strictly rational and scientific religion, attributing all life and power to the action of the sun's rays; but it only lasted 20 years in Egypt, and then vanished. The other important worship was that of Zeus Sarapis. The Zeus statue is said to have been imported from Sinope by Ptolemy I, but the Sarapis was the god of Memphis, Osarhapi, the Osiris form of the Hapi bull. The Egyptian worshipped his old gods; the Greek was satisfied with Zeus; and both nations united in adoring Zeus Sarapis. The temples and ritual are too wide a subject to touch in our present space; but the essential principle was that of providing a banquet for the god, and feasting in his temple, not that of an expiatory sacrifice or burnt offering, which is Semitic.

7. Laws:

The laws are but little known until the late Greek accounts. Marriage was usual with a sister, but this may have been with a half-sister, as among the Greeks and early Hebrews. Polygamy was unusual, but was legal, as many as six wives being represented in one instance. Kings of course had unlimited harems. Divorce was unusual, but was probably easy. In Coptic times a marriage contract provides for divorce by either party, upon paying six times the marriage gift. Property was strictly guarded.

8. Character:

The national character was easygoing, kindly, never delighting in torture like the Assyrians and Romans, but liable to be too slack and careless. Firmness, decision and fortitude were held up as the leading virtues. The structure of society, the arts and the industries are outside of the scope of this article.

(For differing views on chronology and sites, see *articles EXODUS; WANDERINGS; PITHOM; RAAMSES*, etc., and on individual kings, etc., articles under their names, and *EGYPTIAN KINGS*.)

LITERATURE.

Works in English, that are the most accessible, are stated in preference to foreign works, the references to which will be seen in the books stated below.

The Country:

Baedeker's Egypt; on the flora, Petrie, Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsioe.

The History:

Prehistoric: Petrie, Diospolis Parva, etc.; de Morgan, Recherches; Maspero, The Dawn of Civilization, The Struggle of the Nations, The Passing of the Empires; Petrie, Student's History of Egypt; Breasted, A History of Egypt, etc. On the Ist-IInd Dynasties, Petrie, Royal Tombs. On the IIId-VIth Dynasties, Petrie, The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh; Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I. On the VIIth-XIVth Dynasties, Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh; de Morgan, Dahchour, I, II. On the XVth-XXIVth Dynasties, Weigall, Guide to Antiquities; Baedeker on Thebes; Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes. On the XXVth Dynasty to Roman times, Petrie, Temple of Apries; Mahaffy, The Empires of the Ptolemies; Milne, History of Egypt under Roman Rule. On the early foreign connections, Petrie, Methods and Aims in Archaeology.

On the Semitic Connections:

Petrie, Syria and Egypt from the Tell el-Amarna Tablets.

On the Old Testament Connections:

Petrie, Egypt and Israel.

On the Language:

Murray, Elementary Grammar.

On the Writing and Literature:

Erman, Life in Ancient Egypt; Petrie, Egyptian Tales, I, II.

On the Religion:

Wiedemann, Religion of the Ancient Egyptians.

On the Customs:

Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians.

On the Arts:

Petrie, The Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt.

W. M. Flinders Petrie

EGYPT, BROOK (RIVER, STREAM) OF

See BROOK OF EGYPT.

EGYPTIAN KINGS (LATER)

See PHARAOH; HOPHRA; NECOH; SHISHAK; EGYPT, III.

EGYPTIAN, THE

<e-jip'-shan> ([ὁ Αιγύπτιος, *ho Aiguptios*]): Mentioned in ⁴²¹³⁸Acts 21:38, by Claudius Lysias as having "before these days stirred up to sedition and led out into the wilderness the four thousand men of the *ASSASSINS*" (which see). Reference to this Egyptian and to the suppression of his rebellion by the procurator Felix is likewise found in Josephus (Ant., XX, viii, 6; BJ, II, xiii, 5).

EGYPTIAN VERSIONS

<vur'-shuns>.

See COPTIC VERSIONS.

EGYPTIANS, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

EHI

<e'-hi> ([יְּחִ אֵחִ *'ehi*]): Apparently a contracted form (⁰¹⁴⁶²¹Genesis 46:21).

See AHIRAM.

EHUD

<e'-hud> ([ᴅᴡʜᵃₑ*ehudh*], "united," "strong"): A Benjamite, son of Gera, deliverer of Israel from oppression by Moab (ᴶᵘᵈᵍᵉˢJudges 3:15-30). Gaining access alone to the presence of King Eglon under pretense of a secret errand connected with the payment of Israel's tribute, Ehud, a left-handed man, drew the sword he had concealed upon his right side, and thrust the king through. He locked the doors of the upper chamber after him, made his escape, and with the Israelites overcame Moab at the fords of the Jordan, slaying some 10,000. Ehud's name occurs again in the Benjamite genealogy (1 Chronicles 7:10).

F. K. Farr

EITHER

<e'-ther>, *<i'-ther>*: Often in the sense still common, "one or the other" (1 Chronicles 21:21; Matthew 6:24, etc.), but also in the obsolete sense of "both" or "each" (Leviticus 10:1; 1 Kings 7:15; John 19:18; Revelation 22:2), or in place of (Revised Version) "or" (Luke 6:42; 15:8; Philippians 3:12; James 3:12).

EKER

<e'-ker> ([ʳᑫ[ₑ*'eqer*], "root"): A Jerahmeelite (1 Chronicles 2:27).

EKREBEL

<ek'-re-bel> ([ʼ Ἐκρεβήλ, *Ekrebel*]): Appears only in Judith 7:18. It lay on the brook Mochmur, South of Dothart. It is identical with Akrabbein, of which Eusebius (Onomasticon) speaks as the capital of the district of Akrabattine. It corresponds to the modern `Akrabeh, 8 miles Southeast of Nablus.

EKRON; EKRONITE

<ek'-ron>, *<ek'-ron-it>* [ˆᴡʳᑫ[, *'eqron*], "migration," "rooting out"; [ʼ Ἀκκαρών, *Akkaron*]): The most northerly of the chief cities of the Philistines. It was not subdued by Joshua (13:3) but was allotted, in the division of the land, first to Judah and then to Daniel (Joshua 15:11,45,46; 19:43). It was taken by Judah (Judges 1:18). The people of Ekron are prominent in the story of the ark in the land of the Philistines.

It was they who proposed to have it sent back to Israel (⟨0950⟩1 Samuel 5:10; 6:16,17). After the defeat of the Philistines, when David killed Goliath, the Israelites pursued them to the gates of Ekron, which was evidently the nearest walled town in which the fugitives could take refuge (⟨0952⟩1 Samuel 17:52). It was the seat of the worship of the god Baalzebub, as appears in the account of the sickness and death of Ahaziah (⟨1202⟩2 Kings 1:2,3,6:16). It is included among other cities in the denunciations of Amos (1:8) and of Jeremiah (25:20). Zephaniah declares that it shall be rooted up (2:4), and Zechariah speaks of its consternation at the fall of Tyre (9:5,7). From the Assyrian records we learn that it revolted against Sennacherib and expelled Padi, the governor he had placed over it, and sent him to Hezekiah, at Jerusalem, for safe keeping. Sennacherib marched against it and Ekron called in the aid of the king of Mutsri, formerly supposed to be Egypt but now regarded by some scholars as a district of Northwestern Arabia. Sennacherib raised the siege of Ekron to defeat this army, which he did at Eltekeh, and then returned and took the city by storm and put to death the leaders of the revolt and carried their adherents into captivity. He then compelled Hezekiah to restore Padi, who was once more made governor. This affair led to the famous attack of Sennacherib on Hezekiah and Jerusalem (Rawl., Anc. Mon., II, 159). Ekron is mentioned in 1 Macc 10:89 as being given by Alexander Balas to Jonathan Maccabeus, and it appears in the accounts of the first Crusade.

Ekronite: An inhabitant of Ekron, used in plural in ⟨0633⟩Joshua 13:3 and ⟨0950⟩1 Samuel 5:10.

H. Porter

EL

See GOD, NAMES OF.

ELA

<e'-la> ([Ἠλά, *Ela*], 1 Esdras 9:27):

(1) Same as Elam (⟨1506⟩Ezra 10:26).
(2) Father of Shimei (⟨1048⟩1 Kings 4:18, the King James Version "Elah").

See ELAH, 2.

ELADAH

<el'-a-da>.

See *ELEADAH.*

ELAH (1)

<e'-la> ([hl ae'*elah*], "oak" or "terebinth"):

(1) A "duke" or "sheik" (head of a clan, the Revised Version (British and American) "chief") of Edom (Genesis 36:41).

(2) Shimei-ben-Elah, Solomon's commissary in Benjamin (1 Kings 4:18 the King James Version).

(3) A son of Caleb the son of Jephunneh (1 Chronicles 4:15).

(4) Father of Hoshea, last king of Israel (2 Kings 15:30; 17:1).

(5) A Benjamite, son of Uzzi, one of the chiefs of the tribes when the country was settled (1 Chronicles 9:8).
(6) King of Israel. See next article.

ELAH (2)

<e'-la>. Son of Baasha, fourth king of Israel (1 Kings 16:6-14). He reigned two years, 888-887 BC. The statement that he came to the throne in the 26th year of Asa, reigned two years, and died in the 27th year of Asa, illustrates the Hebrew method of synchronizing the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah (compare 1 Kings 15:33; 16:8). Elah appears to have been a debauchee. While he was drinking himself drunk in the house of Azra, his chamberlain, Zimri, one of his military leaders, conspired against him and murdered him. According to Josephus (VIII, xii, 4) he took advantage of the absence of the army, which was at Gibbethon, to kill Elah. The extirpation of the royal family followed the murder of the king. Baasha's dynasty had its origin in a murder and it ended in a murder. The government had no stability. These revolutions illustrate the truth that "they who take the sword shall perish with the sword."

S. K. Mosiman

ELAH, VALE OF

([הל אב;qm[e`*emeq ha-'elah*], "valley of the terebinth"; [ἡ κοιλὰς Ἡλά, *he koilas Ela*]; A, [τῆς δρυός, *tes druos*]): The scene of the events of ⁽⁹¹⁷²⁾1 Samuel 17:2 ff, referred to also in ⁽⁰²¹⁰⁹⁾1 Samuel 21:9. There can be no doubt that this is the Wady ec CunT ("valley of the tercbinth"), or part of it. This is the southernmost of the great valleys which cut through the Shephelah. Commencing near Hebron, close to Beit Sur, it descends under the name Wady es Sur in a more or less northerly direction until near Beit Nettif where it turns abruptly west and receives the name Wady ec CunT. Here it is joined by the Wady en Najil, coming from the North, and from the East by the Wady el-Jindy, down which descends an ancient road from Bethlehem. Where all these valleys coalesce the Wady ec CunT expands into a wide and level bottom, half a mile across. On a steep hill to the southern side and a little Southeast of the wide expanse is Kh. esh-Shuweikeh, the site of Socoh. That the great events of ⁽⁹¹⁷²⁾1 Samuel 17:2 ff took place here there can be no doubt: the Philistines ranged themselves upon the southern hills; the Israelites to the North or Northeast. Upon the wide level valley the contest with Goliath occurred. The exact position of Saul's forces may be a matter of speculation, but the late Principal Miller of Madras, who made a special study of the locality (Least of All Lands, chapter v), considered that the little valley ascending Northeast from Wady ec CunT to Belt Nettif was probably the actual Vale of Elah and that here the Israelites had their fortifications. His elucidation of the whole story is most convincing.

E. W. G. Masterman

ELAM

<e'-lam> ([μl y[e`*elam*]):

(1) A son of Shem (⁽⁰¹⁰²⁾Genesis 10:22; ⁽¹³⁰¹⁷⁾1 Chronicles 1:17; *see* ELAMITES).

(2) A Benjamite (⁽¹³⁰²⁴⁾1 Chronicles 8:24).

(3) A Korahite (⁽¹³²⁶³⁾1 Chronicles 26:3).

(4) Heads of families in the return (⁽¹⁵⁰¹⁷⁾Ezra 2:7 parallel ⁽¹⁶⁰⁷²⁾Nehemiah 7:12; ⁽¹⁵⁰³¹⁾Ezra 2:31 parallel ⁽¹⁶⁰⁷³⁴⁾Nehemiah 7:34; ⁽¹⁵⁰⁸⁰⁷⁾Ezra 8:7; 10:2,26).

(5) A chief of the people (⁽¹⁶¹⁰¹⁴⁾Nehemiah 10:14).

(6) A priest (⁽¹⁶¹²⁴²⁾Nehemiah 12:42).

ELAM; ELAMITES

<e'-lam>, *<e'-lam-its>* ([מ‎ָל‎ְ‎ע‎ `elam]; [Αἰλάμ, *Ailam*]; ⁴⁹³⁶Jeremiah 49:36. Codex Sinaiticus (the original scribe) reads [Ἐλάμ, *Elam*):

1. GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION AND NAMES:

A well-known tract, partly mountainous, whose western boundary, starting on the Northeast side of the Persian Gulf, practically followed the course of the lower Tigris. It was bounded on the North by Media, on the East by Persia and on the West by Babylonia. The Assyro-Babylonians called the tract Elamtu, expressed ideographically by the Sumerian characters for Nimma or Numma, which seems to have been its name in that language. As Numma or Elam apparently means "height," or the like, these names were probably applied to it on account of its mountainous nature. Another name by which it was known in early times was Ashshan, for Anshan or Anzan (Anzhan), one of its ancient cities. The great capital of the tract, however, was Susa (Shushan), whence its Greek name of Susiana, interchanging with Elymais, from the Semitic Elam.

2. SURFACE CONFIGURATION:

Elam consisted of a plain occupying a depression in the mountains of Iran or Persia. Of this the smaller part — which, however, was also the most ancient historically — lay between the Pusht-e-Kuh on the West, the Lur mountains on the North, the Bakhtiari heights to the East and Southeast, and the hills of Ahwaz to the South. The larger plain has as its northern boundary these same Ahwaz hills, and reaches to the sea on the South.

3. MOUNTAIN RANGES:

The Pusht-e-Kuh mountains are a series of very high parallel ranges described as "a veritable wall" between Mesopotamia and the elevated depression of the Kerkha. Its principal peak is in the Kebir-Kuh (2,500 meters = 8,200 ft.) — a difficult range of surprising regularity. The valleys on the Southwest slope belong properly to Babylonia, and could be invaded on that side with ease, but Northeast of the Kebir-Kuh the country is well protected not only against Mesopotamia, on the West, but also against Persia on the East. The nomad Lurs of the present day are practically independent of Persia. The mountain ranges of Luristan increase

in height as one approaches the Persian plain, the loftiest summits of the principal range attaining a height of 5,000 meters (= 16,400 ft.).

4. RIVERS:

From these mountain ranges descend large rivers which flow through Elam to the sea. The Kerkha (Gamas-ab) rises in the Persian plain near Nehavend, and is practically a torrent until it reaches Susa, below which it becomes less rapid, and loses itself in the Hawizeh marshes. The Ab-e-Diz, a river with a greater volume of water, is formed by the uniting of two streams above Dizful. It is so violent that it carries down boulders and even tree-trunks from the mountains, and after a winding course joins the Karun at Kut-e-Bende-Kir. The Belad-Rud, between the Ab-e-Diz and the Kerkha, rises in the mountains of Luristan, and varies greatly as to its volume, being sometimes a mere brook, and at others a large river. The Karun, with which a number of small streams unite, rises in the Bakhtiari mountains. After receiving the Ab-e-Diz and the Belad-Rud at Kut-e-Bende-Kir, it becomes an important waterway, navigable as far as Shuster. This is identified with the Biblical Ulai (Assyrian Ulaa, classical Eulaeus). In ancient times emptying itself into the Persian Gulf, which in past centuries extended much farther inland than now, it at present joins the Shattel-Arab at Mohammerah.

5. CLIMATE:

The climate is a variable one. Between November 1 and 15 the rains begin, with Southeast and South winds, and the mountains are covered with snow. In January and February there are violent storms, and the night brings 8 degrees or 10 degrees of frost. Spring begins at the end of February, and vegetation advances so rapidly that harvest takes place about the end of April. The wind then turns South and Southwest, bringing with it a heat rising sometimes to 140 degree F., destroying all the verdure of the country. Notwithstanding the rigors of the climate, however, it was in ancient times a well-populated district, and exceedingly fruitful, as now. That the district of Arabistan is poor and barren is due to the carelessness and improvidence of the people, who, like the people of the Turkish province of Bagdad, have neglected the ancient irrigation canals which fertilized the land.

6. VEGETATION:

The vegetation of Susiana is said not to be very varied. On the river banks are to be found willows, tamarisks and many kinds of acacias. Apparently there are no forests — the sacred groves referred to by Assur-bani-apli are thought by Deuteronomy Morgan to have been artificial plantations. Oranges and lemons, which are at present cultivated there, are late importations. The date palm has been brought from the banks of the Shatt-el-Arab, and the pomegranate and other fruit trees from the Iranian plain. Wheat and barley, sown in October and November, are harvested in April. Sorghum remains in the ground all through the dry season, and is watered artificially until October, and cut in November. Castor beans, indigo, lentils, haricots, etc., are less cultivated.

7. FAUNA:

The fauna is said at present to be less numerous than formerly. It contains species both of central Asia, Europe, and, to a certain extent, Africa. The elephant, wild ass, wild ox and ostrich are no longer to be found on the Chaldeo-Elamite plain, but a few examples of the lion still exist there. Bears, panthers, wild boars, wolves, wild cats, foxes, jackals, and several species of wild dogs, however, still exist. Numbers of porcupines inhabit the brushwood by the rivers and marshes. Among the birds which do not leave the country are the eagle, vulture, falcon, raven, francolin, martin, sparrow, tomtit, wagtail, etc. The winter birds of passage are the pelican, stork, crane, cormorant, sea gull, many species of wild duck, the wild goose, bustard, woodcock, snipe, pigeon, turtledove, and numerous brilliantly colored waders. The water-courses are full of fish, among them being the barbel, silurus, carp (sometimes of great size), and gurnards similar to those of the Nile. Some of the rivers being salt, sea fish are also to be found, and it is not rare to see sharks at Shuster, and eels in the lower Karun.

8. THE POPULATION:

The population is naturally not homogeneous. Arab tribes, who are in reality Semites, occupy the plains, while Iranians inhabit the cities and dwell at the mountain bases. According to Deuteronomy Morgan, the original population was mainly negritic, and has mingled with the Arab stock to such an extent that mulattoes among them are not rare. He

regards this type as being represented among the soldiers as well as among the people conquered by Naram-Sin about 3000 BC. Nevertheless pure Semites had settled in the country at a very early date, and it is probably on account of this that Elam is called ([0102]Genesis 10:22) a son of Shem — indeed, the many Sere inscriptions found by the French explorers at Susa show how strong their influence was. It was to all appearance during the 2nd millennium BC that certain Kassites overran West Mesopotamia, and settled in the northern part of Elam, which was thereafter called by the Assyrians mat Kassi, "the land of the Cosseans." As these people seem to have spoken an Aryan language, there was apparently no really new race introduced in consequence of their invasion.

9. THE PRINCIPAL CITIES:

The two principal cities were Susa or Shushan, called Susun in the native texts, and regarded as the old capital, situated on the Ulai (Karkha); and Anzan (Ashshan, Anshan), more to the Southwest. This latter was the capital of Cyrus the Great and his immediate predecessors, the tract having been conquered apparently by Sispis (Teispes), his ancestor, at the end of the 6th century BC. Susa, an important commercial center in the 3rd millennium BC, became again one of the three capitals of the Pets empire during the rule of the Achemenians.

10. APIRTI AND THE "BANDIT NATIONS":

From the inscriptions of Mal-Amir, to the East, we learn that that was the place of another kingdom called Apirti, the land of the Apharsites of [5049]Ezra 4:9. In the 2nd (so-called Median or Scythian) version of the late Persian inscriptions this name is given as Hapirti, Halpirti, and Haltupirti, and appears as the equivalent of the Babylonian Elammat (Elamtu) or Elam without the nominative ending. In the Persian version this appears as (H)uwaja or (H)uwazha, whence the modern Huz or Khuzistan. This implies that the kings of Apirti at one time held dominion over Susa, and perhaps the whole of Elam. Strabo (xi.13,1,6), quoting Nearchus, speaks of "four bandit nations" who occupied the mountains East of the Euphrates — the Amardians or Mardians on the Persian border, the Uxians, and Elymeans on the borders of Persia and Susa, and the Cosseans (Kassites) by the Medes. The Amardians would seem to have been the Apirti (Hapirti), the Uxians were probably from (H)uwaja, while the Elymeans (compare 1 Macc 6:1) were the Elamites. Among the tribes who made the

history of the country, therefore, were probably the Uxians, who seem not to be mentioned in the early inscriptions.

11. THE LANGUAGES OF ELAM:

The dialects of Susa, the second Achemenian VSS, and of Apirti, differ but slightly from each other. They are variants of an agglutinative tongue, and are apparently not related to any other known language. The statement in [01102]Genesis 10:22, therefore, applies only to the Semitic section of the population, as it is unlikely that the people speaking Apirtian could be described as "sons of Shem."

12. HISTORY:

(1) The Earliest Period.

Beginning with the semi-mythical period, we have the story of the fight of the Babylonian hero Gilgames with the Elamite tyrant Humbaba, who was defeated by the hero and his helper Enki-du, and beheaded. The earliest really historical reference to the Elamites as the foes of Babylonia, however, is apparently that contained in a letter from the priest Lu-enna to the priest En-e-tarzi announcing that the Elamites had invaded Lagas and carried off considerable booty. The writer, however, had attacked the Elamites, and taken plunder from them in his turn. As there seems to be a reference to division of spoil, this is an excellent parallel to the Elamite expedition, made in alliance with the Babylonians, against the cities of the plain (Genesis 14).

(2) Sargon of Agade and His Successors.

Sargon of Agade, early in his reign, attacked the Elamites, but apparently Elam only fell under the dominion of the Babylonians during the time of Naram-Sin, his son, who is seemingly shown leading his troops in that region on the splendid stele bearing his name that was found at Susa. Elam apparently regained its independence, however, during the time of Uruwus king of Kis, who invaded the country, and brought back considerable spoil. One of the chiefs of Susa about this time was Simbi-ishak. Chaldean domination, however, did not last long, for Dungi, king of Ur of the Chaldees, about 2500 BC, invaded the country, accompanied by his vassal Gudea, viceroy of Lagas. Dungi has left evidences of his conquests in the buildings which he erected at Susa, but the principal buildings of this period were constructed by Ba-sa-Susinak, son of Simbi-ishak, viceroy of

Susa and potentate in Elam. He built a temple to the god Sugu, reservoirs, the gate of Susinak, and dug the Sidur canal. He was evidently one of the great rulers of the land.

(3) The Suzerainty of the Kings of Ur.

Somewhat later came Idadu I, his son Kal-Ruhuratir, and his grandson Idadu II, who in turn occupied the throne during the time of Bur-Sin, king of Ur. Elam was at this time still under Babylonian suzerainty, which continued under his successor, Gimil-Sin, who also built at Susa, his vassal being Ebarti-kin-Daddu, viceroy of Susa. Gimil-Sin was succeeded by his son Ibi-Sin as overlord in Elam, who invaded and devastated the country, probably to suppress a a revolt. There was apparently no ill-will between the two nations, however, for the viceroy of Susa is said to have married a daughter of Ibi-Sin. Another and possibly later viceroy seems to have married Mekubi, daughter of Billama, viceroy of Asnunnak, who, as Elamite princess, erected buildings at Susa.

(4) Elam Becomes Predominant 2280 Years BC.

It was probably shortly after this that Kudur-Nahhunte threw off the Semitic yoke, and, invading Babylonia, brought back much spoil to Elam. The date indicated for this ruler by the inscriptions of Assurbani-apli is 2280 BC. The positions of the rulers of Elam and Babylonia were now changed, and the kings of Babylon had to acknowledge Elamite suzerainty. As Elamite and Babylonian sovereign, Kudur-Nahhunte entrusted Susa to a feudatory ruler, and among the viceroys who governed Elam may be mentioned Sirukdu', who constructed at Susa, and Temti-Agun, his sister's son, who built in that city the temple to Isme-karab, "for the health of Kutir-Nahhunte and his family." After passing to other rulers, the government of Susa fell to Ebari, father of Silhaha, during whose reign Simti-Silhak ruled in Babylonia. Nur-Addi and Rim-Anum, kings of Larsa (Elassar), were his vassals.

(5) The Extension of Elamite Authority Westward.

Attapaksu (or Attahusu), Silhaha's sister's son, then became "shepherd of Susa." Among the temples which he built was one dedicated to the goddess Narute, and he erected a bridge near his residence. Kudur-mabuk, son of Simti-Silhak, was at this time adda ("father," probably meaning protector) of Emutbalu and the West — Amurru, the land of the Amorites,

whither marched Chedorlaomer and Amraphel, with their allies, in the time of Abraham (Genesis 14). Kudur-mabuk of Larsa was succeeded by his son Eri-Aku (probably the Iri-Agun of Larsa of the Elamite texts), and if he be really, as seems probable, the Arioch of ◁0140▷Genesis 14:1,9, then this is also the period when Chedorlaomer ruled in Elam. The strange thing, however, is, that the name of this last does not occur in any recognizable form, unless it be the Kudurlahgumal of certain half-legendary inscriptions (*see CHEDORLAOMER*). The Elamite line in Larsa was continued after the death of Eri-Aku by Rim-Sin, his brother, who succeeded him.

(6) Babylonia Again Supreme.

What the history of Elam during this period was remains to be discovered, but Hammurabi, who is identified with the Amraphel of ◁0140▷Genesis 14:1,9, seems to have invaded the country in his 30th year. In his 31st he defeated Rim-Sin of Larsa, following this up, in his 32nd, by overthrowing the army of Asnunnak. All these successes in Elam and its dependencies probably made the kingdom of Babylon supreme in the land. But more details bearing upon this period are needed. It is thought probable that the Elamite king Sadi(?) or Taki (?) came into conflict with, and was defeated by, Ammi-caduga, the 4th in descent from Hammurabi, who reigned about 1890 BC. Apparently the Elamite ruler had tried to regain his independence, but failed.

(7) Hurbatila's Challenge to Kuri-galzu.

Omitting the names of rulers concerning whom but little or nothing is known, we come to the reign of Untas-Gal, patron of the articles Numerous temples were built by him, and sanctuaries at Susa dedicated. He has left a magnificent bronze statue representing his queen Napir-Asu. He seems to have been overthrown by Untahas-Gal, of a more legitimate line, who was likewise a builder of temples. After the apparently short reign of Kidin-Hutran came that of Hurpatila (Hurbatila), who, desiring to throw off the Babylonian yoke, challenged Kuri-galzu, king of Babylon, to battle at Dur-Dungi. The challenge was accepted, with disastrous results, for Hurbatila was captured by the Babylonian king at the place named. This, however, did not put an end to the strife, and in the end Kidin-Hutrudas was victorious over Belnadin-sum, king of Babylon, about 1180 BC.

(8) Elam Again Supreme.

Later came the military exploits of Sutruk-Nahhunte, who invaded Babylonia, slew the king Zagaga-sum-iddina, and helped by his son Kutir-Nahhunte, destroyed Sippar, and took away the stele of Naram-Sin, the code of Hammurabi, and several other monuments, which were carefully preserved at Susa. He also defeated the king of Asnunnak. It is this collection of spoils which has contributed to make the success of the French excavations at Susa what it is.

(9) Elam Again Defeated, but Recovers.

The war between Babylonia and Elam recorded for the reign of Nebuchadrezzar I (circa 1020 BC) probably took place, according to Scheil, during the reign of Silbina-hamru-Laqamar. The Elamite king was defeated on the banks of the Ulai, Elam was ravaged, and much spoil taken. The principality called Namar was detached from Susian territory and reunited to the domain of Babylonia. Apparently the Elamites now turned their attention to regaining their military prestige, the result being that an Elamite king occupied the Babylonian throne from 939 to 934 BC. The history of this period has still to be discovered, but the Babylonians apparently soon shook off the Elamite yoke. It is about this time, however, that another power — Assyria — appeared on the scene, and took the field — not only against Babylon, but also on the borders of Elam. An Elamite contemporary of Nabonassar of Babylon was Humbanigas, 742 BC.

(10) The Conflict between Elam and Assyria.

At this time, however, the Assyrians became dominant in Babylonia (*see TIGLATH-PILESER* and *SHALMANESER*), but it was probably not until the reign of Sargon of Assyria (*see SARGON*) that Elam came into conflict with Assyria. Merodach-baladan, a pretender to the throne of Babylon, made common cause with Humbanigas, who fought with the Assyrian army at Der. Naturally the Assyrians claim the victory, but the Babylonians say that they were defeated. After the death of Humbanigas, his successor, Sutur-Nahhundi or Ishtar-hundu (Babylonian), still befriended Merodach-baladan, and advanced to his help. Sargon first attacked the Chaldeans and defeated them at Dur-Athara, and, entering Elam, stormed and captured the cities of the land. The Elamite king took refuge in the mountains, and Merodach-baladan had to resist the Assyrians unaided.

(11) Sennacherib against Chaldea and Elam.

As Sargon had his attention fully occupied elsewhere, he made no attempt to follow up his success, and it seems not to have been until the reign of Sennacherib that any serious invasion of the country on the part of the Assyrians was made. In 697 BC that king marched again against Merodach-baladan, who had taken refuge at Nagitu and other places on the Elamite side of then elongated Persian Gulf. Here the Chaldeans, with their Elamite allies, were defeated, and the Elamite cities plundered and destroyed. Hallusu, king of Elam, on the retirement of the Assyrian troops, invaded Babylonia as being part of the territories of the Assyrian king, and having captured Assur-nadin-sum, Sennacherib's son, who had ruled in Babylon 6 years, carried him off to Elam, setting Nergal-usezib on the throne of Babylonia. On the arrival of the Assyrian avenging host in Babylonia, Nergal-usezib fled to Elam, but was captured near Niffer. The Elamites were evidently very dissatisfied with their king — possibly owing to his policy — and killed him in a revolt after a reign of six years. This action on the part of the Elamites, however, did not save the people from Assyrian vengeance, for Sennacherib invaded and ravaged the country from Ras to Bit-Burnaki. Apparently the Elamites had expected their new ruler, Kudurru (Kudur-Nahhunte), to save them from the reprisals of the Assyrians, but as he had failed to do this, he, in his turn, was deposed and killed after a reign of 10 months. The new king of Elam was Umman-Menanu, who espoused the cause of Musezib-Marduk, the new king of Babylon, and gathering a force of Babylonians and Elamites at Halule, fought a battle there, in which the Babylonians record success for the allies. Sennacherib, however, himself claims the victory, and describes with great wealth of detail the horrors of the fight. Next year (689 BC) Sennacherib marched into Babylonia to complete the work, and Musezib-Marduk, having been captured, was sent prisoner to Assyria. Umman-Menanu died at the end of the year, after a 4 years' reign, and was succeeded by Humba-haldasu I (689-682 BC), of whom nothing is known. In 682 BC Humba-haldasu II mounted the throne. The death of Sennacherib and the troubles attending the accession of Esarhaddon encouraged Nabuzer-napisti-Itsir, son of Merodach-baladan, again to raise the standard of revolt. Defeat was the result, and he fled to Elam, there to be captured by Humba-haldasu and put to death.

(12) Assyrian Friendship and Elamite Ingratitude.

Friendship with Assyria was a complete reversal of Elamite policy, and to all appearance peace, though probably unpopular, persisted between the two countries for several years. Humba-haldasu's two brothers revolted against him and assassinated him, and Urtaku, one of the murderers, took the Elamite throne. Not daring to be openly hostile to Assyria, however, he sent his brother Te-umman to intrigue in Chaldea in favor of a man named Nabuusallim, but the Chaldean chiefs answered that Na'id-Marduk, their lord, lived, and they were the servants of the king of Assyria. Also, during a famine in Elam, certain Elamite tribes migrated into Assyria to escape the scarcity, and were kindly treated by Assur-bani-apli, who had succeeded his father on the Assyrian throne. Notwithstanding this, however, Urtaku invaded Babylonia as ally of certain Chaldean tribes. Overtaken by the Assyrian army, he fought with them near his own border, but was defeated and fled. He died prematurely (by his own hand) the same year, and was succeeded by his brother Te-umman (Tepti-Humban).

(13) Te-umman and the Elamite Seed-royal; Assyria's Triumph.

This king, who is described by Assur-bani-apli as being in the likeness of an evil spirit, immediately set to work to secure the death of all the sons of Urtaku and Umman-aldase (Humba-Haldasu II), his brother; and these princes, five in number, with 60 of the royal seed of Elam, fled and sought refuge with the Assyrian king. Te-umman immediately sent two messengers to Assur-bani-apli demanding the surrender of the fugitives. This was refused, and war broke out between the two countries immediately after. The Assyrians came up with the Elamites at Der, but Te-umman feared to join issue there, and retreating, took up a strong position near his capital, Susa, with his front protected by the river Ulai. Defections from his army now so weakened the forces of Te-umman that he endeavored to treat with Assur-bani-apli, who naturally refused to listen to terms, and ordered his troops to attack. The defeat of the Elamites was a foregone conclusion, and Te-umman perished, with his son, in the thick of the battle, as is dramatically depicted by the sculptors of Assur-bani-apli in the bas-reliefs which adorned the walls of his palace. An Assyrian general was now sent to Susa with Umman-igas, the prince chosen to succeed Te-umman, and he was proclaimed while the bodies of the fallen Elamites covered the battlefield, and the waters of the Ulai carried others down to the place of its outflow. Tammaritu, the new king's youngest brother, was

at the same time made king of Hidalu, in the mountain region. In the triumphal procession at Nineveh which took place on the Assyrian army's return, the head of Te-umman and his son Tamritu figured, the former hanging from the neck of Dunanu, king of Gambulu, and the latter from the neck of Samgunu, Dunanu's brother.

(14) Elamite Ingratitude and Treachery.

For a time there was peace in Elam, but soon the discontent of Samas-sum-ukin, king of Babylon, Assur-bani-apli's brother, sought to break it. Urged by him, Umman-igas forgot the benefits which he had received at the hands of Assur-bani-apli, and sent an army into Babylonia under the command of Undasi, son of Te-umman, telling him to avenge upon Assyria the killing of his father. Notwithstanding the great strength of the allied army, they did not succeed in making headway against the Assyrians. Tammaritu, nephew of Umman-igas, after the defeat of the Elamite forces in Chaldea, revolted against him, and having defeated him, cut off his head, and took the crown. Samas-sum-ukin immediately turned his attention to the new ruler, and induced him by fresh presents to come likewise to his aid. Tammaritu therefore marched at the head of an army into Babylonia, but in his absence Indabigas, one of his servants, headed a revolt against him, and proclaimed himself king in Susa. In the battle which ensued between the two pretenders, Tammaritu was defeated, and fled to the seacoast with a part of the Elamite royal family. He ultimately embarked in a ship on the Persian Gulf with the intention of escaping, but was wrecked, and gave himself up to an Assyrian officer, who sent him to Assyria.

(15) Elam's Further Changes of Rulers.

Indabigas, the new Elamite king, now sent an embassy to make peace with Assur-bani-apli, who at once demanded the surrender of Nabu-bel-sumati, son of Merodach-baladan, and the Assyrians whom he had enticed and taken with him. Before this demand could reach Indabigas, however, his people had revolted against him and put him to death, and Umman-aldasu, son of Attametu, sat on the throne, after defeating Indabigas on the banks of the Huthut. The same demand was made to Ummanaldasu as had been made to Indabigas, but Nabubel-sumati, not wishing to fall into the hands of the Assyrians, called on his armor-bearer to dispatch him, and the two ran each other through with their swords.

(16) King Tammaritu's Treachery.

Nevertheless Assur-bani-apli decided to replace Tammaritu, the former Elamite king, on the throne, and to this end invaded Elam. The Assyrians were, as usual, successful, and on learning this, Umman-aldas fled to the mountains. Entering Susa, Tammaritu was once more proclaimed king of Elam, he, in return, promising to regard Assur-bani-apli as his lord, and to pay tribute. No sooner had the Assyrian army departed, than the new king of Elam began to plot against the power which had raised him. To all appearance his intentions to revolt were reported to the Assyrian king, who at once sent an army and plundered the country, and Tammaritu again fell into Assur-bani-apli's hands. Umman-aldas now returned and resumed the government. Unwilling to regard his former efforts as fruitless, the Assyrian king decided to finally subdue the land, and to this end invaded it, the pretext being that the Elamites refused to deliver up the image of the goddess Nana, which had been carried off from Erech 1,635 years before, in the time of Kudur-Nahhunte (see **(4)** above). The two armies faced each other on the banks of the Itite, and after an attack in which the Assyrians were at a disadvantage, the Elamites gave way, and Umman-aldas fled to the mountains. According to the Assyrian king's record, an enormous booty was taken, including many sacred and ancient royal statues preserved at Susa. The image of Nana was restored to its shrine at Erech with great rejoicing. In the triumphal celebrations at Nineveh, Tammaritu was one of the captive kings who drew the Assyrian king's chariot to the temple of Ishtar, when he rendered the goddess thanks for his victories.

(17) Dominion Passes from Assyria.

To all appearance Elam now became a province of the Assyrian empire, though not for long, as this collapsed in the year 606 BC, and the center of government was shifted to Babylon, under Nabopolassar, who became its ruler. Nebuchadrezzar (604), Evil-Merodach (561), Neriglissar (559), and Nabonidus (555-538 BC), were successively masters of Elam. The mention of the kings of Elam in [2525]Jeremiah 25:25, however, suggests that the old states of the country had practically resumed their independence; though 49:35-39 prophesies the dismemberment of the country, and the destruction of its king and princes. This is thought to refer to the annexation of the country by Teispes, and its passing, through his line — Cyrus, Cambyses, and Cyrus the Great, who were all kings of Anzan — to Darius Hystaspis. In [2102]Isaiah 21:2 it is apparently the later Cyrus who is

referred to when Elam, with Media, is called upon "to go up" to the siege of Babylon.

(18) The Later State of Elam.

After Cyrus, the history of Elam was that of Persia, of which it henceforth formed a part. In all probability, however, the Elamites were as warlike and as intractable as ever. During the reign of the little-known Kharacenian king, Aspasine, they made incursions into Babylonia, one of the opponents of this king's generals being Pittit, "the enemy, the Elamite" — a phrase of old standing, apparently. Elam, to its whole extent, was smitten with the sword, and Pittit (was slain or captured). One of the cities which they attacked was Apameia, probably that on the Sellas river. ◄4009►Acts 2:9 implies that the old language of Elam was still in use, and the Elamites were still recognized as a nationality, as late as the 1st century of our era.

13. ELAMITE RELIGION:

Owing to the many Semites in Elam, and the nearness of the Babylonian states, Babylonian deities — Anu and Anatu, Enlil and Ninlil, Merodach and Zer-panitu, Samas and Aa, Tammuz and Ishtar, Ninip, Nergal, Hadad or Rimmon, etc. — were largely worshipped (*see BABEL, BABYLON*). The chief deity of the non-Semitic pantheon seems to have been Insusinak, the patron-deity of Susa, identified with Ninip, the son of Enlil, by the Babylonians, who guote also other names applied to him — Lahuratil Simes, Adaene, Susinak, and Dagbak. Merodach seems to have been represented by the Sumerian character Gal, "great," and Zer-panitu was apparently called Nin-sis in Elam. Ishtar was known as Usan. Lagamar, Laqamar, or Lagamal, was apparently identified with the Babylonian Lagamal, one of the gods of Dailem near Babylon — his name is generally regarded as forming part of the name *CHEDORLAOMER* (which see). Nahhunte, Na'hunte, or (Babylonian) Nan-hundi was the Babylonian sun-god Samas; Kunzibami was the W. Semitic Hadad, also known by his Mitannian (Hittite) name of Tesup. Humban, Human, or Umman (Assyrian), "the god of gods," "the king," was possibly regarded as the Babylonian Merodach. The currency of Babylonian myths in Elam is suggested by the name of the goddess Belala, possibly the Babylonian Belili, sister of Tammuz. The word for "god" in Elamite was nap, explained by the Babylonians as one of the names of Enlil, implying that the Elamites regarded him as "the god" by divine right. Of their deities, six (one of them being Lagamar) were worshipped only by Elamite kings.

Elam had temples and temple-towers similar to those in Babylonia, as well as sacred groves, wherein no stranger penetrated. (See ERE, under the word "Elamites.")

14. ELAM'S IMPORTANCE; HER LITERATURE:

The rediscovery of the history of Elam is one of the most noteworthy things of modern research. It has revealed to us the wonderful development which that kingdom had made at an exceedingly early date, and shows that it was politically just as important as the Babylonian states 4,000 years BC, though probably hardly so advanced in art and literature. Nevertheless, the country had adopted the cuneiform method of writing, and possessed also another script, seemingly of more ancient date. As both Semitic Babylonian and Susian (Anzanite) were spoken in the country, numerous documents in both languages have been found, mostly historical, or of the nature of dedications, some of which are inscribed on objects presented to temples. There are also a number of archaic tablets of the nature of accounts, written in a peculiar cuneiform character. The cylinder-seals are either inscribed with dedications, or with the name of the owner, his father, and the god whom he worshipped, as in Babylonia. Of other literature there are but mere traces — an exorcism against mosquitos shows the desire of the people to rid themselves of the discomforts of this life. Contracts testify to the existence of laws, but the laws themselves have yet to be discovered. The stele of Hammurabi, which was found at Susa, did not belong to Elamitic literature, but to that of Babylonia.

15. ART DURING THE 1ST AND 2ND PREHISTORIC PERIODS:

Elamite art during the first period was naturally rude, and it is doubtful whether metals were then used, as no traces of them were found. There were also no inscribed monuments. The pottery, however, was of extreme delicacy, and very elegant. The second period is described as being less artistic than the first. The pottery is more ordinary, and also more roughly made, though better ware also exists. Painted ornamentation is found. Vessels of white or pink limestone, some of them very large, occur, but alabaster is exceedingly rare. There is no indication of writing at this period, but rudely engraved seals, with animal forms, are found. The buildings were of crude brick or piled-up earth, though baked brick was sometimes used. A change seems to have taken place in the conditions of life at the end of this period, implying invasion by a more civilized race.

16. ART IN THE ARCHAIC PERIOD, THAT OF VICEROYS, AND THAT OF THE KINGS:

The indications of invasion during the second prehistoric period are confirmed, according to M. Jequier, by what is found in the layer of the archaic period, which succeeded it. This is accentuated by the numerous inscribed clay tablets, some of the which have impressions of quite remarkable cylinder-seals. The pottery is scanty and not characteristic, but the working of alabaster into vases had developed considerably, and some of the smaller forms (ointment or scent-bottles) are good and varied. Some have the form of the duck, the wild boar, and other animals. During the period of the issake or viceroys, fine sculptures in low relief occur — the scorpion-man and the sacred tree, military prisoners with their guard, siegeoperations and the dead on the battlefield; and as examples of work in the round, ivory and alabaster statuettes. Later on, during the time of the kings of Elam and Susa, the objects of art increase in number, though large objects in the round are rare. Noteworthy are the statuettes and statues in bronze, the former being very numerous. The largest production of this kind is the almost lifesize statue of queen Napir-Asu, consort of Untas-Gal, which, however, is unfortunately headless. It is a remarkable piece of work, and has great artistic merit.

17. TEMPERAMENT OF THE INHABITANTS OF ELAM:

In all probability Elam was much hindered in her material and intellectual development by the intractable and warlike nature of her people — indeed, the history of the country, as far as it is known, is a record of strife and conflict, and the temperament indicated by the ancient records seems to have been inherited by the wild tribes which occupy the more inaccessible districts. What conduced to quarrels and conflicts in ancient times was the law of succession, for the Elamite kings were not generally succeeded by their eldest sons, but by their brothers (*see ELLASAR*). The inhabitants of the towns at the present time in all probability do not differ in any essential respect from those of Persia in general, and among them there is probably no great amount of ancient Elamite blood, though the Elamite type is met with, and probably occurs, in consequence of ancient mingling, in various parts of modern Persia.

LITERATURE.

For the most complete account of the discoveries in Elam, see Memoires de la delegation en Perse, I ff, Mission scientifique en Perse, I ff, and Histoire et travaux de la delegation en Perse, all under the editorship of J. de Morgan, and written by Deuteronomy Morgan, V. Scheil, G. Lampre, G. Jequier, etc.; also W. K. Loftus, Chaldea and Susiana, 1857.

T. G. Pinches

ELASA

<el'-a-sa>, *<ele-a'sa>* ([ʼΑλασά, *Alasa*]; the King James Version Eleasa): The place where Judas pitched his camp before the battle in which he was overwhelmed and slain (1 Macc 9:5). It probably corresponds to the modern Khirbet il`asa, between the two Beth-horons.

ELASAH

<el'-a-sa> ([hc[l a, *'el`asah*], "God has made"):

(1) An Israelite who had married a foreign wife (Ezra 10:22).
(2) A son of Shaphan, by whom, with Gemariah, King Zedekiah sent a message to Babylon (Jeremiah 29:3).
　　See ELEASAH.

ELATH; ELOTH

<e'-lath>, or *<e'-loth>* ([twlyae *'eloth*], [tl " yae *'elath*]; [Αἰλών, *Ailon*] (Deuteronomy 2:8), [Αἰλάθ, *Ailath*] (2 Kings 16:6)): A seaport on the Red Sea in the territory of Edom. It is named along with Ezion-geber in the account of Israel's journey round the land of Edom (Deuteronomy 2:8). It appears as Ailath, and Alion in the Septuagint, and in Josephus as Ilanis (Ant., VIII, vi, 4), while Eusebius (Onomasticon) has [Αἰλά, *Aila*]. From this we may gather that the Aramaic Ilan or Ilana was in use as well as the Hebrew *'elath* or *'eloth*. The name, "grove," was doubtless derived from the presence of certain sacred trees. It may be identical with El-paran of Genesis 14:6, and Elah of Genesis 36:41. When David conquered Edom, Elath passed into the hands of Israel (2 Samuel 8:14). It was a position of great importance in connection with the trade with South Arabia. Here the merchant fleets of Solomon and

Jehoshaphat were fitted out, and hence, they sailed (◁10926▷1 Kings 9:26; ◁44087▷2 Chronicles 8:17; ◁12248▷1 Kings 22:48). In the reign of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, Edom shook off the hand of Judah (◁12080▷2 Kings 8:20), but under Amaziah and Uzziah it was again subdued (◁12407▷2 Kings 14:7,10,22). Finally it was taken from Ahaz by Rezin, king of Syria. The Jews were driven out and the Syrians (Edomites?) took permanent possession (◁12606▷2 Kings 16:6). It is identical with the modern `*Aqaba*, at the head of the gulf of that name.

W. Ewing

ELBERITH

<el-be'-rith> (◁07046▷Judges 9:46).

See BAALBERITH.

EL-BETH-EL

<el-beth'-el> ([l aAtyBd aε*el beth-'el*], "God of Bethel"; [Βαιθήλ, *Baithel*]): By this name Jacob called the scene of his vision at Luz, when he returned from Paddan-aram (◁01357▷Genesis 35:7).

ELCIA

<el'-shi-a>, the Revised Version (British and American) *ELKIAH* (which see).

ELDAAH

<el-da'-a> ([hDl ạ, *'elda`ah*], "God has called"?): A son of Midian (◁01504▷Genesis 25:4; ◁13033▷1 Chronicles 1:33).

ELDAD

<el'-dad> ([dDl ạ, *'eldadh*], "God has loved"): One of the 70 elders chosen by Moses at the command of Yahweh to share "the burden of the people" (◁04116▷Numbers 11:16-25). Eldad and his companion Medad were not present with the rest at the tent of meeting, yet the Spirit rested also upon them and they prophesied in the camp (◁04126▷Numbers 11:26-29).

ELDAD AND MODAD, BOOK OF

<el'-dad>, *<mo'-dad>*: In the Septuagint they are called Eldad and Modad. In the King James Version the names are given as Eldad and Medad; meaning "God has loved" ("God loves") and "object of love" (?). They were two of the seventy elders chosen by Moses (Numbers 11:26), and while the others obeyed the summons and went to the tabernacle, these two remained in the camp and prophesied (Numbers 11:26). The nature of their prophecy is not recorded, and this naturally became a good subject for the play of the imagination. It furnished the basis for a lost work which was quoted by Hermas (Vis 2 3): "The Lord is near to them who return unto him, as it is written in Eldad and Modad, who prophesied to the people in the wilderness." The Palestine Targums also filled in the subject of the prophecy of Eldad and Modad, and, as they have it, it related to the coming of Gog and Magog against Israel at the end of the days. One of the Targums has the expression, "The Lord is near to them that are in the hour of tribulation." The authors of the Targums were either dependent upon that work or upon a similar tradition; and the former of these views is the more probable. Lightfoot and Holtzman think the lengthy quotation in 1 Clem 23 and 2 Clem 11 is from the Book of Eldad and Modad. The work is found in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and consists of 400 stichoi, which would make it about twice the length of the Cant.

A. W. Fortune

ELDER IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

<el'-der>, ([זָקֵן, *zaqen*]): Among primitive peoples authority seems naturally to be invested in those who by virtue of greater age and, consequently, experience are best fitted to govern thus Iliad iii.149. Later the idea of age became merged in that of dignity (Il. ii.404, ii.570; Odyssey ii.14). In like manner the word patres came to be used among the Romans (Cic. Rep. 2,8,14). So also among the Germans authority was entrusted to those who were older; compare Tacitus Agricola. The same is true among the Arabians to the present day, the sheik being always a man of age as well as of authority.

From the first the Hebrews held this view of government, although the term "elder" came later to be used of the idea of the authority for which, at first, age was regarded necessary. Thus the office appears in both the

Jahwist, J (9th century BC) (Exodus 3:16; 12:21; 24:1, of the elders of the Hebrews; and of the Egyptians, Genesis 50:7); and Elohist (E) (8th century BC) (Exodus 17:5; 18:12; 19:7 (the second Deuteronomist (D2)); Joshua 24:31, elders of Israel, or of the people. Compare the principle of selection of heads of tens, fifties, etc., Exodus 18:13 ff, seventy being selected from a previous body of elders); compare Jahwist(J)-Elohist(E) (Numbers 11:16,24). Seventy are also mentioned in Exodus 24:1, while in Judges 8:14 seventy-seven are mentioned, although this might be taken to include seven princes. Probably the number was not uniform.

Elder as a title continues to have place down through the times of the Judges (Judges 8:16; 2:7(D); compare Ruth 4:2 ff) into the kingdom. Saul asked to be honored before the elders (1 Samuel 15:30); the elders of Bethlehem appeared before Samuel (1 Samuel 16:4); the elders appeared before David in Hebron (2 Samuel 17:15; 1 Chronicles 11:3); elders took part in the temple procession of Solomon (1 Kings 8:3; 2 Chronicles 5:4). They continued through the Persian period (Ezra 5:5,9; 6:7,14; 10:8,14; Joel 1:14 margin) and the Maccabean period (Judith 6:16; 7:23; 8:10; 10:6; 13:12; 1 Macc 12:35), while the New Testament ([πρεσβύτερος, *presbuteros*], Matthew 16:21; 26:47,57; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22; Acts 4:5,23) makes frequent mention of the office.

The elders served as local magistrates, in bringing murderers to trial (Deuteronomy 19:12; 21:1 ff; Joshua 20:4), punishing a disobedient son (Deuteronomy 21:19), inflicting penalty for slander (Deuteronomy 22:15), for noncompliance with the Levirate marriage law (Deuteronomy 25:7 ff), enforcing the Law (Deuteronomy 27:1), conducting the service in expiation of unwitting violation of the Law (Leviticus 4:13 ff).

In certain passages different classes of officers are mentioned as "judges and officers" (Deuteronomy 16:18), "elders" and "officers" (Deuteronomy 31:28), "heads, tribes, elders officers" (Deuteronomy 29:10 (Hebrew 9)). It is probable that both classes were selected from among the elders, and that to one class was assigned the work of judging, and that the "officers" exercised executive functions (Schurer). In entirely Jewish communities the same men would be both officers of the community and elders of the synagogue. In this case the same men would have jurisdiction over civil and religious matters.

LITERATURE.

Schurer, GJV3, section 23, especially 175 ff (Eng. edition, II, i, 149 ff; Benzinger, H A2, 51; Deissmann, Bibelstudien, 153 ff (s.v. [πρεσβύτερος]); BDB, 278 ([ˆqez]); Preuschen, Griechisch-Deutsches Handworterbuch, under the word, 958 f.

W. N. Stearns

ELDER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

([πρεσβύτερος, *presbuteros*]):

(1) The word is used adjectivally to denote seniority (Luke 15:25; 1 Timothy 5:2).
(2) Referring to the Jewish elders of the synagogue, usually associated with the scribes and Pharisees, and New Testament passages cited in the previous article.

(3) It denotes certain persons appointed to hold office in the Christian church, and to exercise spiritual oversight over the flock entrusted to them. From the references in Acts (14:23; 20:17) it may be inferred that the churches generally had elders appointed over them. That "elders" and "bishops" were in apostolic and sub-apostolic times the same, is now almost universally admitted; in all New Testament references their functions are identical. The most probable explanation of the difference of names is that "elder" refers mainly to the person, and "bishop" to the office; the name "elder" emphasizes what he is, while "bishop," that is "overseer," emphasizes what the elder or presbyter does.

See BISHOP; CHURCH GOVERNMENT; MINISTRY.

A. C. Grant

ELEAD

<el'-e-ad> ([d[ˆļá, *'el`adh*], "God has testified"): An Ephraimite, slain while making a raid, by the men of Gath (1 Chronicles 7:21).

ELEADAH; ELADAH

<el-e-a'-da>, (the King James Version) ([hd[ˆļá, *'el`adhah*], "God has adorned"): An Ephraimite (1 Chronicles 7:20).

ELEALEH

<e-le-a'-le> ([הלֶ אָ, 'el`aleh], "God has ascended"): Lay in the country taken from Sihon and within the lot given to Reuben (Numbers 32:3,17 f). "Their names being changed" seems to apply to all the towns mentioned. There is no indication of the other names. Elealeh is noticed with Heshbon in the oracles against Moab in Isaiah 15:4; 16:9; Jeremiah 48:34. Eusebius (Onomasticon) locates it one Roman mile from Heshbon. It is represented today by *el'Al*, a mound crowned with ruins, about a mile North of *Chesban*.

ELEASA

<el-e-a'-sa>.

See *ELASA.*

ELEASAH

<el-e-a'-sa> (in Hebrew identical with *ELASAH*, which see):

(1) A descendant of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:39,40).

(2) A Benjamite, a descendant of Saul (1 Chronicles 8:37; 9:43).

ELEAZAR

<el-e-a'-zar>, <e-le-a'-zar> ([רז[אָ, 'el-`azar]; [Ἐλεάζαρ, *Eleazar*], "God is helper"):

(1) The 3rd son of Aaron by Elisheba (Exodus 6:23; Numbers 3:2). He married one of the daughters of Putiel, who bore him Phinehas (Exodus 6:25). With his father and 3 brothers he was consecrated to the priest's office (Exodus 28:1). After the destruction of Nadab and Abihu, he occupied a more important position, and he and Ithamar "ministered in the priest's office in the presence of Aaron their father" (Leviticus 10:6 f; Numbers 3:4; 1 Chronicles 24:2 ff). He was given the oversight of the Levites and had charge of the tabernacle and all within it (Numbers 3:32; 4:16). To Eleazar fell the duty of beating out for an altar covering the censers of Korah and his fellow-conspirators who had attempted to seize the priesthood (Numbers 16:37,39). On the death of Aaron, Eleazar succeeded him (Numbers 20:25 ff). He assisted

Moses with the census after the plague in the plains of Moab (Numbers 26:1 ff), and with Moses and the elders heard the petition of the daughters of Zelophehad who wished to be served as heirs to their father (Numbers 27:1 ff). After the entrance into Canaan, Eleazar and Joshua gave effect to the decision arrived at by giving the daughters of Zelophehad a share in the land of Manasseh (Joshua 17:4). He was priest and adviser to Joshua, the successor of Moses (Numbers 27:19; 31:12 ff), whom he also assisted in partitioning Canaan among the tribes (Numbers 34:17; Joshua 14:1; 19:51; 21:1). He was buried in the hill (the Revised Version, margin "Gibeah") of Phinehas his son in the hill country of Ephraim (Joshua 24:33). For some reason unknown the descendants of Ithamar seem to have held the chief position among the priests from Eli till the accession of Solomon, when Abiathar was sent into retirement, and Zadok, the descendant of Eleazar, was appointed in his place (1 Kings 2:26 ff). Ezra was a descendant of Zadok (Ezra 7:1 ff); and the high priest's office was in the family of Zadok till the time of the Maccabees.

(2) The son of Abinadab, sanctified to keep the ark of Yahweh, when it was brought from Beth-shemesh to Kiriath-jearim after being sent back by the Philistines (1 Samuel 7:1).

(3) The son of Dodai, one of David's three mighty men. A famous feat of arms with David at Ephes-dammim is recorded (2 Samuel 23:9 f; 1 Chronicles 11:12 f where he is named the son of Dodo).

(4) A Levite, a son of Mahli, a Merarite. It is recorded that he had no sons, but daughters only, who were married to their cousins (1 Chronicles 23:21,22; 24:28).

(5) A priest who accompanied Ezra from Babylon (Ezra 8:33); the son of Phinehas. **(5)** and **(6)** may be identical.

(6) A priest who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 12:42).

(7) A son of Mattathias and brother of Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 2:5; 6:43 f; 2 Macc 8:23).

See ASMONEANS; MACCABEES.

(8, 9) Two others are mentioned in 1 Macc 8:17; 2 Macc 6:18 ff.

(10) An ancestor of Jesus, 3 generations before Joseph (Matthew 1:15).

S. F. Hunter

ELEAZURUS

<el-e-a-zu'-rus>, the Revised Version (British and American) *ELIASIBUS* (which see).

ELECT

<e-lekt'>: That is, "chosen," "selected." In the Old Testament the word represents derivatives of [רָ " בָ; *bachar*], *elegit*; in the New Testament [ἐκλεκτός, *eklektos*]. It means properly an object or objects of selection. This primary meaning sometimes passes into that of "eminent," "valuable," "choice"; often thus as a fact, in places where the King James Version uses "chosen" (or "elect") to translate the original (e.g. ²³⁴⁰Isaiah 42:1; ⁶⁰⁰⁶1 Peter 2:6). In the King James Version "elect" (or "chosen") is used of Israel as the race selected for special favor and to be the special vehicle of Divine purposes (so 4 times in Apocrypha, Tobit and Ecclus); of the great Servant of Yahweh (compare ⁴²³⁵Luke 23:35; the "Christ of God, his chosen"); compare eminent saints as Jacob, Moses, Rufus (⁵¹⁶¹Romans 16:13); "the lady," and her "sister" of 2 Jn; of the holy angels (⁵⁴⁶²1 Timothy 5:21); with a possible suggestion of the lapse of other angels. Otherwise, and prevalently in the New Testament, it denotes a human community, also described as believers, saints, the Israel of God; regarded as in some sense selected by Him from among men, objects of His special favor, and correspondingly called to special holiness and service. See further under *ELECTION*. In the English versions "elect" is not used as a verb: "to choose" is preferred; e.g. ⁴¹³⁰Mark 13:20; ⁴⁰⁰⁴Ephesians 1:4.

Handley Dunelm

ELECT LADY

<e-lekt' la'-di> ([ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ, *eklekte kuria*]; ⁶⁰⁰⁰2 John 1:1): In accordance with strict grammatical usage these words of address may be translated in three ways: "to an elect lady" (which as an address is too indefinite); or, both words being taken as proper names, "to *Eklekte Kuria*" (an improbable combination of two very rare names); or "to *Eklekte*, lady" = *anglice*, "to the lady (or `Madam') *Eklekte*." The other translations which have been given — "to the elect lady" or "to the elect Kuria" — are open to objection on account of the omission of the article; but this violation of rule is perhaps not without parallel (compare ⁶⁰⁰⁰1 Peter 1:1). The translation adopted will partly depend upon whether we regard the

epistle as addressed to an individual or to a community. Dr. Rendel Harris believes this question to be settled by the discovery in the papyri of numerous instances which prove that *kurios* and *kuria* were used by ancient letter-writers as terms of familiar endearment, applicable to brother, sister, son, wife, or intimate friend of either sex (Expositor, March, 1901; see also Findlay, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal*, chapter iii). In the light of this suggestion we should naturally translate, "to my (dear) lady Eklekte." Grammatically, this is strongly supported by 1 Timothy 1:2 and 2 Timothy 1:2 ([Τιμοθέῳ γνησίῳ, *Timotheo gnesio*] .... [ἀγαπητῷ, *agapeto*] .... [τέκνῳ, *tekno*] = "to Tim othy my true .... beloved .... child"); and the fact that the name *Eklekte* has not yet been discovered, though *Eklektos* has, offers no grave objection. This is the translation favored by Clement of Alexandria, who says of the epistle: *scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam nomine Electam, significat autem electionem ecclesiae sanctae* ("It is written to a certain Babylonian, Electa by name; but it signifies the further election of the holy church"). It seems doubtful whether he means by the last clause that Electa is simply a personification of the church, or a real person whose name was derived from the Christian idea of election. Either way the rendering, "to the lady Electa," is suitable, and upon the whole it seems the best. *Eklekte* is not an adjective but a noun. If a person is intended, it is "the lady Electa"; if a church, it is designated, not "the elect Lady," but "the lady Elect." The mention of "thy elect sister" in 2 John 1:13 does not hinder either supposition.

See *further CYRIA; JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF.*

Robert Law

ELECTION

<e-lek'-shun> ([ἐκλογή, *ekloge*], "choice," "selection"):

I. THE WORD IN SCRIPTURE.

The word is absent from the Old Testament, where the related Hebrew verb ([רֹ ״ B; *bachar*]) is frequent. In the New Testament it occurs 6 times (Romans 9:11; 11:5,7,28; 1 Thessalonians 1:4; 2 Peter 1:10). In all these places it appears to denote an act of Divine selection taking effect upon human objects so as to bring them into special and saving relations with God: a selection such as to be at once a mysterious thing, transcending human analysis of its motives (so eminently in

Romans 9:11), and such as to be knowable by its objects, who are (2 Pet) exhorted to "make it sure," certain, a fact to consciousness. It is always (with one exception, Romans 9:11; see below) related to a community, and thus has close affinity with the Old Testament teachings upon the privileged position of Israel as the chosen, selected race (see under ELECT). The objects of election in the New Testament are, in effect, the Israel of God, the new, regenerate race called to special privilege and special service. From one point of view, that of the external marks of Christianity, they may thus be described as the Christian community in its widest sense, the sense in which the sacramental position and the real are prima facie assumed to coincide. But from 2 Peter it is manifest that much more than this has to be said if the incidence of the word present to the writer's mind is to be rightly felt. It is assumed there that the Christian, baptized and a worshipper, may yet need to make "sure" his "calling and election" as a fact to his consciousness. This implies conditions in the "election" which far transcend the tests of sacred rite and external fellowship.

II. THE MYSTERIOUS ELEMENT.

Such impressions of depth and mystery in the word are confirmed by the other, passages. In Romans 9:11 the context is charged with the most urgent and even staggering challenges to submission and silence in the presence of the inscrutable. To illustrate large assertions as to the liberty and sovereignty of the Divine dealings with man, the apostle brings in Esau and Jacob, individuals, twins as yet unborn, and points to the inscrutable difference of the Divine action toward them as such. Somehow, as a matter of fact, the Eternal appears as appointing to unborn Esau a future of comparative disfavor and to Jacob of favor; a future announced to the still pregnant mother. Such discrimination was made and announced, says the apostle, "that the purpose of God according to election might stand." In the whole passage the gravest stress is laid upon the isolation of the "election" from the merit or demerit of its objects.

III. INCIDENCE UPON COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUAL.

It is observable that the same characteristic, the inscrutable, the sovereign, is attached in the Old Testament to the "election" of a favored and privileged nation. Israel is repeatedly reminded (see e.g. Deuteronomy 7) that the Divine call and choice of them to be the people of God has no

relation to their virtues, or to their strength. The reason lies out of sight, in the Divine mind. So too "the Israel of God" (Galatians 6:16) in the New Testament, the Christian community, "the new, peculiar race," holds its great privileges by quite unmerited favor (e.g. Titus 3:5). And the nature of the case here leads, as it does not in the case of the natural Israel, to the thought of a Divine election of the individual, similarly inscrutable and sovereign. For the idea of the New Israel involves the thought that in every genuine member of it the provisions of the New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:31 f) are being fulfilled: the sins are remembered no more, and the law is written in the heart. The bearer of the Christian name, but not of the Christian spiritual standing and character, having "not the Spirit of Christ, is none of his" (Romans 8:9). The chosen community accordingly, not as it seems ab extra, but as it is in its essence, is a fellowship of individuals each of whom is an object of unmerited Divine favor, taking effect in the new life. And this involves the exercise of electing mercy. Compare e.g. 1 Peter 1:3. And consider Romans 11:4-7 (where observe the exceptional use of "the election," meaning "the company of the elect").

IV. COGNATE AND ILLUSTRATIVE BIBLICAL LANGUAGE.

It is obvious that the aspects of mystery which gather round the word "election" are not confined to it alone. An important class of words, such as "calling," "predestination" "foreknowledge," "purpose," "gift," bears this same character; asserting or connoting, in appropriate contexts, the element of the inscrutable and sovereign in the action of the Divine will upon man, and particularly upon man's will and affection toward God. And it will be felt by careful students of the Bible in its larger and more general teachings that one deep characteristic of the Book, which with all its boundless multiplicity is yet one, is to emphasize on the side of man everything that can humble, convict, reduce to worshipping silence (see for typical passages Job 40:3,1; Romans 3:19), and on the side of God everything which can bring home to man the transcendence and sovereign claims of his almighty Maker. Not as unrelated utterances, but as part of a vast whole of view and teaching, occur such passages as Ephesians 2:8,9 and Romans 11:33-36, and even the stern, or rather awestruck, phrases of Romans 9:20,21, where the potter and the clay are used in illustration.

V. LIMITATIONS OF INQUIRY HERE. SCOPE OF ELECTION.

We have sought thus in the simplest outline to note first the word "election" and then some related Scriptural words and principles, weighing the witness they bear to a profound mystery in the action of the Divine will upon man, in the spiritual sphere. What we have thus seen leaves still unstated what, according to Scripture, is the goal and issue of the elective act. In this article, remembering that it is part of a Bible Encyclopedia, we attempt no account of the history of thought upon election, in the successive Christian centuries, nor again any discussion of the relation of election in Scripture to extra-Scriptural philosophies, to theories of necessity, determination, fatalism. We attempt only to see the matter as it lies before us in the Bible. Studying it so, we find that this mysterious action of God on man has relation, in the Christian revelation, to nothing short of the salvation of the individual (and of the community of such individuals) from sin and condemnation, and the preservation of the saved to life eternal. We find this not so much in any single passage as in the main stream of Biblical language and tone on the subject of the Divine selective action. But it is remarkable that in the recorded thought of our Lord Himself we find assertions in this direction which could hardly be more explicit. See [4067]John 6:37,44,45; 10:27-29. To the writer the best summary of the Scriptural evidence, at once definite and restrained, is the language of the 17th Anglican art.: "They which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling; they be justified freely; they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity."

VI. PERSEVERANCE.

The anxious problem of *PERSEVERANCE* will be treated under that word. It may be enough here to say that alike what we are permitted to read as revealed, and what we may humbly apprehend as the reason of the case, tend to the reverent belief that a perseverance (rather of the Lord than of the saints) is both taught and implied. But when we ponder the nature of the subject we are amply prepared for the large range of Scriptures which on the other hand condemn and preclude, for the humble disciple, so gross a misuse of the doctrine as would let it justify one moment's presumption

upon Divine mercy in the heart which is at the same time sinning against the Divine love and holiness.

VII. CONSIDERATIONS IN RELIEF OF THOUGHT.

We close, in view of this last remark, with some detached notes in relief, well remembering the unspeakable trial which to many devout minds the word before us has always brought.

1. Antinomies:

First in place and importance is the thought that a spiritual fact like election, which belongs to the innermost purpose and work of the Eternal, necessarily leads us to a region where comprehension is impossible, and where we can only reverently apprehend. The doctrine passes upward to the sphere where antinomies live and move, where we must be content to hear what sound to us contradictions, but which are really various aspects of infinite truth. Let us be content to know that the Divine choice is sovereign; and also that "his tender mercies are over all his works," that `He willeth not the death of a sinner,' that "God is love." Let us relieve the tension of such submissive reliance by reverently noting how the supreme antinomy meets one type of human need with its one side, and with its other another. To the "fearful saint" the Divine sovereignty of love is a sacred cordial. To the seeking penitent the Divine comprehensiveness of love opens the door of peace. To the deluded theorist who does not love and obey, the warnings of a fall and ruin which are possible, humanly, from any spiritual height, are a merciful beacon on the rocks.

2. Fatalism Another Thing:

Further, we remember that election, in Scripture, is as different as possible from the fatal necessity of, e.g. the Stoics. It never appears as mechanical, or as a blind destiny. It has to do with the will of a God who has given us otherwise supreme proofs that He is all-good and all-kind. And it is related to man not as a helpless and innocent being but as a sinner. It is never presented as an arbitrary force majeure. Even in Romans 9 the "silence" called for is not as if to say, "You are hopelessly passive in the grasp of infinite power," but, "You, the creature, cannot judge your Maker, who must know infinitely more of cause and reason than his handiwork can know." The mystery, we may be sure, had behind it supreme right and reason, but in a region which at present at least we cannot penetrate.

Again, election never appears as a violation of human will. For never in the Bible is man treated as irresponsible. In the Bible the relation of the human and Divine wills is inscrutable; the reality of both is assured.

3. *The Moral Aspects:*

Never is the doctrine presented apart from a moral context. It is intended manifestly to deepen man's submission to — not force, but — mystery, where such submission means faith. In the practical experience of the soul its designed effect is to emphasize in the believer the consciousness (itself native to the true state of grace) that the whole of his salvation is due to the Divine mercy, no part of it to his merit, to his virtue, to his wisdom. In the sanctified soul, which alone, assuredly, can make full use of the mysterious truth, is it designed to generate, together and in harmony, awe, thanksgiving and repose.

4. *"We Know in Part":*

A necessary caution in view of the whole subject is that here, if anywhere in the regions of spiritual study, we inevitably "know in part," and in a very limited part. The treatment of election has at times in Christian history been carried on as if, less by the light of revelation than by logical processes, we could tabulate or map the whole subject. Where this has been done, and where at the same time, under a sort of mental rather than spiritual fascination, election has been placed in the foreground of the system of religious thought, and allowed to dominate the rest, the truth has (to say the least) too often been distorted into an error. The Divine character has been beclouded in its beauty. Sovereignty has been divorced from love, and so defaced into an arbitrary fiat, which has for its only reason the assertion of omnipotence. Thus, the grievous wrong has been done of [αἰσχρόν τι λέγειν περὶ τοῦ θείου, *aischron ti legein peri tou Theiou*], "defamation of God." For example, the revelation of a positive Divine selection has been made by inference to teach a corresponding rejection ruthless and terrible, as if the Eternal Love could ever by any possibility reject or crush even the faintest aspiration of the created spirit toward God. For such a thought not even the dark words of ⁴⁵⁹¹⁸Romans 9:18 give Scriptural excuse. The case there in hand, Pharaoh's, is anything but one of arbitrary power trampling on a human will looking toward God and right. Once more, the subject is one as to which we must on principle be content with knowledge so fragmentary that its parts may seem contradictory in our

present imperfect light. The one thing we may be sure of behind the veil is, that nothing can be hidden there which will really contradict the supreme and ruling truth that God is love.

5. The Unknown Future:

Finally, let us from another side remember that here, as always in the things of the Spirit, "we know in part." The chosen multitude are sovereignly "called, ... justified, ... glorified" (Romans 8:29,30). But for what purposes? Certainly not for an end terminating in themselves. They are saved, and kept, and raised to the perfect state, for the service of their Lord. And not till the cloud is lifted from the unseen life can we possibly know what that service under eternal conditions will include, what ministries of love and good in the whole universe of being.

Handley Dunelm

ELECTRUM

<e-lek'-trum>: The Revised Version, margin rendering of [חַשְׁמַל, *chashmal*], of Ezekiel 1:4,27; 8:2 Septuagint [ἤλεκτρον, *elektron*], Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) electrum). Both the King James Version and the English Revised Version have "amber" while the American Standard Revised Version has "glowing metal." Gesenius says electrum must not be understood as being here used for amber, but for a kind of metal remarkable for brightness, compounded of gold and silver. "Amber" is undoubtedly a poor rendering, as the Hebrew term means "polished brass." the American Standard Revised Version has the more correct rendering. Amber, however, may well have been known to Ezekiel (Encyclopaedia Biblica, which see).

See also STONES, PRECIOUS; BUYING, IV.

A. W. Fortune

EL-ELOHE-ISRAEL

<el-e-lo'-he-iz'-ra-el>, *<el-el'-o-he-iz'-ra-el>* ([אֵל אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *'el 'elohe yisra'el*], translated "God, the God of Israel" in the American Revised Version, margin and the King James Version margin): Found only in Genesis 33:20 as the name given to the altar erected at Shechem by Jacob, henceforth, known as Israel, on the parcel of ground purchased by him from the inhabitants of Shechem, his first encampment of length and

importance since the return to Palestine from Paddan-aram and the eventful night at Peniel (Genesis 32:30). This unusual combination of names has given occasion for much speculation and for various text emendations. Already the Septuagint sought to meet the difficulty by reading *wa-yiqra' 'el 'elohe yisra'el*, "and he called upon the God of Israel," instead of the *wa-yiqra' lo 'el* of Massoretic Text, "and he called it El" etc. Wellhausen, followed by Dillmann, Driver and others, changes "altar" to "pillar," because the Hebrew verb, *hitstsibh*, is used with *mitstsbhah*, "pillar," in Genesis 35:14,20, so making this religious act a parallel to that at Bethel. But Delitzsch, New Commentary on Genesis, properly rejects this purely fanciful change, and understands the compound name as the altar's inscription. Dillmann well suggests that "altar" (or "pillar") be supplied, reading thus: "called it the altar of El, the God of Israel." The peculiar phrase is best and most readily understood in its close connection with the struggle at Peniel, recorded in Genesis 32. Being victorious in that struggle, Jacob received the new name "Israel"; and to his first altar in Palestine he gave that name of God which appeared in his own new name, further explaining it by the appositive phrase "Elohe-Israel." Thus, his altar was called, or dedicated to, "El, the God of Israel."

Edward Mack

EL ELYON

<el e-li'-on>.

See *GOD, NAMES OF*.

ELEMENT; ELEMENTS

<el'-e-ment>, ([τὰ στοιχεῖα, *ta stoicheia*], "the letters of the alphabet," "the elements out of which all things are formed," "the heavenly bodies," "the fundamental principles of any art or science"):

(1) In 2 Peter 3:10, the constituent parts of the physical universe ("elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat," the American Revised Version, margin "the heavenly bodies").

(2) In Galatians 4:3,1, the Revised Version (British and American) has "rudiments," as in the King James Version margin, and in Colossians 2:8,20, where the reference is to imperfect Jewish ordinances.
See *RUDIMENTS*.

ELEPH

<e'-lef> ([tlah; *ha-'eleph*], "the ox"): A place in the lot of Benjamin not far from Jerusalem (⁰⁶¹⁸²⁸Joshua 18:28). The name is omitted by Septuagint, unless, indeed, it is combined with that of Zelah. It may be identical with Lifta, a village W. of Jerusalem (Conder, HDB, under the word). Others identify Lifta with Nephtoah.

ELEPHANT

<el'-e-fant> (⁽¹⁸⁰¹⁵⁾Job 40:15 the King James Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin "hippopotamus," the Revised Version (British and American) "ivory"); ⁽¹¹⁰²⁾1 Kings 10:22 the King James Version margin; ⁽¹⁴⁰⁹²¹⁾2 Chronicles 9:21 the King James Version; 1 Macc 3:34; 6:28 ff; 8:6): Possibly in Job it is the extinct mammoth.

   See BEHEMOTH; IVORY.

ELEPHANTINE

<el-e-fan-ti'-ne>.

   See SEVENEH.

ELEUTHERUS

<e-lu'-ther-us> ([Ἐλεύθερος, *Eleutheros*]; 1 Macc 11:7; 12:30): A river separating Syria and Phoenicia.

ELEVEN; STARS

<e-lev'-'-n>.

   See ASTRONOMY.

ELEVEN, THE

<e-lev'-'-n>, ([οἱ ἕνδεκα, *hoi hendeka*]): The eleven apostles remaining after the death of Judas. The definite article used serves to designate them as a distinct and definite group whose integrity was not destroyed by the loss of one of the twelve. The college of "the Twelve" had come to be so well recognized that the gospel writers all used on occasions the word with the definite article to represent the Twelve Apostles chosen by Jesus. This

custom still remained and the numeral merely changed, as, "Afterward he was manifested unto the eleven" (⁴¹¹⁶¹⁴Mark 16:14; compare ⁴²²⁴⁹Luke 24:9,33; ⁴⁴²¹⁴Acts 2:14). On the other hand, however, the substantive is also sometimes used, as "The eleven disciples went into Galilee" (⁴⁰²⁸¹⁶Matthew 28:16; compare also ⁴⁰⁰²⁶Acts 1:26). As an illustration of the fixedness of usage, Paul refers to the eleven as "the twelve" when he recounts the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection: "And that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve" (⁴⁶¹⁵⁵1 Corinthians 15:5).

Walter G. Clippinger

ELHANAN

<el-ha'-nan> ([ʾnj ﬥ אַ, *'elchanan*], "whom God gave"):

(1) A great warrior in the army of David who slew a Philistine giant. There is a discrepancy between ⁴¹⁰²¹¹⁹2 Samuel 21:19 and ⁴¹³³⁰¹⁵1 Chronicles 20:5. In the former passage we read, "And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob; and Elhanan, the son of Jaare-oregim the Beth-lehemite, slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam"; while in the latter we are told, "And there was again war with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam." Most modern critics prefer as the original text of the latter part of the two discrepant statements the following: "and Elhanan the son of Jair the Beth-lehemite slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam." It is contended that the Chronicler slightly modified the text before him, in order to bring it into harmony with 1 Samuel 17, where David is said to have slain a Philistine giant Goliath. There is almost unanimous agreement that "Jaare-oregim" is a corrupt reading, and the "Jair" in 1 Chronicles is to be preferred. From Jerome to the present some scholars identify Elhanan with David, and thus remove the discrepancy. Ewald (Hist, III, 70) argued that the name "Goliath" was inserted in 1 Samuel 17 and 21 by the narrators whose compositions are embodied in Samuel, Elhanan being the real victor over Goliath, while David's antagonist was simply called "the Philistine."
(2) The son of Dodo of Bethlehem, one of David's mighty men (⁴¹⁰²³²⁴2 Samuel 23:24; ⁴¹³¹¹²⁶1 Chronicles 11:26). Some moderns think that there was only one Elhanan, and that he was the son of Dodo of the clan of Jair.

John Richard Sampey

ELI

<e'-li> ([עֵלִי *`eli*]): A descendant of Ithamar, the fourth son of Aaron, who exercised the office of high priest in Shiloh at the time of the birth of Samuel. For the first time in Israel, Eli combined in his own person the functions of high priest and judge, judging Israel for 40 years (⟨09448⟩1 Samuel 4:18). The incidents in Eli's life are few; indeed, the main interest of the narrative is in the other characters who are associated with him. The chief interest centers in Samuel. In Eli's first interview with Hannah (⟨09012⟩1 Samuel 1:12 ff), she is the central figure; in the second interview (⟨09124⟩1 Samuel 1:24 ff), it is the child Samuel. When Eli next appears, it is as the father of Hophni and Phinehas, whose worthless and licentious lives had profaned their priestly office, and earned for them the title "men of Belial" (or "worthlessness"). Eli administered no stern rebuke to his sons, but only a gentle chiding of their greed and immorality. Thereafter he was warned by a nameless prophet of the downfall of his house, and of the death of his two sons in one day (⟨09027⟩1 Samuel 2:27-36), a message later confirmed by Samuel, who had received this word directly from Yahweh Himself (⟨09031⟩1 Samuel 3:11 ff). The prophecy was not long in fulfillment. During the next invasion by the Philistines, the Israelites were utterly routed, the ark of God was captured, and Hophni and Phinehas were both slain. When the news reached Eli, he was so overcome that he "fell from off his seat backward by the side of the gate; and his neck brake, and he died" (⟨09448⟩1 Samuel 4:18). The character of Eli, while sincere and devout, seems to have been entirely lacking in firmness. He appears from the history to have been a good man, full of humility and gentleness, but weak and indulgent. His is not a strong personality; he is always overshadowed by some more commanding or interesting figure.

A. C. Grant

ELI; ELI, LAMA; SABACHTHANI

<e'-li> or *<a'-le>*, *<la'-ma>*, *<sa-bak'-tha-ni>*.

See *ELOI, ELOI, etc.*

ELIAB

<e-li'-ab> ([אֱלִיאָב *'eli'abh*], "God is father"):

(1) Prince of the tribe of Zebulun in the Exodus (Numbers 1:9; 2:7; 7:24,29; 10:16).

(2) A Reubenite, father of Dathan and Abiram (Numbers 16:11,12; 26:8 f; Deuteronomy 11:6).

(3) Eldest son of Jesse and brother of David (1 Samuel 16:6), once called Elihu (1 Chronicles 27:18). He was of commanding appearance (1 Samuel 16:6) and when serving with Saul's army at the time when it was confronting the Philistines and Goliath, was inclined to lord it over his brother David (1 Samuel 17:28 f). His daughter Abihail became a Wife of Rehoboam (2 Chronicles 11:18).

(4) An Ephraimite, an ancestor of Samuel (1 Chronicles 6:27); called Eliel in 1 Chronicles 6:34, and Elihu in 1 Samuel 1:1.

(5) A Gadire warrior with David (1 Chronicles 12:9), one of 11 mighty men (1 Chronicles 12:8,14).

(6) A Levite musician (1 Chronicles 15:18,20; 16:5).

(7) An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1; compare 9:2).

F. K. Farr

ELIADA; ELIADAH

<e-li'-a-da>, ([[dyl a, *'elyadha`*], "God is knowing." Compare HPN, 219, 266, 301; [Ἐπιδαέ, *Epidae*], or [Ἐλιδαέ, *Elidae*]):

(1) One of the sons of David (2 Samuel 5:16; 1 Chronicles 3:8; called *BEELIADA*, 1 Chronicles 14:7 (which see)).

(2) A descendant of Benjamin and a captain in the army of Jehoshaphat, commander of 200,000 men (2 Chronicles 17:17).

(3) Father of Rezon, an "adversary" of Solomon (1 Kings 11:23, the King James Version "Eliadah").

ELIADAS

<e-li'-a-das> ([Ἐλιαδάς, *Eliadas*]): A son of Zamoth who had married a strange wife (1 Esdras 9:28); called Elioenai in Ezra 10:27.

ELIADUN

<e-li'-a-dun>, the Revised Version (British and American) ILIADUN (which see).

ELIAH

<e-li'-a>.

See *ELIJAH.*

ELIAHBA

<e-li'-a-ba>, *<e-li-a'-ba>* ([aBj ȳ" I ḥ, *'elyach-ba'*], "God hides"): One of David's 30 mighty men (ᐸ¹⁰²³²ᐳ2 Samuel 23:32; ᐸ¹³¹³³ᐳ1 Chronicles 11:33).

ELIAKIM

<e-li'-a-kim> ([μγqiȳl ḥ, *'elyaqim*]; [Ἐλιακείμ, *Eliakeim*], "God sets up"):

(1) The son of Hilkiah who succeeded Shebna as gorvernor of the palace and "grand vizier" under Hezekiah (ᐸ²³²²⁰ᐳIsaiah 22:20). The functions of his office are seen from the oracle of Isaiah in which Shebna is deposed and Eliakim set in his place (ᐸ²³²¹⁵ᐳIsaiah 22:15 ff). He is the "treasurer" (the Revised Version, margin "steward"), and is "over the house" (ᐸ²³²¹⁵ᐳIsaiah 22:15). At his installation he is clothed with a robe and girdle, the insignia of his office, and, having the government committed into his hand, is the "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah" (ᐸ²³²²¹ᐳIsaiah 22:21). The key of the house of David is laid on his shoulder, and he alone has power to open and shut, this being symbolic of his absolute authority as the king's representative (ᐸ²³²²²ᐳIsaiah 22:22). One of Solomon's officials is the first mentioned as occupying this position (ᐸ¹¹⁰⁰⁶ᐳ1 Kings 4:6), and this office was continued in both the Northern and Southern Kingdom (ᐸ¹¹¹⁶⁰⁹ᐳ1 Kings 16:9; 18:3; ᐸ¹²⁰⁰⁵ᐳ2 Kings 10:5; 15:5). Its importance is seen from the fact that after Azariah was smitten with leprosy, Jotham his heir "was over the household, judging the people of the land" (ᐸ¹²¹⁵⁰⁵ᐳ2 Kings 15:5). When Sennacherib sent an army against Jerusalem in 701, Eliskim was one of these Jewish princes who held on behalf of Hezekiah a parley with the Assyrian officers (ᐸ¹²¹⁸¹⁸ᐳ2 Kings 18:18,26,37; ᐸ²³⁶⁰⁸ᐳIsaiah 36:3,11,22). As a result of the invader's threats, he was sent by Hezekiah in sackcloth to Isaiah, entreating his prayers to Yahweh on behalf of Jerusalem (ᐸ¹²¹⁹⁰²ᐳ2 Kings 19:2; ᐸ²³⁷⁰²ᐳIsaiah 37:2).
(2) The original name of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah, whom Pharaoh-

necoh made king of Judah (⁽¹²²³⁴⁾2 Kings 23:34; ⁽⁴³⁶⁰⁴⁾2 Chronicles 36:4).
(3) A priest who assisted at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, rebuilt after his return from Babylon (⁽³⁶¹²⁴¹⁾Nehemiah 12:41).
(4) A grandson of Zerubbabel and ancestor of Jesus (⁽⁴⁰⁰¹³⁾Matthew 1:13).

(5) An ancestor of Jesus (⁽⁴²⁰³⁰⁾Luke 3:30).

S. F. Hunter

ELIALI

<e-li'-a-li> ([ʾ Ελιαλεί, *Elialei*]): 1 Esdras 9:34; possibly corresponds to "Binnui" in ⁽¹⁵¹⁰⁸⁸⁾Ezra 10:38.

ELIAM

<e-li'-am> ([μ[ץ| ﬡ] *'eli'-am*], "people's God"?):

(1) Father of Bathsheba (⁽¹⁰¹⁰³⁾2 Samuel 11:3); in ⁽¹³³⁰⁵⁾1 Chronicles 3:5 called Ammiel.
(2) One of David's "thirty," son of Ahithophel the Gilonite (⁽¹⁰²³⁴⁾2 Samuel 23:34).

ELIAONIAS

<e-li-a-o-ni'-as> ([ʾ Ελιαλωνίας, *Elialonias*]): A descendant of Phaath Moab (1 Esdras 8:31); called "Eliehoenai" in ⁽¹⁵⁸⁰⁴⁾Ezra 8:4.

ELIAS

<e-li'-as>.

See ELIJAH.

ELIASAPH

<e-li'-a-saf> ([tsץ| ﬡ, *'elyacaph*], "God has added"):

(1) Son of Deuel; prince of the tribe of Gad in the Exodus (⁽⁰⁰⁰¹⁴⁾Numbers 1:14; 2:14; 7:42,47; 10:20).

(2) Son of Lael; prince of the Gershonites (⁽⁰⁰³²⁴⁾Numbers 3:24).

ELIASHIB

<e-li'-a-shib> ([בְיָשֶׁל‎ א‎, *'elyashibh*], "God restores"):

(1) A descendant of David (⟨13824⟩1 Chronicles 3:24).

(2) Head of the eleventh course of priests (⟨13242⟩1 Chronicles 24:12).

(3) The high priest in the time of Nehemiah. He, with his brethren the priests, helped in the rebuilding of the wall (⟨16001⟩Nehemiah 3:1). But later he was "allied unto Tobiah" the Ammonite (⟨16304⟩Nehemiah 13:4) and allowed that enemy of Nehemiah the use of a great chamber in the temple (⟨16305⟩Nehemiah 13:5); and one of his grandsons, a son of Joiada, married a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite and was for this expelled from the community by Nehemiah (⟨16328⟩Nehemiah 13:28).
   See SANBALLAT.

(4, 5, 6) Three Israelites, one a "singer," who had married foreign wives (⟨15024⟩Ezra 10:24,27,36).
(7) Father of Jehohanan (⟨15006⟩Ezra 10:6); probably identical with
   (3) above. Called Eliasib in 1 Esdras 9:1.

F. K. Farr

ELIASIB

<e-li'-a-sib>.

   See ELIASHIB.

ELIASIBUS

<e-li-as'-i-bus> ([Ἐλιάσιβος, *Eliasibos*], the King James Version Eleazurus): One of the holy singers who had married a foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:24); called "Eliashib" in ⟨15027⟩Ezra 10:27.

ELIASIMUS

<e-li-as'-i-mus> ([Ἐλιάσιμος, *Eliasimos*]; the King James Version Elisimus): One who had married a foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:28).

ELIASIS

<e-li'-a-sis> ([Ἐλιάσις, *Eliasis*]): One who had married a foreign wife (1

Esdras 9:34); corresponds to "Jaasu" in ^{⟨5107⟩}Ezra 10:37.

ELIATHAH

<e-li'-a-tha> ([htayl à] *'eli'-athah*], "God has come"): A Hemanite, head of the twentieth division of the temple musicians (^{⟨13250⟩}1 Chronicles 25:4,27).

ELIDAD

<e-li'-dad> ([ddyl à] *'elidhadh*], "God has loved"): Prince of Benjamin in the division of the land (^{⟨0832⟩}Numbers 34:21); perhaps the same as *ELDAD* (which see).

ELIEHOENAI

<e-li-e-ho'-e-ni> ([yn″ yOÿl à, *'elyeho`enay*], "to Yahweh are mine eyes"):

(1) (the King James Version Elioenai) a Korahite doorkeeper (^{⟨13268⟩}1 Chronicles 26:3).
(2) (the King James Version Elihoenai) Head of a family in the Return (^{⟨15804⟩}Ezra 8:4).

ELIEL

<e-li'-el>, *<el'-i-el>* ([l aÿl à] *'eli'el*], "El is God," or "my God is God"):

(1, 2, 3) Mighty men of David (^{⟨13146⟩}1 Chronicles 11:46,47; 12:11).

(4) A chief of Manasseh, east of the Jordan (^{⟨13024⟩}1 Chronicles 5:24).

(5, 6) Two chiefs of Benjamin (^{⟨13080⟩}1 Chronicles 8:20,22).

(7) A chief Levite from Hebron (^{⟨13159⟩}1 Chronicles 15:9,11):
(8) A Kohathite in the line of Elkshah, Samuel and Heman (^{⟨13064⟩}1 Chronicles 6:34).

See ELIAB (4).

(9) A Levite of the time of Hezekiah (^{⟨14613⟩}2 Chronicles 31:13).

ELIENAI

<el-i-e'-na-i> ([yn″ yịl ȧ] *'eli`enay*]): A Benjamite chief (⟨3080⟩1 Chronicles 8:20).

ELIEZER

<el-i-e'-zer>, *<e-li-e'-zer>* ([rz[yl ȧ] *'eli`ezer*]; [Ἐλιέζερ, *Eliezer*], "God is help"):

(1) The chief servant of Abram (⟨0152⟩Genesis 15:2); the American Standard Revised Version "Eliezer of Damascus," the English Revised Version "Dammesek Eliezer." The Hebrew is peculiar: literally, "And the son of the possession (*mesheq*) of my house is *Dammeseq* (of) Eliezer." A possible but unlikely meaning is that his property would become the possession of Damascus, the city of Eliezer. Targum Syriac (Revised Version margin) read "Eliezer the Damascene": this supposes a reading, "Eliezer *ha-dammasqi*" or "*mid-dammeseq*." The text may be corrupt: the assonance between *mesheq* and Dammeseq is suspicious. Abram calls Eliezer "one born in my house" i.e. a dependant, a member of his household, and so regards him as his heir, Lot having gone from him (Genesis 13). Eliezer is probably the servant, "the eider of his house, that ruled over all that he had," of Genesis 24.
(2) The 2nd son of Moses and Zipporah, called thus for "the God of my father was my help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" (⟨0804⟩Exodus 18:4; ⟨3235⟩1 Chronicles 23:15 ff).
(3) A son of Becher, one of the sons of Benjamin (⟨3708⟩1 Chronicles 7:8).
(4) A priest who assisted in bringing up the ark from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (⟨3524⟩1 Chronicles 15:24).

(5) The son of Zichri, ruler over the Reubenites in the time of David (⟨3276⟩1 Chronicles 27:16).

(6) The son of Dodavahu of Mareshah who prophesied the destruction of the ships which Jehochaphat, king of Judah, built, because he had done so in cooperation with Ahaziah, king of Israel (⟨4085⟩2 Chronicles 20:35 ff).

(7) One of the messengers whom Ezra sent to Iddo, the chief at Casiphia, with the request for ministers for the Temple (⟨5816⟩Ezra 8:16 ff).
(8, 9, 10) A priest, a Levite, and one of the sons of Harim who had married non-Israelitish women (⟨5108⟩Ezra 10:18,23,11).

(11) An ancestor of Jesus in the genealogy given by Luke (⁽⁴⁰⁸⁹⁾Luke 3:29).

S. F. Hunter

ELIHABA

<e-li'-ha-ba>.

> **See** *ELIAHBA*.

ELIHOENAI

<el-i-ho-e'-na-i>.

> **See** *ELIEHOENAI*.

ELIHOREPH

<el-i-ho'-ref> ([ףרֹחֱילֹא] *'elichoreph*], "God of autumn"?): A scribe of Solomon and son of Shisha (⁽¹⁰⁴⁸⁾1 Kings 4:3).

ELIHU (1)

<e-li'-hu> ([אוּהילֵא] *'elihu*]; [Ἠλείου, *Eleiou*], "He is (my) God," or "my God is He"):

(1) An ancestor of Samuel (⁽⁰⁹⁰¹⁾1 Samuel 1:1), called Eliel in ⁽¹³⁰⁶⁴⁾1 Chronicles 6:34 and Eliab in ⁽¹³⁰⁶⁷⁾1 Chronicles 6:27.
> **See** *ELIAB*.

(2) Found in ⁽¹³²⁷¹⁸⁾1 Chronicles 27:18 for Eliab, David's eldest brother (⁽⁰⁹¹⁶⁰⁶⁾1 Samuel 16:6); called "one of the brethren of D."
(3) A Manassite who joined David at Ziklag (⁽¹³¹²⁰⁾1 Chronicles 12:20).

(4) A Korahite porter (⁽¹³⁰⁷⁾1 Chronicles 26:7).
(5) A friend of Job. See next article.

(6) An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

ELIHU (2)

([אוּהילֵא] *'elihu*], [אוּהילֱא] *'elihu'*], "He is (my) God"; [Ἐλιοῦς, *Elious*]): One of the disputants in the Book of Job; a young man who, having listened in silence to the arguments of Job and his friends, is moved

to prolong the discussion and from his more just views of truth set both parties right. He is of the tribe of Buz (compare Genesis 22:21), a brother-tribe to that of Uz, and of the family of Ram, or Aram, that is, an Aramean. He is not mentioned as one of the characters of the story until chapter 32; and then, as the friends are silenced and Job's words are ended, Elihu has the whole field to himself, until theophany of the whirlwind proves too portentous for him to bear. His four speeches take up chapters 32 through 37. Some critics have considered that the Elihu portion of the Book of Job was added by a later hand, and urge obscurities and prolixities, as well as a different style, to prove that it was the work of an inferior writer. This estimate seems, however, to take into account only the part it plays in a didactic treatise, or a theological debate. It looks quite different when we read it as a real dramatic element in a story; in other words, when we realize that the prevailing interest of the Book of Job is not dialectic but narrative. Thus viewed, the Elihu episode is a skillfully managed agency in preparing the denouncement. Consider the situation at the end of Job's words (31:40). Job has vindicated his integrity and stands ready to present his cause to God (31:35-37). The friends, however, have exhausted their resources, and through three discourses have been silent, as it were, snuffed out of existence. It is at this point, then, that Elihu is introduced, to renew their contention with young constructive blood, and represent their cause (as he deems) better than they can themselves. He is essentially at one with them in condemning Job (34:34-37); his only quarrel with them is on the score of the inconclusiveness of their arguments (32:3,1). His self-portrayal is conceived in a decided spirit of satire on the part of the writer, not unmingled with a sardonic humor. He is very egotistic, very sure of the value of his ideas; much of his alleged prolixity is due to that voluble self-deprecation which betrays an inordinate opinion of oneself (compare 32:6-22). This, whether inferior composition or not, admirably adapts his words to his character. For substance of discourse he adds materially to what the friends have said, but in a more rationalistic vein; speaks edifyingly, as the friends have not done, of the disciplinary value of affliction, and of God's means of revelation by dreams and visions and the interpreting of an intercessory friend (33:13-28). Very evidently, however, his ego is the center of his system; it is he who sets up as Job's mediator (33:5-7; compare 9:32-35), and his sage remarks on God's power and wisdom in Nature are full of self-importance. All this seems designed to accentuate the almost ludicrous humiliation of his collapse when from a natural phenomenon the oncoming tempest shows unusual and

supernatural signs. His words become disjointed and incoherent, and cease with a kind of attempt to recant his pretensions. And the verdict from the whirlwind is: "darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge." Elihu thus has a real function in the story, as honorable as overweening self-confidence is apt to be.

John Franklin Genung

ELIJAH

<e-li'-ja> ([װhℲׁ אֶﬞ*'eliyahu*] or (4 times) [hℲׁ אֶﬞ*'eliyah*], "Yah is God"; Septuagint [Ἠλειού, *Eleiou*], New Testament [Ἠλείας, *Eleias*] or *Elias*, the King James Version of New Testament Elias):

 (1) The great prophet of the times of Ahab, king of Israel. Elijah is identified at his first appearance (◁¹¹⁷⁰▷1 Kings 17:1) as "Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the sojourners of Gilead." Thus his native place must have been called Tishbeh. A Tishbeh (Thisbe) in the territory of Naphtali is known from Tobit 1:2; but if (with most modern commentators) the reading of the Septuagint in 1 Kings is followed, the word translated "sojourners" is itself "Tishbeh," locating the place in Gilead and making the prophet a native of that mountain region and not merely a "sojourner" there.

I. THE WORKS OF ELIJAH.

In ◁¹¹⁶⁹▷1 Kings 16:29-34 we read of the impieties of Ahab, culminating in his patronage of the worship of the Tyrian Baal, god of his Tyrian queen Jezebel (◁¹¹⁶¹▷1 Kings 16:31). ◁¹¹⁶⁴▷1 Kings 16:34 mentions as another instance of the little weight attached in Ahab's time to ancient prophetic threatenings, the rebuilding by Hiel the Bethelite of the banned city of Jericho, "with the loss" of Hiel's eldest and youngest sons. This is the situation which calls for a judgment of Yahweh, announced beforehand, as is often the case, by a faithful prophet of Yahweh.

1. The Judgment of Drought:

Whether Elijah was already a familiar figure at the court of Ahab, the narrative beginning with ◁¹¹⁷⁰▷1 Kings 17:1 does not state. His garb and manner identified him as a prophet, in any case (◁¹²⁰⁰⁸▷2 Kings 1:8; compare ◁³⁸¹³¹⁴▷Zechariah 13:4). Elijah declared in few words that Yahweh, true and only rightful God of Israel, whose messenger he was, was even at the very

time sending a drought which should continue until the prophet himself declared it at an end. The term is to be fixed, indeed, not by Elijah but by Yahweh; it is not to be short ("these years"), and it is to end only when the chastisement is seen to be sufficient. Guided, as true prophets were continually, by the "word of Yahweh," Elijah then hid himself in one of the ravines east of ("before") the Jordan, where the brook Cherith afforded him water, and ravens brought him abundant food ("bread and flesh" twice daily), [11702]1 Kings 17:2-6. As the drought advanced the brook dried up. Elijah was then directed, by the "word of Yahweh," as constantly, to betake himself beyond the western limit of Ahab's kingdom to the Phoenician village of Zarephath, near Sidon. There the widow to whom Yahweh sent him was found gathering a few sticks from the ground at the city gate, to prepare a last meal for herself and her son. She yielded to the prophet's command that he himself should be first fed from her scanty store; and in return enjoyed the fulfillment of his promise, uttered in the name of Yahweh, that neither barrel of meal nor cruse of oil should be exhausted before the breaking of the drought. (Josephus, Ant, VIII, xiii, 2, states on the authority of Menander that the drought extended to Phoenicia and continued there for a full year.) But when the widow's son fell sick and died, the mother regarded it as a Divine judgment upon her sins, a judgment which had been drawn upon her by the presence of the man of God. At the prayer of Elijah, life returned to the child ([11717]1 Kings 17:17-24).

"In the third year," [11801]1 Kings 18:1 ([42025]Luke 4:25; [59617]James 5:17 give three years and six months as the length of the drought), Elijah was directed to show himself to Ahab as the herald of rain from Yahweh. How sorely both man and beast in Israel were pressed by drought and the resulting famine, is shown by the fact that King Ahab and his chief steward Obadiah were in person searching through the land for any patches of green grass that might serve to keep alive some of the king's own horses and mules ([11805]1 Kings 18:5,6). The words of Obadiah upon meeting with Elijah show the impression which had been produced by the prophet's long absence. It was believed that the Spirit of God had carried Elijah away to some unknown, inaccessible, mysterious region ([11810]1 Kings 18:10,12). Obadiah feared that such would again be the case, and, while he entreated the prophet not to make him the bearer of a message to Ahab, appealed to his own well-known piety and zeal, as shown in his sheltering and feeding, during Jezebel's persecution, a hundred prophets of Yahweh. Elijah reassured the steward by a solemn oath that he would show himself to

Ahab (◁11815▷1 Kings 18:15). The king greeted the prophet with the haughty words, "Is it thou, thou troubler of Israel?" Elijah's reply, answering scorn with scorn, is what we should expect from a prophet; the woes of Israel are not to be charged to the prophet who declared the doom, but to the kings who made the nation deserve it (◁11817▷1 Kings 18:17,18).

2. *The Ordeal by Prayer:*

Elijah went on to challenge a test of the false god's power. Among the pensioners of Jezebel were 450 prophets of Baal and 400 prophets of the Asherah — still fed by the royal bounty in spite of the famine. Accepting Elijah's proposal, Ahab called all these and all the people to Mt. Carmel (◁11819▷1 Kings 18:19,20). Elijah's first word to the assembly implied the folly of their thinking that the allegiance of a people could successfully be divided between two deities: "How long go ye limping between the two sides?" (possibly "leaping over two thresholds," in ironical allusion to the custom of leaping over the threshold of an idol temple, to avoid a stumble, which would be unpropitious; compare ◁09501▷1 Samuel 5:1-5). Taking the people's silence as an indication that they admitted the force of his first words, Elijah went on to propose his conditions for the test: a bullock was to be offered to Baal, a bullock to Yahweh, but no fire put under; "The God that answereth by fire, let him be God." The voice of the people approved the proposal as fair (◁11822▷1 Kings 18:22-24). Throughout a day of blazing sunshine the prophets of Baal called in frenzy upon their god, while Elijah mocked them with merciless sarcasm (◁11825▷1 Kings 18:25-29). About the time for the regular offering of the evening sacrifice in the temple of Yahweh at Jerusalem, Elijah assumed control. Rebuilding an ancient altar thrown down perhaps in Jezebel's persecution; using in the rebuilding twelve stones, symbolizing an undivided Israel such as was promised to the patriarch Jacob of old; drenching sacrifice and wood with water from some perennial spring under the slopes of Carmel, until even a trench about the altar, deep and wide enough to have a two-ce'ah (half-bushel) measure set in it, was filled — the prophet called in few and earnest words upon the God of the fathers of the nation (◁11830▷1 Kings 18:30-37). The answer of Yahweh by fire, consuming bullock, wood, altar and the very dust, struck the people with awe and fear. Convinced that Yahweh was God alone for them, they readily carried out the prophet's stern sentence of death for the prophets of the idol god (◁11838▷1 Kings 18:38-40). Next the prophet bade Ahab make haste with the meal, probably a sacrificial feast for the multitude, which had been made ready; because rain was at hand. On the

mountain top Elijah bowed in prayer, sending his servant seven times to look out across the sea for the coming storm. At last the appearance of a rising cloud "as small as a man's hand" was reported; and before the hurrying chariot of the king could cross the plain to Jezreel it was overtaken by "a great rain" from heavens black with clouds and wind after three rainless years. With strength above nature, Elijah ran like a courier before Ahab to the very gate of Jezreel (⟨11841⟩1 Kings 18:41-46).

3. At Horeb:

The same night a messenger from Jezebel found Elijah. The message ran, "As surely as thou art Elijah and I am Jezebel" (so the Septuagint), "so let the gods do to me, and more also" (i.e. may I be cut in pieces like a sacrificed animal if I break my vow; compare ⟨01158⟩Genesis 15:8-11,17,18; ⟨26848⟩Jeremiah 34:18,19), "if I make not thy life as the life of one of" the slain prophets of Baal "by to-morrow about this time." Explain Elijah's action how we may — and all the possible explanations of it have found defenders — he sought safety in instant flight. At Beersheba, the southernmost town of Judah, he left his "servant," whom the narrative does not elsewhere mention. Going onward into the southern wilderness, he sat down under the scanty shade of a desert broom-bush and prayed that he might share the common fate of mankind in death (⟨11901⟩1 Kings 19:1-4). After sleep he was refreshed with food brought by an angel. Again he slept and was fed. In the strength of that food he then wandered on for forty days and nights, until he found himself at Horeb, the mountain sacred because there Yahweh had revealed Himself to Moses (⟨11905⟩1 Kings 19:5-8). The repetition of identical words by Elijah in ⟨11910⟩1 Kings 19:10 and 14 represents a difficulty. Unless we are to suppose an accidental repetition by a very early copyist (early, since it appears already in the Septuagint), we may see in it an indication that Elijah's despondency was not easily removed, or that he sought at Horeb an especial manifestation of Yahweh for his encouragement, or both. The prophet was bidden to take his stand upon the sacred mount; and Yahweh passed by, heralded by tempest, earthquake and thunderstorm (19:9-12). These were Yahweh's fore-runners only; Yahweh was not in them, but in the "still small voice," such as the prophets were accustomed to hear within their souls. When Elijah heard the not unfamiliar inner voice, he recognized Yahweh present to hear and answer him. Elijah seems to be seeking to justify his own retreat to the wilderness by the plea that he had been "very jealous," had done in Yahweh's cause all that mortal prophet could do, before he fled, yet all in vain! The same people who had forsaken

the law and "covenant" of Yahweh, thrown down His altars and slain His prophets, would have allowed the slaughter of Elijah himself at the command of Jezebel; and in him would have perished the last true servant of Yahweh in all the land of Israel (19:13,14).

Divine compassion passed by Elijah's complaint in order to give him directions for further work in Yahweh's cause. Elijah must anoint Hazael to seize the throne of Syria, Israel's worst enemy among the neighboring powers; Jehu, in like manner, he must anoint to put an end to the dynasty of Ahab and assume the throne of Israel; and Elisha, to be his own successor in the prophetic office. These three, Hazael and his Syrians, Jehu and his followers, even Elisha himself, are to execute further judgments upon the idolaters and the scorners in Israel. Yahweh will leave Himself 7,000 (a round number, a limited but not an excessively small one, conveying a doctrine, like the doctrine of later prophets, of the salvation of a righteous remnant) in Israel, men proof against the judgment because they did not share the sin. If Elijah was rebuked at all, it was only in the contrast between the 7,000 faithful and the one, himself, which he believed to number all the righteous left alive in Israel ([11915]1 Kings 19:15-18).

4. The Case of Naboth:

The anointing of Hazael and of Jehu seems to have been left to Elijah's successor; indeed, we read of no anointing of Hazael, but only of a significant interview between that worthy and Elisha ([12807]2 Kings 8:7-15). Elijah next appears in the narrative as rebuker of Ahab for the judicial murder of Naboth. In the very piece of ground which the king had coveted and seized, the prophet appeared, unexpected and unwelcome, to declare upon Ahab, Jezebel and all their house the doom of a shameful death (1 Kings 21). There was present at this scene, in attendance upon the king, a captain named Jehu, the very man already chosen as the supplanter of Ahab, and he never forgot what he then saw and heard ([12925]2 Kings 9:25,26).

5. Elijah and Ahaziah:

Ahab's penitence ([12128]1 Kings 21:28,29) averted from himself some measure of the doom. His son Ahaziah pulled it down upon his own head. Sick unto death from injuries received in a fall, Ahaziah sent to ask an oracle concerning his recovery at the shrine of Baal-zebub in Ekron. Elijah met the messengers and turned them back with a prediction, not from Baal-zebub but from Yahweh, of impending death. Ahaziah recognized by the

messengers' description the ancient "enemy" of his house. A captain and fifty soldiers sent to arrest the prophet were consumed by fire from heaven at Elijah's word. A second captain with another fifty met the same fate. A third besought the prophet to spare his life, and Elijah went with him to the king, but only to repeat the words of doom (2 Kings 1).

6. Elijah Translated:

A foreboding, shared by the "sons of the prophets" at Beth-el and Jericho, warned Elijah that the closing scene of his earthly life was at hand. He desired to meet the end, come in what form it might, alone. Elisha, however, bound himself by an oath not to leave his master. Elijah divided Jordan with the stroke of his mantle, that the two might pass over toward the wilderness on the east. Elisha asked that he might receive a firstborn's portion of the spirit which rested upon his master. "A chariot of fire, and horses of fire" appeared, and parted the two asunder; "and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2 Kings 2:1-11).

7. The Letter to Jehoram:

In 2 Chronicles 21:12-15 we read of a "writing" from Elijah to Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. The statements of 2 Kings 3:11,12 admit of no other interpretation than that the succession of Elisha to independent prophetic work had already occurred in the lifetime of Jehoshaphat. It has been pointed out that the difficult verse, 2 Kings 8:16, appears to mean that Jehoram began to reign at some time before the death of his father; it is also conceivable that Elijah left a message, reduced to writing either before or after his departure, for the future king of Judah who should depart from the true faith.

II. THE WORK OF ELIJAH.

One's estimate of the importance of the work of Elijah depends upon one's conception of the condition of things which the prophet confronted in Northern Israel. While it is true that the reign of Ahab was outwardly prosperous, and the king himself not without a measure of political sagacity together with personal courage, his religious policy at best involved such tolerance of false faiths as could lead only to disaster. Ever since the time of Joshua, the religion of Yahweh had been waging its combat with the old Canaanite worship of the powers of Nature, a worship rendered to local deities, the "Baalim" or "lords" of this and that neighborhood, whose ancient altars stood "upon the high mountains, and

upon the hills, and under every green tree" (⟨6322⟩Deuteronomy 12:2). The god imported from Phoenicia by Jezebel bore also the title Baal; but his character and his worship were worse and more debasing than anything that had before been known. Resistance offered by the servants of Yahweh to the claims of the queen's favored god led to persecution, rightly ascribed by the historian to Jezebel (⟨11804⟩1 Kings 18:4). In the face of this danger, the differences between the worship of Yahweh as carried on in the Northern Kingdom and the same worship as practiced at Jerusalem sank out of sight. The one effort of Elijah was to recall the people from the Tyrian Baal to Yahweh, the God of their fathers. The vitality of the true religion in the crisis is shown by the fidelity of such a man as Obadiah (⟨11803⟩1 Kings 18:3 f), or by the perseverance of a righteous remnant of 7,000, in spite of all that had happened of persecution (⟨11918⟩1 Kings 19:18). The work begun by Elijah was finished, not without blood, by Jehu; we hear no more of the worship of the Tyrian Baal in Israel after that anointed usurper's time (2 Kings 9; 10). To say that Elijah at Horeb "learns the gentleness of God" (Strachan in HDB) is to contradict the immediate text of the narrative and the history of the times. The direction given Elijah was that he should anoint one man to seize the throne of Syria, another to seize that of Israel, and a prophet to continue his own work; with the promme and prediction that these three forces should unite in executing upon guilty Israel the judgment still due for its apostasy from Yahweh and its worship of a false god. Elijah was not a reformer of peace; the very vision of peace was hidden from his eyes, reserved for later prophets for whom he could but prepare the way. It was his mission to destroy at whatever cost the heathen worship which else would have destroyed Israel itself, with consequences whose evil we cannot estimate. Amos and Hosea would have had no standing-ground had it not been for the work of Elijah and the influences which at Divine direction he put in operation.

III. CHARACTER OF THE PROPHET.

It is obvious that the Scripture historian does not intend to furnish us with a character-study of the prophet Elijah. Does he furnish even the material upon which such a study may profitably be attempted? The characterization found in ⟨50617⟩James 5:17, "Elijah was a man of like passions (margin, "nature") with us," is brief indeed; but examination of the books which have been written upon the life of Elijah leads to the conclusion that it is possible to err by attaching to events meanings which those events were never intended to bear, as well as by introducing into one's study too

much of sheer imagination. It is easy, for example, to observe that Elijah is introduced to the reader with suddenness, and that his appearances and disappearances in the narrative seem abrupt; but is one warranted in arguing from this a like abruptness in the prophet's character? Is not the sufficient explanation to be reached by observing that the historian's purpose was not to give a complete biography of any individual, whether prophet or king, but to display the working of Yahweh upon and with the kingdoms of Israel and Judah through the prophets? Few personal details are therefore to be found recorded concerning even such a prophet as Elijah; and none at all, unless they have a direct bearing upon his message. The imagination of some has discerned a "training of Elijah" in the experiences of the prophet; but to admit that there must have been such a training does not oblige us to discover traces of it in the scenes and incidents which are recorded.

Distrusting, for the reasons above suggested, any attempt at a detailed representation of the prophet's inner life, one may seek, and prize, what seems to lie upon the surface of the narrative: faith in Yahweh as God of Nature and as covenant God of the patriarchs and their descendants; consuming "zeal" against the false religion which would displace Yahweh from the place which must be His alone; keen vision to perceive hypocrisy and falsehood, and sharp wit to lash them, with the same boldness and disregard of self that must needs mark the true prophet in any age.

IV. MIRACLES IN THE ELIJAH NARRATIVES.

The miraculous element must be admitted to be prominent in the experiences and works of Elijah. It cannot be estimated apart from the general position which the student finds it possible to hold concerning miracles recorded in the Old Testament. The effort to explain away one or another item in a rationalistic way is wholly unprofitable. Elijah's "ravens" may indeed be converted by a change of vowel-points into "Arabians"; but, in spite of the fact that Orientals would bring offerings of food to a holy hermit, the whole tenor of the narrative favors no other supposition than that its writer meant "ravens," and saw in the event another such exercise of the power of Yahweh over all things as was to be seen in the supply of meal and oil for the prophet and the widow of Zarephath, the fire from heaven, the parting of the Jordan, or the ascension of the prophet by whirlwind into heaven. Some modern critics recognize a different and later source in the narrative of 2 Kings 1; but here again no real difficulty, if any

difficulty there be, is removed. The stern prophet who would order the slaughter of the 450 Baal prophets might well call down fire to consume the soldiers of an apostate and a hostile king. The purpose and meaning of the Elijah chapters is to be grasped by those who accept their author's conception of Yahweh, of His power, and of His work in Nature and with men, rather than by those who seek to replace that conception by another.

V. ELIJAH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Malachi (4:5) names Elijah as the forerunner of "the great and terrible day of Yahweh," and the expectation founded upon this passage is alluded to in [41615]Mark 6:15 parallel [42908]Luke 9:8; [40164]Matthew 16:14 parallel [40828]Mark 8:28 parallel [42919]Luke 9:19; [40747]Matthew 27:47-49 parallel [41535]Mark 15:35,36. The interpretation of Malachi's prophecy foreshadowed in the angelic annunciation to Zacharias [42017]Luke 1:17), that John the Baptist should do the work of another Elijah, is given on the authority of Jesus Himself ([40114]Matthew 11:14). The appearance of Elijah, with Moses, on the Mount of Transfiguration, is recorded in [40701]Matthew 17:1-13 parallel [41092]Mark 9:2-13 parallel [42928]Luke 9:28-36, and in [40114]Matthew 11:14 parallel [41093]Mark 9:13 Jesus again identifies the Elijah of Malachi with John the Baptist. The fate of the soldiers of Ahaziah (2 Kings 1) is in the mind of James and John on one occasion ([42954]Luke 9:54). Jesus Himself alludes to Elijah and his sojourn in the land of Sidon ([42025]Luke 4:25,26). Paul makes use of the prophet's experience at Horeb ([45102]Romans 11:2-4). In [59517]James 5:17,18 the work of Elijah affords an instance of the powerful supplication of a righteous man.

(2) A "head of a father's house" of the tribe of Benjamin ([13827]1 Chronicles 8:27, the King James Version "Eliah").

(3) A man of priestly rank who had married a foreign wife ([15102]Ezra 10:21).
(4) A layman who had married a foreign wife ([15026]Ezra 10:26).

LITERATURE.

The histories of Israel and commentaries on Kings are many. Those which tend to rationalizing tend also to decrease the importance of Elijah to the history. F. W. Robertson, Sermons, 2nd series, V; Maurice, Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament, Sermon VIII; Milligan, Elijah ("Men of the Bible" series); W. M. Taylor, Elijah the Prophet.

F. K. Farr

ELIKA

<e-li'-ka> ([אֱלִיקָא] *'eliqa'*], "God is rejector(?)"): The Harodite (Uradite), one of David's guard, the "thirty" ([10325]2 Samuel 23:25). Omitted from [131127]1 Chronicles 11:27.

ELIM

<e'-lim> ([אֵילִם *'elim*], "terebinths"; [Αἰλείμ, *Aileim*]): The second encampment of the Israelites after crossing the Red Sea. It was a contrast to the previous camp called "Marah" because of the bitterness of the waters, for there "were twelve springs of water, and threescore and ten palm trees" ([01527]Exodus 15:27; 16:1; [04309]Numbers 33:9 f). The traditional site is an oasis in Wady Ghurundel, circa 63 miles from Suez.
See EXODUS; WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

ELIMELECH

<e-lim'-e-lek> ([אֱלִימֶלֶךְ] *'elimelekh*], "my God is king"; [Ἀβειμέλεχ, *Abeimelech*], [Ἀλιμέλεκ, *Alimelek*]): Elimelech was a member of the tribe of Judah, a native of Bethlehem Judah, a man of wealth and probably head of a family or clan ([08012]Ruth 1:2,3; 2:1,3). He lived during the period of the Judges, had a hereditary possession near Bethlehem, and is chiefly known as the husband of Naomi, the mother-in-law of Ruth and ancestress of David the king. Because of a severe famine in Judea, he emigrated to the land of Moab with his wife and his sons, Mahlon and Chilion. Not long afterward he died, and his two sons married Moabite women, Ruth and Orpah. Ten years in all were spent in Moab, when the two sons died, and the three widows were left. Soon afterward Naomi decided to return to Judah, and the sequel is told in the Book of Ruth.
See RUTH; NAOMI.

J. J. Reeve

ELIOENAI

<e-li-o-e'-na-i>.

See ELIEHOENAI.

ELIONAS

<el-i-o'-nas> ([Ἐλιωνάς, *Elionas*], [Ἐλιωναΐς, *Elionais*]): The name of two men who had married foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:22,23), corresponding respectively to "Elioenai" and "Eliezer" in ^{⁴⁵⁰²}Ezra 10:22,31.

ELIPHAL

<e-li'-fal>, <el'-i-fal> ([l pyl à] *'eliphal*], "God has judged"): Son of Ur, one of the mighty men of David's armies (^{⟨³¹³⁵⟩}1 Chronicles 11:35). the Revised Version (British and American) in a footnote identifies him with Eliphelet, son of Ahasbai, the son of the Maachathite (^{⁴²³⁴}2 Samuel 23:34; ef Davis, Dict. of the Bible, under the word "Ur"). See also ^{⁴³⁴⁰⁵}1 Chronicles 14:5,7.

ELIPHALAT

<e-lif'-a-lat> ([Ἐλιφαλέτ, *Eliphalet*]; 1 Esdras 8:39; 9:33): Called "Eliphelet" in ^{⁴⁵⁸¹³}Ezra 8:13; 10:33.

ELIPHAZ (1)

<el'-i-faz>, <e-li'-faz> ([zp″ yl à] *'eliphaz*], "God is fine gold" (?)):

(1) Son of Esau by Adah, and father of Teman, Kenaz and Amalek (^{⟨⁰³⁶⁰⁴⟩}Genesis 36:4,10; ^{⟨³⁰³⁵⟩}1 Chronicles 1:35 f).
See also EDOU.

(2) See next article.

ELIPHAZ (2)

The first and most prominent of the three friends of Job (^{⟨¹⁸⁰²¹¹⟩}Job 2:11), who come from distant places to condole with and comfort him, when they hear of his affliction. That he is to be regarded as their leader and spokesman is shown by the greater weight and originality of his speeches (contained in Job 4; 5; 15; 22), the speeches of the other friends being in fact largely echoes and emotional enforcements of his thoughts, and by the fact that he is taken as their representative (^{⟨¹⁸⁴⁰⁷⟩}Job 42:7) when, after the address from the whirlwind, Yahweh appoints their expiation for the wrong done to Job and to the truth. He is represented as a venerable and benignant sage from Teman in Idumaea, a place noted for its wisdom (compare ^{⟨²⁴⁴⁰⁷⟩}Jeremiah 49:7), as was also the whole land of Edom (compare Obidiah 1:8); and

doubtless it is the writer's design to make his words typical of the best wisdom of the world. This wisdom is the result of ages of thought and experience (compare ¹⁸⁵¹⁷Job 15:17-19), of long and ripened study (compare ¹⁸⁵²⁷Job 5:27), and claims the authority of revelation, though only revelation of a secondary kind (compare Eliphaz' vision, ¹⁸⁰⁴²Job 4:12 ff, and his challenge to Job to obtain the like, 5:1). In his first speech he deduces Job's affliction from the natural sequence of effect from cause (¹⁸⁴⁰⁷Job 4:7-11), which cause he makes broad enough to include innate impurity and depravity (¹⁸⁴¹⁷Job 4:17-19); evinces a quietism which deprecates Job's selfdestroying outbursts of wrath (¹⁸⁵⁰²Job 5:2,3; compare Job's answer, 6:2,3 and 30:24); and promises restoration as the result of penitence and submission. In his second speech he is irritated because Job's blasphemous words are calculated to hinder devotion (¹⁸⁵⁰⁴Job 15:4), attributes them to iniquity (¹⁸⁵⁰⁵Job 15:5,6), reiterates his depravity doctrine (¹⁸⁵¹⁴Job 15:14-16), and initiates the lurid descriptions of the wicked man's fate, in which the friends go on to overstate their case (¹⁸⁵²⁰Job 15:20-35). In the third speech he is moved by the exigencies of his theory to impute actual frauds and crimes to Job, iniquities indulged in because God was too far away to see (22:5-15); but as a close holds open to him still the way of penitence, abjuring of iniquity, and restoration to health and wealth (22:21-30). His utterances are well composed and judicial (too coldly academic, Job thinks, 16:4,5), full of good religious counsel abstractly considered. Their error is in their inveterate presupposition of Job's wickedness, their unsympathetic clinging to theory in the face of fact, and the suppressing of the human promptings of friendship.

John Franklin Genung

ELIPHELEHU

<e-lif'-e-le-hu> ([אֱלִיפְלֵהוּ] *'eliphelehu*], "May God distinguish him," the King James Version Elipheleh): The eleventh of the fourteen doorkeepers mentioned as "brethren of the second degree" and as appointed in connection with the bringing up of the ark to Jerusalem by David (¹³⁵¹⁸1 Chronicles 15:18).

ELIPHELET

<e-lif'-e-let>.

See *ELIPHALAT; ELIPHAL.*

ELISABETH

<e-liz'-a-beth> ([Ἐλισάβετ, *Elisabet*], Westcott and Hort [Ἐλεισάβετ, *Eleisdbet*], from Hebrews *'elishebha`* (Elisheba), "God is (my) oath," i.e. a worshipper of God): Wife of Zacharias the priest and mother of John the Baptist (Luke 1:5 ff). Elisabeth herself was of priestly lineage and a "kinswoman" (the King James Version *COUSIN*, which see) of the Virgin Mary (Luke 1:36), of whose visit to Elisabeth a remarkable account is given in Luke 1:39-56.

See ZACHARIAS.

ELISEUS

<el-i-se'-us>.

See ELISHA.

ELISHA

<e-li'-sha> [[vyl à] *'elisha`*], "God is salvalion"; Septuagint [Ἐλεισαῖε, *Eleisaie*]; New Testament [Ἐλισαῖος, *Elisaios*], Eliseus, (Luke 4:27 the King James Version)):

A prophet, the disciple and successor of Elijah. He was the son of Shaphat, lived at Abel-meholah, at the northern end of the Jordan valley and a little South of the Sea of Galilee. Nothing is told of his parents but the father's name, though he must have been a man of some wealth and doubtless of earnest piety. No hint is given of Elisha's age or birth-place, and it is almost certain that he was born and reared at Abel-meholah, and was a comparatively young man when we first hear of him. His early life thus was spent on his father's estate, in a god-fearing family, conditions which have produced so many of God's prophets. His moral and religious nature was highly developed in such surroundings, and from his work on his father's farm he was called to his training as a prophet and successor of Elijah.

I. HIS CALL AND PREPARATION.

The first mention of him occurs in 1 Kings 19:16. Elijah was at Horeb, learning perhaps the greatest lesson of his life; and one of the three duties with which he was charged was to anoint Elisha, the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah, as prophet in his stead.

1. His Call:

Elijah soon went northward and as he passed the lands of Shaphat he saw Elisha plowing in the rich level field of his father's farm. Twelve yoke of oxen were at work, Elisha himself plowing with the twelfth yoke. Crossing over to him Elijah threw his mantle upon the young man (◁11919▷1 Kings 19:19). Elisha seemed to understand the meaning of the symbolic act, and was for a moment overwhelmed with its significance. It meant his adoption as the son and successor of Elijah in the prophetic office. Naturally he would hesitate a moment before making such an important decision. As Elijah strode on, Elisha felt the irresistible force of the call of God and ran after the great prophet, announcing that he was ready to follow; only he wished to give a parting kiss to his father and mother (◁11920▷1 Kings 19:20). Elijah seemed to realize what it meant to the young man, and bade him "Go back again; for what have I done to thee?" The call was not such an urgent one as Elisha seemed to think, and the response had better be deliberate and voluntary. But Elisha had fully made up his mind, slew the yoke of oxen with which he was plowing, boiled their flesh with the wood of the implements he was using, and made a farewell feast for his friends. He then followed Elijah, making a full renunciation of home ties, comforts and privileges. He became Elijah's servant; and we have but one statement describing their relationship (◁12030▷2 Kings 3:11): he "poured water on the hands of Elijah."

2. His Preparation:

They seem to have spent several years together (◁12201▷1 Kings 22:1; ◁12017▷2 Kings 1:17), for Elisha became well known among the various schools of the prophets. While ministering to the needs of his master, Elisha learned many deep and important lessons, imbibed much of his spirit, and developed his own religious nature and efficiency until he was ready for the prophetic service himself. It seems almost certain that they lived among the schools of the prophets, and not in the mountains and hills as Elijah had previously done. During these years the tie between the two men became very deep and strong. They were years of great significance to the young prophet and of careful teaching on the part of the older. The lesson learned at Horeb was not forgotten and its meaning would be profoundly impressed upon the younger man, whose whole afterlife shows that he had deeply imbibed the teaching.

3. The Parting Gift of Elijah:

The final scene shows the strong and tender affection he cherished toward his master. Aware that the end was near, he determined to be with him until the last. Nothing could persuade him to leave Elijah. When asked what should be done for him, before his master was taken away, he asks for the elder son's portion, a double portion, of his master's spirit (^{ᴵᴵᴵ}2 Kings 2:9). He has no thought of equality; he would be Elijah's firstborn son. The request shows how deeply he had imbibed of his master's spirit already. His great teacher disappears in a whirlwind, and, awestruck by the wonderful sight, Elisha rends his clothes, takes up the garment of Elijah, retraces his steps to the Jordan, smites the waters to test whether the spirit of Elijah had really fallen upon him, and as the water parts, he passes over dry shod. The sons of the prophets who have been watching the proceedings from the hills, at once observe that the spirit of Elijah rested upon Elisha, and they bowed before him in reverence and submission (^{ᴵᴵᴵ}2 Kings 2:12-15). Elisha now begins his prophetic career which must have lasted 50 years, for it extended over the reign of Jehoram, Jehu, Jehoahaz and Joash. The change in him is now so manifest that he is universally recognized as Elijah's successor and the religious leader of the prophetic schools. The skepticism of the young prophets regarding the translation of Elijah found little sympathy with Elisha, but he is conciliatory and humors them (^{ᴵᴵᴵ}2 Kings 2:16-18).

II. HIS PROPHETIC CAREER.

1. Record of His Career:

As we study the life of Elisha we look first at the record of his career. The compiler of these records has followed no strict chronological order. Like other scripture writers he has followed the system of grouping his materials. The records in ^{ᴵᴵᴵ}2 Kings 2:19 through 5:27 are probably in the order of their occurrence. The events in chapters 6 through 9 cannot be chronologically arranged, as the name of the king of Israel is not mentioned. In 6:23 we are told that the Syrians came no more into the land of Israel, and 6:24 proceeds to give an account of Ben-hadad's invasion and the terrible siege of Samaria. In chapter 5 Gehazi is smitten with leprosy, while in chapter 8 he is in friendly converse with the king. In chapter 13 the death of Joash is recorded, and this is followed by the record of his last interview with Elisha (^{ᴵᴵᴵ}2 Kings 13:14-19) which event occurred some years previously.

2. His Ministry in a Private Capacity:

When he began his career of service he carried the mantle of Elijah, but we read no more of that mantle; he is arrayed as a private citizen (⟨⟩2 Kings 2:12) in common garmerits (*beghadhim*). He carries the walking-staff of ordinary citizens, using it for working miracles (⟨⟩2 Kings 4:29). He seems to have lived in different cities, sojourning at Bethel or Jericho with the sons of the prophets, or dwelling in his own home in Dothan or Samaria (⟨⟩2 Kings 6:24,32). He passed Shunem so frequently on foot that a prophet's chamber was built for his special use (⟨⟩2 Kings 4:8-11). **(1)** Elijah's ministry began by shutting up the heavens for three and a half years; Elisha's began by healing a spring of water near Jericho (⟨⟩2 Kings 2:21). One of these possessed certain noxious qualities, and complaint is made to Elisha that it is unfit for drinking and injurious to the land (⟨⟩2 Kings 2:19). He takes salt in a new vessel, casts it into the spring and the waters are healed so that there was not "from thence any more death or miscarrying" (⟨⟩2 Kings 2:21).

(2) Leaving Jericho, `a pleasant situation,' he passes up to the highlands of Ephraim, doubtless by the Wady Suweinit, and approaches Bethel, a seat of Baal worship and headquarters of idolatry. The bald head, or perhaps closely cropped head, of Elisha, in contrast with that of Elijah, provoked the ridicule of some "young lads out of the city" who called after him "Go up, thou baldhead,' their taunt manifesting the most blatant profanity and utter disregard of God or anything sacred. Elisha, justly angered, turned and cursed them in the name of Yahweh. Two bears soon break forth from the woods of that wild region and make fearful havoc among the boys. Elisha may have shown severity and a vindictiveness in this, but he was in no way to blame for the punishment which overtook the boys. He had nothing to do with the bears and was in no way responsible for the fate of the lads. The Septuagint adds that they threw stones, and the rabbis tell how Elisha was himself punished, but these attempts to tone down the affair are uncalled for and useless (⟨⟩2 Kings 2:23,14).

(3) From Bethel Elisha passed on to Mt. Carmel, the home of a school of the prophets, spent some time there and returned to Samaria the capital (⟨⟩2 Kings 2:25). His next deed of mercy was to relieve the pressing needs of a widow of one of the prophets. The name of the place is not given (⟨⟩2 Kings 4:1-7)
(4) On his many journeys up and down the country, he frequently passed

by the little village of Shunem, on the slopes of "Little Hermon." The modern name is Solam. It was about three miles from Jezreel. Accustomed to accept hospitality of one of the women of the place, he so impressed her with his sanctity that she appealed to her husband to build a chamber for the "holy man of God, that passeth by us continually." This was done, and in return for this hospitality a son was born to the woman, who suddenly dies in early boyhood and is restored to life by the prophet (2 Kings 4:8-37).

(5) Elisha is next at Gilgal, residing with the sons of the prophets. It is a time of famine and they are subsisting on what they can find. One of them finds some wild gourds (*paqqu`oth*), shreds them into the pot and they are cooked. The men have no sooner begun to eat than they taste the poison and cry to Elisha, "O man of God, there is death in the pot." Throwing in some meal, Elisha at once renders the dish harmless and wholesome (2 Kings 4:38-41).

(6) Probably at about the same time and place and during the same famine, a man from Baal-shalishah brought provisions as a present to Elisha — twenty loaves of fresh barley bread and fresh ears of grain. Unselfishly Elisha commands that it be given to the people to eat. The servant declared it was altogether insufficient for a hundred men, but Elisha predicts that there will be enough and to spare (2 Kings 4:42-44). This miracle closely resembles the two miracles of Jesus.

(7) The next incident is the healing of Naaman, the leprous commander of the Syrian army (2 Kings 5:1-19). He is afflicted with the white leprosy, the most malignant kind (2 Kings 5:27). A Jewish maiden, captured in one of their numerous invasions of Eastern Palestine, and sold into slavery with a multitude of others, tells her mistress, the wife of Naaman, about the wonder-working Elisha. The maiden tells her mistress that Elisha can heal the leprosy, and Naaman resolves to visit him. Through the king he obtains permission to visit Elisha with a great train and rich presents. The prophet sends his servant to tell him to dip seven times in the Jordan and he will be healed. Naaman is angered at the lack of deference on the part of Elisha and turns away in a rage to go home. Better counsels prevail, and he obeys the prophet and is cured. Elisha absolutely refuses the rich presents Naaman offers, and permits the Syrian to take some earth from Yahweh's land, that he may build an altar in Syria and worship Yahweh there. The idea was that a God was localized and could be worshipped only on his own land. Elisha grants Naaman permission apparently to worship Rimmon

while avowedly he is a worshipper of Yahweh. The prophet appreciates the difficulties in Naaman's path, believes in his sincerity, and by this concession in no way proves that he believes in the actual existence of a god named Rimmon, or that Yahweh was confined to his own land, or in any way sanctions idolatrous worship. He is conciliatory and tolerant, making the best of the situation.

(8) An act of severity on the part of Elisha follows, but it was richly deserved. Gehazi's true character now manifests itself. He covets the rich presents brought by Naaman, runs after him, and by a clever story secures a rich present from the general. Elisha divines his trick and dooms him and his family to be afflicted with Naaman's leprosy forever (2 Kings 5:20-27).

(9) A group of the sons of the prophets, probably at Jericho, finding their quarters too small, determine to build new quarters near the Jordan. While felling the timber the ax-head of one, a borrowed tool, fell into the water and disappeared. It would have been useless to have attempted to search for it in that swift and muddy stream, so he cries in distress to the prophet. Elisha breaks off a stick, casts it in the spot where the ax fell, and makes the iron swim on the surface (2 Kings 6:1-7).

3. His Ministry in a Public and National Capacity:

Elisha's services to his king and country were numerous and significant.

(1) The first one recorded took place during the attempt of Jehoram to resubjugate Moab which had revolted under King Mesha. In company with Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom, his southern allies, the combined hosts found themselves without water in the wilderness of Edom. The situation is desperate. Jehoram appeals to Jehoshaphat, and on discovering that Elisha was in the camp all three kings appeal to him in their extremity. He refuses any help to Jehoram, bidding him appeal to the prophets of his father Ahab and his mother Jezebel. For Jehoshaphat's sake he will help, calls for a minstrel, and under the spell of the music receives his message. He orders them to dig many trenches to hold the water which shall surely come on the morrow from the land of Edom and without rain. He moreover predicted that Moab would be utterly defeated. These predictions are fulfilled, Mesha is shut up in his capital, and in desperation sacrifices his firstborn son and heir on the walls in sight of all Israel. In great horror the Israelites withdraw, leaving Mesha in possession (2 Kings 3:4-27).

(2) His next services occurred at Samaria. The king of Syria finds that his

most secret plans are divulged in some mysterious way, and he fails more than once to take the king of Israel. He suspects treachery in his army, but is told of Elisha's divining powers. Elisha is living at Dothan; and thither the king of Syria sends a large army to capture him. Surrounded by night, Elisha is in no way terrified as his servant is, but prays that the young man's eyes may be opened to see the mountains full of the chariots and horses of Yahweh. Going forth to meet the Syrians as they close in, Elisha prays that they may be stricken with blindness. The word *canwerim* is used only here and in ⁰¹¹⁹¹Genesis 19:11 and probably means mental blindness, or bewilderment, a confusion of mind amounting to illusion. He now tells them that they have come to the wrong place, but he will lead them to the right place. They follow him into the very heart of Samaria and into the power of the king. The latter would have smitten them, but is rebuked by Elisha who counseled that they be fed and sent away (¹²⁰⁶⁸2 Kings 6:8-23). Impressed by such mysterious power and strange clemency the Syrians ceased their marauding attacks.

(3) The next incident must have occurred some time previous, or some time after these events. Samaria is besieged, the Israelites are encouraged to defend their capital to the last, famine prices prevail, and mothers begin to cook their children and eat them. The king in horror and rage will wreak vengeance on Elisha. The latter divines his purpose, anticipates any action on the king's part, and predicts that there will be abundance of food on the morrow. That night a panic seized the Syrian host. They imagined they heard the Hittites coming against them, and fled in headlong rout toward the Jordan. Four lepers discover the deserted camp and report the fact to the king. He suspects an ambuscade, but is persuaded to send a few men to reconnoiter. They find the camp deserted and treasures strewing the path right to the Jordan. The maritans lose no time in plundering the camp and Elisha's predictions are fulfilled to the letter (¹²⁰⁶²2 Kings 6:24 through 7).

(4) The prophet's next act was one of great significance. It was the carrying out of the first order given to Elijah at Horeb, and the time seemed ripe for it. He proceeds north to Damascus and finds Benhadad sick. Hearing of his presence the king sends a rich present by the hands of his chief captain Hazael and inquires whether he will recover. Elisha gives a double answer. He will recover, the disease will not be fatal, yet he will die. Fixing his eyes on Hazael, Elisha sees a fierce and ruthless successor to Benhadad who will be a terrible scourge to Israel. The man of God weeps, the fierce captain is ashamed, and when told of what he shall do, represents

himself as a dog and not able to do such things. But the prospect is too enticing; he tells Benhadad he will recover, and on the morrow smothers him and succeeds to the throne (⁽¹²⁸⁰⁾2 Kings 8:7-15).

(5) The next, move of Elisha was even more significant. It is the fulfilling of the second order given Elijah at Mt. Horeb. The Israelites are fighting the Syrians in defense of Ramoth-gilead. The king, Jehoram, is wounded and returns home to Jezreel to recover. Elisha seizes on the opportune moment to have the house of Ahab avenged for its many sins. He dispatches one of the young prophets with a vial of oil to Ramoth-gilead with orders to anoint Jehu, one of the captains of the army, as king over Israel. The young prophet obeys, delivers his message and flees. Jehu tries to conceal the real nature of the interview, but is forced to tell, and is at once proclaimed king. He leaps into his chariot, drives furiously to Jezreel, meets the king by the vineyard of Naborb, sends an arrow through his heart, tramples to death the queen Jezebel, butchers the king's sons and exterminates the royal family. He then treacherously murders the priests of Baal and the revolution is complete; the house of Ahab is destroyed, Baal worship overthrown and an able king is upon the throne (2 Kings 9; 10).

(6) Elisha retains his fervent and patriotic spirit until the last. His final act is in keeping with his long. life of generous deeds and faithful patriotic service. He is on his death bed, having witnessed the fearful oppressions of Israel by Hazael who made Israelites as dust under his feet. The young king Joash visits him, weeps over him, calling him, "My father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof." The dying prophet bids him take his bow and arrow and shoot eastward, an act symbolic of his victory over Syria. Being then commanded to smite upon the ground, he smites three times and stops. The prophet is angry, tells him he should have smitten many times, then he would have smitten Syria many times, but now he shall smite her only thrice (⁽¹²¹³⁴⁾2 Kings 13:14-19).

(7) The last wonder in connection with Elisha occurs after this death. His bones were reported to have v italizing power (⁽¹²¹³⁰⁾2 Kings 13:20-21). Tradition says that the man thus restored to life lived but an hour; but the story illustrates something of the reverence held for Elisha.

4. Characteristics of His Ministry:

(1) **In Comparison with Elijah.**

In many respects Elisha is a contrast to his great predecessor. Instead of a few remarkable appearances and striking events, his was a steady lifelong ministry; instead of the rugged hills his home was in the quiet valley and on the farm; instead of solitariness he loved the social life and the home. There were no sudden appearances add disappearances, people always knew where to find him. There were no long seasons of hiding or retirement, he was constantly moving about among the people or the prophetic schools. There were no spectacular revolutions, only the effect of a long steady ministry. His career resembled the latter portion of Elijah's more than the earlier. Elijah had learned well his lesson at Horeb. God is not so much in the tempest, the fire and the earthquake, as in the "still small voice" (<11912>1 Kings 19:12). Elijah was a prophet of fire, Elisha more of a pastor. The former called down fire out of heaven to consume those sent to take him; Elisha anticipates the king when he comes to take him (<12062>2 Kings 6:32,33) and gives promises of relief. He merely asks for blindness to come upon the army which surrounded him at Dothan, and spares them when the king would have smitten them (<12062>2 Kings 6:21-23). Elijah was austere and terrible, but Elisha was so companionable that the woman at Shunera built him a chamber. His prophetic insight could be helped more by the strains of music than by the mountain solitude (<12001>2 Kings 3:15). Some of his miracles resemble Elijah's. The multiplication of the oil and the cruse is much like the continued supply of meal and oil to the widow of Zarephath (<11710>1 Kings 17:10-16), and the raising of the Shunammite's son like the raising of the widow's son at Zarephath (<11717>1 Kings 17:17-24).

(2) **General Features of His Ministry.**

His services as a pastor-prophet were more remarkable than his miracles. He could be very severe in the presence of deliberate wrongdoing, stern and unflinching when the occasion required. He could weep before Hazael, knowing what he would do to Israel, yet he anointed him king of Syria (<12081>2 Kings 8:11-15). When the time was ripe and the occasion opportune, he could instigate a revolution that wiped out a dynasty, exterminated a family, and caused the massacre of the priests of Baal (2 Kings 8; 9). He possessed the confidence of kings so fully that they addressed him as father and themselves as sons (<12062>2 Kings 6:21; 13:14). He accompanied an army

of invasion and three kings consult him in extremity (2 Kings 3:11-19). The king of Syria consults him in sickness (2 Kings 8:7,8). The king of Israel seems to blame him for the awful conditions of the siege and would have wreaked vengeance on him (2 Kings 6:31). He was something of a military strategist and many times saved the king's army (2 Kings 6:10). The king of Israel goes to him for his parting counsel (2 Kings 13:14-19). His advice or command seemed to be always taken unhesitatingly. His contribution to the religious life of Israel was not his least service. Under Jehu he secured the destruction of the Baal worship in its organized form. Under Hazael the nation was trodden down and almost annihilated for its apostasy. By his own ministry many were saved from bowing the knee to Baal. His personal influence among the schools of the prophets was widespread and beneficial. He that escaped the sword of Hazael was slain by Jehu, and he that escaped Jehu was slain by Elisha. Elisha finished the great work of putting down Baal worship begun by Elijah. His work was not so much to add anything to religion, as to cleanse the religion already possessed. He did not ultimately save the nation, but he did save a large remnant. The corruptions were not all eradicated, the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat were never fully overcome. He passed through a bitter and distressing national humiliation, but emerged with hope. He eagerly watched every turn of events and his counsels were more frequently adopted than those perhaps of any other prophet. He was "the chariots of Israel and tire horsemen thereof" (2 Kings 13:14). No condemnation of calf-worship at Daniel and Bethel is recorded, but that does not prove that he fully sanctioned it. His was a contest between Yahweh worship and Baal worship. The corrupted form of Yahweh worship was a problem which Amos and Hosea had to face nearly a century later.

III. GENERAL ESTIMATE.

His character was largely molded by his home life. He was friend and benefactor of foreigner as well as of Israelite. He was large-hearted and generous, tolerant to a remarkable degree, courageous and shrewd when the occasion required, a diplomat as well as a statesman, severe and stern only in the presence of evil and when the occasion demanded. He is accused of being vindictive and of employing falsehood with his enemies. His faults, however, were the faults of his age, and these were but little manifested in his long career. His was a strenuous pastor's life. A homeloving and social man, his real work was that of teaching and helping, rather than working of miracles. He continually went about doing good. He

was resourceful and ready and was gifted with a sense of humor. Known as "the man of God," he proved his right to the title by his zeal for God and loving service to man.

LITERATURE.

Driver, LOT, 185 f; W. R. Smith, Prophets of Israel, 85 ff; Cornill, Isr. Prophets, 14 f, 33 ff; Farrar, Books of Kings; Kuenen, Religions of Israel, I, 360 ff; Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures, 94 f; Maurice, Prophets and Kings, 142; Liddon, Sermons on Old Testament Subjects, 195-334.

J. J. Reeve

ELISHAH

<e-li'-sha> ([hvyl a] *'elishah*], "God saves"; [Ἐλισά, *Elisa*], [Ἐλεισαί, *Eleisai*]): Mentioned in Genesis 10:4 as the eldest son of Javan, and in Ezekiel 27:7 as the source from which the Tyrians obtained their purple dyes. On the ground of this latter statement attempts have been made to identify it with Southern Italy or the north of Africa. Josephus (Ant., I, vi, 1) identified Elisha with the Aeolians. The Targum on Ezekiel gives "the province of Italy." Other suggestions include Hellas, Ells, and Alsa; the last named is a kingdom mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, but its precise location is unknown. It is impossible as yet to claim certainty for any of these conjectures.

A. C. Grant

ELISHAMA

<e-lish'-a-ma> ([[mvyl a] *'elishama`*], "God has heard"):

(1) Grandfather of Joshua and son of Ammihud; prince of the tribe of Ephraim in the Exodus (Numbers 1:10; 7:48,53; 1 Chronicles 7:26).

(2) A son of David, born in Jerusalem (2 Samuel 5:16; 1 Chronicles 3:8).

(3) By textual corruption in 1 Chronicles 3:6 for Elishua, another of David's sons; compare 2 Samuel 5:15.

(4) A scribe of Jehoiakim (Jeremiah 36:12,20,21).

(5) One "of the seed royal," grandfather of Ishmael, the slayer of Gedaliah (2 Kings 25:25; Jeremiah 41:1).

(6) A man of the tribe of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:41).

(7) One of the priests appointed by Jehoshaphat to teach the law (⟨44708⟩2 Chronicles 17:8).

F. K. Farr

ELISHAPHAT

<e-lish'-a-fat> ([ʃpʌyl אַ] *'elishaphat*], "God is judge"): This man figures in the Levitical conspiracy against Athaliah, to make Joash king. He was one of the "captains of hundreds" employed in the enterprise by Jehoiada the priest (⟨44201⟩2 Chronicles 23:1).

ELISHEBA

<e-lish'-e-ba> ([[b" ʌyl אַ] *'elishebha`*], "God swears," "God is an oath"): Daughter of Amminadab, sister of Nashon, wife of Aaron, mother of Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, the foundress, therefore, of the entire Levitical priesthood (⟨00623⟩Exodus 6:23).

ELISHUA

<el-i-shu'-a>, *<e-lish'-u-a>* ([[ʃʌyl אַ] *'elishua`*], " `God is rich," "God is salvation"): Son of David (⟨10515⟩2 Samuel 5:15; ⟨13405⟩1 Chronicles 14:5); apparently called Elishama (⟨13306⟩1 Chronicles 3:6). In the latter locus we have most probably a misreading by the copyist of the name Elishua.

ELISIMUS

<e-lis'-i-mus>, the Revised Version (British and American) *ELIASIMUS* (which see).

ELIU

<e-li'-u> ([Ἠλιού, *Eliou*]; the Revised Version (British and American) ELIHU): One of the ancestors of Judith (Judith 8:1), and therefore of the tribe of Simeon.

ELIUD

<e-li'-ud> ([Ἐλιούδ, *Elioud*], "God my praise"): An ancestor of Jesus, four generations before Joseph (⟨40115⟩Matthew 1:15).

ELIZAPHAN

<el-i-za'-fan>, *<e-liz'-a-fan>* ([ˆpxyl a] *'elitsaphan*]; Septuagint [Ἐλεισαφάν, *Eleisaphan*], [Ἐλισαφάν, *Elisaphan*], [Ἐλισαφά, *Elisapa*], [Ἐλισαφάτ, *Elisaphat*], "God has protected; compare [hynp″ x] *tsephanyah*], Zephaniah, "Yah has protected," and the Phoenician, l [bnpx, "Baal has protected"):

(1) The son of Uzziel, the son of Kohath, and so a prince of the Levitical class of the Kohathites (⁰⁰⁶⁸⁰Numbers 3:30; ¹³¹⁵⁸1 Chronicles 15:8; ⁴²⁹¹³2 Chronicles 29:13). But in ¹³¹⁵⁸1 Chronicles 15:8; 2 Chronicles 39:13 his class seems to be coordinate with that of the Kohathites. He is called Elzaphan in ⁰⁰⁶²Exodus 6:22; ⁰³¹⁰⁰⁴Leviticus 10:4.
(2) A "prince" or chief of Zebulun, who represented that tribe in the division of the land (⁰³²⁵Numbers 34:25).

Walter R. Betteridge

ELIZUR

<e-li'-zur> ([r‖xyl a] *'elitsur*]; Septuagint [Ἐλειούρ, *Eleiour*], [Ἐλισούρ, *Elisour*], "My God is a rock"; compare Zuriel "my rock is God" (⁰⁰³³⁵Numbers 3:35)): A chief or prince of the tribe of Reuben (⁰⁰⁰⁵Numbers 1:5; 2:10; 7:30,35; 10:18).

ELKANAH

<el-ka'-na> ([hnql a, *'elqanah*], "God has possessed"):

(1) An Ephraimite, the father of Samuel (⁰⁹⁰¹⁰1 Samuel 1:1-28; 2:11-20). Of his two wives, Hannah, the childless, was best beloved. At Shiloh she received through Eli the promise of a son. Elkanah, with Hannah, took the young Samuel to Shiloh when he was weaned, and left him with EIi as their offering to Yahweh. They were blessed with three other sons and two daughters.
(2) The second son of Korah (⁰⁰⁶²⁴Exodus 6:24), who escaped the fate of Korah, Dathan and Abiram (⁰²⁶¹¹Numbers 26:11).

(3) One "next to the king" in Jerusalem in the time of Ahaz; slain by one Zichri of Ephraim in war with Pekah (⁴²⁸⁰⁷2 Chronicles 28:7).
(4) One of the Korahites among David's "mighty men" (¹³¹²⁰⁶1 Chronicles 12:1,6).

(5) A Levite, possibly the same as **(2)** above (^{⟨1302⟩}1 Chronicles 6:23,15,36).

(6) Another Levite of the same line (^{⟨1306⟩}1 Chronicles 6:26,35).

(7) Another Levite, ancestor of Berechiah (^{⟨1309⟩}1 Chronicles 9:16).

(8) Another Levite (if not the same as **(4)** above), one of the "doorkeepers for the ark" (^{⟨1315⟩}1 Chronicles 15:23).

<div align="right">

F. K. Farr

</div>

ELKIAH

<el-ki'-a> ([Ἐλκία, *Elkia*]; the King James Version Elcia): An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

ELKOSHITE

<el'-kosh-it> ([ha-'elqoshi]; *ha-'elqoshi*]); Septuagint [Ἐλκεσαίου, *Elkesaiou*], [Ἐλκαισέου, *Elkaiseou*], [Ἐλκεσέου, *Elkeseou*]): Used with the article "the Elkoshite" (^{⟨4010⟩}Nahum 1:1). Probably a gentilic adjective giving the home of the prophet; not definitely identified. Three traditions may be noted:

(1) The Nestorians venerate the supposed tomb of the prophet in the village of Alqush not far from the east bank of the Tigris, about two days' journey almost directly north of Mosul.

(2) Jerome states in the prologue to his commentary on Nahum that the village of Helkesei in Galilee was pointed out to him as Elkosh. This Helkesei is probably El-Kauzeh between Ramieh and Bint Jebeil.

(3) The treatise Deuteronomy Vitis Prophetarum of the Pseudo-Epiphanius says that Nahum came from "Elkesei beyond Jordan towards Begabor and was of the tribe of Simeon." Nestle has shown that the words "beyond Jordan" are probably a gloss, and that for Begabor should be read Betogabra, the modern Beit Jibrin in Southern Palestine. In favor of this identification may be urged the following facts:

(a) that parallels to the name Elkosh, such as Eltekeh and Eltekon, are found in the southern country;

(b) that the word probably contains the name of the Edomite god Qaush, whose name appears in the names of Edomite kings in the Assyrian inscriptions of the 8th and 7th centuries BC, such as Qaush-malaka and the like, and

(c) that the internal evidence of the prophecy makes the Judean origin of the prophet almost certain.

LITERATURE.

Davidson, "Nah," "Hab," "Zeph," in Cambridge Bible, 9-13; G. A. Smith, "Book of the Twelve," in Expositor's Bible, Commentary on Nah; Billerbeck and Jeremias, Beitraege zur Assyriologie, III, 91 ff; Peiser, ZATW, 1897, 349; Nestle, PEFS, 1879, 136.

Walter R. Betteridge

ELLASAR

<el-a'-sar> ([ﬧﬡﬥﬡ, *'ellacar*]):

1. THE NAME AND ITS ETYMOLOGY:

The city over which Arioch (Eri-Aku) and other Babylonian kings ruled (Genesis 14:1). The Semitic-Babylonians form of its name is (al) Larsa, "the city Larsa," a form which implies that the Hebrew has interchanged r and s, and transposed the final vowel. Its Sumerian name is given as Ararwa, apparently for Arauruwa, "light-abode," which, in fact, is the meaning of the ideographic group with which it is written. The ruins of this ancient site are now known as Senqara, and lie on the East bank of the Euphrates, about midway between Warka (Erech) and Muqayyar (Ur of the Chaldees). In addition to the name Larsa, it seems also to have been called Aste azaga "the holy (bright, pure) seat" (or throne), and both its names were apparently due to its having been one of the great Babylonian centers of sun-god worship.

2. ITS HOLY PLACES:

Like most of the principal cities of Babylonia, it had a great temple-tower, called E-dur-an-ki, "house of the bond of heaven and earth." The temple of the city bore the same name as that at Sippar, i.e. E-babbar, "House of Light," where the sun-god Samas was worshipped. This temple was

restored by Ur-Engur, Hammurabi (Amraphel), Burna-burias, Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus. Among the tablets found on this site by Loftus was that which gives measures of length and square and cube roots, pointing to the place as one of the great centers of Babylonian learning. Besides the remains of these temples, there are traces of the walls, and the remains of houses of the citizens. The city was at first governed by its own kings, but became a part of the Babylonian empire some time after the reign of Hammurabi.

LITERATURE.

Loftus, Chaldea and Susiana; Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies?; Zehnpfund, Babylonien in seinen wichtigsten Ruinenstatten, 53-54.

T. G. Pinches

ELM

<elm>: [20413]Hosea 4:13 the King James Version, but in the Revised Version (British and American) TEREBINTH (which see).

ELMADAM

<el-ma'-dam> (WH [ʼΕλμαδάμ, *Elmadam*]; Textus Receptus of the New Testament [ʼΕλμωδάμ, *Elmodam*]; the King James Version Elmodam): An ancestor of Jesus, according to Luke's genealogy, in the 6th generation before Zerubbabel ([40838]Luke 3:28).

ELNAAM

<el-na'-am> ([μ[ת״ ׀ ם, *'elna`am*], "God is delightfulness"; compare Phoenician "Gadnaam"): According to Massoretic Text the father of two of David's warriors ([13146]1 Chronicles 11:46); according to Septuagint himself one of the warriors.

ELNATHAN

<el-na'-than> ([ˆtn׀ ם, *'elnathan*], "God has given"):

(1) The grandfather of Jehoiachin ([12408]2 Kings 24:8).
(2) A courtier of Jehoiakim; he was one of those sent to Egypt to bring back the prophet Uriah ([24822]Jeremiah 26:22), and one of those who heard the reading of Jeremiah's roll and entreated Jehoiakim not to burn the roll

(⟨2862⟩Jeremiah 36:12,25) — possibly the same person as **(1)** above.

(3, 4, 5) The name of two "chief men" — unless textual corruption has introduced the name at its second occurrence — and of one "teacher" sent for by Ezra from the camp at the river Ahava (⟨15816⟩Ezra 8:16).

F. K. Farr

ELOHIM

<e-lo'-him>, *<el'-o-hem>*.

See *GOD, NAMES OF.*

ELOI

<e'-loi>, *<e-lo'-i>*.

See *GOD, NAMES OF.*

ELOI; ELOI; LAMA; SABACHTHA; ELI; ELI; LAMA SABACHTHANI

<e'-loi>, *<e-lo'i>*, *<la'-ma>*, *<sa-bakh-tha'-ni>*, or ([Ἐλωΐ, *Eloi*], [ἐλωΐ, *eloi*], [λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί, *lama sabachthanei*]): The forms of the first word as translated vary in the two narratives, being in Mark as first above and in Matthew as in second reading. With some perversions of form probably from ⟨19201⟩Psalm 22:1 ([יni̇Tb̊} ” [}hml ;yl ae̩yl ae̩*'eli 'eli lamah `azabhtani*]). A statement uttered by Jesus on the cross just before his death, translated, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (⟨40746⟩Matthew 27:46; ⟨41534⟩Mark 15:34).

There is an interesting but difficult problem in connection with the interpretation of this passage. There seems to be a mixture of Aramaic and Hebrew. The first two words, whether in Hebrew or Aramaic, have sufficient similarity to each other and each sufficient similarity to the name itself to warrant the jeer that Jesus was calling upon Elias, or the sincere supposition of those who might not fully understand the language, that he was actually calling on Elias. The forms lema and lama used in Matthew and Mark respectively (Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek) represent the various possible forms, the first the Aramaic, and the second the Hebrew. The various readings and translations of the latter word, sabachthani, only add confusion to an effort at ultimate explanation of the real statement. Certainly the influence of the Aramaic played a geat part in

the translation and transmission of the original. The spirit revealed by Jesus in this utterance seems to be very much like that displayed in the Garden when He cried out to have the cup removed from Him.

Walter G. Clippinger

ELON (1)

<e'-lon> ([ˆwOyaꜥˆl ꜥaꜥˆwOaꜥ *'elon*] "terebinth"):

(1) A Zebulunite, who judged Israel ten years, and was buried in Aijalon (Judges 12:11,12).

(2) A son of Zebulun (Genesis 46:14; Numbers 26:26).

(3) A Hittite whose daughter Esau wedded (Genesis 26:34; 36:2).

ELON (2)

<e'-lon> ([ˆwOyaꜥ *'elon*], a "terebinth"; [Αἰλών, *Ailon*]): An unidentified town in the territory of Daniel named between Ithlah and Timnah (Joshua 19:43). It is possibly identical with Elon-beth-Hanan which, along with Shaalbim and Bethshemesh, formed one of Solomon's commissariat districts (1 Kings 4:9). Conder has suggested Beit' Anan, about 4 miles Northwest of *Neby Samwil*: it is quite uncertain.

ELO-BETH-HANAN

<e-lon-beth-ha'-nan>.

See *ELON.*

ELONITES

<e'-lon-its>: Descendants of *ELON* (which see **(2)**) (Numbers 26:26).

ELOQUENT

<el'-o-kwent>: "Moses said .... I am not eloquent" ([μyrbD]vya¡ *'ish debharim*], "a man of words" (Exodus 4:10)); but Aaron could "speak well." In Isaiah 3:3 the Revised Version (British and American) [ˆyB¡ *bin*], "intelligent," is rendered "skilful (enchanter)," the King James Version "eloquent (orator)." Apollos was "an eloquent man" ([λόγιος,

logios], "full of words" (⁴⁴⁸²⁴Acts 18:24, the King James Version margin, "a learned man")).

ELOTH

<e'-loth>.

    See ELATH.

ELPAAL

<el-pa'-al> ([l [P″ l ḁ, *'elpa`al*], "God has wrought" (compare [hc[l ḁ, *el`asah*], ²²⁹⁰⁸Jeremiah 29:3)): The name of a descendant of Benjamin (¹³⁰⁸¹1 Chronicles 8:11,12,18).

ELPALET

<el-pa'-let>: (the Revised Version (British and American) ELPELET): The name of a son of David (¹³⁴⁰⁵1 Chronicles 14:5).
    See ELIPHALAT.

EL-PARAN

<el-pa'-ran>.

    See PARAN.

ELPELET

<el'-pe-let>.

    See ELIPHALAT.

EL ROI

(⁰¹⁶¹³Genesis 16:13 margin).

    See GOD, NAMES OF.

EL SHADDAI

<el shad'-a-i>, *<el shad'-i>*.

    See GOD, NAMES OF.

ELTEKE; ELTEKEH

<el'-te-ke>, ([hq∓] ḁ, *'elteqeh]* ([᷍]Joshua 19:44], [aq∓] ḁ, *'elteqe']*
([᷍]Joshua 21:23); Codex Vaticanus [᾽Αλκαθά, *Alkatha*]; Codex
Alexandrinus, [᾽Ελκεθώ, *Elketho*]): A place in the territory of Daniel
named between Ekron and Gibbethon ([᷍]Joshua 19:44), and again
between Beth-horon and Gibbethon, as given to the Kohathite Levites
([᷍]Joshua 21:23). It is probably identical with the Assyrian Altaqu, where
Sennacherib (Hexagon prism inscrip.) claims to have defeated the allied
armies of the Philistines and the Egyptians. It should probably be sought
somewhere East of Ekron. Beit Likia, the place marked Eltekeh on the
PEF map, seems a position for such an encounter. It is about 2 1/2 miles
Southwest of Beth-horon the Upper.

W. Ewing

ELTEKON

<el'-te-kon> ([ˆq∰] ḁ, *'elteqon]*, "founded by God"): A city in the hill
country of Judah ([᷍]Joshua 15:59) near *BETHANOTH* (which see) to be
looked for, therefore, a little North of Hebron. Site unknown.

ELTOLAD

<el-to'-lad> ([dl ″ w∭l ḁ, *'eltoladh]*, "kindred of God"): A city of Judah
in the Negeb near Edom ([᷍]Joshua 15:30); in ([᷍]Joshua 19:4 ascribed to
Simeon. Probably the same as Tolad ([᷍]1 Chronicles 4:29), the Arabic
article "el" being omitted. Site unknown.

ELUL

<e'-lul>, *<e-lool'>* ([l ∭l a] *'elul]*, [᷍]Nehemiah 6:15; [᾽Ελούλ, *Eloul*], 1
Macc 14:27): The 6th month of the Hebrew year, corresponding to
August-September. The derivation is uncertain.
   See TIME.

ELUZAI

<e-lu'-za-i> ([yz″ ∭[l ḁ, *'el`uzai]*, "God is my strength"; compare
UZZIEL): One of David's heroes ([᷍]1 Chronicles 12:5).

ELYMAEANS

<el-i-me'-ans>.

> **See** *ELAMITES.*

ELYMAIS

<el-i-ma'-is> ([Ἐλύμαις, *Elumais*]): This name, representing the Old Testament Elam (*see ELAM*), was given to a district of Persia lying South of Media and North of Susiana. In 1 Macc 6:1 the common reading, which is adopted by the King James Version, refers to Elymais as a rich city in Persia. No other reference, however, to such a city is found except in Josephus (Ant., XII, ix, 1) who simply follows 1 Macc. The text should therefore be corrected to read as in the Revised Version (British and American), "in Elymais in Persia there was a city."

ELYMAS

<el'-i-mas> ([Ἐλύμας, *Elumas*], "wise"; <4138>Acts 13:8).
> **See** *BAR-JESUS.*

ELYON

<e-li'-on>.

> **See** *EL-ELYON; GOD NAMES OF.*

ELZABAD

<el-za'-bad> ([dbzl אֶ, *'elzabhadh*], "God has given"; Compare *ZABDIEL* and *ZEBADAH*):

(1) The ninth of David's Gadite heroes (<13212>1 Chronicles 12:12).

(2) A Korahite doorkeeper (<13607>1 Chronicles 26:7).

ELZAPHAN

<el-za'-fan>.

> **See** *ELIZAPHAN.*

EMADABUN

<e-ma'-da-bun> ([Ἠμαδαβούν, *Emadaboun*]); the King James Version, Madiabun (1 Esdras 5:58)): The head of a family of Levites who superintended the repair of the temple; not named in ⁅⁆Ezra 3:9.

EMATHEIS

<e-ma-the'-is> ([Ἀμαθίας, *Amathias*]; Emeus; Codex Vaticanus, [Ἐμαθθίς, *Emaththis*]; Codex Alexandrinus, [Ἐμαθείς, *Ematheis*]; the King James Version, Amatheis): One of the sons of Bebai (1 Esdras 9:29), called "Athlai" in ⁅⁆Ezra 10:28.

EMBALMING

<em-bam'-ing> ([חָנַט; *chanaT*], "to spice"): Embalming. is mentioned in Scripture only in the cases of Jacob and Joseph (⁅⁆Genesis 50:2 f,26). It was a distinctly Egyptian invention and method of preserving the bodies of men and animals. Examples of it reach back to over 3,000 years ago. It prevailed to some extent among the peoples of Asia, and at a later period among the Greeks and Romans, but was in origin and use distinctly non-Israelitish.

See BURIAL.

EMBRACE

<em-bras'>: The word has two distinct meanings in the Old Testament:

(1) to clasp and hold fondly in the arms, pointing to a common custom (⁅⁆Genesis 29:13; 33:4; 48:10; ⁅⁆2 Kings 4:16; Song 2:6; 8:3; compare ⁅⁆Acts 20:10), and

(2) to have sexual intercourse (⁅⁆Proverbs 4:8; 5:20; ⁅⁆Ecclesiastes 3:5). It seems to have acquired this technical sense in later Jewish usage.

EMBROIDERY

<em-broid'-er-i> ([רִקְמָה; *riqrnah*]; the King James Version Needlework):

Riqmah was applied to any kind of cloth which showed designs in variegated colors. The method of manufacture is unknown. The designs may have been woven into cloth or drawn in by a needle or hook

(⟨0705⟩Judges 5:30; ⟨1954⟩Psalm 45:14; ⟨2560⟩Ezekiel 16:10,13,18; 26:16; 27:7,16,24).

Ma`aseh raqam is translated "the work of the embroiderer" in the Revised Version (British and American) instead of "needlework" (⟨0266⟩Exodus 26:36; 27:16; 28:39; 36:37; 38:18; 39:29; ⟨0705⟩Judges 5:30; ⟨1954⟩Psalm 45:14).

Raqam, "embroiderer," occurs in ⟨2555⟩Exodus 35:35; 38:23. The fact that this word is used instead of `aragh, "weaver," would lead us to suppose that the embroiderers' work was either different from that of the weaver or that a "*raqam*" was especially skilled in fine weaving. Another word, *choshebh*, is used to describe a skillful weaver. "Cunning work" in the King James Version of ⟨0260⟩Exodus 26:1,31; 28:6,15; 35:33,15; 36:8,35; 39:3,1 is rendered in the American Standard Revised Version "work of the skillful workmen." The passage has been freely rendered "designers." In the Revised Version (British and American) of ⟨0289⟩Exodus 28:39 *shabhats* is translated "weave."

In ⟨0280⟩Exodus 28:4 occurs the word *tashbets*, which is translated "broidered" in the King James Version and "checker work" in the Revised Version (British and American). If this kind of work is what it is supposed to be, it is more truly "needlework" than the embroidery. This work is still done in some of the Syrian cities and towns, especially in Damascus. Small caps for men to wear under their ordinary headdress and loose outer garments or dressing-gowns are the forms in which it is commonly seen. The checker-work effect is obtained by sewing in a cotton string between two pieces of cloth, so as to form designs. The patterns Usually run to straight lines such as zigzags or squares. The effect is striking, and we can well imagine would have made an impressive priest's robe, especially if costly materials were used.

 See also CRAFTS.

                James A. Patch

EMEK-KEZIZ

<e-mek-ke'-ziz> ([6y×ʧ]qm[e`*emeq qetsits*]); the King James Version Valley of Keziz (⟨0682⟩Joshua 18:21)): A town in Benjamin named between Beth-hoglah and Beth-arabah, and therefore to be sought in the plain, probably South of Jericho. The name has not been recovered.

EMERALD

<em'-er-ald>.

See *STONES, PRECIOUS.*

EMERODS

<em'-er-odz> [μγl þ[} `*ophalim*], [μγrj ɓ] *techorim*]): These words are used in the account of the plague which broke out among the Philistines while the captive Ark of the Covenant was in their land. `*Ophalim* literally means rounded eminences or swellings, and in the Revised Version (British and American) is translated "tumors" (1 Samuel 5:6-12). In the Hebrew text of this passage the Qere substitutes for it the word *techorim*, a term which occurs in the next chapter in the description of the golden models of these swellings that were made as votive offerings (1 Samuel 6:11-17). The swellings were symptoms of a plague, and the history is precisely that of the outbreak of an epidemic of bubonic plague. The older writers supposed by comparison of the account in 1 Samuel with Psalm 78:66 that they were hemorrhoids (or piles), and the older English term in the King James Version is a 16th-century form of that Greek word, which occurs in several medical treatises of the 16th and 17th centuries. There is, however, no evidence that this identification is correct. In the light of the modern research which has proved that the rat-flea (Pulex cheopis) is the most active agent in conveying the virus of plague to the human subject, it is worthy of note that the plague of tumors was accompanied by an invasion of mice (`*akhbor*) or rats. The rat is not specifically mentioned in the Bible, although it was as common in Canaan and Israelite times as it is today, a fact demonstrated by the frequency with which their bones occur in all strata of the old Palestinian cities, so it is probable that the term used was a generic one for both rodents.

The coincidence of destructive epidemics and invasions of mice is also recorded by Herodotus (ii.141), who preserves a legend that the army of Sennacherib which entered Egypt was destroyed by the agency of mice. He states that a statue of Ptah, commemorating the event, was extant in his day. The god held a mouse in his hand, and bore the inscription: "Whosoever sees me, let him reverence the gods." This may have been a reminiscence of the story in Isaiah 37:36. For other references *see PLAGUE*.

Alex. Macalister

EMIM

<e'-mim> ([μymïαε*'emim*]; [᾿Ομμαείν, *Ommaein*], [᾿Ομμείν, *Ommein*], or [᾿μμιείν, *Ommiein*]): Stated to have been the earlier inhabitants of Moab (Deuteronomy 2:10,11), and to have been of tall stature, and hence, "accounted Rephaim (or giants) as the Anakim" or the Zamzummim of Ammon (Deuteronomy 2:20). As the name was given to them by the Moabites, it may not have been that by which they called themselves. A tall race, known to the Israelites as *REPHAIM* (which see), once existed in Southern Palestine as well as on the East side of the Jordan, but its exact relationship is unknown. In the time of Abraham the Emim were living in the Moabite district of Shaveh-kiriathaim, identified with the modern Kureiyat (Genesis 14:5).

A. H. Sayce

EMINENT

<em'-i-nent>: In the King James Version (only in Ezekiel 16:24,31,39; 17:22) refers literally to physical elevation; the Revised Version (British and American) in the last passage renders "lofty" (Hebrew *talul*, "uplifted," "heaped up") and in the others "vaulted place" (Hebrew *gabh*, "rounded place," "mound" the English Revised Version, margin "a vaulted chamber").

EMMANUEL

<e-man'-n-el>.

See *IMMANUEL.*

EMMAUS

<e-ma'-us>, *<em'-a-us>* ([᾿Εμμαούς, *Emmaous*], derivation uncertain, but probably from [tM″ j ″, *chammath*], "a hot spring"): Josephus (BJ, IV, i, 3) says: "Now Emmaus, if it be interpreted, may be rendered `a warm bath' for therein is a spring of warm water useful for healing." Here he is referring to the hot springs near Tiberias. Possibly the same Greek name may not always have been derived from the same Hebrew, and as Cheyne suggests

(2) may have come from [hxMb″, *ha-motsah*] (see below).

1. EMMAUS OF THE APOCRYPHA:

A place where Judas Maccabeus defeated Gorgias (1 Macc 4); it was "in the plain" (1 Macc 3:40); it was subsequently fortified by Bacchides (1 Macc 9:50). It is frequently mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XIV, xi, 2; BJ, I, xi, 2; II, v, 1; xx, 4; IV, viii, 1; V, i, 6), and also in the Talmud and Midrash. It is now the modern mud-village of `Amwas, 20 miles along, and a little North of, the main road from Jerusalem to Jaffa. In the 3rd century it was called Nicopolis and was an episcopal see; in early Christian times it was famous for a spring of reputed healing qualities.

2. EMMAUS OF ST. LUKE:

The Emmaus of [42413]Luke 24:13, a village 60 furlongs (stadia) from Jerusalem. Early Christian tradition appears to have identified it with (1) and hence, to harmonize the distance, some manuscripts have 160 furlongs. Eusebius and Jerome place this Emmaus at `Amwas; but in the first place

(1) was a city and not a village (*kome*), and secondly

(2) the distance, 40 miles there and back, is an almost impossible one for the narrative. In Crusading times this difficulty appears to have been realized, and on what grounds is not known, Kubeibeh at just over 60 stadia, Northwest of Jerusalem, was selected as the site of Emmaus. There a fine church was built which has in recent years been rebuilt and today a Franciscan hospice and school, attached to the church, and a newer German Roman Catholic hospice, combine with the considerable picturesqueness of the place itself to fortify the tradition.

A much more probable site is Quloniyeh, a village about 35 stadia from Jerusalem, on the road to Jaffa. Josephus narrates (BJ, VII, vi, 6) that Vespasian "assigned a place for 800 men only whom he had dismissed from his army which he gave them for their habitation; it is called Emmaus and is distant from Jerusalem 60 furlongs." This is almost certainly the Emmaus of Luke; it is highly probable that the name quloniyeh is derived from the fact of its being this Colonia. Close to this place is a ruin known as Bet Mizza, which is probably the Mozah ([hxMb″ , *ha-motsah*]) of [06826]Joshua 18:26 which in the Talmud (Cukk. 4 5) is also described as a *colonia*. Today it is a "colony" of Jews who have revived and always use the old name Motsah for their settlement.

Other suggestions for this Emmaus are

(a) el Khamsa, considerably over 60 stadia Southwest of Jerusalem (Conder);

(b) Koriet el `enab, some 10 stadia farther a1ong the Jerus-Jaffa road than Kuloniyeh (LB, etc.); and

(c) `Artas, S. of Bethlehem, where remains of Roman baths have been found (Mrs. Finn). In not one of the places suggested are there any hot springs.

E. W. G. Masterman

EMMER

<em'-er> ([Ἐμμήρ, *Emmer*]): Head of a family, some of whom had married foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:21); called "Immer" in Ezra 10:20.

EMMERUTH

<em'-er-uth> ([Ἐμμηρούθ, *Emmerouth*]; the King James Version Meruth; 1 Esdras 5:24): Corresponding to "Immer" in Ezra 2:37.

EMMOR

<em'-or>: Transliterated from the Greek [Ἐμμώρ, *Emmor*], the translation of Hebrew [רומֹח } *chamor*], "ass" (Acts 7:16 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "Hamor", which see).

EMPEROR

<emp'-er-er> ([ὁ σεβαστός, *ho sebastos*]; Latin *augustus*: The title of the Roman emperors; Acts 25:21,25).

See AUGUSTUS; CAESAR.

EMPTY; EMPTIER

<emp'-ti>, *<emp'-ti-er>* ([κενός, *kenos*]): "Empty," adjective meaning void, etc., as the translation of [רֵק *req*], [רִיק *riq*], [רֵקָם *reqam*], etc., occurs in the literal sense of "with nothing" (Genesis 31:42; Job 22:9); in 2 Samuel 1:22, it is equivalent to "in vain," "hungry"

(²³⁹⁰⁸Isaiah 29:8); in some instances the meaning is comparative only; [qq″ B; baqaq], "to gush out," "to pour out," "to empty" is used adjectively (²⁸⁰⁰¹Hosea 10:1, "Israel is an empty vine"; but the Revised Version (British and American) takes the Hebrew word in its original sense of "pouring out," rendering "Israel is a luxuriant vine"); tohu, "emptiness" (¹⁸²⁰⁷Job 26:7); *kenos*, "empty" is so translated (⁴¹¹⁰⁸Mark 12:3); in ⁴⁰²⁴⁴Matthew 12:44, the Greek word is *scholazo*, "to be free," "unoccupied"; "to empty" (verb) is the translation of *baqaq* (³⁴¹⁰²Nahum 2:2), of *dalal*, "to become poor," etc. (²³⁹⁰⁶Isaiah 19:6, the English Revised Version "minished," the American Standard Revised Version "diminished"). the Revised Version (British and American) has "empty" for "vain" (⁴⁹⁵⁰⁶Ephesians 5:6), "emptied himself" for "made himself of no reputation" (⁵⁰²⁰⁷Philippians 2:7), "emptied out" for "gathered" (¹²²⁰⁹2 Kings 22:9; ¹⁴³⁴⁷2 Chronicles 34:17, margin "poured out").

W. L. Walker

EMULATION

<em-u-la'-shun> ([ζῆλος, *zelos*], [παπαζηλόω, *parazeloo*]): Occurs twice in the New Testament, once in a bad sense and once in a good sense.

(1) In ⁴⁸⁰⁵⁰Galatians 5:20 the King James Version it is the translation of *zelos* ("zeal," "earnestness," "enthusiasm") where it is classed among "the works of the flesh" and signifies the stirring up of jealousy or envy in others, because of what we are, or have, or profess. The Greek word is used in this sense in ⁴⁴³⁴⁵Acts 13:45; ⁴⁵³¹³Romans 13:13; ⁴⁶⁰⁰³1 Corinthians 3:3; ⁵⁹⁸¹⁴James 3:14,16; ⁴⁷²²⁰2 Corinthians 12:20; ⁴⁸⁰⁵⁰Galatians 5:20; the Revised Version (British and American) translated by "jealousy." It denotes a work of the flesh or lower nature, which Christians often fail sufficiently to guard against; it pleases "the flesh" to excite such a feeling in others.

(2) In ⁴⁵¹¹⁴Romans 11:14 the King James Version "emulation" is the translation of *parazeloo* ("to make one zealous or jealous"), and is there used in a good sense. "If by any means I may provoke to emulation (the Revised Version (British and American) jealousy) them that are my flesh" (compare ⁴⁵⁰¹⁹Romans 10:19, quoted from ⁰⁵²²¹Deuteronomy 32:21). It is well to "provoke to emulation" in this sense, those who are slow or indifferent, by the example of earnestness and zeal on our part. This is not to please "the flesh," but to serve "the Spirit."

W. L. Walker

EN-

([ˆyʿ[ַ ʿ `ayin] (compare Arabic `Ain)): The Hebrew word for "spring" or "fountain" (⁰¹⁶⁰⁷Genesis 16:7; ⁰⁵³⁰⁹Numbers 33:9; ¹⁶²¹⁴Nehemiah 2:14; ²⁰⁸²⁸Proverbs 8:28 (feminine plural)). It occurs in numerous compound words, as *EN-GEDI, EN-HADDAH, EN-HAKKORE, EN-HAZOR, EN-RIMMON, ENROGEL, EN-SHEMESH* (which see). In the same way the word `*Ain* is a very common component of Arabic names of places throughout Palestine and Syria at the present day. Places with names compounded with "En-" were almost certainly located near a spring.
See FOUNTAIN; WELL.

ENABLE

<en-a'-b'-l>: Only in ⁵⁴⁰¹²1 Timothy 1:12 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) in the sense of "strengthen" (Greek *endunamoo*, "endue with strength").

ENAIM

<e-na'-im> ([μyִnֵ" y[ֵ e`enayim], "place of a fountain"; [Αἰνάν, *Ainan*]; ⁰¹⁸¹⁴Genesis 38:14 (the King James Version "in an open place"; ⁰¹³²¹Genesis 38:21 the King James Version "openly")): A place which lay between Adullam and Timnath; probably the same as Enam (⁰⁶⁶⁵³⁴Joshua 15:34). Also mentioned in close connection with Adullam. It was in the Shephelah of Judah. The Talmud (Pesik. Rab. 23) mentions a Kephar Enaim. Conder proposes Khurbet Wady `Alin, which is an ancient site, evidently of great strength and importance, lying between Kh. `Ain Shems and the village of Deir Aban. The ruins crown a lofty and almost isolated hill; the greatest objection to the identification is that there is no fountain at all in the immediate neighborhood. There may have been one in earlier times. See PEF, III, 128.

E. W. G. Masterman

ENAM

<e'-nam>. See preceding article.

ENAN

<e'-nan> ([ˆn[ë`*enan*], "having fountains," or "eyes," i.e. "keen-eyed"; in Septuagint [Αἰνάν, *Ainan*]): The father of Ahira, and prince of Naphtali at the first census of Israel (⁰⁰¹⁵Numbers 1:15; 2:29; 7:78,83; 10:27).

ENASIBUS

<e-nas'-i-bus> ([᾿Ενάσιβος, *Enasibos*], 1 Esdras 9:34): Corresponding to "Eliashib" in ⁵¹⁰⁸⁶Ezra 10:36.

ENCAMPMENT

<en-kamp'-ment>.

See *WAR.*

ENCAMPMENT BY THE RED SEA

According to the version of the wanderings of Israel given in Numbers 33, they "encamped by the Red Sea" (verse 10) after leaving Elim and before entering the Wilderness of Sin.

See *WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.*

ENCHANTMENT

<en-chant'-ment>: The occult arts, either supposedly or pretentiously supernatural, were common to all oriental races. They included enchantment, sorcery, witchcraft, sooth-saying, augury, necromancy, divination in numberless forms, and all kinds of magic article Nine varieties are mentioned in one single passage in the Pentateuch (⁵¹⁸¹⁰Deuteronomy 18:10,11); other varieties in many passages both in the Old Testament and New Testament, e.g. ⁰³¹⁹²⁶Leviticus 19:26,31; ²³⁰⁰⁶Isaiah 2:6; 57:3; ²⁴⁷⁰⁹Jeremiah 27:9; ³³⁰⁵¹²Micah 5:12; ⁴⁴⁰⁸⁰⁹Acts 8:9,11; 13:6,8; ⁴⁸⁰⁵⁰Galatians 5:20; ⁶⁶⁰⁹²¹Revelation 9:21. The extent of the magic arts (forbidden under Judaism and Christianity) may incidentally be seen from the fact that the Scriptures alone refer to their being practiced in Chaldea (²⁷⁰⁵¹¹Daniel 5:11), Babylon (²⁶²¹²¹Ezekiel 21:21), Assyria (¹²¹⁷¹⁷2 Kings 17:17), Egypt (⁰²⁰⁷¹¹Exodus 7:11), Canaan (⁰³¹⁸⁰³Leviticus 18:3,11; 19:26,31), Asia (Ephesus, ⁴⁴¹⁹¹³Acts 19:13,19), Greece (⁴⁴¹⁶¹⁶Acts 16:16), Arabia also, as "customs from the East," etc. (²³⁰⁰⁶Isaiah 2:6) indicates. These secret arts

were prohibited by the laws of Moses (⟨5809⟩Deuteronomy 18:9-12), inasmuch as they constituted a peculiar temptation to Israel to apostatize. They were a constant incentive to idolatry, clouded the mind with superstition, tended and were closely allied to imposture (⟨4024⟩Matthew 24:24). The term "enchantment" is found only in the Old Testament and its Hebrew originals indicate its varieties.

(1) [לַט ; *laTim*], and [לְהָט] *lehaTim*] "to wrap up," "muffie," "cover," hence, "clandestine," "secret." It was this hidden element that enabled the magicians of Egypt to impose on the credulity of Pharaoh in imitating or reproducing the miracles of Moses and Aaron; "They .... did in like manner with their enchantments" (⟨0071⟩Exodus 7:11,22). Their inability to perform a genuine miracle is shown by ⟨0808⟩Exodus 8:18.

(2) [נָ " חַשׁ; *nachash*], "to hiss," "whisper" referring to the mutterings of sorcerers in their incantations. Used as a derivative noun this Hebrew word means "a serpent." This involves the idea of cunning and subtlety. Although employed in the wider sense of augury or prognostication, its fundamental meaning is divination by serpents. This was the form of enchantment sought by Balaam (⟨0401⟩Numbers 24:1). Its impotence against the people of God is shown by ⟨0423⟩Numbers 23:23 m. Shalmaneser forced this forbidden art upon the Israelites whom he carried captive to Assyria (⟨1217⟩2 Kings 17:17). It was also one of the heathen practices introduced during the apostasy under Ahab, against which Elijah protested (compare ⟨1120⟩1 Kings 21:20).

(3) [לָ " חַשׁ; *lachash*], "to whisper," "mutter," an onomatopoetic word, like the above, in imitation of the hiss of serpents. It is used of the offensive practice of serpent charming referred to in ⟨2101⟩Ecclesiastes 10:11, and as Delitzsch says, in the place cited., "signifies the whispering of formulas of charming." See also ⟨2303⟩Isaiah 3:3, "skilful enchanter"; ⟨2408⟩Jeremiah 8:17, "serpents, cockatrices (the Revised Version (British and American) "adders") .... which will not be charmed"; ⟨1958⟩Psalm 58:4,5, "the voice of charmers (the Revised Version, margin "enchanters"), charming never so wisely." Ophiomancy, the art of charming serpents, is still practiced in the East.

(4) [חֶבֶר , *chebher*], "spell," from [חָב " ר ; *chabhar*], "to bind," hence, "to bind with spells," "fascinate," "charm," descriptive of a species of magic practiced by binding knots. That this method of imposture, e.g. the use of the magic knot for exorcism and other purposes, was common, is indicated

by the monuments of the East. The moral mischief and uselessness of this and other forms of enchantment are clearly shown in ^{⟨2409⟩}Isaiah 47:9,12. This word is also used of the charming of serpents (^{⟨5181⟩}Deuteronomy 18:11; ^{⟨1985⟩}Psalm 58:5).

(5) [ˆn″ [; `anan], "to cover," "to cloud," hence, "to use covert arts." This form of divination was especially associated with idolatry (so Gesenius, Hebrew Lexicon). Delitzsch, however, in a note on this word (^{⟨2006⟩}Isaiah 2:6), doubts the meaning "conceal" and thinks that it signifies rather "to gather auguries from the clouds." He translates it "cloud-interpretive" (^{⟨3052⟩}Micah 5:12). This view is not generally supported. Rendered "enchanters" (^{⟨2409⟩}Jeremiah 27:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "soothsayers"; so also in ^{⟨2006⟩}Isaiah 2:6). Often translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "practice augury," as in ^{⟨3926⟩}Leviticus 19:26; ^{⟨5180⟩}Deuteronomy 18:10,14; ^{⟨1220⟩}2 Kings 21:6; ^{⟨4430⟩}2 Chronicles 33:6; a form of magical art corresponding in many respects to that of the Greek mantis, who uttered oracles in a state of divine frenzy. Septuagint [κληδονίζομαι, kledonizomai], i.e. augury through the reading or acceptance of a sign or omen. A kindred form of enchantment is mentioned in the New Testament (^{⟨5813⟩}2 Timothy 3:13; Greek [γόητες, goetes], "enchanters," "jugglers," the original indicating that the incantations were uttered in a kind of howl; rendered "seducers" the King James Version, "impostors" the Revised Version (British and American); compare ^{⟨6690⟩}Revelation 19:20). The New Testament records the names of several magicians who belonged to this class of conscious impostors: Simon Magus (^{⟨4089⟩}Acts 8:9); Bar-Jesus and Elymas (^{⟨4430⟩}Acts 13:6,8); the slave girl with the spirit of Python ("divination," ^{⟨4466⟩}Acts 16:16); "vagabond (the Revised Version (British and American) "strolling") Jews, exorcists" (^{⟨4493⟩}Acts 19:13; compare ^{⟨2119⟩}Luke 11:19); also the magicians of Moses' day, named Jannes and Jambres (^{⟨5008⟩}2 Timothy 3:8).

All these forms of enchantment claimed access through supernatural insight or aid, to the will of the gods and the secrets of the spirit world. In turning away faith and expectation from the living God, they struck a deadly blow at the heart of true religion. From the enchanters of the ancient Orient to the medicine-men of today, all exponents of the "black art" exercise a cruel tyranny over the benighted people, and multitudes of innocent victims perish in body and soul under their subtle impostures. In no respect is the exalted nature of the Hebrew and Christian faiths more clearly seen than in their power to emancipate the human mind and spirit from the mental and moral darkness, the superstition and fear, and the darkening effect of these

occult and deadly articles For more detailed study *see DIVINATION; ASTROLOGY*.

Dwight M. Pratt

END

([6qe*qets*], [spa, *'ephec*], [hl K; *kalah*]; [τέλος, *telos*], [συντελέω, *sunteleo*]): The end of anything is its termination, hence, also, final object or purpose. It is the translation of several Hebrew and Greek words, chiefly in the Old Testament of *qets* (properly, "a cutting off") and other words from the same root (Genesis 6:13, "The end of all flesh is come before me"); *'acharith*, "hinder part," is also frequently translated "end" (Deuteronomy 11:12; Psalm 37:37,38, American Revised Version: "There is a happy end to the man of peace .... The end of the wicked shall be cut off"; the English Revised Version "latter end" (Psalm 37:37), margin "reward" or "future posterity"; Psalm 73:17; Jeremiah 5:31); *coph* (from *cuph* "to come to an end") is several times translated "end" (2 Chronicles 20:16; Ecclesiastes 3:11; 7:2). "End" in the sense of purpose is the translation of *lema`an*, "to the intent" (Exodus 8:22, "to the end thou mayest know"), and of *dibhrah* (from *dabhar*, "to speak"); Ecclesiastes 7:14 "to the end that man should find nothing after him" (the Revised Version (British and American) "should not find out anything (that shall be) after him"). "Ends of the earth" is the translation of *'ephec*, "extremities" (Deuteronomy 33:17; Psalm 22:27), also of *kanaph*, "wing" (Job 37:3; 38:13). Other words are *netsah*, "utmost" (Job 34:36), *tequphah*, "circuit," "revolution" (Exodus 34:22; 2 Chronicles 24:23, the Revised Version, margin "revolution"), etc. The verb occurs almost invariably in the phrase "to make an end," as the translation of *kalah*, "to finish," "complete" (Genesis 17:30; Deuteronomy 20:9; Jeremiah 26:8, etc.); also of *nalah*, "to complete" (Isaiah 33:1), and shalam, "to finish" (Isaiah 38:12,13).

In Daniel 9:24, the Iteb text has [μt" j; *chatham*], "to seal up" ("to complete or finish"), but the margin, followed by the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American), Driver and most moderns, has [μtḥ; *hathem*], "to finish," "end," "complete," a difference of one letter, but practically none in the sense, "to bring to an end"; compare "to finish the transgression," which precedes.

In the New Testament the common word for "end" is *telos* "an end," "completion," "termination" (Matthew 10:22; 24:6; John 13:1, the

Revised Version, margin "to the uttermost"; ⁴⁵⁰⁶²¹Romans 6:21, "The end of those things is death"; 6:22, "the end eternal life; 10:4, Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness"; ⁶²⁰⁶Revelation 21:6; 22:13, etc.); *ekbasis*, "outgoing" (⁵⁸³⁰⁷Hebrews 13:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "issue"); *sunteleia*, "full end," is used of "the end of the world" (⁴⁰¹³⁹Matthew 13:39; ⁵⁸⁰⁹²⁶Hebrews 9:26); *peras*, "extremity," "the ends of the world" (⁴⁵⁰¹⁸Romans 10:18); *akros*, "a point, end" (⁴¹²⁶³Matthew 24:31, "from one end of heaven to the other"). End as purpose is the translation of *eis* to, "with a view to" (⁴⁴⁰⁷¹⁹Acts 7:19; ⁴⁵⁰¹¹Romans 1:11; 4:16; ⁵²⁸¹³1 Thessalonians 3:13); of *eis touto*, "unto this" (⁴³¹⁸³⁷John 18:37; ⁴⁵¹⁴⁹Romans 14:9; ⁴⁷⁰¹⁹2 Corinthians 2:9); of *pros* to, "toward this" (⁴²³⁸⁰Luke 18:1). "To end" (verb) is *pleroo*, "to fill up" (⁴²⁰⁷⁰¹Luke 7:1; ⁴⁴¹⁹²¹Acts 19:21); once ginomai, "to become" (⁴³¹³⁰²John 13:2, "supper being ended," which the Revised Version (British and American) corrects, giving, "during supper"). For "end" the Revised Version (British and American) has "uttermost part" (⁰⁶⁵⁰⁸Joshua 15:8, etc.), "latter end" (⁴⁹⁷³¹⁷Psalm 73:17; the English Revised Version ⁴⁹⁷³⁸Psalm 37:38; ²⁰⁵⁰⁴Proverbs 5:4); "issue" (²⁷¹²⁰⁸Daniel 12:8, margin "latter end"; ⁵⁸³⁰⁷Hebrews 13:7); "side" (²⁶⁴¹²Ezekiel 41:12). Conversely, it has "end" for "uttermost part" (⁰⁶⁵⁰⁵Joshua 15:5); for "side" (⁰⁵⁰⁴²Deuteronomy 4:32); for "conclusion" (²¹¹²¹³Ecclesiastes 12:13); for "an end" (²⁰²³¹⁸Proverbs 23:18); "a reward," margin "sequel" or "future," Hebrew "latter end"; "final" (⁵⁸⁰⁶¹⁶Hebrews 6:16); for "an end of" (¹⁸¹⁸⁰²Job 18:2), "snares for" (the American Standard Revised Version "hunt for"); for "at one end" (²⁴⁵¹³¹Jeremiah 51:31), "on every quarter"; for "until the day and night come to an end" (¹⁸²⁶¹⁰Job 26:10), "unto the confines of light and darkness"; for "have an end" (⁴²²³⁷Luke 22:37), "hath fulfillment," margin, Greek "end"; for "to the end for" (⁶⁰⁰¹¹³1 Peter 1:13), "perfectly on"; "at the end of" for "in these last days" (⁵⁸⁰¹⁰²Hebrews 1:2); "His end was nigh" for "He died" (⁵⁸¹¹²²Hebrews 11:22); "its own end," instead of "for himself" (²⁰¹⁶⁰⁴Proverbs 16:4, margin "his own purpose"); "neither is there any end to" instead of "for thine iniquities are infinite" (¹⁸²²⁰⁵Job 22:5); "to this end" for "therefore" (⁴⁰⁰¹³⁸Mark 1:38; ⁵⁴⁰⁴⁰1 Timothy 4:10); for "for this cause," "to this end" (⁴³¹⁸³⁷John 18:37 twice), "unto this end" (⁶⁰⁰⁴⁶1 Peter 4:6); "to this end" for "for this purpose" (⁴⁴²⁵¹⁶Acts 26:16; ⁶²⁰³⁰⁸1 John 3:8); "to which end" for "wherefore" (⁵³⁰¹¹¹2 Thessalonians 1:11); "to the end" is inserted in ⁰¹⁸¹⁹Genesis 18:19 bis, and several other passages. For "ends of the earth" *see ASTRONOMY*, III, 2.

W. L. Walker

END OF THE WORLD

See ESCHATOLOGY; WORLD, END OF THE.

ENDAMAGE

<en-dam'-aj>: Archaic for "damage"; [15013]Ezra 4:13 the King James Version: "Thou shalt damage the revenue of the kings," the Revised Version (British and American) "It will be hurtful unto the kings" (Aramaic [nezaq]); compare 1 Esdras 6:33.

ENDEAVOR

<en-de'-ver>: The sense of this word has suffered weakening since the time of the King James Version. Then it implied utmost exertion and success; now rather forlorn hope and possible failure. Thus the Revised Version (British and American) reads "giving diligence," "give diligence," for the King James Version "endeavoring," "endeavor," in [49013]Ephesians 4:3; [61015]2 Peter 1:15, respectively; but "endeavored" is suffered to remain in [52017]1 Thessalonians 2:17 ([σπουδάζω, *spoudazo*], "hasten," "exert oneself"). Compare also [44160]Acts 16:10, the King James Version "endeavored," the Revised Version (British and American) "sought" (Greek *zeteo*, "seek").

ENDIRONS

<end'-i-urnz> ([μγῑ″ ρ″ ∨] *shephattayim*]): Used once ([26013]Ezekiel 40:43 the King James Version) in the margin only. In text, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "hooks," denoting stalls or places for the fastening of victims for sacrifice, or perhaps the two hearthstones. The term is a corruption from another word similar in form and identity of usage. This word, "andiron," from Middle English, has assumed many peculiar forms, as "anderne," "aundirne," from which the form is doubtless derived, though this is not the original and has no relation to it. the American Revised Version, margin reads, "According to Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and Syriac, *ledges*."

ENDLESS

<end'-les> ([ἀκατάλυτος, *akatalutos*] ([58016]Hebrews 7:16], [ἀπέραντος, *aperantos*] ([54014]1 Timothy 1:4)): This English word occurs twice in the New Testament, and is there represented by the two Greek words above

noted.

(1) In ⁵⁰⁷⁶Hebrews 7:16 Jesus is said to be a priest "after the power of an endless life." The word means literally, as in the Revised Version, margin, "indissoluble." It is not simply that Christ's priesthood was eternal. The priesthood was based upon His possession, by nature, of a life which in time and eternity death could not touch. This distinguished Him essentially from priests under the law.

(2) In ⁵⁴⁰⁴1 Timothy 1:4, Paul warns Timothy against giving heed in his ministry to "fables (*muthoi*) and endless (limitless) genealogies." The allusion seems to be to the series of emanations (aeons) in Gnostic speculation, to which no limit could be set.

Distinct from the above are the words denoting "everlasting," "eternal," which see.

James Orr

EN-DOR

<en'-dor> [רֹדּﬣﬠ *ʿen dor*], ⁰⁶¹⁷¹Joshua 17:11; [רﬢﬠ ﬠﬠ *ʿen dor*], ⁰²⁸⁰⁷1 Samuel 28:7; [ראﬢ ﬠﬠ *ʿen do'r*], ¹⁹⁸¹⁰Psalm 83:10; Codex Alexandrinus, [Νηνδώρ, *Nendor*]; Codex Vaticanus, [Ἀελδώρ, *Aeldor*]): A town in the lot of Issachar assigned to Manasseh (⁰⁶¹⁷¹Joshua 17:11). Here dwelt the woman who had a familiar spirit, whom Saul consulted on the night before the battle of Gilboa (⁰²⁸⁰⁷1 Samuel 28:7). Here also, according to ¹⁹⁸¹⁰Psalm 83:10, perished fugitives of Sisera's army, after their defeat at the Kishon. The place was therefore not far from the Kishon and Tabor. It is generally identified with the modern Endur, a small village on the northern slope of Jebel ed-Duchy, with several ancient caves. It is not far from Nain and Shunem, and looks across the valley along which the broken ranks of Sisera may have attempted to make their way eastward to the open uplands, and thence to their native North. Coming hither from Gilboa, eluding the Philistine outposts under cover of the darkness, Saul would cross the Vale of Jezreel, and pass round the eastern base of the mountain, the Philistines being on the west.

W. Ewing

EN-DOR, WITCH OF

<wich>: In ⁰²⁸⁰⁸1 Samuel 28:3-25, it is narrated how Saul, in despair of mind because Yahweh had forsaken him, on the eve of the fatal battle of

Gilboa, resorted in disguise to "a woman that had a familiar spirit" (*'obh*: *see DIVINATION; NECROMANCY*), at En-dor, and besought the woman to divine for him, and bring him up from the dead whom he should name. On the woman reminding him how Saul had cut off from the land those who practiced these arts — a proof of the existence and operation of the laws against divination, witchcraft, necromancy, etc. (Leviticus 19:31; Deuteronomy 18:9-14) — the king assured her of immunity, and bade her call up Samuel. The incidents that followed have been the subject of much discussion and of varied interpretation. It seems assumed in the narrative that the woman did see an appearance, which the king, on her describing it, recognized to bethat of Samuel. This, however, need be only the narrator's interpretation of the events. It is not to be credited that the saintly Samuel was actually summoned from his rest by the spells of a professional diviner. Some have thought that Samuel, by God's permission, did indeed appear, as much to the woman's dismay as to the king's; and urge in favor of this the woman's evident surprise and terror at his appearance (1 Samuel 28:12 ff), and the true prophecy of Saul's fate (1 Samuel 28:16-19). It may conceivably have been so, but the more reasonable view is that the whole transaction was a piece of feigning on the part of the woman. The Septuagint uses the word eggastrimuthos ("a ventriloquist") to describe the woman and those who exercised kindred arts (1 Samuel 28:9). Though pretending ignorance (1 Samuel 28:12), the woman doubtless recognizes Saul from the first. It was she who saw Samuel, and reported his words; the king himself saw and heard nothing. It required no great skill in a practiced diviner to forecast the general issue of the battle about to take place, and the disaster that would overtake Saul and his sons; while if the forecast had proved untrue, the narrative of the witch of En-dor would never have been written. Saul, in fact, was not slain, but killed himself. The incident, therefore, may best be ranked in the same category as the feats of modern mediumship.

James Orr

ENDOW; ENDUE

<en-dou'>, *<en-du'>*: "Endow" meant originally "to provide with a dowry"; "indue" took the meaning "clothe"; the likeness between the literal meanings has confused the metaphorical use of the words in spite of their difference in origin. Thus we find in Genesis 30:20, the King James Version "endued me with a good dowry" the Revised Version (British and American) "endowed" ([db" z; *zabhadh*], "bestow upon," "endow");

⁰²²¹⁶Exodus 22:16, the King James Version "endow her to be his wife" the Revised Version (British and American) "pay a dowry for her" [rh″ m; *mahar*], "purchase" "endow"); compare ⁰⁵²²⁹Deuteronomy 22:29; ¹⁴²¹²2 Chronicles 2:12,13, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "endued" with understanding (from [[d″ y; *yadha`*], "know"); and ⁴²⁴⁴⁹Luke 24:49, the King James Version "endued with power," the Revised Version (British and American) "clothed" ([ἐνδύω, *enduo*], "clothe").

F. K. Farr

ENDS OF THE EARTH

See ASTRONOMY, III, 2.

ENDURE

<en-dur'>: Used in the Bible

(1) in the sense of "continue," "last," as in ¹⁹⁰⁰⁷Psalm 9:7, "The Lord shall endure for ever" (the American Standard Revised Version "Yahweh sitteth as king forever"); 30:5, "Weeping may endure for a night" (the Revised Version (British and American) "tarry" margin "may come in to lodge at even"); ⁴³⁰²⁷John 6:27, "the meat which endureth," the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the food which abideth";

(2) in the sense of "bear" (⁵⁸¹²⁰Hebrews 12:20): "bear up under," hardship, persecution, etc. (⁵⁵³¹¹2 Timothy 3:11; ⁶⁰²¹⁹1 Peter 2:19); "to remain under" (⁵⁸⁰³²Hebrews 10:32; 12:2; ⁵⁹⁰¹²James 1:12; 5:11); "to be strong, firm" (⁵⁸¹²⁷Hebrews 11:27); "to persevere" beneath a heavy burden (⁴⁰⁰²²Matthew 10:22).

EN-EGLAIM

<en-eg'-la-im>, <en-eg-la'-im> ([μyl ″ gI ˌ^y[e `*en `eghlayim*], "fountain of calves"?): In Ezekiel's vision of the waters it is one of the two points between which "fishers shall stand" (²⁶⁴⁷⁰Ezekiel 47:10). The situation must be near the entrance of the Jordan into the Dead Sea (*see EN-GEDI*). Tristram (Bible Places, 93) identifies it with `Ain Hajlah (compare *BETH-HOGLAH*); Robinson (BRP, II, 489), with `Ain Feshkah.

ENEMESSAR

<en-e-mes'-ar> ([Ἐνεμεσσάρ, *Enemessar*], [Ἐνεμέσσαρος, *Enemessaros*]): Generally allowed, since Grotius, to be a corruption, though occasionally defended as an alternative form, of Shalmaneser (Tobit 1:2,15, etc.) who carried Israel captive to Nineveh, as related in 2 Ki. Among the captives was Tobit, taken from Thisbe in Gilead, where the prophet Elijah was born and for a time lived. The writer of Tobit makes Sennacherib the son (1 15), as well as the successor of Enemessar, whereas, according to the Assyrian inscriptions, Sennacherib was the son of Sargon. This is only one of several serious historical difficulties in the narrative of Tobit. The corruption of the name is variously explained. Rawlinson supposes the first syllable of the word "Shal" to have been dropped, comparing the Bupalussor of Abydenus for Nabopolassar. Dr. Pinches takes Enemessar for Senemessar, the "sh" being changed to "s" and then to the smooth breathing, though the rough breathing more commonly takes the place of a dropped "s"; both scholars admit the easy transposition of the liquids "m" and "n". Shalman-asharid is the Assyrian form of Shalmaneser.

J. Hutchison

ENEMY

<en'-e-mi> ([byap‘*oyebh*], [rx″ , *tsar*], [rx; *tsar*]; [ἐχθρός, *echthros*]): "Enemy," "enemies," are frequent words in the Old Testament. The Hebrew word most often so translated is *‘oyebh*, meaning perhaps literally, "one who hates"; very frequent in the Psalms, e.g. 3:7; 6:10; 7:5; 8:2; 9:3,1; 13:2, where the cry is often for deliverance from enemies. Another word for "enemy," found chiefly in the poetical books, is *tsar*, or *tsar*, "distresser," "straitener" (Numbers 10:9; Job 16:9; Psalm 27:2,12, the Revised Version (British and American) "adversary," etc.); also *tsarar* (Est 3:10; Psalm 8:2; 10:5 the King James Version, etc.). Other words are `*ar*, "one awake" (1 Samuel 28:16 the King James Version; Daniel 4:19 the King James Version); *sane'*, perhaps, "to be sharp or bite" (Exodus 1:10; Proverbs 25:21; 27:6); *sharar*, "to watch" (Psalm 5:8; 27:11), and *qum*, "to stand up," or "withstand" (Exodus 32:25).
In the New Testament *echthros*, "enemy," "opponent," is the only word translated "enemy" (Matthew 5:43,14; Mark 12:36; Luke

1:71,74, etc.; ⁴⁵⁰⁵¹⁰Romans 5:10; 11:28, etc.), once with *anthropos* ("a man"), joined to *echthros* (⁴⁰¹³²⁸Matthew 13:28).

In the Revised Version (British and American) "adversary" is frequently substituted for "enemy" (⁰⁴²⁰⁸Numbers 24:8; ⁰⁵³²⁴Deuteronomy 32:41; ¹⁹⁰⁶⁰⁷Psalm 6:7; 7:6; 44:10, etc.); for "O thou enemy," etc. (¹⁹⁰⁹⁰⁶Psalm 9:6) we have "The enemy are come to an end"; instead of "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him" (²³⁵⁹¹⁹Isaiah 59:19) we have "For he will come as a rushing stream, which the breath of Yahweh driveth" (with the text of the King James Version in margins); for "The fire of thine enemies shall devour them" (²³²⁶¹¹Isaiah 26:11), "Fire shall devour thine adversaries" (text of the King James Version in the margin).
The frequent reference to enemies in the Old Testament is what we should expect to see in these early times on the part of a people settling in a land that had been occupied by other tribes, worshipping other gods. The spirit of their law was that expressed by our Lord in His Sermon on the Mount, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy." This He changed: "but I say unto you, Love your enemies." An approach toward this spirit had been made in the later prophets by their inclusion of the whole world under one God, who had a gracious purpose toward all, but the near statement of it we only find in ²⁰²⁵²¹Proverbs 25:21 (quoted by Paul, ⁴⁵¹²²⁰Romans 12:20). See also ⁰²²⁰⁴Exodus 23:4, and compare ¹²⁰⁶²2 Kings 6:22; ¹⁴²⁸¹⁵2 Chronicles 28:15.

W. L. Walker

ENENEUS

<e-ne'-ne-us>, <en-e-ne-us> ([Ἐνήνιος, *Enenios*]; the King James Version Enenius, the Revised Version, margin "Enenis"): Occurring only in Apocrypha. According to 1 Esdras 5:8, Eneneus was one of the 12 leaders over the returning exiles from Babylon under Zerubbabel. Ezra 2 contains the parallel list of the returning leaders but omits Eneneus, giving only 11; but Eneneus corresponds to Nahamani (¹⁶⁰⁷⁰⁷Nehemiah 7:7).

ENFLAME

See INFLAME.

EN-GADDI

<en-gad'-i> (Sirach 24:14 the Revised Version (British and American), "on the sea shore").

See *EN-GEDI.*

ENGAGE

<en-gaj'>: From [br" [; `arabh], "to pledge," <2421>Jeremiah 30:21, the King James Version "Who is this that engaged his heart?"; the Revised Version (British and American) "he that hath had boldness?"; the Revised Version, margin Hebrew "hath been surety for his heart?"

EN-GANNIM

<en-gan'-im> ([µyNG" ˆy[e`*en gannim*], "spring of gardens"):

(1) A town in the territory of Judah, named with Zanoah and Eshtaol (<06154>Joshua 15:34). It is probably identical with the modern Umm Jina, South of *Wady ec-Carar*, not far from Zanoah (Zanu`a).

(2) A town in the lot of Isaachat (<06921>Joshua 19:21), assigned to the Gershonite Levites (21:29). In <13673>1 Chronicles 6:73 it is replaced by Anem. It probably corresponds to the Ginnea of Josephus (Ant., XX, vi, 1; BJ, III, iii, 4), and may certainly be identified with the modern Jenin, a prosperous village on the southern edge of the plain of Esdraelon, with beautiful gardens, fruitful orchards and plentiful supplies of water from the local springs.

W. Ewing

EN-GEDI

<en'-ge-di>, <en-ge'-di> ([ydG, ˆy[e`*en gedhi*], "fountain of the kid"): Identical with the present Ain Jidi. According to <14002>2 Chronicles 20:2 it is the same as Hazazon-tamar, mentioned in <01407>Genesis 14:7 as occupied by the Amorites and as having been attacked by Chedorlaomer after leaving Kadesh and El Paran on his way to the Vale of Siddim. The place is situated upon the West shore of the Dead Sea about midway between the North and the South ends, and was included in the territory of Judah (<06552>Joshua 15:62). The spot is rendered attractive by the verdure clothing it by reason of immense fountains of warm water, 80 degrees F., which

pour out from beneath the limestone cliffs. In the time of Solomon (Song 1:14) palms and vines were cultivated here. Josephus also mentions its beautiful palm groves. In the time of Eusebius it was still a place of importance, but since the Middle Ages it has been almost deserted, being occupied now only by a few Arabs. The oasis occupies a small area a few hundred feet above the Dead Sea marked by the 650 ft. sedimentary terrace heretofore described (*see DEAD SEA*). The limestone borders rise so abruptly to a height of 2,000 ft. immediately on the West, that the place can be approached only by a rock-cut path. Two streams, Wady Sugeir and Wady el-Areyeh, descend on either side through precipitous rocky gorges from the uninhabitable wilderness separating it from Bethlehem and Hebron. It was in the caves opening out from the sides of these gorges that David took refuge from Saul ([09240]1 Samuel 24:1). During the reign of Jehoshaphat ([44002]2 Chronicles 20:2), the children of Ammon, Moab and Mt. Seir attempted to invade Judah by way of En-gedi, but were easily defeated as they came up from the gorges to occupy the advantageous field of battle chosen by Jehoshaphat.

George Frederick Wright

ENGINE

<en'-jin> ([42615]2 Chronicles 26:15; [25609]Ezekiel 26:9; 1 Macc 6:51; 13:43 f).
See *SIEGE.*

ENGLISH VERSIONS

<in'-glish> <vur'-shunz>:

ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES.

1. Introductory:

The battle for vernacular Scripture, the right of a nation to have the sacred writings in its own tongue, was fought and won in England. Ancient VSS, such as the Syriac and the Gothic, were produced to meet obvious requirements of the teacher or the missionary, and met with no opposition from any quarter. The same was the case with the efforts of the Anglo-Saxon church to provide portions of Scripture for the use of the people. Even in later times the Latin church seems to have followed no consistent policy in permitting or forbidding the translation of the Scriptures. In one country the practice was forbidden, in another it was regarded with

forbearance or permitted under authority (Addis and Arnold, Catholic Dictionary, London, 1884, article "Bible"); and so it came about that the different nations of Europe came by the inestimable boon of an open Bible in different ways. Germany, for example, after the attempts of numerous translators who seem to have been quite untrammeled in their work owed, under Providence, to the faith, the intrepidity and the genius of Luther the national version which satisfied it for more than three centuries, and, after a recent and essentially conservative revision, satisfies it still. In England, as related below, things took a different course. In the Reformation period the struggle turned mainly on the question of the translation of the Bible.

2. The Bible in Anglo-Saxon and Norman Times:

The clergy and learned men had always of course access to the Scriptures in the Vulgate, a translation of the original Scriptures into Latin completed by Jerome at the very beginning of the 5th century; and from this version — the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) — practically all further translations were made till the days of Luther. Within a century or little more after the landing of Augustine in England and his settlement at Canterbury (597 AD) Caedmon, a monk of Whitby, produced (670) his metrical version of the Bible, hardly indeed to be reckoned a version of the Scriptures in the ordinary sense, though it paved the way for such. Bede of Jarrow (672-735) translated the Creed and the Lord's Prayer and, according to the beautiful letter of his pupil, Cuthbert, breathed his last on the completion of his translation of the Gospel of John into the language of the people. Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne in the county of Dorset (died 709), translated the Psalter in another translation with which the name of King Alfred is associated; and the other efforts of that ruler to spread the knowledge of the Scriptures among his people are well known. Notice, too, should be taken of the glosses. "The gloss," says Eadie (English Bible, I, 14, note), "was neither a free nor yet a literal translation, but the interlinear insertion of the vernacular, word against word of the original, so that the order of the former was really irrespective of idiom and usage." The finest example of these is seen in the Lindisfarne Gospels, which were written in Latin about the year 700, and provided with an interlinear translation about 950 by Aldred, the priest. These with a version of a considerable section of the Old Testament by Aelfric, archbishop of Canterbury about the year 990, comprise the main efforts at Bible translation into English before the Norman Conquest. In Anglo-Saxon there is no proof of the existence of any translation of the complete Bible,

or even of the complete New Testament. The sectional VSS, moreover, cannot be shown to have had any influence upon succeeding versions. For nearly three centuries after the Conquest the inter-relations of the different sections of the people and the conditions of the language prevented any real literary progress. The period, however, was marked by the appearance of fragmentary translations of Scripture into Norman French. From some Augustinian monastery, too, in the north of the East Midland district of England, about the year 1200, appeared the Ormulum, a curious metrical work of some 20,000 lines, consisting of a paraphrase of the Gospel of the day and an explanatory homily for 32 days of the year. Like the work of Caedmon the monk, it was not exactly Bible translation, but it doubtless prepared the way for such. Three versions of the Psalter, naturally always a favorite portion of Scripture with the translator, are assigned to the first half of Wycliffe's century. The reformer himself in one of his tracts urges a translation of the Bible to suit the humbler classes of society, on the plea that the upper classes already have their version in French. It was only in the long and splendid reign of Edward III (1327-77), when the two races that had existed in the country since the Conquest were perfectly united, that the predominance of English asserted itself, and the growth of the power and of the mental activity of the people instinctively demanded a new form of expression. The century of Wycliffe, it is to be remembered, was also that of Langland, Gower and Chaucer.

3. John Wycliffe:

Born in Yorkshire about the year 1320, Wycliffe was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, of which he soon became a Fellow and was for a short time Master, resigning the latter position in the year 1361 on his presentation to a living in Lincolnshire. He died at Lutterworth in Leicestcrshire in 1384. It was during the last quarter of his life that he came forward as a friend of the people and as a prolific writer on their behalf. Notwithstanding the external glory of the reign of Edward III, there was much in the ecclesiastical and social circumstances of the time to justify popular discontent. The Pope derived from England alone a revenue larger than that of any prince in Christendom. The nobles resented the extortion and pretensions of the higher clergy; and, according to Green, "the enthusiasm of the Friars, who in the preceding century had preached in praise of poverty, had utterly died away and left a crowd of impudent mendicants behind it." The Black Death, "the most terrible plague the world ever witnessed," fell in the middle of the century and did much

further to embitter the already bitter condition of the poor. In France things were no better than in England, and the Turk had settled permanently in Europe. It is not wonderful that Wycliffe began, as is said, his version of the New Testament with the Book of Revelation. With his social teaching the present article is not specially concerned. It probably involved no more than the inculcation of the inherently democratic and leveling doctrines of Christianity, though some of the Lollards, like the Munster peasants in the German Reformation, associated it with dangerous socialistic practice. In any case the application of Christianity to the solution of social problems is not in any age easy to effect in practice. His tracts show (Eadie, I, 59 ff) that it was from what Wycliffe had felt the Bible to be to himself that there sprang his strong desire to make the reading of it possible for his countrymen. To this was due the first English version of the Bible. To this also was likewise due the institution of the order of "poor priests" to spread the knowledge of the Bible as widely as possible throughout the country.

4. How Far Was the 14th-Century Version Wycliffe's Work?:

There is some uncertainty as to the exact share which Wycliffe had in the production of the 14th century version. The translation of the New Testament was finished about the year 1380 and in 1382 the translation of the entire Bible was completed, the greater part of the Old Testament being the work of Nicholas Hereford, one of the reformer's most ardent supporters at Oxford. The work was revised on thoroughly sound principles of criticism and interpretation, as these are explained in the prologue to the new edition, by John Purvey, one of Wycliffe's most intimate friends during the latter part of his life, and finished in 1388. "Other scholars," says Mr. F. G. Kenyon, of the British Museum, "assisted him in his work, and we have no certain means of knowing how much of the translation was actually done by himself. The New Testament is attributed to him, but we cannot say with certainty that it was entirely his own work" (Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 200, 3rd edition, London, 1898). This entirely corresponds with the position taken up by Forshall and Madden, the editors of the great Oxford edition of Wycliffe's version issued in 4 large quarto volumes in 1850. That work was undertaken to honor Wycliffe and in some measure to repay England's indebtedness to the reformer. The editors were men of the first literary rank; they spent 22 years upon this work; and it is recognized as a credit at once to the scholarship and research of Oxford and of England. Its honest

and straightforward Introduction answers by anticipation by far the greater part of the criticisms and claims put forth by Dr. Gasquet (Our Old English Bible and Other Essays, London, 1898; 2nd edition, 1908). The claim is made that the work published in Oxford in 1850 is really not Wycliffe's at all but that of his bitterest opponents, the bishops of the English church who represented the party of Rome. Gasquet's work on this subject is mainly worthy of notice on account of his meritorious research in other departments of the English Reformation. His arguments and statements are met by Kenyon (op. cit., 204-8). The controversy is further noticed in The Age of Wycliffe, by G. M. Trevelyan (2nd edition, London, 1908), a work which cannot be too highly praised for its deep research, its interesting exposition and its cordial appreciation of the reformer and his works. "Nothing," says Trevelyan (Appendix, 361), "can be more damning than the licenses to particular people to have English Bibles, for they distinctly show that without such licenses it was thought wrong to have them." The age of printing, it is to be remembered, was not yet.

The Wycliffe Bible was issued and circulated in copies each of which was written by the hand. About 170 copies of this manuscript Bible are still in existence. They form a striking proof of what England and the world owe to the faith, the courage and the labor of John Wycliffe and his "poor priests."

5. From Wycliffe to Tyndale:

It is a remarkable fact that before the year 1500 most of the countries of Europe had been supplied with a version of the Scriptures printed in the vernacular tongue, while England had nothing but the scattered copies of the Wycliffe manuscript version. Even Caxton, eager as was his search for works to translate and to print, while he supplied priests with service-books, preachers with sermons, and the clerk with the "Golden Legende," left the Scriptures severely alone. Nor was there a printed English version, even of the New Testament, for close on half a century after Caxton's death, a circumstance largely due to the energy of the Tudor dictatorship and the severity of the Arundelian Constitutions enacted by Convocation at Oxford in the year 1408:against Wycliffe and his work. These enactments forbade "upon pain of the greater excommunication the unauthorized translation of any text of the Scriptures into English or any other tongue by way of a book, pamphlet, treatise or the reading of such." Meanwhile the study of the new learning, including that of the original languages of

Scripture, though generally resisted by the clergy, was greatly promoted by the invention of printing.

6. William Tyndale:

Erasmus, perhaps the chief representative name of the new age in the domain of learning, was professor of Greek at Cambridge from 1509 to 1524, and in the 2nd year of his professorship William Tyndale, an Oxford student in the 26th year of his age, migrated to Cambridge to study Greek. Ten years later Tyndale returned to his native county — Gloucestershire — to take up a private tutorship and there formed the determination which became the one fixed aim of his life — to put an English translation, not of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) but of the original Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, into the hands of his countrymen. "If God spared him life," he said, "ere many years he would cause a boy that driveth a plow to know more of the Scriptures than the Pope did." Erasmus at Cambridge had uttered a similar aspiration. "He boldly avows his wish for a Bible open and intelligible to all. .... `I long for the day when the husbandman shall sing to himself portions of the Scriptures as he follows the plow, when the weaver shall hum them to the time of his shuttle, when thetraveler shall while away with their stories the weariness of his journey'" (Green, History of the English People, 1st edition, 308). In 1522 Tyndale went to London to try to find a patron for his work in Tunstall, bishop of London, who had studied Greek with Latimer at Padua and was one of the most noted humanists of the day. To show himself capable for the work, Tyndale took with him to London a version of a speech of Isocrates. But the Bishop of London's service was full; and after spending a year with a friendly alderman in London, "at last," he says in the Preface to his Five Books of Moses, "I understood not only that there was no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England." He left the country and never returned to it. He spent the remaining twelve years of his life in exile and for the most part in great hardship, sustained by steady labor and by the one hope of his life — the giving to his countrymen of a reliable version of the Holy Scriptures in their own tongue. He went first to Hamburg, and there, as it seems, issued in the year 1524 versions of Matthew and Mark separately, with marginal notes. Next year he removed to Cologne, and arranged for the printing of the complete New Testament, the translation of which he accomplished alone, from the study of the Greek text of Erasmus in its original and revised editions and by a comparison of these with the

Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and several European vernacular versions which, as already stated, had anticipated that of England. The story of the interruption by Cochlaeus of the actual work of printing, and of his warning the King and Wolsey of the impending invasion of England by Lutheranism, reads like a romance. His interference resulted in the prohibition by the city authorities of the printing of the work and in the sudden flight of Tyndale and his assistant, Joye, who sailed up the Rhine with the precious sheets already printed of their 3,000 quarto edition to Worms, the city of the famous Diet in which Luther four years before had borne his testimony before the Emperor. The place was now Lutheran, and here the work of printing could be carried out in security and at leisure. To baffle his enemies, as it seems, a small octavo edition was first printed without glosses; then the quarto edition was completed. The "pernicious literature" of both editions, without name of the translator, was shipped to England early in 1526; and by 1530 six editions of the New Testament in English (three surreptitiously) were distributed, numbering, it is computed, 15,000 copies. The unfavorable reception of Tyndale's work by the King and the church authorities may in some measure be accounted for by the excesses which at the moment were associated with the Reformation in Germany, and by the memories of Lollardism in connection with the work of Wycliffe. So vehement was the opposition at any rate to Tyndale's work, and so determined the zeal in buying up and burning the book, that of the six editions above mentioned there "remains of the first edition one fragment only; .... of the second one copy, wanting the title-page, and another very imperfect; and of the others, two or three copies which are not however satisfactorily identified" (Westcott, History of the English Bible, 45, London, 1868). Meanwhile Tyndale took to working on the Old Testament. Much discussion has taken place on the question whether he knew Hebrew (see Eadie, I, 209 ff). Tyndale's own distinct avowal is that it was from the Hebrew direct that such translation of the Old Testament as he accomplished was made. Very early in 1531 he published separately versions of Genesis and Deuteronomy, and in the following year the whole of the Pentateuch in one volume, with a preface and marginal glosses. In 1534 appeared the Book of Jon, with a prologue; and in the same year a new version of the New Testament to counteract one made by Joye from the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) This has been described by Westcott (op. cit., 185) as "altogether Tyndale's noblest monument," mainly on account of its short and pregnant glosses. "Bengel himself is not more terse or pointed." A beautifully

illuminated copy of this edition was struck off on vellum and presented to Queen Anne Boleyn; and an edition of his revised New Testament was printed in London — "The first volume of Holy Scripture printed in England" — in 1536, the year of the Queen's death. Tyndale had for some time lived at Antwerp, enjoying a "considerable yearly exhibition" from the English merchants there; but his enemies in England were numerous, powerful and watchful. In 1534 he was betrayed and arrested; and after an imprisonment of nearly a year and a half at the castle of Vilorde, about 18:miles from Brussels, he was strangled and then burned in 1536, the same year as that of the death of the Queen. The last days of the hero and martyr may have been cheered by the news of the printing of his revised edition of the New Testament in England.

7. Miles Coverdale:

Miles Coverdale, who first gave England a complete and authorized version of the Bible, was a younger contemporary of Tyndale. Tyndale was a year younger than Luther, who was born in 1483, and Coverdale was four years younger than Tyndale. Born in the North Riding of Yorkshire, he found his way to Cambridge at the time when Erasmus was professor of Greek, and appears at an early date — how is not known — to have got into the good graces of Crumwell, the "malleus monachorum," factotum and secretary to Wolsey, and later on the King's principal abettor in his efforts to render the Church of England thoroughly national, if not to an equal extent Protestant. Adopting the liberal party in the church, he held Lutheran or evangelical views of religion, east off his monastic habit, and, as Bale says, gave himself up wholly to the preaching of the gospel. He is found in 1527 in intimate connection with More and Crumwell and probably from them he received encouragement to proceed with a translation of the Bible. In 1528 he was blamed before Tunstall, bishop of London, as having caused some to desert the mass, the confessional and the worship of images; and seeking safety, he left England for the Continent. He is said by Foxe to have met Tyndale at Hamburg in 1529, and to have given him some help in the translation of the Pentateuch. An uncertainty hangs over Coverdale's movements from 1529 to 1535, a period during which much was happening that could not fail to be powerfully changing opinion in England. The result of the Assembly held at Westminster by Warham in May, 1530, and of the Convocation held under his successor, Cranmer, in December, 1534, was that in the latter it was petitioned that "his Majesty would vouchsafe to decree that the sacred

Scriptures should be translated into the English tongue by certain honest and learned men, named for that purpose by his Majesty, and should be delivered to the people according to their learning." Crumwell, meanwhile, who had a shrewd forecast of the trend of affairs, seems to have arranged with Coverdale for the printing of his translation. However this may be, by the year 1534 "he was ready, as he was desired, to set forth" (i.e. to print) his translation; and the work was finished in 1535. And thus, "as the harvest springs from the seed which germinates in darkness, so the entire English Bible, translated no one knows where, presented itself, unheralded and unanticipated, at once to national notice in 1535" (Eadie, I, 266). It is declared on the title-page to be "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe: MDXXXV." Coverdale's own statements about his work leave the impression that he was a conspicuously honest man. Unlike Tyndale who regarded himself as, in a way, a prophet, with his work as a necessity Divinely laid upon him, Coverdale describes that he had no particular desire to undertake the work — and how he wrought, as it were, in the language of these days, under a committee from whom he took his instructions and who "required-him to use the Douche (i.e. the German) and the Latyn." He claims further to have done the work entirely himself, and he certainly produced a new version of the Old Testament and a revised version of the New Testament. He used, he says, five sundry interpreters of the original languages. These interpreters were, in all probability, the Vulgate, Luther's version, the Zurich or Swiss-German Bible, the Latin version of Pagninus, and he certainly consulted Tyndale on the Pentateuch and the New Testament. He successfully studied musical effect in his sentences and many of the finest phrases in the King James Version are directly traced to Coverdale. His version of the Psalms is that which is retained and is still in daily use in the ritual of the Church of England. Two new editions of Coverdale's version were issued in 1537 "with the King's most gracious license," and after this the English Bible was allowed to circulate freely. Certain changes in the title-page, prefaces and other details are discussed in the works mentioned at the end of this article.

8. Matthew's Bible:

Convocation meanwhile was not satisfied with Coverdale's translation, and Coverdale himself in his honest modesty had expressed the hope that an improved translation should follow his own. Accordingly in 1537 — probably at the suggestion of, and with some support from, Crumwell and

certainly to his satisfaction — a large folio Bible appeared, as edited and dedicated to the King, by Thomas Matthew. This name has, since the days of Foxe, been held to be a pseudonym for John Rogers, the protomartyr of the Marian persecution, a Cambridge graduate who had for some years lived in intimacy with Tyndale at Antwerp, and who became the possessor of his manuscript at his death. Besides the New Testament, Tyndale, as above mentioned, had published translations of the Pentateuch, the Book of Jonah, and portions of the Apocrypha, and had left a manuscript version of Joshua to 2 Chronicles. Rogers, apparently taking all he could find of the work of Tyndale, supplemented this by the work of Coverdale and issued the composite volume with the title, "The Bible, which is all the Holy Scriptures, in which are contayned the Olde and Newe Testaments, truely and purely translated into English by Thomas Matthew. Esaye I, Hearken to, ye heavens, and thou earth, geave eare: for the Lord speaketh. MDXXXVII." After the banning and burning of Tyndale's New Testament on its arrival in England 11 years before, it is not easy to account for the royal sanction with which the translation appeared. It was probably granted to the united efforts of Cranmer and Crumwell, aided perhaps by the King's desire to show action independent of the church. The royal sanction, it will be noted, was given in the same year in which it was given to Coverdale's second edition. That version became the basis of our present Bible. It was on Matthew's version that for 75 years thereafter all other versions were based.

9. Richard Taverner:

Matthew's first edition of 1,500 copies was soon exhausted, and a new edition was issued with some revision by Richard Taverner, a cultivated young layman and lawyer who had in his early years been selected by Wolsey for his college at Oxford. He was imprisoned in its cellar for reading Tyndale's New Testament; but he was soon released for his singular musical accomplishments. He was an excellent Grecian, of good literary taste and of personal dignity. For the Old Testament curiously enough he made, good Grecian as he was, no use of the Septuagint; but throughout aimed successfully at idiomatic expression, as also at compression and vividness. Some of his changes are kept in the King James Version, such as "parables" for "similitudes" and in [4042]Matthew 24:12, "The love of the many shall wax cold," and others. He also does greater justice to the Greek article. His dedication to the king is manly and dignified and compares most favorably with the dedications of other

translators, including that of the King James Version. The book appeared in two editions, folio and quarto, in 1539, and in the same year two editions, folio and quarto, of the New Testament. The Bible and the New Testament were each reprinted once, and his Old Testament was adopted in a Bible of 1551. But with these exceptions Taverner's version was practically outside of influence on later translations.

10. The Great Bible (Cranmer's Bible):

The next Bible to appear was named from its size. Its pages are fully 15 inches long and over 9 inches broad. It was meant to be in a way a state edition, and is known as the Great Bible. As sufficiently good type, paper and other requisites could not be found in England, it was resolved that it should be printed in Paris. Coverdale and Grafton, the printer, went to Paris to superintend the printing; but the French church authorities interfered and the presses, types and workmen had to be transferred to London where the work was finished. It was the outcome of the Protestant zeal of Crumwell who wished to improve upon the merely composite volume of Tyndale and Coverdale. Its origin is not very accurately known, and authorities such as Hume, Burnet and Froude have ventured upon statements regarding it, for which there is really no proof (Eadie, I, 356 ff). The duty of editor or reviser was by Crumwell assigned to Coverdale who, as a pliant man and really interested in the improvement of the English version, was quite willing to undertake a work that might supersede his own. The rapidity with which the work was executed and the proofs of the minute care devoted to it by Coverdale may appear remarkable to those who are acquainted with the deliberate and leisurely methods of the large committee that produced the King James Version in the reign of King James or the Revised Version (British and American) in the reign of Queen Victoria. Of course Coverdale had been over all the work before and knew the points at which improvements were to be applied; and a zealous and expert individual can accomplish more than a committee. Luther translated the New Testament and, after revising his work with Melanchthon, had it printed and published in less than a year. The printing of the Great Bible began in May, 1538, and was completed in April, 1539, a handsome folio, printed in black letter, with the title, "The Bible in Englyshe, that is to say, the contents of all the holy scripture, bothe of the olde and newe testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by the dylygent studye of dyverse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tongues. Prynted by Rychard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch. Cum

privilegio ad imprimendum solum. 1539." The elaborate notes for which asterisks and various other marks are provided were never supplied; but the actual translation shows devoted attention to the work and much fine appreciation of the original languages and of English. In the New Testament the version derived assistance from the Latin version of Erasmus, and in the Old Testament from Munster and Pagninus. Variations in the text could of course be got from the Complutensian Polyglot. The Great Bible shows considerable improvement upon Tyndale in the New Testament, and upon Coverdale in the Old Testament. "So careful," says Eadie (I, 370), "had been Coverdale's revision and so little attachment had he to his own previous version, that in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah the Bible of 1539 differs in nearly forty places from his version of 1535." The clergy of course had no love for Crumwell and still less for his work, though to avert clerical prejudices, Coverdale had made concessions in his translation. The work was cordially welcomed by the people, and a copy was ordered to be printed for every parish church, the cost to be paid half by the parson and half by the parishioners. A further revision of this version was carried out by Coverdale for a second edition which appeared in April, 1540, and is known as Cranmer's Bible, mainly from the judicious and earnest preface which the archbishop wrote for it. "It exhibits a text formed on the same principles as that of 1539, but after a fuller and more thorough revision" (Westcott, 254). Two other editions followed in the same year and three more in the year following (1541).

11. Reaction, 1541-57:

After the publication of the Great Bible (1539-41) no further advance took place for many years. The later years of Henry VIII indeed were marked by serious reaction. In 1542 Convocation with the royal consent made an attempt, fortunately thwarted by Cranmer, to Latinize the English version and to make it in reality what the Romish version of Rheims subsequently became. In the following year Parliament, which then practically meant the King and two or three members of the Privy Council, restricted the use of the English Bible to certain social classes that excluded nine-tenths of the population; and three years later it prohibited the use of everything but the Great Bible. It was probably at this time that there took place the great destruction of all previous work on the English Bible which has rendered examples of that work so scarce. Even Tunstall and Heath were anxious to escape from their responsibility in lending their names to the Great Bible. In the midst of this reaction Henry VIII died, January 28, 1547.

12. Edward VI:

No new work marked the reign of Edward VI, but great activity prevailed in the printing of previous versions Thirty-five New Testaments and thirteen Bibles were published during his reign of six years and a half; and injunctions were issued urging every person to read "the very lively Word of God" and for a copy of the Great Bible with the English paraphrase of Erasmus to be set up in every church. By royal order a New Testament was to be sold for 22nd, a sum representing as many shillings of present value.

13. Mary:

Less repressive work regarding the translation and diffusion of Scripture than might have been expected occurred in the reign of Mary, though in other directions the reaction was severe enough. According to Lord Burghley, during the three years and nine months of Mary's reign, the number of 400 persons perished — men, women, maidens and children — by imprisonment, torment, famine and fire. Among the martyrs were Cranmer and Rogers; Coverdale escaped martyrdom only by exile and the powerful intervention of the king of Denmark. The copies of the Bibles in the churches were of course burned; and — though individual translations were not specified — proclamations were issued against certain books and authors. Still the books were not, as formerly, bought up and confiscated; and so the activity of Edward's reign in the production of Bibles left copies widely distributed throughout the country at the close of Mary's reign. At this time a New Testament was printed at Geneva which had great influence upon future versions of the Bible.

14. The Geneva Bible (the "Breeches Bible"):

This New Testament was issued in 1557 and was most probably the work of West Whittingham, an English exile who had married Calvin's sister. It was translated from the Greek and compared carefully with other versions It had also a marginal commentary which was more complete than anything similar that had yet appeared in England; and it was the first translation that was printed in roman letter and in which chapters were divided into verses. Calvin wrote for it an introductory epistle, and it had also an address by the reviser himself. A few months after its publication the more serious task of the revision of the whole Bible was begun and continued for the space of two years and more, the translators working at it "day and night." Who the

translators were is not said; but Whittingham, probably with Gilby and Sampson, stayed at Geneva for a year and a half after Elizabeth came to the throne, and saw the work through. It was finished in 1560, and in a dignified preface was dedicated to Elizabeth. The cost was met by members of the Congregation at Geneva, among whom was John Bodley, father of the founder of the great library at Oxford. Its handy form — a modest quarto — along with its vigorously expressed commentary, made it popular even with people who objected to its source and the occasional Calvinistic tinge of its doctrines. It became and remained the popular edition for nearly three- quarters of a century. The causes of its popularity are explained in Westcott, 125 f. Bodley had received the patent for its publication; and upon his asking for an extension of the patent for twelve years, the request was generously granted by Archbishop Parker and Grindly, bishop of London, though the Bishops' Bible was already begun.

The "Breeches Bible."

The Geneva version is often called the "Breeches Bible" from its translation of Genesis 3:7: "They sewed figleaves together, and made themselves breeches." This translation, however, is not peculiar to the Genevan version. It is the translation of perizomata in both the Wycliffe VSS; it is also found in Caxton's version of the "Golden Legende."

15. The Bishops' Bible:

Queen Elizabeth, the beginning of whose reign was beset with great difficulties, restored the arrangements of Edward VI. A copy of the Great Bible was required to be provided in every church, and every encouragement was given to the reading of the Scriptures. The defects of the Great Bible were admitted, and were the not unnatural result of the haste with which — notwithstanding its two revisions — it had been produced. These became more apparent when set beside the Geneva version, which, however, the archbishop and clergy could hardly be expected to receive with enthusiasm, as they had had nothing to do with its origin and had no control over its renderings and marginal notes. Archbishop Parker, moreover, who had an inclination to Biblical studies, had at the same time a passion for uniformity; and probably to this combination of circumstances may be traced the origin of the Bishops' Bible. Parker superintended the work, which was begun in 1563-64; he was aided by eight bishops — from whom the version received its name — and other scholars. It appeared in a magnificent volume in 1568, without a

word of flattery, but with a preface in which the revisers express a lofty consciousness of the importance of their work. It was published in 1568: cum privilegio regiae Majestatis. A revised and in many places corrected edition was issued in 1572, and another in 1575, the year of the archbishop's death. The general aim of the version is a quaint literality, but along with this is found the use of not a few explanatory words and phrases not found in the original text. More exact notice also than in previous versions is taken of the use of the Greek article and of the particles and conjunctions. It bears marks, however, of the hand of the individual translators by whom the work was done; and of the want of the revision of each translator's work by the rest, and of some general revision of the whole. The Genevan version was the work of collegiate labor, to which much of its superiority is due. Though Parker did not object to the circulation of the Genevan version, Convocation after his death made some unsuccessful attempts to popularize the Bishops' Bible; but the Genevan translation was not easily thrust aside. "It grew," says Eadie (II, 35), "to be in greater demand than the Bishops' or Cranmer's. Ninety editions of it were published in the reign of Elizabeth, as against forty of all the other versions Of Bibles, as distinct from New Testaments, there were twenty-five editions of Cranmer's and the Bishops', but sixty of the Genevan."

16. Rheims and Douai Version:

The production of an official version of the sacred Scriptures for English Roman Catholics was probably due more to rivalry with the Reformers than to any great zeal of the authorities of the Roman church for the spread of vernacular Scripture; though, according to the Arundelian Constitution above mentioned, it was only to the printing and reading of unauthorized translations that objection was then taken by the Roman authorities. But if there was to be a special version for Catholics, it was clearly reasonable that the work should be done by Catholics and accompanied by Catholic explanations. This was undertaken by some English Catholic scholars who, on the success of the Reformation in England, had left the country and settled at Douai in the Northeast of France, with a short transference of their seminary to Rheims. The version was probably produced under the influence of (Cardinal) Allen and an Oxford scholar, Gregory Martin. It was made from the Vulgate, the Bible of Jerome and Augustine, and not, like the Protestant VSS, from the Hebrew and Greek originals. The New Testament was issued from Rheims in 1582 and the Old Testament from Douai in 1609. The main objection to the version is the too close

adherence of the translators to the words of the original and the too great Latinizing of the English, so that their translation "needs," as Fuller said, "to be translated." Still they have a few words which along with a few Latinisms were adopted by the translators of the King James Version, such as "upbraideth not," "bridleth his tongue," at his own charges, and others; and they have the special merit of preserving uniformity of rendering. The translation met with no great success and the circulation was not large.

17. The Authorized Version:

The King James Version owed its origin to a chance remark regarding mistranslations in the existing versions made at the Hampton Court Conference, a meeting of bishops and Puritan clergy held (1604) in the interest of religious toleration before James was actually crowned. The meeting was ineffectual in all points raised by the Puritans, but it led to the production of the English Bible. Dr. Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, probably with some reference to the rivalry between the Bishops' Bible and the Genevan version, remarked on the imperfections of the current Bibles. The remark was not very enthusiastically received except by the King, who caught eagerly at the suggestion of a fresh version, "professing that he could never yet see a Bible well translated in English," and blaming specially the Genevan version, probably on account of the pointed character of its marginal notes. Probably with the aid of the universities, the King without delay nominated the revisers to the number of fifty-four from among the best Hebrew and Greek scholars of the day. Only 47 actually took part in the work which, however — officially at least — they were in no hurry to begin; for, although named in 1604 and with all the preliminaries arranged before the end of that year, they did not begin their work till 1607. Their remuneration was to be by church preferment, for which the archbishop was to take measures. The immediate expenses, the King suggested, should be supplied by the bishops and chapters who, however, did not respond. "King James' version never cost King James a farthing," says Eadie (II, 153 f), who here gives some interesting information on this aspect of the revision. They wrought in six companies of which two met respectively in Westminster, Cambridge and Oxford. Elaborate rules, given in full in most histories of the Bible, were laid down for the revisers' guidance, the King being particularly insistent upon Rule 9, which provided for the revision of the work of each Company by the rest. When any Company had finished the revision of a book, it was to be sent to all the rest for their criticism and suggestions, ultimate differences

of opinion to be settled at a general meeting of each Company. Learned men outside the board of revisers were to be invited to give their opinions in cases of special difficulty.

18. The Apocrypha:

One of the Cambridge Companies was specially appointed to revise the Apocrypha, in which considerable license was taken, as the seven members composing the Company had probably no very firm belief in the inspiration of its books. The marginal notes, too, are freer in character than those of the Old Testament. By the early translators, Tyndale and Coverdale, the Apocrypha was simply accepted as part of the heritage of the church; it had a place likewise in the Great Bible, the Bishops' Bible and most even of the Gentvan copies. But by the middle of the 17th century opinion even in the Church of England had changed regarding it, and it was about this time that Bibles began to be printed having the canonical books only. The Apocrypha is now hardly at all printed otherwise than separately (note also should be taken of the treatment of the Apocrypha in the Revised Version (British and American), as stated below).

Impressed with the importance of their task, the revisers worked strenuously at it for two years; and nine months more were devoted to revision by a special committee consisting of two members from each center, and in 1611 the result of the work appeared. It is not wonderful that the work was described by a contemporary entitled to give a judgment on it (Selden, Table Talk) as "the best translation in the world" — a verdict that later opinion has abundantly ratified. It was the copestone of a work on which 90 years of solid labor had by different hands been expended, and it was done by half a hundred of the foremost scholars of the day who knew Hebrew and Greek, and who also knew English For three centuries it has grown in popular esteem, and it is justly regarded as one of the best possessions and one of the most unifying influences of the widely scattered English-speaking race.

On the title-page as issued in 1611 the version is described as "newly translated out of the original tongues" and as "appointed to be read in churches," two statements not easy to reconcile with the actual facts. The first rule for the revisers' guidance provided that the work was to consist in a revision of the Bishops' Bible: it was not said that it was to be a new translation. There is, further, no sanction of the version by King,

Parliament, Convocation or Privy Council. Like Jerome's version twelve centuries before, it was left to find acceptance as best it might by its own intrinsic merit.

19. Further Revisions:

Already in the days of the Commonwealth proposals were made for a new version; but though several meetings were held of a committee appointed by Parliament for the purpose in 1657, nothing came of the movement (Lewis, History of Translations, 354). For nearly half a century the chief rival of the King James Version was the Geneva Bible which was in wide private use. Formal revision was not undertaken again till the reign of Queen Victoria. But between 1611 and the date of the recent revision not a few small alterations had been silently introduced into the King James Version, as was indeed only to be expected if the changes in the orthography of the language were to be correctly represented on the printed page. Advancing literary criticism, too, and minute linguistic study showed that since the days of the revisers many words had changed their meaning, and that verbal inaccuracies and a few less venial errors could be proved in the revisers' work. But what probably weighed most with scholars in inducing them to enter upon a new version was the extraordinary increase that since the last revision had taken place in our knowledge of the Hebrew text and more especially of the Greek text of Scripture. Important manuscripts had been brought to light of which the 17th-century revisers knew nothing, and scholars had with minute care examined and compared all the early copies of the Scripture studies which, without altering the main import of the gospel story, were shown to have considerable importance on the actual words' and sometimes on the meaning of the text. After much discussion of the subject in special volumes and in the leading magazines and reviews of Britain and America, there was a general agreement among scholars that a fresh version was advisable.

20. English Revised Version:

The history of the English revision is given at length in the preface to the English Revised Version of the New Testament. It originated with the Convocation of Canterbury of the Church of England in the year 1870, when a committee of 16 members was appointed with power to add to its numbers. By this committee invitations to join it were issued to the

outstanding Hebrew and Greek scholars of the country, irrespective of religious denomination, and eventually two Companies were formed, one for the Old Testament and one for the New Testament, consisting each of 27 members, in which all the churches of the country were represented, the Roman Catholics alone excepted, and Dr. Newman had been invited to join the New Testament committee. The churches of America were also invited to cooperate, and this they did by forming two Companies corresponding to the British with due provision for the mutual comparison of results and suggestions. Where the suggestions from America were not accepted by the British revisers, they were recorded in an appendix to the published volume. The names of the revisers and the rules and principles laid down for the procedure of both Companies will be found in Eadie (II, 481 ff). The New Testament was published in May, 1881; the work occupied the Company for about 40 days in each year for 10 years. The Old Testament revision occupied the Company for 792 days in a period of 14 years. The entire Bible was published in May, 1885. It did not include the Apocrypha, a revision of which was issued separately in 1895.

21. American Revised Version:

This was undertaken, not by Convocation, but by the University Presses, a special Company being formed for the purpose from the Old Testament and New Testament Companies. For *AMERICAN REVISED VERSION* see separate article. On *REVISED VERSION* see also *BIBLE*.

22. Has the Revised Version (British and American) Displaced the American Version?:

The Revised Version (British and American) has been before the English-speaking world for a quarter of a century and it can hardly be said with safety that it has as yet made any progress in displacing the King James Version in public esteem. Of course as much could be said for the King James Version in its day. It was very slow in gaining acceptance with the people: and yet unreasoning affection for its very words and phraseology is now one of the main obstacles to the acceptance of an admittedly more scientifically based original text and a more correct and not displeasing rendering of the same. A large number of the changes are certainly not such as appeal strongly to popular sympathy. "The Greek text of the New Testament of 1881 has been estimated to differ from that of 1611 in no less than 5,788: readings, of which about a quarter are held notably to modify

the subject-matter; though even of these only a small proportion can be considered as of first-rate importance" (Kenyon, 239). On the other hand Hebrew, and especially the cognate Semitic languages, are now a great deal better known than before 1611, and considerable improvement is noticeable in the bringing out of the meaning in the poetical and prophetical books. The Revised Version (British and American) contains the best results of the scholarship of the Victorian age and cannot fail to be regarded as of the greatest utility to the reader and student of the King James Version. In the religious life the mind is essentially conservative, and nothing but time will show whether the undoubted merits of the Revised Version (British and American) are such as to outweigh the claims of sentiment and affection with which the King James Version is held.

See further AMERICAN REVISED VERSION.

LITERATURE.

Perhaps the most complete work on the subject in all its aspects is that by Dr. John Eadie, The English Bible: an External and Critical History of the Various English Translations of Scripture, 1876. Eadie was himself one of the revisers of 1870, and some of his concluding chapters contain "Remarks on the Need of Revision of the English New Testament." He is also highly appreciative but judiciously critical of his predecessors in the same field, e.g. of Lewis, Complete History of Several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament into English, 1731, 1818; and Christopher Anderson, The Annals of the English Bible, 2 volumes, 1845, 1 volume rev. edition, 1862. An earlier and also very good book is Westcott's General View of the History of the English Bible, 1868. Westcott was also one of the revisers of 1870 and criticizes the work of the various translators as well as narrates the succession of the translations. A good discussion of the internal history of the text will also be found in the History of the English Bible by Dr. Moulton, another of the revisers. Kenyon, Our Bible and Ancient manuscripts, 1895, considers specially the text on which the successive English versions were based. He writes judiciously also on the Wycliffe period and on the Revised Version (British and American). The Wycliffe period should also be studied in Forshall and Madden, 4 volumes, 4to, Oxford, 1850; England in the Age of Wycliffe, by G. M. Trevelyan; Dr. Gasquet's Our Old English Bible and Other Essays, 1908; and Lechler's John Wycliffe and His English Precursors, translated and edited by Lorimer. For the Reformation period generally Foxe's

History of the Acts and Monuments of the Church still deserves to be studied. "Foxe's story is doubtless substantially true, although disfigured by credulity and bitter prejudice." For Tyndale's special work see William Tyndale, a Biography, by R. Demaus, new edition by Lovett, 1886; and Fry's Bibliographical Descriptions of the Editions of the New Testament, Tyndale's Version in English Fry has also written special works on the Great Bible, Cranmer's Bible and the Genevan Version. The King James Version is very fully described in the works above mentioned, and in this connection notice is due to Scrivener, The Authorised Edition of the English Bible, 1884, and more especially to his careful and thorough "Introduction" to the Quarto Paragraph Bible, 1873. More popular histories of the Bible are those of Stoughton, Pattison, 1874, and Professor Milligan of Glasgow, 1895. General histories of England and of English literature may also be profitably consulted on the history of the Bible and its translation into the vernacular, such as those of Hume, Burnet, Hallam, Froude, Green and Gardiner. The revision of the King James Version called forth a large literature, either in the way of preparation for it or of criticism of it when carried through. To this literature many of the revisers themselves contributed, among whom may be mentioned Eadie, Ellicott, Westcott, Humphry, Newth and Kennedy; nor should the important contributions of Archbishop Trench and Dean Alford, though of a slightly earlier generation, be overlooked. The American revisers also republished a series of Essays written by some of their number on Biblical Revision: Its Necessity and Purpose, 1879; and account should be taken also of the Documentary History of the American Committee on Revision prepared by that committee for the use of its members.

J. Hutchison

ENGRAFT

<en-graft'> ([5021]James 1:21 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) *IMPLANT* (which see)).

ENGRAVING

<en-grav'-ing>.

See *CARVING; CRAFTS.*

EN-HADDAH

<en-had'-a> ([חַדָּה עֵין `en chaddah], "swift fountain"): A town in the lot of Issachar mentioned along with En-gannim (<06921>Joshua 19:21). It is probably identical with *Kefr Adan*, a village some 3 miles West of *Jenin*.

EN-HAKKORE

<en-hak'-o-re>, *<en-hak-o'-re>* ([עֵין הַקּוֹרֵא , `en ha-qore'], "spring of the partridge"): Interpreted (<07519>Judges 15:19) as meaning "the spring of him that called." So the Septuagint: [πηγὴ τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου, *pege tou epikaloumenou*]. The spring was in Lehi but the site is unknown.

EN-HAZOR

<en-ha'-zor> ([עֵין חָצוֹר; `en chatsor]; [πηγὴ Ἀσόρ, *pege Asor*]: A city in the territory of Naphtali mentioned along with Kedesh, Edrei and Iron (<06997>Joshua 19:37). The ancient name probably survives in that of *Hazireh*, on the slopes West of Kedesh. "En" however points to a fountain. and no fountain has been found here.

ENIGMA

<e-nig'-ma>.

See *GAMES.*

ENJOIN

<en-join'>: Its usual sense is "to impose something," as a command, a charge or a direction. In this last sense it is used in <18623>Job 36:23, i.e. "Who hath directed?" In Est 9:31 it means "to command"; in Philem 1:8, "to order" or "direct."

ENLARGE; ENLARGEMENT

<en-larj'>, *<en-larj'-ment>*: "To enlarge" is very frequently used figuratively: "God enlarge Japheth" (<01927>Genesis 9:27), i.e. "make him a great nation"; or "Thou hast enlarged my steps under me" (<10237>2 Samuel 22:37), i.e. "Thou hast given me success." A very peculiar use of "enlarge" is found in the King James Version <19040>Psalm 4:1: "Thou hast enlarged me" (the Revised Version (British and American) "set me at large"), i.e. "Thou

hast given me freedom, deliverance from distress." "Our heart is enlarged" ([πλατύνω, *platuno*]; 2 Corinthians 6:11), and "Be ye also enlarged" (2 Corinthians 6:13), express great love of one party to another. See also 1 Samuel 2:1, "My mouth is enlarged," i.e. "full of praise." Ezekiel 41:7, "were broader" (the King James Version "an enlarging"). Enlargement, the King James Version, Est 4:14 from [j w″ r; *rawach*], "to enlarge," "to respite," is rendered "relief" by the Revised Version (British and American) in better harmony with "deliverance" with which the word is paired.

A. L. Breslich

ENLIGHTEN

<en-lit'-'-n>:

(1) [rwa, *'or*], "illumination" in every sense, used in the ordinary sense of giving natural light (Psalm 97:4 the King James Version; see also Ezra 9:8) or as a sign of health and vigor (1 Samuel 14:27,29). "His eyes were enlightened," literally, "became bright." He had become weary and faint with the day's exertions and anxieties, and now recovers (see Job 33:30 and compare Psalm 13:3). Thus in sickness and grief, the eyes are dull and heavy; dying eyes are glazed; but health and joy render them bright and sparkling, as with a light from within.
(2) In Psalm 18:28 the King James Version, The word [Hg″ n; *nagah*], figuratively describes the believer's deliverance from the gloom of adversity and the restoration of joy in the knowledge of God.
(3) Most frequently the terms so translated mean the giving of spiritual light to the soul (Psalm 19:8; Ephesians 1:18, [φωτίζω, *photizo*]; Hebrews 6:4; 10:32). This spiritual enlightening the Spirit of God brings about through the Divine word (Psalm 119:130; 2 Timothy 3:15; 2 Peter 1:19). Sin mars the intellectual discernment; "but he that is spiritual discerneth all things" (1 Corinthians 2:15 King James Version, margin).
M. O. Evans

EN-MISHPAT

<en-mish'-pat>.

See KADSSH.

ENMITY

<en'-mi-ti> ([hbyae 'ebhah]; [ἔχθρα, echthra]): "Enmity" (hate) occurs as the translation of 'ebhah in ˂01815˃Genesis 3:15, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed," and in ˂04521˃Numbers 35:21,22, where the absence of enmity on the part of the man-slayer modifies the judgment to be passed on him.

In the New Testament "enmity" is the translation of echthra: ˂02312˃Luke 23:12; ˂05807˃Romans 8:7, "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God." ˂05004˃James 4:4, "The friendship of the world is enmity with God" (because "the world" is preferred to God); in ˂04925˃Ephesians 2:15,16, Christ is said to have "abolished in his flesh the enmity," by His cross to have "slain the enmity," that is, the opposition between Jew and Gentile, creating in Himself "one new man, (so) making peace."

See also ABOLISH; HATE.

W. L. Walker

ENNATAN

<en'-a-tan> ([Ἐννατάν, Ennatan]; the King James Version Eunatan (a misprint)): One of Ezra's messengers to fetch Levites for the temple service (1 Esdras 8:44); called "Elnathan" in ˂15816˃Ezra 8:16.

ENOCH

<e'-nok> ([Ëwū } chanokh], "initiated"; [Ἑνώχ, Henoch]):

(1) The eldest son of Cain (˂01417˃Genesis 4:17,18).

(2) The son of Jared and father of Methuselah, seventh in descent from Adam in the line of Seth (˂65014˃Jude 1:14). He is said (˂00523˃Genesis 5:23) to have lived 365 years, but the brief record of his life is comprised in the words, "Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him" (˂00524˃Genesis 5:24). The expression "walked with God" denotes a devout life, lived in close communion with God, while the reference to his end has always been understood, as by the writer of He, to mean, "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God translated him" (˂58105˃Hebrews 11:5).

See further, APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, II, i, 1.

A. C. Grant

ENOCH (CITY)

In ^{⟨01:04:17⟩}Genesis 4:17 it is narrated that Cain, who had taken up his abode in the land of Nod, East of Eden (verse 16), built there a city, and called it after the name of his firstborn son Enoch. It is impossible to fix more definitely the locality of this first of cities, recorded, as Delitzsch says (*Genesis*, in the place cited.), as registering an advance in civilization. The "city" would be a very simple affair, a place of protection for himself, wife and household, perhaps connected with the fear spoken of in 4:14.

ENOCH; ETHIOPIC, BOOK OF

<e-thi-op'-ik>.

> **See** *APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.*

ENOCH; SLAVONIC, BOOK OF

<sla-von'-ik>.

> **See** *APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.*

ENOCH; THE BOOK OF THE SECRETS OF

> **See** *APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.*

ENORMITY

<e-nor'-mi-ti>: The marginal rendering in the King James Version of ^{⟨28:06:9⟩}Hosea 6:9 for "lewdness," and in the Revised Version (British and American) of ^{⟨03:18:17⟩}Leviticus 18:17; 19:29; 20:14 for "wickedness." In each case it is the translation of [hMzi *zimmah*], meaning originally, "thought" or "plot," mostly in a bad sense, lewdness, wickedness; in Leviticus it is unnatural wickedness — incest.

ENOS; ENOSH

<e'-nos>, *<e'-nosh>* ([vw0a] *'enosh*], "mortal"; '[᾽Ενώς, *Enos*]): In the New Testament (the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version) and the Old Testament (the King James Version except ^{⟨13:01:1⟩}1 Chronicles 1:1), the form is Enos; in the Old Testament (the Revised Version (British and American) and ^{⟨13:01:1⟩}1 Chronicles 1:1 the King James Version), the form is Enosh. The son of Seth and grandson of Adam

(⁰⁰⁴²⁶Genesis 4:26; 5:6 ff; ¹³⁰¹⁰¹1 Chronicles 1:1; ⁴⁰⁶³⁸Luke 3:38). *Enosh* denotes man as frail and mortal. With Enosh a new religious development began, for "then began men to call upon the name of Yahweh" (⁰⁰⁴²⁶Genesis 4:26). There seems to be an implied contrast to ⁰¹⁰⁴¹⁷Genesis 4:17 ff which records a development in another department of life, represented by Enoch the son of Cain.

S. F. Hunter

ENQUIRE

<en-kwir'>: This is an Old English word now obsolescent. It is common in the King James Version. In the American Standard Revised Version it is nearly always replaced by the more modern "inquire," a few times by "seek" and "ask," once by "salute" (¹³¹⁸¹⁰1 Chronicles 18:10). With this one exception in the Old Testament the change does not affect the meaning. In ⁴²³¹⁵Acts 23:15, "enquire something more perfectly" is substituted by "judge more exactly." In ⁴⁰¹⁰¹¹Matthew 10:11, "search out" replaces it. In ⁴⁰²⁰⁷Matthew 2:7,16, "learned exactly" replaces "inquired diligently."

See *INQUIRE.*

EN-RIMMON

<en-rim'-on> ([ˆwⵍrⵊˆy[ⲣ`*en-rimmon*], "the fountain of Rimmon" (*see RIMMON*), or perhaps "the spring of the pomegranate"; [᾿Ερωμώθ, *Eromoth*], [῾Ρεμμών, *Rhemmon*]): A city of Judah (⁰⁶¹⁵²Joshua 15:32), "Ain and Rimmon"; ascribed to Simeon (⁰⁶⁹⁰⁷Joshua 19:7; ¹³⁰⁴³²1 Chronicles 4:32, "Ain, Rimmon"). In ¹⁶¹²⁹Nehemiah 11:29 mentioned as reinhabited after the Captivity. ³⁸¹⁴¹⁰Zechariah 14:10, runs: "All the land shall be made like the Arabah, from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem." It must have been a very southerly place. In the Eusebius, Onomasticon, ("Erimmon") it is described as a "very large village 16 miles South of Eleutheropolis." Kh. Umm er Rumamin, 9 miles North of Beersheba is the usually accepted site. See PEF, 398; Sh XXIV.

E. W. G. Masterman

EN-ROGEL

<en-ro'-gel> ([l gⲉˆy[ⲣ`*en roghel*]; [πηγὴ ῾Ρωγήλ, *pege Rhogel*]; meaning uncertain, but interpreted by some to mean "the spring of the fuller"):

No argument from this meaning can be valid because

(1) it is a very doubtful rendering and

(2) "fulling" vats are common in the neighborhood of most town springs and are today plentiful at both the proposed sites. G. A. Smith thinks "spring of the current," or "stream," from Syriac rogulo, more probable.

(1) En-rogel was an important landmark on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin (⟨06507⟩Joshua 15:7; 18:16). Here David's spies, Jonathan and Ahimaaz, hid themselves (⟨10717⟩2 Samuel 17:17), and here (⟨11009⟩1 Kings 1:9) "Adonijah slew sheep and oxen and fatlings by the stone of Zoheleth, which is beside En-rogel," when he anticipated his father's death and caused himself rebelliously to be proclaimed king.
(2) The identification of this important landmark is of first-class importance in Jerusalem topography. Two sites have been proposed:

(a) The older view identifies En-rogel with the spring known variously as "the Virgin's Fount," `Ain sitti Miriam and `Ain Umm el deraj, an intermittent source of water which rises in a cave on the West side of the Kedron valley opposite Siloam (*see GIHON*). The arguments that this is the one Jerusalem spring and that this must have been a very important landmark are inconclusive. The strongest argument for this view is that put forward by M. Clermont-Ganneau, who found that a rough rock surface on the mountain slope opposite, an ascent to the village of Silwan, is known as es Zechweleh, a word in which there certainly appears to linger an echo of Zoheleth. The argument is, however, not as convincing as it seems. Firstly, Zoheleth was a stone; this is a natural rock scarp; such a stone might probably have been transferred from place to place. Secondly, it is quite common for a name to be transferred some miles; instances are numerous. Thirdly, the writer, after frequent inquiries of the fellahin of Silwan, is satisfied that the name is by no means confined to the rock scarp near the spring, but to the whole ridge running along from here to, or almost to, Bir Eyyub itself. The strongest argument against this identification is, however, that there are so much stronger reasons for identifying the "Virgin's Fount" with Gihon (*see* GIHON), and that the two springs En-rogel and Gihon cannot be at one site, as is clear from the narrative in 1 Kings 1.

(b) The view which places En-rogel at Bir Eyyub in every way harmonizes with the Bible data. It has been objected that the latter is not a spring but a well. It is today a well, 125 ft. deep, but one with an inexhaustible supply — there must be a true spring at the bottom. Probably one reason it only overflows today after periods of heavy rain is that such enormous quantities of debris have now covered the original valley bed that the water cannot rise to the surface; much of it flows away down the valley deep under the present surface. The water is brackish and is impregnated with sewage, which is not extraordinary when we remember that a large part of the rock strata from which the water comes is overlaid by land constantly irrigated with the city's sewage.

Although the well may itself be of considerable antiquity, there is no need to insist that this is the exact position of the original spring En-rogel. The source may in olden times have arisen at some spot in the valley bottom which is now deeply buried under the rubbish, perhaps under the southernmost of the irrigated gardens of the fellahin of Silwan. The neighborhood, at the junction of two deep valleys — not to count the small el wad, the ancient Tyropceon — is a natural place for a spring. There would appear to have been considerable disturbance here. An enormous amount of debris from various destructions of the city has collected here, but, besides this, Josephus records a tradition which appears to belong to this neighborhood. He says (Ant., IX, x, 4) that an earthquake took place once at Eroge — which appears to be En-rogel — when "half of the mountain broke off from the remainder on the West, and rolling 4 furlongs, came to stand on the eastern mountain till the roads, as well as the .king's gardens, were blocked." It is sufficient that En-rogel is to be located either at Bir Eyyub or in its immediate neighborhood; for practical purposes the former will do. En-rogel was an important point on the boundary line between Judah and Benjamin. The line passed down the lower end of the Kidron valley, past En-rogel (Bir Eyyub) and then up the Valley of Hinnom (Wady er Rababi) — a boundary well adapted to the natural conditions.

With regard to David's spies (2 Samuel 17:17), whereas the Virgin's Fount — the great source of the city's water supply (*see GIHON*) — just below the city walls (*see ZION*) was an impossible place of hiding, this lower source, out of sight of almost the whole city and removed a considerable distance from its nearest point, was at least a possible place.

Further, the facts that it was off the main road, that it afforded a supply of one of the main necessities of life — water — and that there were, as there are today, many natural caves in the neighborhood, greatly added to its suitability.

Here too was a most appropriate place for Adonijah's plot (1 Kings 1:9). He and his confederates dared not go to Gihon, the original sacred spring, but had to content themselves with a spot more secluded, though doubtless still sacred. It is recorded (1 Kings 1:40,41) that the adherents of Solomon saluted him at Gihon (the Virgin's Fount) and the people "rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them. And Adonijah and all the guests that were with him (at En-rogel) heard it as they had made an end of eating." The relative positions of these two springs allow of a vivid reconstruction of the narrative as do no other proposed identifications. The two spots are out of sight the one of the other, but not so far that the shout of a multitude at the one could not be carried to the other.

E. W. G. Masterman

ENROLMENT

<en-rol'-ment>.

See *QUIRINIUS; TAX.*

ENSAMPLE

<en-sam'-p'-l>.

See *EXAMPLE.*

EN-SHEMESH

<en-she'-mesh> ([∨m∨Aˆy[e`*en shemesh*], "spring of the sun"): An important landmark on the boundary line between Judah and Benjamin (Joshua 15:7; 18:17). The little spring `Ain el chand, East of Bethany, the last spring on the road descending to Jericho, seems to suit the conditions. `Ain el chaud is usually called the "Apostles' Fountain" by Christians, on account of a tradition dating from the 15th century that the apostles drank there.

ENSIGN

<en'-sin>.

   See BANNER.

ENSUE

<en-su'>: Synonymous with "to pursue," "ensue" is found in ⁴⁰³¹¹1 Peter 3:11 the King James Version as a translation of [διώκω, *dioko*], "to follow after," "to pursue." Also in Judith 9:5, "such as ensued after" ([τὰ μετέπειτα, *ta metepeita*], "the things that follow").

ENTANGLE

<en-tan'-g'-l>: Found but 5 times in the Scriptures (the King James Version), once in the Old Testament, yet most significant as illustrating the process of mental, moral and spiritual confusion and enslavement.

(1) PHYSICAL:

Used of *physical* entanglement, as in the mazes of a labyrinth ([ĖⱲB, *bukh*], to involve," "be perplexed"). At Moses' command the children of Israel, before crossing the Red Sea, took the wrong way in order to give Pharaoh the impression that they were lost in the wilderness and cause him to say "They are entangled in the land" (⁰²¹⁴⁸Exodus 14:3).

(2) MENTAL:

[παγιδεύω, *pagideuo*], "to entrap," "ensnare," with words, as birds are caught in a snare; compare ²¹⁰⁹²Ecclesiastes 9:12. The Pharisees sought to "entangle" (the Revised Version (British and American) "ensnare") Jesus in His talk (⁴⁰²¹⁵Matthew 22:15).

(3) MORAL:

[ἐμπλέκω, `*empleko*], "to inweave," hence, intertwine and involve. "A god soldier of Jesus Christ," says Paul, does not "entangle himself," i.e. become involved, "in the affairs of this life" (⁵⁵⁰⁰⁴2 Timothy 2:4). Having "escaped the defilements of the world," Christians are not to be "again entangled therein" (⁶¹⁰²⁰2 Peter 2:20).

(4) SPIRITUAL:

[ἐνέχω, *enecho*], "to hold in," hence, to hold captive, as a slave in fetters or under a burden. Having experienced spiritual emancipation, freedom, through Christ from bondage to sin and false religion (Galatians 5:1; compare 4:8), the Gentiles were not to become "entangled again in a yoke of bondage" by submission to mere legal requirements, as the external rite of circumcision.

With reference to the thoroughness and irresistibleness of God's judgments, we read in Nahum 1:10, "For entangled like thorns" (the King James Version "while they be folden together as thorns"), damp, closely packed and intertwined, "they are consumed utterly as dry stubble" (the King James Version "devoured as stubble fully dry").

Dwight M. Pratt

EN-TAPPUAH

<en-tap'-u-a>, <en-ta-pu'-a> ([יֵן תַּפּוּחַ *en tappuach*]; [πηγὴ Θαφθώθ, *pege Thaphthoth*], "apple spring"): Probably in the land of Tappuah which belonged to Manasseh, although Tappuah, on the border of Manasseh, belonged to Ephraim (Joshua 17:7 f). It lay on the border of Ephraim which ran southward East of Shechem, and is probably to be identified with the spring at *Yasuf*, about 3 miles North of Lebonah.

ENTREAT

<en-tret'>.

See INTREAT.

ENVY

<en'-vi> ([קִנְאָה *qin'ah*]; [ζῆλος, *zelos*], [φθόνος, *phthonos*]): "Envy," from Latin in, "against," and video, "to look," "to look with ill-will," etc., toward another, is an evil strongly condemned in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. It is to be distinguished from jealousy. "We are jealous of our own; we are envious of another man's possessions. Jealousy fears to lose what it has; envy is pained at seeing another have" (Crabb's English Synonyms). In the Old Testament it is the translation of *qin'ah* from *kana'*, "to redden," "to glow" (Job 5:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy," margin "indignation"; in Isaiah 26:11 the Revised Version (British and American) renders "see thy zeal for the

people"; [21704]Proverbs 27:4, etc.); the verb occurs in [02614]Genesis 26:14, etc.; [04129]Numbers 11:29 the King James Version; [19A616]Psalm 106:16; [21081]Proverbs 3:31, etc.; in the New Testament it is the translation of *phthonos*, "envy" ([41718]Matthew 27:18; [45029]Romans 1:29; [48521]Galatians 5:21, "envyings," etc.); of *zelos*, "zeal, "jealousy," "envy" ([44135]Acts 13:45), translated "envying," the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy" ([45313]Romans 13:13; [46008]1 Corinthians 3:3; [47120]2 Corinthians 12:20; [59014]James 3:14,16); the verb *phthoneo* occurs in [48526]Galatians 5:26; *zeloo* in [44709]Acts 7:9; 17:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "moved with jealousy"; [46304]1 Corinthians 13:4, "charity (the Revised Version (British and American) "love") envieth not."

The power of envy is stated in [21704]Proverbs 27:4: "Who is able to stand before envy?" (the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy"); its evil effects are depicted in [18052]Job 5:2 (the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy"), in [20143]Proverbs 14:30 (the Revised Version, margin "jealousy"); it led to the crucifixion of Christ ([41718]Matthew 27:18; [41510]Mark 15:10); it is one of "the works of the flesh" ([48521]Galatians 5:21; compare [45029]Romans 1:29; [54604]1 Timothy 6:4); Christian believers are earnestly warned against it ([45313]Romans 13:13 the King James Version; [46003]1 Corinthians 3:3 the King James Version; [48526]Galatians 5:26; [60201]1 Peter 2:1). In [59045]James 4:5 "envy" is used in a good sense, akin to the jealousy ascribed to God. Where the King James Version has "The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy," the Revised Version (British and American) reads "Doth the spirit which he made to dwell in us long unto envying?"; the American Revised Version, margin "The spirit which he made to dwell in us he yearneth for even unto jealous envy"; compare [24014]Jeremiah 3:14; [28019]Hosea 2:19 f; or the English Revised Version, margin "That spirit which he made to dwell in us yearneth (for us) even unto jealous envy." This last seems to give the sense; compare "Ye adulteresses" ([28004]Hosea 2:4), the American Revised Version, margin "That is, who break your marriage vow to God."

W. L. Walker

EPAENETUS

<ep-e'-ne-tus> ([Ἐπαίνετος, *Epainetos*], "praised"): One of the Christians at Rome to whom greetings are sent by Paul ([45165]Romans 16:5). All that is known of him is told here. Paul describes him as

(1) "my beloved,"

(2) "who is the firstfruits of Asia unto Christ." Textus Receptus of the New Testament has "firstfruits of Achaia" but this wrong reading is due to ⁴⁶¹⁶¹⁵1 Corinthians 16:15. He was one of the first Christians in the Roman province of Asia.

This salutation brings up the question of the destination of ⁴⁵¹⁶⁰³Romans 16:3-16, for it is argued that they are addressed to the church in Ephesus owing to the fact that Prisca and Aquila and Epenetus are known to have dwelt in Asia. On the other hand, there are more than 20 others in this list who are not known to have spent any time in Asia. Prisca and Aquila had once dwelt in Rome (⁴⁴¹⁸⁰²Acts 18:2), and there is nothing unusual in an Ephesian dwelling in the capital of the empire. An interesting discovery was made in Rome of an inscription in which was the name of Epenetus, an Ephesian.

<div align="right">

S. F. Hunter

</div>

EPAPHRAS

<ep'-a-fras> ([Ἐπαφρᾶς, *Epaphras*]): A contracted form of Epaphroditus. He must not, however, be confounded with the messenger of the Philippian community. He was with Paul during a part of his 1st Roman imprisonment, joining in Paul's greetings to Philemon (Philem 1:23). Epaphras was the missionary by whose instrumentality the Colossians had been converted to Christianity (⁵¹⁰⁰⁷Colossians 1:7), and probably the other churches of the Lycus had been founded by him. In sending his salutation to the Colossians Paul testified, "He hath much labor for you, and for them in Laodicea, and for them in Hierapolis" (⁵¹⁰⁴¹³Colossians 4:13). Epaphras had brought to Paul good news of the progress of the gospel, of their "faith in Christ Jesus" and of their love toward all the saints (⁵¹⁰⁰⁴Colossians 1:4). Paul's regard for him is shown by his designating him "our beloved fellow-servant," "a faithful minister of Christ" (⁵¹⁰⁰⁷Colossians 1:7), and "a bondservant of Christ Jesus" (⁵¹⁰⁴¹²Colossians 4:12 margin) . The last designation Paul uses several times of himself, but only once of another besides Epaphras (⁵⁰¹⁰¹Philippians 1:1).

<div align="right">

S. F. Hunter

</div>

EPAPHRODITUS

<e-paf-ro-di'-tus> ([Ἐπαφρόδιτος, *Epaphroditos*], "lovely"): Mentioned only in ⁵⁰⁷⁴²⁵Philippians 2:25; 4:18. The name corresponds to the Latin Venustus (= handsome), and was very common in the Roman period.

"The name occurs very frequently in inscriptions both Greek and Latin, whether at full length Epaphroditus, or in its contracted form Epaphras" (Lightfoot, Philippians, 123). Epaphroditus was the delegate of the Christian community at Philippi, sent with their gift to Paul during his first Roman imprisonment. Paul calls him "my brother and fellow-worker and fellow-soldier." "The three words are arranged in an ascending scale: common sympathy, common work, common danger and toil and suffering" (Lightfoot, l.c.). On his arrival at Rome, Epaphroditus devoted himself to "the work of Christ," both as Paul's attendant and as his assistant in missionary work. So assiduously did he labor that he lost his health, and "was sick nigh unto death." He recovered, however, and Paul sent him back to Philippi with this letter to quiet the alarm of his friends, who had heard of his serious illness. Paul besought for him that the church should receive him with joy and hold him in honor.

S. F. Hunter

EPHAH (1)

<e'-fa> ([hpy[e`*ephah*], "darkness"; [Γεφάρ, *Gephar*] (Genesis 25:4), [Γαιφά, *Gaipha*] (Isaiah 60:6): The name of three persons in the Old Testament, both masculine and feminine

(1) The son of Midian, descended from Abraham by his wife Keturah (Genesis 25:4 = 1 Chronicles 1:33), mentioned again in Isaiah 60:6 as a transporter of gold and frankincense from Sheba, who shall thus bring enlargement to Judah and praise to Yahweh. According to Fried. Delitzsch, Schrader, and Hommel, `*Ephah* is an abbreviation of `*Ayappa*, the Kha-yappa Arabs of the time of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon. See treatment of this view in Dillmann's Commentary on Genesis (25:4).

(2) A concubine of Caleb (1 Chronicles 2:46).

(3) The son of Jahdai, a descendant of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:47).

Charles B. Williams

EPHAH (2)

<e'-fa> ([hpyae`*ephah*]): A dry measure of about one bushel capacity. It corresponds to the bath in liquid measure and was the standard for measuring grain and similar articles since it is classed with balances and weights (Leviticus 19:36; Amos 8:5) in the injunctions regarding just dealing in trade. In Zechariah 5:6-10 it is used for the utensil itself (*see*

WEIGHTS AMD MEASURES).

EPHAI

<e'-fi>, *<e'-fa-i>* ([yp" y[ě`*ephay*], in Qere, [yp" wɒ, `*ophai*], in Kethibh; [᾽Ιωφέ, *Iophe*], [᾽Ωφέ, *Ophe*], "gloomy," "obscuring," in the Septuagint, Septuagint): "The Netophathite," whose sons were numbered among "the captains of the forces" left in Judah after the carrying away to Babylon (Jeremiah 40 ([LXX 47) 8). His sons assembled at Mizpah with Gedaliah, governor of the scattered Jews, and with him were slain by Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah (Jet 41:3).

EPHER

<e'-fer> ([rp[ě`*epher*], "calf," "young deer"; ["Αφερ, *Apher*], ["Οφερ, *Opher*]:

(1) The second son of Midian, descended from Abraham by his wife Keturah (Genesis 25:4; 1 Chronicles 1:33). See further Dillmann's Commentary on Genesis (25:4).

(2) The third son of Ezra, descended from the tribe of Judah (1 Chronicles 4:17).

(3) The first of five heads of their fathers' houses, "mighty men of valor, famous men," in the halftribe of Manasseh, who dwelt between Bashan and Mt. Hermon (1 Chronicles 5:23,14).

EPHES-DAMMIM

<e-fes-dam'-im> ([μyMD" spa, *'ephec dammim*]): Some spot between Socoh and Azekah (1 Samuel 17:1) where the Philistines were encamped; called in 1 Chronicles 11:13, "Pas-dammin." Ephes" end of" or "boundary" and the whole word may mean the "boundary of blood." The deep red color of the newly plowed earth in this situation is noticeable and may have given origin to the idea of "blood" (compare *ADAMMIM*). Cheyne suggests that from [μymda, *'adhummin*], to [μymd, *dammim*], is an easy step, and that the former, meaning "red brown earth," may have been the original. No other satisfactory locality has been found to explain the name or fix the site.

E. W. G. Masterman

EPHESIAN; EPHESIANS

<e-fe'-zhan> ([Ἐφέσιος, *Ephesios*]), *<e-fe'-zhanz>*: A term which, as in Acts 19:28,34,35 and 21:29, was applied to those natives or residents of the city of Ephesus who were adherents of the cult of the goddess Diana. A Jew or a Christian, though a native of Ephesus, would probably have been designated as such, rather than as an Ephesian.

EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO THE

I. AUTHENTICITY.

1. External Evidence:

None of the epistles which are ascribed to Paul have a stronger chain of evidence to their early and continued use than that which we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians. Leaving for the moment the question of the relation of Ephesians to other New Testament writings, we find that it not only colors the phraseology of the Apostolic Fathers, but is actually quoted. In Clement of Rome (circa 95 AD) the connection with Ephesians might be due to some common liturgical form in xlvi.6 (compare Ephesians 4:6); though the resemblance is so close that we must feel that our epistle was known to Clement both here and in lxiv (compare Ephesians 1:3-4); xxxviii (compare Ephesians 5:21); xxxvi (compare Ephesians 4:18); lix (compare Ephesians 1:18; 4:18). Ignatius (died 115) shows numerous points of contact with Ephesians, especially in his Epistle to the Ephesians. In chap. xii we read: "Ye are associates and fellow students of the mysteries with Paul, who in every letter makes mention of you in Christ Jesus." It is difficult to decide the exact meaning of the phrase "every letter," but in spite of the opinion of many scholars that it must be rendered "in all his epistle," i.e. in every part of his epistle, it is safer to take it as an exaggeration, "in all his epistles," justified to some extent in the fact that besides Ephesians, Paul does mention the Ephesian Christians in Romans (16:5); 1 Corinthians (15:32; 16:8,19); 2 Corinthians (1:8 f); 1 Timothy (1:3) and 2 Timothy (1:18). In the opening address the connection with Ephesians 1:3-6 is too close to be accidental. There are echoes of our epistle in chap. i (Ephesians 6:1); ix (Ephesians 2:20-22); xviii (*oikonomia*, Ephesians 1:10); xx (Ephesians 2:18; 4:24); and in Ignat. ad Polyc. v we have close identity with Ephesians 5:25 and less certain connection with Ephesians 4:2,

and in vi with [4063]Ephesians 6:13-17. The Epistle of Polycarp in two passages shows verbal agreement with Eph: in chap. i with [4018]Ephesians 1:8, and in xii with [4026]Ephesians 4:26, where we have (the Greek is missing here) ut his scripturis dictum est. Hermas speaks of the grief of the Holy Spirit in such a way as to suggest Ephesians (Mand. X, ii; compare [4050]Ephesians 4:30). Sim. IX, xiii, shows a knowledge of [4043]Ephesians 4:3-6, and possibly of 5:26 and 1:13. In the Didache (4) we find a parallel to [4065]Ephesians 6:5: "Servants submit yourselves to your masters." In Barnabas there are two or three turns of phrase that are possibly due to Ephesians. There is a slightly stronger connection between II Clement and Ephesians, especially in chap. xiv, where we have the Ephesian figure of the church as the body of Christ, and the relation between them referred to in terms of husband and wife.

This early evidence, slight though it is, is strengthened by the part Ephesians played in the 2nd century where, as we learn from Hippolytus, it was used by the Ophites and Basilides and Valentinus. The latter (according to Hip., Phil., VI, 29) quoted [40816]Ephesians 3:16-18, saying, "This is what has been written in Scripture," while his disciple Ptolemais is said by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.8, 5) to have attributed [40513]Ephesians 5:13 to Paul by name. According to the addenda to the eighth book of the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria, Theodotus, a contemporary of Valentinus, quoted [4040]Ephesians 4:10 and 30 with the words: "The apostle says," and attributes [4024]Ephesians 4:24 to Paul. Marcion knew Ephesians as Tertullian tells us, identifying it with the epistle referred to in [51046]Colossians 4:16 as ad Laodicenos. We find it in the Muratorian Fragment (10b, l. 20) as the second of the epistles which "Paul wrote following the example of his predecessor John." It is used in the letter from the church of Lyons and Vienne and by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and later writers. We can well accept the dictum of Dr. Hort that it "is all but certain on this evidence that the Epistle was in existence by 95 AD; quite certain that it was in existence by about fifteen years later or conceivably a little more" (Hort, Judaistic Christianity, 118).

2. Internal Evidence:

To this very strong chain of external evidence, reaching back to the very beginning of the 2nd century, if not into the end of the 1st, showing Ephesians as part of the original Pauline collection which no doubt Ignatius and Polycarp used, we must add the evidence of the epistle itself, testing it

to see if there be any reason why the letter thus early attested should not be accredited to the apostle.

(1) That it claims to be written by Paul is seen not only in the greeting, "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God, to the saints that are at Ephesus," but also in Ephesians 3:1, where we read: "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus in behalf of you Gentiles," a phrase which is continued in 4:1: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord." This claim is substantiated by the general character of the epistle which is written after the Pauline norm, with greeting and thanksgiving, leading on to and serving as the introduction of the special doctrinal teaching of the epistle. This is the first great division of the Pauline epistles and is regularly followed by an application of the teaching to practical matters, which in turn yields to personal greetings, or salutations, and the final benediction, commonly written by the apostle's own hand. In only one particular does Ephesians fail to answer completely to this outline. The absence of the personal greetings has always been marked as a striking peculiarity of our letter. The explanation of this peculiarity will meet us when we consider the destination of the epistle (see III below).

(2) Further evidence for the Pauline authorship is found in the general style and language of the letter. We may agree with von Soden (Early Christ. Lit., 294) that "every sentence contains verbal echoes of Pauline epistles, indeed except when ideas peculiar to the Epistle come to expression it is simply a mosaic of Pauline phraseology," without accepting his conclusion that Paul did not write it. We feel, as we read, that we have in our hands the work of one with whom the other epistles have made us familiar. Yet we are conscious none the less of certain subtle differences which give occasion for the various arguments that critics have brought against the claim that Paul is the actual author. This is not questioned until the beginning of the last century, but has been since Schleiermacher and his disciple Usteri, though the latter published his doubts before his master did his. The Tubingen scholars attacked the epistle mainly on the ground of supposed traces of Gnostic or Montanist influences, akin to those ascribed to the Colossians. Later writers have given over this claim to put forward others based on differences of style (Deuteronomy Wette, followed by Holtzmann, von Soden and others); dependence on Colossians (Hitzig, Holtzmann); the attitude to the Apostles (von Soden); doctrinal differences, especially those that concern Christology and the Parousia, the conception of the church (Klopper, Wrede and others). The tendency,

however, seems to be backward toward a saner view of the questions involved; and most of those who do not accept the Pauline authorship would probably agree with Julicher (Encyclopedia Biblica), who ascribes it to a "Pauline Christian intimately familiar with the Pauline epistles, especially with Colossians, writing about 90," who sought in Ephesians "to put in a plea for the true catholicism in the meaning of Paul and in his name."

(3) Certain of these positions require that we should examine the doctrinal objections.

(a) First of these is the claim that Ephesians has a different conception of the person and work of Christ from the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Not only have we the exaltation of Christ which we find in Colossians 1:16 ff, but the still further statement that it was God's purpose from the beginning to "sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth" (Ephesians 1:10). This is no more than the natural expansion of the term, "all things," which are attributed to Christ in 1 Corinthians 8:6, and is an idea which has at least its foreshadowing in Romans 8:19,20 and 2 Corinthians 5:18,19. The relation between Christ and the church as given in Ephesians 1:22 and 5:23 is in entire agreement with Paul's teaching in Romans 12, and 1 Corinthians 12. It is still the Pauline figure of the church as the body of Christ, in spite of the fact that Christ is not thought of as the head of that body. The argument in the epistle does not deal with the doctrine of the cross from the standpoint of the earlier epistles, but the teaching is exactly the same. There is redemption (Ephesians 1:7,14; 4:30); reconciliation (Ephesians 2:14-16); forgiveness (Ephesians 1:7; 4:32). The blood of Christ shed on the cross redeems us from our sin and restores us to God. In like manner it is said that the Parousia is treated (Ephesians 2:7) as something far off. But Paul has long since given up the idea that it is immediately; even in 2 Thessalonians 2 he shows that an indeterminate interval must intervene, and in Romans 11:25 he sees a period of time yet unfulfilled before the end.

(b) The doctrine of the church is the most striking contrast to the earlier epistles. We have already dealt with the relation of Christ to the church. The conception of the church universal is in advance of the earlier epistles, but it is the natural climax of the development of the apostle's conception of the church as shown in the earlier epistles. Writing from Rome with the

idea of the empire set before him, it was natural that Paul should see the church as a great whole, and should use the word *ekklesia* absolutely as signifying the oneness of the Christian brotherhood. As a matter of fact the word is used in this absolute sense in ⁽⁴⁶²⁸⁾1 Corinthians 12:28 before the Captivity Epistles (compare ⁽⁴⁶¹⁰²⁾1 Corinthians 1:2; 10:32). The emphasis here on the unity of Jew and Gentile in the church finds its counterpart in the argument of the Epistle to the Romans, though in Ephesians this is "urged on the basis of God's purpose and Christian faith, rather than on the Law and the Promises." Neither is it true that in Ephesians the Law is spoken of slightingly, as some say, by the reference to circumcision (2:11). In no case is the doctrinal portion of the epistle counter to that of the acknowledged Pauline epistles, though in the matter of the church, and of Christ's relationship to it and to the universe, there is evidence of progress in the apostle's conception of the underlying truths, which none the less find echoes in the earlier writings. "New doctrinal ideas, or a new proportion of these ideas, is no evidence of different authorship."

(c) In the matter of organization the position of Ephesians is not in any essential different from what we have in 1 Cor.

(4) The linguistic argument is a technical matter of the use of Greek words that cannot well be discussed here. The general differences of style, the longer "turgid" sentences, the repetitions on the one hand; the lack of argument, the full, swelling periods on the other, find their counterpart in portions of Romans. The minute differences which show themselves in new or strange words will be much reduced in number when we take from the list those that are due to subjects which the author does not discuss elsewhere (e.g. those in the list of armor in ⁽⁴⁹⁰⁶³⁾Ephesians 6:13 ff). Holtzmann (Einl, 25) gives us a list of these *hapax legomena* (76 in all). But there are none of these which, as Lock says, Paul could not have used, though there are certain which he does not use elsewhere and others which are only found in his accepted writings and here. The following stand out as affording special ground for objection. The phrase "heavenly places" (*ta epourania*, ⁽⁴⁹⁰⁶³⁾Ephesians 1:3,10; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12) is peculiar to this epistle. The phrase finds a partial parallel it in ⁽⁴⁶¹⁵⁴⁾1 Corinthians 15:49 and the thought is found in ⁽⁵⁰⁸⁰⁾Philippians 3:20. The devil (*ho diabolos*, ⁽⁴⁹⁰²⁷⁾Ephesians 4:27; 6:11) is used in place of the more usual Satan (*satanas*). But in Acts Paul is quoted as using *diabolos* in 13:10 and *satanas* in 26:18. It is at least natural that he would have used the Greek term when writing from Rome to a Greek-speaking community. The

objection to the expression "holy" (*hagiois*) apostles (⟨4005⟩Ephesians 3:5) falls to the ground when we remember that the expression "holy" (*hagios*) is Paul's common word for Christian and that he uses it of himself in this very epistle (⟨4008⟩Ephesians 3:8). In like manner "mystery" (*musterion*), "dispensation" (*oikonomia*) are found in other epistles in the same sense that we find them in here.

The attack on the epistle fails, whether it is made from the point of teaching or language; and there is no ground whatever for questioning the truth of Christian tradition that Paul wrote the letter which we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

II. PLACE AND DATE OF WRITING.

The time and place of his writing Ephesians turn on the larger question of the chronology of Paul's life (*see PAUL*) and the relation of the Captivity Epistles to each other; and the second question whether they were written from Caesarea or Rome (for this *see PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO*). Suffice it here to say that the place was undoubtedly Rome, and that they were written during the latter part of the two years' captivity which we find recorded in ⟨4080⟩Acts 28:30. The date will then be, following the later chronology, 63 or 64 AD; following the earlier, which is, in many ways, to be preferred, about 58 AD.

III. DESTINATION.

To whom was this letter written?

1. Title:

The title says to the Ephesians. With this the witness of the early church almost universally agrees. It is distinctly stated in the Muratorian Fragment (10b, 1. 20); and the epistle is quoted as to the Ephesians by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., v.14, 3; 24, 3); Tertullian (Adv. Marc., v.11, 17; Deuteronomy Praesc., 36; Deuteronomy Monag., v); Clement of Alexandria (Strom., iv.65; Paed., i.18) and Origen (Contra Celsum, iii.20). To these must be added the evidence of the extant manuscripts and VSS, which unite in ascribing the epistle to the Ephesians. The only exception to the universal evidence is Tertullian's account of Marcion (circa 150 AD) who reads Ad Laodicenos (Adv. Marc., v.11: "I say nothing here about another epistle which we have with the heading `to the Ephesians,' but the heretics `to the Laodiceans' .... (v.17): According to the true belief of the

church we hold this epistle to have been dispatched to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans; but Marcion had to falsify its title, wishing to make himself out a very diligent investigator").

2. The Inscription:

This almost universal evidence for Ephesus as the destination of our epistle is shattered when we turn to the reading of the first verse. Here according to Textus Receptus of the New Testament we read "Paul unto the saints which are at Ephesus (*en Epheso*) and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." When we look at the evidence for this reading we find that the two words *en Epheso* are lacking in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, and that the corrector of the cursive known as 67 has struck them out of his copy. Besides these a recently described MS, Cod. Laura 184, giving us a text which is so closely akin to that used by Origen that the scribe suggests that it was compiled from Origen's writings, omits these words (Robinson, Ephesians, 293). To this strong manuscript evidence against the inclusion of these two words in the inscription we must add the evidence of Origen and Basil. Origen, as quoted in Cramer's Catena at the place, writes: "In the Ephesians alone we found the expression `to the saints which are,' and we ask, unless the phrase `which are' is redundant, what it can mean. May it not be that as in Exodus He who speaks to Moses declares His name to be the Absolute One, so also those who are partakers of the Absolute become existent when they are called, as it were, from non-being into being?" Origen evidently knows nothing here of any reading *en Epheso*, but takes the words "which are" in an absolute, metaphysical sense. Basil, a century and a half later, probably refers to this comment of Origen (Contra Eun., ii.19) saying: "But moreover, when writing to the Ephesians, as to men who are truly united with the Absolute One through clear knowledge, he names them as existent ones in a peculiar phrase, saying `to the saints which are and faithful in Christ Jesus.' For so those who were before us have handed it down, and we also have found (this reading) in old copies." In Jerome's note on this verse there is perhaps a reference to this comment on Origen, but the passage is too indefinitely expressed for us to be sure what its bearing on the reading really is. The later writers quoted by Lightfoot (Biblical Essays, 384 f) cannot, as Robinson shows (Eph, 293), be used as witnesses against the Textus Receptus. We may therefore conclude that the reading *en Epheso* was wanting in many early manuscripts, and that there is good ground for questioning its place in the original autograph.

But the explanations suggested for the passage, as it stands without the words, offend Pauline usage so completely that we cannot accept them. To take "which are" in the phrase "the saints which are" (*tois ousin*) as absolute, as Origen did; or as meaning "truly," is impossible. It is possible to take the words with what follows, "and faithful" (*kai pistois*), and interpret this latter expression (*pistois*) either in the New Testament sense of "believers" or in the classical sense of "steadfast." The clause would then read either "to the saints who are also believers," or "to the saints who are also faithful," i.e. steadfast. Neither of these is wholly in accord with Paul's normal usage, but they are at least possible.

3. The Evidence of the Letter Itself:

The determining factor in the question of the destination of the epistle lies in the epistle itself. We must not forget that, save perhaps Corinth, there was no church with which Paul was so closely associated as that in Ephesus. His long residence there, of which we read in Acts (chapters 19; 20), finds no echo in our epistle. There is no greeting to anyone of the Christian community, many of whom were probably intimate friends. The close personal ties, that the scene of ⁰ᵂⁱ⁰ᵂˑActs 20:17-38 shows us existed between him and his converts in Ephesus, are not even hinted at. The epistle is a calm discussion, untouched with the warmth of personal allusion beyond the bare statement that the writer is a prisoner (⁰ᵂᵂ⁰Ephesians 3:1; 4:1), and his commendation of Tychicus (⁰ᵂᵒᵉᵇEphesians 6:21,22), who was to tell them about Paul's condition in Rome. This lack of personal touch is intensified by the assumption underlying Ephesians 3 and 4 that the readers do not know his knowledge of the mysteries of Christ. In 3:2 and 4:21,22 there is a particle (*eige*, "if indeed") which suggests at least some question as to how far Paul himself was the missionary through whom they believed. All through the epistle there is a lack of those elements which are so constant in the other epistles, which mark the close personal fellowship and acquaintance between the apostle and those to whom he is writing.

4. Conclusion:

This element in the epistle, coupled with the strange fact of Marcion's attributing it to the Laodiceans, and the expression in ⁵ᴵ⁰ᵂᵇColossians 4:16 that points to a letter coming from Laodicea to Colosse, has led most writers of the present day to accept Ussher's suggestion that the epistle is really a circular letter to the churches either in Asia, or, perhaps better, in

that part of Phrygia which lies near Colosse. The readers were evidently Gentiles (Ephesians 2:1; 3:1,2) and from the mission of Tychicus doubtless of a definite locality, though for the reasons given above this could not well be Ephesus alone. It is barely possible that the cities to whom John was bidden to write the Revelation (Revelation 1 through 3) are the same as those to whom Paul wrote this epistle, or it may be that they were the churches of the Lycus valley and its immediate neighborhood. The exact location cannot be determined. But from the fact that Marcion attributed the epistle to Laodicea, possibly because it was so written in the first verse, and from the connection with Colossians, it is at least probable that two of these churches were at Colosse and Laodicea. On this theory the letter would seem to have been written from Rome to churches in the neighborhood of, or accessible to, Colosse, dealing with the problem of Christian unity and fellowship and the relations between Christ and the church and sent to them by the hands of Tychicus. The inscription was to be filled in by the bearer, or copies were to be made with the name of the local church written in, and then sent to or left with the different churches. It was from Ephesus, as the chief city of Asia in all probability, that copies of this circular letter reached the church in the world, and from this fact the letter came to be known in the church at large as that from Ephesus, and the title was written "to the Ephesians," and the first verse was made to read to the "saints which are in Ephesus."

IV. RELATION TO OTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

Ephesians raises a still further question by the close resemblances that can be traced between it and various other New Testament writings.

1. Peter:

The connection between Ephesians and 1 Peter is not beyond question. In spite of the disclaimer of as careful a writer as Dr. Bigg (ICC) it is impossible to follow up the references given by Holtzmann and others and not feel that Peter either knew Ephesians or at the very least had discussed these subjects with its author. For, as Dr. Hort tells us, the similarity is one of thought and structure rather than of phrase. The following are the more striking passages with their parallels in 1 Peter: Ephesians 1:3 (1 Peter 1:3); 1:18-20 (1 Peter 1:3-5); 2:18-22 (1 Peter 2:4-6); 1:20-22 (1 Peter 3:22); 3:9 (1 Peter 1:20); 3:20 (1 Peter 1:12); 4:19 (1 Peter 1:14). The explanations that 1 Peter and Ephesians are both from the pen of the same writer, or that Ephesians is based on 1 Pet, are

overthrown, among other reasons, by the close relation between Ephesians and Colossians.

2. *Johannine Writings:*

The connection with the Apocalypse is based on [49020]Ephesians 2:20 as compared with [66214]Revelation 21:14; [49305]Ephesians 3:5 and [66107]Revelation 10:7; [49511]Ephesians 5:11 and [66804]Revelation 18:4, and the figure of the bride of the Lamb ([66907]Revelation 19:7; compare [49525]Ephesians 5:25). Holtzmann adds various minor similarities, but none of these are sufficient to prove any real knowledge of, let alone dependence on Ephesians. The contact with the Fourth Gospel is more positive. Love (*agape*) and knowledge (*gnosis*) are used in the same sense in both Ephesians and the Gospel. The application of the Messianic title, the Beloved ([49106]Ephesians 1:6), to Christ does not appear in the Gospel (it is found in [40317]Matthew 3:17), but the statement of the Father's love for Him constantly recurs. The reference to the going up and coming down of Christ ([49409]Ephesians 4:9) is closely akin to [43313]John 3:13 ("No man hath ascended into heaven, but he," etc.). So, too, [49511]Ephesians 5:11,13 finds echo in [43319]John 3:19,20; [49404]Ephesians 4:4,7 in [43334]John 3:34; [49506]Ephesians 5:6 in [43336]John 3:36. [49508]Ephesians 5:8 f is akin to [62006]1 John 1:6 and [49203]Ephesians 2:3 to [62310]1 John 3:10.

3. *Colossians:*

When we turn to Colossians we find a situation that is without parallel in the New Testament. Out of 155 verses in Ephesians, 78 are found in Colossians in varying degrees of identity. Among them are these: [49106]Ephesians 1:6 parallel [51013]Colossians 1:13; [49116]Ephesians 1:16 ff parallel [51009]Colossians 1:9; [49121]Ephesians 1:21 ff parallel [51016]Colossians 1:16 ff; [49216]Ephesians 2:16 parallel [51220]Colossians 2:20; [49402]Ephesians 4:2 parallel [51312]Colossians 3:12; [49415]Ephesians 4:15 parallel [51219]Colossians 2:19; [49422]Ephesians 4:22 parallel [51309]Colossians 3:9; [49432]Ephesians 4:32 parallel [51312]Colossians 3:12 ff; [49505]Ephesians 5:5 parallel [51305]Colossians 3:5; [49519]Ephesians 5:19 ff parallel [51316]Colossians 3:16 ff; [49604]Ephesians 6:4 parallel [51321]Colossians 3:21; [49605]Ephesians 6:5-9 parallel [51322]Colossians 3:22 through 4:1. For a fuller list see Abbott (ICC, xxiii). Not only is this so, but there is an identity of treatment, a similarity in argument so great that Bishop Barry (NT Commentary for English Readers, Ellicott) can make a parallel analysis showing the divergence and similarity by the simple device of different type. To this we must add that there are at least a dozen Greek words common to these two epistles not found elsewhere. Over against

this similarity is to be set the dissimilarity. The general subject of the epistles is not approached from the same standpoint. In one it is Christ as the head of all creation, and our duty in consequence. In the other it is the church as the fullness of Christ and our duty — put constantly in the same words — in consequence thereof. In Ephesians we have a number of Old Testament references, in Colossians only one. In Ephesians we have unique phrases, of which "the heavenly spheres" (*ta epourania*) is most striking, and the whole treatment of the relation of Jew and Gentile in the church, and the marriage tie as exemplified in the relation between Christ and the church. In Colossians we have in like manner distinct passages which have no parallel in Ephesians, especially the controversial section in chapter 2, and the salutations. In truth, as Davies (Ephesians, Paul to Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians.) well says: "It is difficult indeed to say, concerning the patent coincidences of expression in the two epistles, whether the points of likeness or of unlikeness between them are the more remarkable." This situation has given rise to various theories. The most complicated is that of H. Holtzmann, who holds that some passages point to a priority of Colossians, others to that of Ephesians; and as a result he believes that Colossians, as we have it, is a composite, based on an original epistle of Paul which was expanded by the author of Ephesians — who was not Paul — after he had written this epistle. So Holtzmann would give us the original Colossians (Pauline), Ephesians (based on it), and the present Colossians (not Pauline) expanded from the former through the latter. The theory falls to the ground on its fundamental hypothesis, that Colossians as it stands is interpolated. The most reasonable explanation is that both Colossians and Ephesians are the work of Paul, written at practically the same time, and that in writing on the same subjects, to different people, there would be just the differences and similarity which we have in these epistles. The objection that Paul could not repeat himself and yet differ as these two letters do is purely imaginary. Zahn shows us that men do just this very thing, giving an account of Bismarck's speaking on a certain subject to a group of officers and later to a large body of men, and yet using quite different language. Moreover, Paul is not averse to repeating himself (compare Romans and Galatians and 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy) when to do so will serve his purpose. "Simultaneous authorship by one writer," and that writer Paul, is the only explanation that will satisfy all the facts in the case and give them due proportion.

V. THE PURPOSE.

If our interpretation of the circumstances, composition and destination of Ephesians be right, we are now in a position to look beneath the surface and ask why the apostle wrote it. To understand its central theme we must remember that Paul, the prisoner of the Lord, is writing in the calm of his imprisonment, far from the noise and turmoil, the conflict and strife, that marked his earlier life. He is now able to look out on the church and get a view of it in its wholeness, to see the part it is to play in God's scheme for the restoration of the human race, to see God's purpose in it and for it and its relation to Him. With this stand-point he can write to the churches about Ephesus on the occasion of Tychicus' return to Colosse, not to correct false views on some special point, but to emphasize the great central truth which he had put in the very forefront of his letter. God's eternal purpose is to gather into one the whole created universe, to restore harmony among His creatures and between them and Himself. The apostle's whole prayer is for this end, his whole effort and desire is toward this goal: that they may have full, clear knowledge of this purpose of God which He is working out through Christ Jesus, who is the head of the church, the very fullness of Him who is being fulfilled all over the world. Everything, for the apostle, as he looks forth upon the empire, centers in the purpose of God. The discord between the elements in the church, the distinction between Jew and Gentile, all these must yield to that greater purpose. The vision is of a great oneness in Christ and through Him in God, a oneness of birth and faith and life and love, as men, touched with the fire of that Divine purpose, seek to fulfil, each in himself, the part that God has given him to play in the world, and, fighting against the foes of God, to overcome at last.

It is a noble purpose to set before men this great mystery of the church as God's means by which, in Christ, He may restore all men to union with Himself. It is an impossible vision except to one who, as Paul was at the time, is in a situation where the strife and turmoil of outside life can enter but little, but a situation where he can look out with a calm vision and, in the midst of the world's discord, discern what God is accomplishing among men.

VI. ARGUMENT.

The Argument of Ephesians is as follows:

⟨49010⟩Ephesians 1:1,2:
Greeting.

⟨49003⟩Ephesians 1:3-10:
Hymn of praise to God for the manifestation of His purpose for men in
Christ Jesus, chosen from the beginning to a holy life in love, predestined
to adoption as sons through Jesus Christ, in whom as the Beloved He has
given us grace (1:3-6). Redeemed by the blood of Christ by whom we have
forgiveness of sins through His grace abounding in us and making us know
the mystery of His purpose, namely, to unite all in one, even the entire
universe (1:7-10).

⟨49011⟩Ephesians 1:11-14:

For this Israel has served as a preparation, and to this the Gentiles are
come, sealed unto salvation by the Holy Spirit of power.

⟨49015⟩Ephesians 1:15,16a:

Thanksgiving for their faith.

⟨49016⟩Ephesians 1:16b-21:

Prayer that they may, by the spirit of wisdom and revelation, know their
destiny and the power of God to fulfill it.

⟨49022⟩Ephesians 1:22 through 2:10:

Summary of what God has done in Christ. Christ's sovereignty (1:22,23),
and headship in the church (1:22,23); His work for men, quickening us
from a death of sin into which man has sunk, and exalting us to fellowship
with Christ by His grace, who has created us for good works as part of His
eternal purpose (2:1-10).

⟨49211⟩Ephesians 2:11-13:

The contrast between the former estate of the Gentiles, as strangers and
aliens, and their present one, "near" by the blood of Christ.

⟨49214⟩Ephesians 2:14-18:

Christ, who is our peace, uniting Jew and Gentile and reconciling man to
God through the cross; by whom we all have access to the Father.

⟨40219⟩*Ephesians 2:19-22:*

This is theirs who as fellow-citizens of the saints, built up on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, become a sanctuary of God in the Spirit.

⟨40301⟩*Ephesians 3:1-21:*

A digression on the "mystery," i.e. the revelation to Paul, together with a prayer that men may grasp it. The "mystery" is that all men, Jews and Gentiles, are partakers of the promise. Of this Paul is a minister, to whom has been given the stewardship of that mystery, unfolding to all creatures God's wisdom, in accord with His eternal purpose (3:1-13). Prayer that they may live up to their opportunities (3:14-19). Doxology (3:20,21).

⟨40401⟩*Ephesians 4:1-6:*

The outcome of this privilege, the fulfillment of the Divine purpose, must show itself in unity of life in the Christian fellowship.

⟨40407⟩*Ephesians 4:7-16:*

The different gifts which the Christians have are for the upbuilding of the church into that perfect unity which is found in Christ.

⟨40417⟩*Ephesians 4:17-24:*

The spiritual darkness and corruption of the old Gentilelife set over against the enlightenment and purity and holiness of the new life in Christ.

⟨40425⟩*Ephesians 4:25 through 6:9:*

Special features of the Christian life, arising out of the union of Christians with Christ and making for the fellowship in the church. On the side of the individual: sins in word (4:25-30); of temper (4:31,32); self-sacrifice as opposed to self-indulgence (5:1-8); the contrast of the present and the past repeated (5:9-14); general behavior (5:15-20); on the side of social relations: husband and wife exemplified in the relation of Christ and the church (5:23-33); children and parents (6:1-4); servants and masters (6:5-9).

⟨40619⟩*Ephesians 6:19-20:*

The Christian warfare, its foes and armor and weapons.

<4962>*Ephesians 6:21-24:*

Conclusion.

VII. TEACHING.

The keynote to the doctrinal basis of the epistle is struck at the very outset.
The hymn of praise centers in the thought of God, the Father of our Lord
Jesus Christ. It is to Him that the blessing is due, to Him, who had chosen
us from the beginning, in whom there is redemption in Ephesians (1:3-7).
God as the very heart and soul of everything, "is over all, and through all,
and in all" (4:6). He is the Father from whom all revelation comes (1:17),
and from whom every human family derives its distinctive characteristics
(3:15). But He is not only Father in relation to the universe: He is in a
peculiar sense the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (1:3). The eternity of
our Lord is distinctly asserted (1:4,5) as of one existing before the
foundation of the world, in whom everything heavenly as well as earthly is
united, summed up (1:10; compare 2:12; 4:18). He is the Messiah (the
Beloved (1:6) is clearly a Messianic term, as the voice from heaven at
Christ's baptism, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,"
shows (<4087>Matthew 3:17)). In Him we are quickened (2:5). He is made
flesh (2:15). He died on the cross (2:16), and by His blood (1:7) we have
redemption (4:30), and reconciliation with God (2:16). He whom God
raised from the dead (1:20), now is in heaven (1:20; 4:8) from which place
He comes (4:8), bringing gifts to men. (This interpretation makes the
descent follow the ascent, and the passage teaches the return of Christ
through His gifts of the Spirit which He gave to the church.) He who is in
heaven fills all things (4:10); and, from a wealth which is unsearchable
(3:8), as the Head of the church (1:22), pours out His grace to free us from
the power of sin (2:1). To this end He endues us with His Spirit (3:16).
This teaching about God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is no abstract
theorizing. It is all intensely practical, having at its heart the purpose of
God from the ages, which, as we saw above, is to restore again the unity of
all things in Him (1:9,10); to heal the breach between man and God
(2:16,17); to break down the separation between Jew and Gentile, and to
abolish the enmity not only between them, but between them and God.
This purpose of God is to be accomplished in a visible society, the one
church, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (2:20), of
which Jesus Christ is the head of the corner, into which men are to be

admitted by holy baptism, where they own one Lord, hold to one faith, in one God and Father of all who is above all and through all (4:4-7).

The teaching as to the church is one of the most striking elements of the epistle. In the first place we have the absolute use of the term, which has been already discussed. The apostle sees the whole Christian community throughout the world bound together into a unity, one fellowship, one body. He has risen to a higher vision than man had ever had before. But there is a further teaching in the epistle. Not only is the church throughout the world one body, but it is the body of Christ who is its Head (Ephesians 1:21 f). He has, as Lightfoot suggests, the same relation to the church which in Ephesians 1:10 He has to the universe. He is its Head, "the inspiring, ruling, guiding, combining, sustaining power, the mainspring of its activity, the center of its unity, and the seat of its life." But the relation is still closer. If, as the evidence adduced would necessitate, one accepts J. Armitage Robinson's explanation of pleroma, as that without which a thing is incomplete (Eph, 255 f), then the church, in some wonderful mystery, is the complement of Christ, apart from which He Himself, as the Christ, lacks fullness. We are needed by Him, that so He may become all in all. He, the Head of restored humanity, the Second Adam, needs His church, to fulfill the unity which He came upon earth to accomplish (compare Stone, Christian Church, 85, 86). Still further, we find in this epistle the two figures of the church as the Temple of the Spirit (2:21 ff;, and the Bride of Christ (5:23 ff). Under the latter figure we find the marriage relation of the Lord to Israel, which runs through the Old Testament (Hosea 3:16, et al.), applied to the union between Christ and the church. The significance is the close tie that binds them, the self-sacrificing love of Christ and the self-surrender of obedience on the part of the church; and the object of this is that so the church may be free from any blemish, holy and spotless. In the figure of the Temple, which is an expansion of the earlier figure in 1 Corinthians 3:16; 2 Corinthians 6:16, we see the thought of a spiritual building, a sanctuary, into which all the diverse elements of the churches grow into a compact unity. These figures sum up the apostle's thought of that in which the Divine purpose finds its fulfillment. The progress forward to that fulfillment is due to the combined effort of God and man. "The church, the society of Christian men .... is built and yet it grows. Human endeavor and Divine energy cooperate in its development" (Westcott). Out of this doctrinal development the apostle works out the practical life by which this Divine

purpose can find its fulfillment. Admitted into the fellowship of the church by baptism, we become members one of another Ephesians (4:25). It is on this basis that he urges honesty and patience and truth in our intercourse with each other, and pleads for gentleness and a forgiving spirit (4:25-32). As followers of God we are to keep free from the sins that spring from pride and self-indulgence and any fellowship with the spirit of evil (5:1-14). Our life is to be lived as seeking the fulfillment of God's purpose in all the relationships of life (5:15 through 6:9). All is to be done with the full armor of the Christian soldier, as is fitting for those who fight spiritual enemies (6:10 ff). The epistle is preeminently practical, bringing the significance of the great revelation of God's will to the everyday duties of life, and lifting all things up to a higher level which finds its ideal in the indwelling of Christ in our hearts, out of which we may be filled with all the fullness of God (3:17-19).

LITERATURE.

J. Armitage Robinson, Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; Westcott, Epistle to the Ephesains; Abbott, "Ephesians and Colossians," International Critical Commentary; Moule, "Ephesians," Cambridge Bible; Salmond, "Ephesians," Expositor's Greek Testament; Macpherson, Commentary on Ephesians; Findlay, "Epistle to the Ephesians," Expositor's Bible; Alexander, "Colossians and Ephesians," Bible for Home and School; Haupt, Meyer's Exeget. und krit. Kommentar; von Soden, Handcommentar; Hort, Prolegomena to the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians; Dale, Lectures on the Ephesians.

Charles Smith Lewis

EPHESUS

<ef'-e-sus> ([Ἔφεσος, *Ephesos*], "desirable"): A city of the Roman province of Asia, near the mouth of the Cayster river, 3 miles from the western coast of Asia Minor, and opposite the island of Samos. With an artificial harbor accessible to the largest ships, and rivaling the harbor at Miletus, standing at the entrance of the valley which reaches far into the interior of Asia Minor, and connected by highways with the chief cities of the province, Ephesus was the most easily accessible city in Asia, both by land and sea. Its location, therefore, favored its religious, political and commercial development, and presented a most advantageous field for the missionary labors of Paul. The city stood upon the sloping sides and at the

base of two hills, Prion and Coressus, commanding a beautiful view; its climate was exceptionally fine, and the soil of the valley was unusually fertile.

Tradition says that in early times near the place where the mother goddess of the earth was born, the Amazons built a city and a temple in which they might worship. This little city of the Amazons, bearing at different times the names of Samorna, Trachea, Ortygia and Ptelea, flourished until in the early Greek days it aroused the cupidity of Androclus, a prince of Athens. He captured it and made it a Greek city. Still another tradition says that Androclus was its founder. However, under Greek rule the Greek civilization gradually supplanted that of the Orientals, the Greek language was spoken in place of the Asiatic; and the Asiatic goddess of the temple assumed more or less the character of the Greek Artemis. Ephesus, therefore, and all that pertained to it, was a mixture of oriental and Greek Though the early history of the city is obscure, it seems that at different times it was in the hands of the Carians, the Leleges and Ionians; in the early historical period it was one of a league of twelve Ionfan cities. In 560 BC it came into the possession of the Lydians; 3 years later, in 557, it was taken by the Persians; and during the following years the Greeks and Persians were constantly disputing for its possession. Finally, Alexander the Great took it; and at his death it fell to Lysimachus, who gave it the name of Arsinoe, from his second wife. Upon the death of Attalus II (Philadelphus), king of Pergamos, it was bequeathed to the Roman Empire; and in 190, when the Roman province of Asia was formed, it became a part of it. Ephesus and Pergamos, the capital of Asia, were the two great rival cities of the province. Though Pergamos was the center of the Roman religion and of the government, Ephesus was the more accessible, the commercial center and the home of the native goddess Diana; and because of its wealth and situation it gradually became the chief city of the province. It is to the temple of Diana, however, that its great wealth and prominence are largely due. Like the city, it dates from the time of the Amazons, yet what the early temple was like we now have no means of knowing, and of its history we know little except that it was seven times destroyed by fire and rebuilt, each time on a scale larger and grander than before. The wealthy king Croesus supplied it with many of its stone columns, and the pilgrims from all the oriental world brought it of their wealth. In time the temple possessed valuable lands; it controlled the fishcries; its priests were the bankers of its enormous revenues. Because of

its strength the people stored there their money for safe-keeping; and it became to the ancient world practically all that the Bank of England is to the modern world.

In 356 BC, on the very night when Alexander the Great was born, it was burned; and when he grew to manhood he offered to rebuild it at his own expense if his name might be inscribed upon its portals. This the priests of Ephesus were unwilling to permit, and they politely rejected his offer by saying that it was not fitting for one god to build a temple to another. The wealthy Ephesians themselves undertook its reconstruction, and 220 years passed before its final completion.

Not only was the temple of Diana a place of worship, and a treasure-house, but it was also a museum in which the best statuary and most beautiful paintings were preserved. Among the paintings was one by the famous Apelles, a native of Ephesus, representing Alexander the Great hurling a thunderbolt. It was also a sanctuary for the criminal, a kind of city of refuge, for none might be arrested for any crime whatever when within a bowshot of its walls. There sprang up, therefore, about the temple a village in which the thieves and murderers and other criminals made their homes. Not only did the temple bring vast numbers of pilgrims to the city, as does the Kaaba at Mecca at the present time, but it employed hosts of people apart from the priests and priestesses; among them were the large number of artisans who manufactured images of the goddess Diana, or shrines to sell to the visiting strangers.

Such was Ephesus when Paul on his 2nd missionary journey in Acts (18:19-21) first visited the city, and when, on his 3rd journey (19:8-10; 20:31), he remained there for two years preaching in the synagogue (19:8,10), in the school of Tyrannus (19:9) and in private houses (20:20). Though Paul was probably not the first to bring Christianity to Ephesus, for Jews had long lived there (2:9; 6:9), he was the first to make progress against the worship of Diana. As the fame of his teachings was carried by the pilgrims to their distant homes, his influence extended to every part of Asia Minor. In time the pilgrims, with decreasing faith in Diana, came in fewer numbers; the sales of the shrines of the goddess fell off; Diana of the Ephesians was no longer great; a Christian church was rounded there and flourished, and one of its first leaders was the apostle John. Finally in 262 AD, when the temple of Diana was again burned, its influence had so far departed that it was never again rebuilt. Diana was dead. Ephesus became

a Christian city, and in 341 AD a council of the Christian church was held there. The city itself soon lost its importance and decreased in population. The sculptured stones of its great buildings, which were no longer in use and were falling to ruins, were carried away to Italy, and especially to Constantinople for the great church of Saint Sophia. In 1308 the Turks took possession of the little that remained of the city, and deported or murdered its inhabitants. The Cayster river, overflowing its banks, gradually covered with its muddy deposit the spot where the temple of Diana had once stood, and at last its very site was forgotten.

The small village of Ayasaluk, 36 miles from Smyrna on the Aidin R.R., does not mark the site of the ancient city of Ephesus, yet it stands nearest to its ruins. The name Ayasaluk is the corruption of three Greek words meaning "the Holy Word of God." Passing beyond the village one comes to the ruins of the old aqueduct, the fallen city walls, the so-called church of John or the baths, the Turkish fort which is sometimes called Paul's prison, the huge theater which was the scene of the riot of Paul's time, but which now, with its marble torn away, presents but a hole in the side of the hill Prion. In 1863 Mr. J.T. Wood, for the British Museum, obtained permission from the Turkish government to search for the site of the lost temple of Diana. During the eleven years of his excavations at Ephesus, $80,000 were spent, and few cities of antiquity have been more thoroughly explored. The city wall of Lysimachus was found to be 36,000 ft. in length, enclosing an area of 1,027 acres. It was 10 1/2 ft. thick, and strengthened by towers at intervals of 100 ft. The six gates which pierced the wall are now marked by mounds of rubbish. The sites and dimensions of the various public buildings, the streets, the harbor, and the foundations of many of the private houses were ascertained, and numerous inscriptions and sculptures and coins were discovered. Search, however, did not reveal the site of the temple until January 1, 1870, after six years of faithful work. Almost by accident it was then found in the valley outside the city walls, several feet below the present surface. Its foundation, which alone remained, enabled Mr. Wood to reconstruct the entire temple plan. The temple was built upon a foundation which was reached by a flight of ten steps. The building itself was 425 ft. long and 220 ft. wide; each of its 127 pillars which supported the roof of its colonnade was 60 ft. high; like the temples of Greece, its interior was open to the sky. For a further description of the temple, see Mr. Wood's excellent book, Discoveries at Ephesus.

E. J. Banks

EPHLAL

<ef'-lal> ([l l pִֶa, *'ephlal*], "judgment"): A descendant of Judah (⁽¹³¹²⁵⁷⁾1 Chronicles 2:37).

EPHOD (1)

<ef'-od> ([dwִpa, *'ephowdh*] (28 times), [dpaְֶ*'ephodh*] (20 times); Septuagint [ἐπωμίς, *epomis*], [ἐφώθ, *ephoth*], [ἐφώδ, *ephod*], [ἐφούδ, *ephoud*], [στολὴ ἔξαλλος, *stole exallos*], [στολὴ βυσσίνη, *stole bussine*]):

(1) A sacred vestment originally designed for the high priest (⁽⁰²⁸⁰⁴⁾Exodus 28:4 ff; 39:2 ff), and made "of gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen," held together by two shoulder-pieces and a skillfully woven band which served as a girdle for the ephod. On the shoulderpieces were two onyx stones on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. It is not known whether the ephod extended below the hips or only to the waist. Attached to the ephod by chains of pure gold was a breastplate containing twelve precious stones in four rows. Underneath the ephod was the blue robe of the ephod extending to the feet of the priest. The robe of the ephod was thus a garment comprising, in addition to the long robe proper, the ephod with its shoulderpieces and the breastplate of judgment.
(2) From the historical books we learn that ephods were worn by persons other than the high priest. Thus, the boy Samuel was girded with a linen ephod while assisting the aged high priest (⁽⁰⁹⁰²¹⁸⁾1 Samuel 2:18); the priests at Nob, 85 in number, are described as men wearing a linen ephod (⁽⁰⁹²²¹⁸⁾1 Samuel 22:18); and David was girded with a linen ephod when he danced in the procession that brought the ark into Jerusalem (⁽¹⁰⁰⁶⁰⁴⁾2 Samuel 6:14). The ephod was considered appropriate for the king on this solemn and happy occasion; but it would be reading into the narrative more than it contains to infer that lay worshippers were regularly clothed with the ephod; nor are we to suppose that priests other than the high priest were accustomed to wear ephods as rich and elaborate as that of the high priest. Abiathar, who became high priest after the assassination of his father by Doeg, probably brought to the camp of David the ephod worn by the high priest in his ministrations at Nob (⁽⁰⁹²³⁰⁶⁾1 Samuel 23:6), and through this ephod David sought in certain crises to learn Yahweh's will (⁽⁰⁹²³⁰⁹⁾1 Samuel

23:9; 30:7). Some have argued that the ephod, which Abiathar brought in his hand, was an image rather than a priestly garment, but there seems no sufficient reason for regarding it as other than a vestment for the high priest. The ephod behind which the sword of Goliath was kept wrapped in a cloth may well have been a garment suspended from the wall or itself wrapped in a protecting cloth (⟨0209⟩1 Samuel 21:9).

(3) The ephod mentioned in ⟨0775⟩Judges 17:5; 18:14 f; ⟨2804⟩Hosea 3:4 is associated with teraphim and other idolatrous images. We may frankly confess that we do not know the shape, size and use of the ephod in these cases, though even here also the ephod may well have been a priestly garment. The same remark holds good of the ephod made by Gideon, and which became an object of idolatrous worship in Israel (⟨0782⟩Judges 8:27). It has been argued that a vestment would not cost seventeen hundred shekels of gold. Possibly Gideon set up an apparatus of worship containing other articles just as the mother of Micah began with the promise to make a graven image and a molten image, and afterward added an ephod and teraphim (⟨0770⟩Judges 17:1-5). Moreover, if gems and brilliants were put on Gidcon's ephod, who can say that it did not cost seventeen hundred shekels?

LITERATURE.

Braun, Deuteronomy vestitu sacerdotum (1698), 462 ff; Ugolini, Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum (1744-69), XII, 785 f; Ancessi, Annales de philos. chretienne, 1872; Konig, Rel. Hist. of Israel, 107 ff; Van Hoonackcr, Leviticus sacerdoce levitique (1899), 370 ff; Foote, The Ephod, in "Johns Hopkins University Circulars," 1900.

John Richard Sampey

EPHOD (2)

<e'-fod> ([dpae, *'ephodh*]): Father of Hanniel, prince of Manasseh (⟨0823⟩Numbers 34:23).

EPHPHATHA

<ef'-a-tha>, *<ef-a'-tha>* ([Ἐφφαθά, *Ephphatha*]): Aramaic word used by Christ (⟨4074⟩Mark 7:34), the 'ethpa`al imperative of Aramaic *pethach* (Hebrew *pathach*), translated, "Be (thou) opened"; compare ⟨2305⟩Isaiah 35:5. The Aramaic was the sole popular language of Palestine (Shurer,

History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, IIg, 9) and its use shows that we have here the graphic report of an eyewitness, upon whom the dialectic form employed made a deep impression. This and the corresponding act of the touch with the moistened finger is the foundation of a corresponding ceremony in the Roman Catholic formula for baptism.

EPHRAIM (1)

<e'-fra-im>, *<e'-fra-im>* ([μyir″ pảa, *'ephrayim*], "double fruit"):

1. THE PATRIARCH:

The younger of the two sons of Joseph and Asenath, born in Egypt. He and his brother Manasseh were adopted by Jacob, and ranked as his own sons, each becoming the ancestor of a tribe in Israel. In blessing his grandchildren, despite their father's protest, Jacob preferred the younger, foreshadowing the future eminence of his descendants (Genesis 41:50 ff; 48:20 ff). In the Blessing of Jacob however, the two are included under the name of Joseph (Genesis 49:22 f).

2. THE TRIBE:

At the first census on leaving Egypt, Ephraim's men of war numbered 40,500; and at the second census they are given as 32,500 (Numbers 1:33; 26:37). See, however, article NUMBERS. The head of the tribe at the Exodus was Elishama, son of Ammihud (Numbers 1:10). With the standard of the tribe of Ephraim on the West of the tabernacle in the desert march were Manasseh and Benjamin (Numbers 2:18 ff). The Ephraimite among the spies was Hoshea (i.e. Joshua), the son of Nun (Numbers 13:8). At the division of the land Ephraim was represented by prince Kemuel, son of Shiphtan (Numbers 34:24). The future power of this tribe is again foreshadowed in the Blessing of Moses (Deuteronomy 33:17). When Moses died, a member of the tribe, Joshua, whose faith and courage had distinguished him among the spies, succeeded to the chief place in Israel. It was natural that the scene of national assemblies, and the center of the nation's worship, should be chosen within the land occupied by the children of Joseph, at Shechem and Shiloh respectively. The leadership of Ephraim was further emphasized by the rule of Samuel. From the beginning of life in Palestine they enjoyed a certain prestige, and were very sensitive on the point of honor (Judges 7:24; 8:1; 12:1 ff). Their acceptance of and loyalty to Saul, the first king chosen over Israel, may be

explained by his belonging to a Rachel tribe, and by the close and tender relations existing between Joseph and Benjamin. But they were never reconciled to the passing of the scepter to Judah in the person of David (2 Samuel 2:8 f). That Israel would have submitted to the sovereignty of Absalom, any more than to that of David, is not to be believed; but his revolt furnished an opportunity to deal a shrewd blow at the power of the southern tribe (2 Samuel 15:13). Solomon's lack of wisdom and the crass folly of Rehoboam in the management of the northern tribes fanned the smoldering discontent into a fierce flame. This made easy the work of the rebel Jeroboam; and from the day of the disruption till the fall of the Northern Kingdom there was none to dispute the supremacy of Ephraim, the names Ephraim and Israel being synonymous. The most distinguished of Ephraim's sons were Joshua, Samuel and Jeroboam I.

3. THE TERRITORY:

The central part of Western Palestine fell to the children of Joseph; and, while the boundaries of the territory allotted to Ephraim and Manasseh respectively are given in Joshua 16; 17:1 ff, it seems to have been held by them in common for some time (17:14). The Canaanites in certain cities of both divisions were not driven out. It was probably thought more profitable to enslave them (16:10; 17:13). The boundaries of Ephraim cannot be followed with accuracy, but roughly, they were as follows: The southern boundary, agreeing with the northern border of Benjamin, started from Bethel, and passed down westward by nether Beth-horon and Gezer toward the sea (16:3; in verse 5 it stops at upper Beth-horon); it turned northward to the southern bank of the brook Kanah (Wady Kanah) along which it ran eastward (17:10) to Michmethath (the plain of Mukhneh); thence it went northward along the western edge of the plain to Shechem. It then bent eastward and southward past Taanath-shiloh (Ta`ana), Janoah (Yankun) to Ataroth and Naarah (unidentified) and the Jordan (16:7). From Ataroth, which probably corresponds to Ataroth-addar (16:5), possibly identical with the modern et-Truneh, the southern border passed up to Bethel. Along the eastern front of the land thus defined there is a steep descent into the Jordan valley. It is torn by many gorges, and is rocky and unfruitful. The long slopes to the westward, however, furnish much of the finest land in Palestine. Well watered as it is, the valleys are beautiful in season with cornfields, vineyards, olives and other fruit trees. The uplands are accessible at many points from the maritime plain; but the great avenue of entrance to the country runs up Wady esh-Sha`ir to Nablus, whence,

threading the pass between Gerizim and Ebal, it descends to the Jordan valley. In this favored region the people must have lived in the main a prosperous and happy life. How appropriate are the prophetic allusions to these conditions in the days of Ephraim's moral decay ([23801]Isaiah 28:1,4; [26118]Jeremiah 31:18; [28913]Hosea 9:13; 10:11, etc.)!

W. Ewing

EPHRAIM (2)

(1) A position apparently of some importance, since the position of Baalhazor (probably = Tell `Asur) where Abraham's sheep-farm was located, is determined by relation to it ([10323]2 Samuel 13:23). That it lay North of Jerusalem seems to be indicated in [10334]2 Samuel 13:34. It may be identical with the Ephraim of Eusebius, Onomasticon, 20 Roman miles North of Jerusalem, and therefore to be sought somewhere in the neighborhood of Sinjil and el- Lubban. Connected with this may have been the name Aphaerema, a district in Samaria mentioned in 1 Macc 11:34; Ant, XIII, iv, 9.

(2) The town near the wilderness to which Jesus retired after the raising of Lazarus ([43154]John 11:54). This probably corresponds to Ephrem of Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Afra") 5 Roman miles East of Bethel. This may be the place named along with Bethel by Josephus (BJ, IV, ix, 9). It probably answers to eT-Taiyebeh, a large village about 4 miles North of Beitin. The antiquity of the site is attested by the cisterns and rock tombs. It stands on a high hill with a wide outlook including the plains of Jericho and the Dead Sea.

See EPHRON.

W. Ewing

EPHRAIM, FOREST OF

([μyr" p̱a,r[y" , *ya`ar 'ephrayim*]): The word *ya`ar* (Hebrew) probably agrees in meaning with the Arabic wa`r, which indicates a rough country, abounding in rocks, stones and scrub, with occasional trees; not a "forest," as we understand the term. Here Absalom was defeated and slain ([10806]2 Samuel 18:6 ff, the King James Version "wood of Ephraim"). It must be sought, therefore, East of the Jordan, in the neighborhood of Mahanaim; but no identification is yet possible.

EPHRAIM, GATE OF

See JERUSALEM.

EPHRAIM, MOUNT

([מהר אֶפְרַיִם, *har 'ephrayim*]): Means that part of the mountain which fell to Ephraim (Joshua 19:50, etc.). The natives speak today of *Jebel Nablus*, *Jebel Cafed*, etc., meaning that section of the central range which is subject to each city. It is better therefore to retain the rendering of the King James Version, and not to read with the Revised Version (British and American) "hill-country of Ephraim."

EPHRAIM, WOOD OF

See EPHRAIM, FOREST OF.

EPHRAIMITE

<e'-fra-im-it> ([מהר אֶפְרַיִם, *'ephrayim*]; singular [אֶפְרָתִי, *'ephrathi*]): A member of the tribe of Ephraim (Joshua 16:10, etc.).

See also EPHRATHITE.

EPHRAIN

<e'-fra-in> (2 Chronicles 13:19), the Revised Version (British and American) *EPHRON*, which see.

EPHRATH; EPHRATHAH

<ef'-rath>, <e'-frath>, <ef'-ra-tha>, <ef-ra'-tha> ([אֶפְרָת, *'ephrath*]; [Ἐφράθα, *Ephratha*]; Genesis 35:16; 48:7); ([אֶפְרָתָה, *'ephrathah*], in the other references: Joshua 15:59 (in added verse of Septuagint only); Ruth 4:11; 1 Chronicles 2:19,24,50; Psalm 132:6; Micah 5:2, the King James Version "Ephratah"): The name either of Bethlehem itself or of a district in which Bethlehem was situated. A man of this place was called an Ephrathite (Ruth 1:2; 1 Samuel 17:12). It is held by many authorities that the Ephrath where Rachel was buried (Genesis 35:16; 48:7) was a different place, the words "the same is Bethlehem" being a gloss. The reading in Psalm 132:6 is doubtful; the Revised Version,

margin has "Ephraim."

E. W. G. Masterman

EPHRATHITE

<ef'-rath-it>, *<e'-frath-it>*.

See *EPHRATH*.

EPHRON (1)

<e'-fron> ([ˆwOpɪÎ, *'ephron*], "fawnlike"): The Hittite of whom Abraham bought the field and cave of Machpelah (⟨01238⟩Genesis 23:8 ff; 25:9; 49:30). The transaction was conducted in true oriental fashion, with excessive courtesy; but the large sum of 400 shekels' weight of silver was in the end required (compare 33:19; ⟨11624⟩1 Kings 16:24).

See also *MONEY; MONEY, CURRENT*.

EPHRON (2)

<e'-fron> ([ˆwOpɪÎ, `*ephron*]; [ʾΕφρών, *Ephron*]):

(1) ⟨44319⟩2 Chronicles 13:19: "And Abijah pursued after Jeroboam, and took cities from him, Beth-el with the towns thereof, and Jeshanah with the towns thereof, and Ephron with the towns thereof." Another reading is "Ephraim" (Revised Version, margin). This is thought by many to be identical with Ophrah ([hrpɪÎ; `*ophrah*], ⟨06823⟩Joshua 18:23) and perhaps with Ephraim ([µyɾ˝ pà, `*ephrayim*], ⟨10323⟩2 Samuel 13:23) which both have been localized at the lofty town of *eT Taiyibeh*.

(2) A city East of the Jordan between Carnion (Ashteroth-karnain) and Scythopolis (Beisan): "Then Judas gathered together all the Israelites that were in the country. .... Now when they came unto Ephron (this was a great city in the way as they should go, very well fortified) they could not turn from it either on the right hand or on the left, but they must needs pass through the midst of it" (1 Macc 5:45,46 the King James Version; Ant, XII, viii, 5; also 2 Macc 12:27). Buhl and Schumacher propose *Kacr Wady el Ghafr*, a ruined tower which completely commands the deep Wady el Ghafr, but the ruins appear to be scanty.

(3) Mt. Ephron: The border of Judah is described (⟨06859⟩Joshua 15:9): "It

went out to the cities of Mount Ephron." The position will depend on that of Nephtoah and of Kiriath-jearim.

E. W. G. Masterman

EPICUREANS

<ep-i-ku-re'-anz> ([Ἐπικούρειοι, *Epikoureioi*]):

The Epicureans with the *STOICS* (which see) encountered Paul in Athens (<4417l8>Acts 17:18). They were the followers of Epicurus, a philosopher who was born in Samos in 341 BC, and who taught first in Asia Minor and afterward in Athens till his death in 270 BC. His system, unlike most philosophies, maintained its original form, with little development or dissent, to the end of its course. The views of Paul's opponents of this school may therefore be gathered from the teaching of Epicurus.

1. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CAUSES:

The conditions for the rise of Epicureanism and Stoicism were political and social rather than intellectual. Speculative thought had reached its zenith in the great constructive ideals of Plato, and the encyclopaedic system of Aristotle. Criticism of these would necessarily drive men back upon themselves to probe deeper into the meaning of experience, as Kant did in later times. But the conditions were not propitious to pure speculation. The breaking up of the Greek city-states and the loss of Greek independence had filled men's minds with a sense of insecurity. The institutions, laws and customs of society, which had hitherto sheltered the individual, now gave way; and men demanded from philosophy a haven of rest for their homeless and weary souls. Philosophy, therefore, became a theory of conduct and an art of living.

Epicurus deprecated the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, whether as philosophy or science, and directed his inquiries to the two practical questions: What is the aim of life? and How to attain to it? Philosophy he defined as "a daily business of speech and thought to secure a happy life."

2. EGOISTIC HEDONISM:

His ethical teaching is therefore the central and governing factor of Epicurus' philosophy. It belongs to the type generally described as Egoistic Hedonism. The same general principles had been taught by Aristippus and

his school, the Cyrenaics, a century earlier, and they were again revived in the 17th century in England by Thomas Hobbes.

The aim and end of life for every man is his own happiness, and happiness is primarily defined as pleasure. "Wherefore we call pleasure the Alpha and Omega of a blessed life. Pleasure is our first and kindred good. It is the starting-point of every choice and of every aversion, and to it we come back, inasmuch as we make feeling the rule by which to judge every good thing" (Epicurus, Letter to Menoeceus). So far Epicurus might seem to be simply repeating the view of the Cyrenaics. But there are important differences. Aristippus held the pleasure of the moment to be the end of action; but Epicurus taught that life should be so lived as to secure the greatest amount of pleasure during its whole course. And in this larger outlook, the pleasures of the mind came to occupy a larger place than the pleasures of the body. For happiness consists not so much in the satisfaction of desires, as in the suppression of wants, and in arriving at a state of independence of all circumstances, which secures a peace of mind that the privations and changes of life cannot disturb. Man's desires are of various kinds: "Some are natural, some are groundless; of the natural, some are necessary as well as natural, and some are natural only. And of the necessary desires, some are necessary if we are to be happy, some if the body is to be rid of uneasiness, some if we are even to live." Man's aim should be to suppress all desires that are unnecessary, and especially such as are artificially produced. Learning, culture, civilization and the distractions of social and political life are proscribed, much as they were in the opposite school of the Cynics, because they produce many desires difficult to satisfy, and so disturb the peace of the mind. This teaching has been compared to that of Rousseau and even of Buddha. Like the former, Epicurus enjoins the withdrawal of life from the complexities and perplexities of civilization, to the bare necessities of Nature, but he stops short of the doctrine of Nirvana, for life and the desire to live he regards as good things.

3. BACK TO NATURE:

He even rises above Naturalism to a view that has some kinship with modern Spiritualism, in his affirmation of the mastery of mind over adverse circumstances. "Though he is being tortured on the rack, the wise man is still happy."

4. ATARAXY:

Epicurus' definition of the end of life and of the way to it bears a superficial resemblance to that of his opponents, the Stoics. The end sought by both is ataraxia, "imperturbability," a peace of mind that transcends all circumstances, and the way to it is the life according to Nature. But Nature for Epicurus is purely physical and material, and the utmost happiness attainable is the complete absence of pain.

5. PLEASURE IS THE ABSENCE OF PAIN:

He justly protests against the representation of his teaching as gross and immoral. "When we say, then, that pleasure is the end and aim, we do not mean the pleasures of the prodigal, or the pleasures of sensuality, as we are understood to do by some, through ignorance, prejudice or willful misrepresentation. By pleasure we mean the absence of pain in the body and trouble in the soul" (Letter to Menoeceus). His own life was marked by a simplicity verging on asceticism, and by kindly consideration for his friends. But theory was capable of serving the purposes of worse men to justify license and selfishness.

6. SOCIAL CONTRACT:

Justice and ordinary morality were recognized in the system as issuing from an original social compact, such as Hobbes and Rousseau supposed, and resting upon the self-interest and happiness of individuals who entered into the compact the better to gain those ends. Ordinary morality has therefore no stronger sanction than the individual's desire to secure his own happiness. Against public violations of the moral code, the sanction finds its agent in the social order and the penalties it inflicts; but the only deterrent from secret immorality is the fear of being found out, and the necessarily disturbing character of that fear itself. Friendship, the supreme virtue of Epicureanism, is based upon the same calculating selfishness, and is to be cultivated for the happiness it begets to its owners. The fundamental defect of the system is its extreme individualism, which issues in a studied selfishness that denies any value of their own to the social virtues, and in the negation of the larger activities of life.

Epicurus had no interest in knowledge for its own sake, whether of the external world, or of any ultimate or supreme, reality. But he found men's minds full of ideas about the world, immortality and the gods, which

disturbed their peace and filled them with vain desires and fears. It was therefore necessary for the practical ends of his philosophy to find a theory of the things outside of man that would give him tranquillity and serenity of mind.

7. ATOMIC THEORY:

For this purpose Epicurus fell back upon Democritus' atomic theory of the world. The original constituents of the universe, of which no account could be given, were atoms, the void, and motion. By a fixed law or fate, the atoms moved through the void, so as to form the world as we know it. The same uniform necessity maintains and determines the abiding condition of all that exists. Epicurus modified this system so far as to admit an initial freedom to the atoms, which enabled them to divert slightly from their uniform straight course as they fell like rain through space, and so to impinge, combine and set up rotatory motions by which the worlds, and all that is in them, came into being.

8. MATERIALISM:

He did not follow the idea of freedom in Nature and man beyond the exigencies of his theory, and the thoroughly materialistic nature of his universe precluded him from deducing a moral realm. By this theory he gets rid of the causes of fear and anxiety that disturb the human mind. Teleology, providence, a moral order of the universe, the arbitrary action of the gods, blind fate, immortality, hell, reward and punishment after death, are all excluded from a universe where atoms moving through space do everything. The soul, like the body, is made of atoms, but of a smaller or finer texture. In death, the one like the other dissolves and comes to its end.

9. THEORY OF IDEAS:

From the same premises one would expect the complete denial of any Divine beings. But it is a curiosity of the system that a grossly materialistic theory of knowledge should require the affirmation of the existence of the gods. Men's ideas are derived from thin material films that pass from the objects around them into the kindred matter of their minds. It follows that every idea must have been produced by a corresponding object. Men generally possess ideas of gods. Therefore, gods must exist to produce those ideas, which come to men in sleep and dreams. But they are not such

gods as men generally believe to exist. They are constituted of the same atomic matter as men, but of a still finer texture. They dwell in the intermundia, the interspaces outside the worlds, where earthly cares and the dissolution of death cannot approach them. They are immortal and completely blessed. They cannot therefore know anything of the world, with its pain and its troubles, nor can they be in any way concerned with it. They are apotheoses of the Epicurean sage, entirely withdrawn from the world's turmoil, enjoying a life of calm repose, and satisfied with the bounty that Nature provides for them.

10. EPICUREAN GODS:

"For the nature of the gods must ever in itself of necessity enjoy immortality with supreme repose, far removed and withdrawn from our concerns; since exempt from every pain, exempt from all dangers, strong in its own resources, not wanting aught of us, it is neither gained by favors nor moved by anger" (Lucretius). All religion is banned, though the gods are retained. Epicurus' failure to carry the logic of his system to the denial of the gods lies deeper than his theory of ideas.

11. CONSENSUS GENTIUM:

He was impressed by the fact that "a steadfast unanimity continues to prevail among all men without exception" that gods exist. "A consciousness of godhead does not allow him to deny the existence of God altogether. Hence, his attempt to explain the fact so as not to interfere with his general theory" (Wallace, Epicureanism, 209).

During his lifetime, Epicurus attracted a large following to his creed, and it continued to flourish far down into the Christian era. It was presented to the Roman world by the poet Lucretius in his poem Deuteronomy natura rerum, which is still the chief source for the knowledge of it. One Old Testament writer, the author of Eccl, may have been influenced by its spirit, though he did not adopt all its ideas.

12. CAUSES OF SUCCESS:

The personal charm and engaging character of Epicurus himself drew men to him, and elevated him into the kind of ideal sage who personified the teaching of the school, as was the custom of all schools of philosophy. The system was clear-cut and easily understood by ordinary men, and it offered

a plausible theory of life to such as could not follow the profounder and more difficult speculations of other schools. Its moral teaching found a ready response in all that was worldly, commonplace and self-seeking in men that had lost their high ideals and great enthusiasms. Above all it delivered men from the terrors of a dark superstition that had taken the place of religion. It is a remarkable revelation of the inadequacy of Greek religion that Epicurus should have relegated the gods from the visible world, without any sense of loss, but only the relief of a great deliverance.

13. COMPLETE ANTITHESIS OF PAUL'S TEACHING:

It was inevitable that the teaching of Paul should have brought this school up against him. He came to Athens teaching a God who had become man, who had suffered and died to accomplish the utmost self-sacrifice, who had risen from the dead and returned to live among men to guide and fashion their lives, and who at last would judge all men, and according to their deeds reward or punish them in a future world. To the Epicurean this was the revival of all the ancient and hated superstitions. It was not only folly but impiety; for Epicurus had taught that "not the man who denies the gods worshipped by the multitude, but he who affirms of the gods what the multitude believe about them, is truly impious."

LITERATURE.

Hicks, Stoic and Epicurean (whose translations are adopted in all quotations in this article); Zeller, Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics; Wallace, Epicureanism; Lucretius, Deuteronomy natura rerum.

T. Rees

EPILEPSY

<ep'-i-lep-si>.

See *LUNATIC.*

EPIPHANES

<e-pif'-a-nez>.

See *ANTIOCHUS IV.*

EPIPHI

<ep'-i-fi> ([᾽Επιφί, *Epiphi*]): Name of a month mentioned in connection with Pachon in 3 Macc 6:38.

See TIME.

EPISTLE

<e-pis'-'-l> ([ἐπιστολή, *epistole*], "a letter," "epistle"; from [ἐπιστέλλω, *epistello*], "to send to"):

1. NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES:

A written communication; a term inclusive of all forms of written correspondence, personal and official, in vogue from an early antiquity. As applied to the twenty-one letters, which constitute well-nigh one-half of the New Testament, the word "epistle" has come to have chiefly a technical and exclusive meaning. It refers, in common usage, to the communications addressed by five (possibly six) New Testament writers to individual or collective churches, or to single persons or groups of Christian disciples. Thirteen of these letters were written by Paul; three by John; two by Peter; one each by James and Jude; one — the epistle to the Hebrews — by an unknown writer.

2. DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS:

As a whole the Epistles are classified as Pauline, and Catholic, i.e. general; the Pauline being divided into two classes: those written to churches and to individuals, the latter being known as Pastoral (1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus; some also including Philemon; see Lange on Romans, American edition, 16). The fact that the New Testament is so largely composed of letters distinguishes it, most uniquely, from all the sacred writings of the world. The Scriptures of other oriental religions — the Vedas, the Zend Avesta, the Tripitaka, the Koran, the writings of Confucius — lack the direct and personal address altogether. The Epistles of the New Testament are specifically the product of a new spiritual life and era. They deal, not with truth in the abstract, but in the concrete. They have to do with the soul's inner experiences and processes. They are the burning and heart-throbbing messages of the apostles and their confreres to the fellow-Christians of their own day. The chosen disciples who witnessed the events following

the resurrection of Jesus and received the power (⟨4008⟩Acts 1:8) bestowed by the Holy Spirit on, and subsequent to, the Day of Pentecost, were spiritually a new order of men. The only approach to them in the spiritual history of mankind is the ancient Hebrew prophets. Consequently the Epistles, penned by men who had experienced a great redemption and the marvelous intellectual emancipation and quickening that came with it, were an altogether new type of literature. Their object is personal. They relate the vital truths of the resurrection era, and the fundamental principles of the new teaching, to the individual and collective life of all believers. This specific aim accounts for the form in which the apostolic letters were written. The logic of this practical aim appears conspicuously in the orderly Epistles of Paul who, after the opening salutation in each letter, lays down with marvelous clearness the doctrinal basis on which he builds the practical duties of daily Christian life. Following these, as each case may require, are the personal messages and affectionate greetings and directions, suited to this familiar form of address.

The Epistles consequently have a charm, a directness, a vitality and power unknown to the other sacred writings of the world. Nowhere are they equaled or surpassed except in the personal instructions that fell from the lips of Jesus. Devoted exclusively to experimental and practical religion they have, with the teachings of Christ, become the textbook of the spiritual life for the Christian church in all subsequent time. For this reason "they are of more real value to the church than all the systems of theology, from Origen to Schleiermacher" (Schaff on St.Paul's Epistles, History of the Christian Church, 741). No writings in history so unfold the nature and processes of the redemptive experience. In Paul and John, especially, the pastoral instinct is ever supreme. Their letters are too human, too personal, too vital to be formal treatises or arguments. They throb with passion for truth and love for souls. Their directness and affectionate intensity convert their authors into prophets of truth, preachers of grace, lovers of men and missionaries of the cross. Hence, their value as spiritual biographies of the writers is immeasurable. As letters are the most spontaneous and the freest form of writing, the New Testament Epistles are the very life-blood of Christianity. They present theology, doctrine, truth, appeal, in terms of life, and pulsate with a vitality that will be fresh and re-creative till the end of time. (For detailed study of their chronology, contents and distinguishing characteristics, see articles on the separate epistles.)

3. LETTER-WRITING IN ANTIQUITY:

While the New Testament Epistles, in style and quality, are distinct from and superior to all other literature of this class, they nevertheless belong to a form of personal and written address common to all ages. The earliest known writings were epistolary, unless we except some of the chronologies and inscriptions of the ancient Babylonian and Assyrian kings. Some of these royal inscriptions carry the art of writing back to 3800 BC, possibly to a period still earlier (see Goodspeed, Kent's Historical Series, 42-43, secs. 40-41), and excavations have brought to light "an immense mass of letters from officials to the court — correspondence between royal personages or between minor officials," as early as the reign of Khammurabi of Babylon, about 2275 BC (ibid., 33). The civilized world was astonished at the extent of this international correspondence as revealed in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (1480 BC), discovered in Egypt in 1887, among the ruins of the palace of Amenophis IV. This mass of political correspondence is thus approximately synchronous with the Hebrew exodus and the invasion of Canaan under Joshua.

4. LETTERS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

As might be expected, then, the Old Testament abounds with evidences of extensive epistolary correspondence in and between the oriental nations. That a postal service was in existence in the time of Job (³⁸²⁵Job 9:25) is evident from the Hebrew term [םיצר; *ratsim*], signifying "runners," and used of the mounted couriers of the Persians who carried the royal edicts to the provinces. The most striking illustration of this courier service in the Old Testament occurs in Est 3:13,15; 8:10,14 where King Ahasuerus, in the days of Queen Esther, twice sends royal letters to the Jews and satraps of his entire realm from India to Ethiopia, on the swiftest horses. According to Herodotus, these were usually stationed, for the sake of the greatest speed, four parasangs apart. Hezekiah's letters to Ephraim and Manasseh were sent in the same way (⁴⁸⁰⁰2 Chronicles 30:1,6,10). Other instances of epistolary messages or communications in the Old Testament are David's letter to Joab concerning Uriah and sent by him (¹⁰¹¹⁴2 Samuel 11:14,15); Jezebel's, to the elders and nobles of Jezreel, sent in Ahab's name, regarding Naboth (¹¹²⁰⁸1 Kings 21:8,9); the letter of Ben-hadad, king of Syria, to Jehoram, king of Israel, by the hand of Naaman (¹²⁰⁵⁵2 Kings 5:5-7); Jehu's letters to the rulers of Jezreel, in Samaria (¹²¹⁰⁰2 Kings 10:1,2,6,7); Sennacherib's letter to Hezekiah (¹²⁹¹⁴2 Kings 19:14; ²³⁷¹⁴Isaiah

37:14; [44217]2 Chronicles 32:17), and also that of Merodach-baladan, accompanied with a gift ([12012]2 Kings 20:12; [23901]Isaiah 39:1). Approximating the New Testament epistle in purpose and spirit is the letter of earnest and loving counsel sent by Jeremiah to the exiles in Babylon. It is both apostolic and pastoral in its prophetic fervor, and is recorded in full ([24901]Jeremiah 29:1,4-32) with its reference to the bitterly hostile and jealous letter of Shemaiah, the false prophet, in reply.

As many writers have well indicated, the Babylonian captivity must have been a great stimulus to letter-writing on the part of the separated Hebrews, and between the far East and Palestine. Evidences of this appear in the histories of Ezra and Nehemiah, e.g. the correspondence, back and forth, between the enemies of the Jews at Jerusalem and Artaxerxes, king of Persia, written in the Syrian language ([15407]Ezra 4:7-23); also the letter of Tattenai (the King James Version "Tatnai") the governor to King Darius ([15606]Ezra 5:6-17); that of Artaxerxes to Ezra ([15711]Ezra 7:11 ff), and to Asaph, keeper of the royal forest ([16108]Nehemiah 2:8); finally the interchange of letters between the nobles of Judah and Tobiah; and those of the latter to Nehemiah ([16617]Nehemiah 6:17,19; so Sanballat verse 5).

5. LETTERS IN THE APOCRYPHA:

The Old Testament Apocrypha contains choice specimens of personal and official letters, approximating in literary form the epistles of the New Testament. In each case they begin, like the latter, in true epistolary form with a salutation: "greeting" or "sendeth greeting" (1 Macc 11:30,32; 12:6,20; 15:2,16), and in two instances closing with the customary "Fare ye well" or "Farewell" (2 Macc 11:27-33,34-38; compare [47131]2 Corinthians 13:11), so universally characteristic of letter-writing in the Hellenistic era.

6. EPISTOLARY WRITINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The most felicitous and perfect example official correspondence in the New Testament is Claudius Lysias' letter to Felix regarding Paul ([44225]Acts 23:25-30). Equally complete in form is the letter, sent, evidently in duplicate, by the apostles and elders to their Gentilebrethren in the provinces of Asia ([44523]Acts 15:23-29). In these two letters we have the first, and with [59001]James 1:1, the only, instance of the Greek form of salutation in the New Testament ([χαίρειν, *chairein*]). The latter is by many scholars regarded as probably the oldest letter in epistolary form in

the New Testament, being in purport and substance a Pastoral Letter issued by the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem to the churches of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. It contained instructions as to the basis of Christian fellowship, similar to those of the great apostle to the churches under his care.

The letters of the high priest at Jerusalem commending Saul of Tarsus to the synagogues of Damascus are samples of the customary letters of introduction (Acts 9:2; 22:5; compare 28:21; also 18:27). As a Christian apostle Paul refers to this common use of "epistles of commendation" (2 Corinthians 3:1; 1 Corinthians 16:3) and himself made happy use of the same (Romans 16:1 ff); he also mentions receiving letters, in turn, from the churches (1 Corinthians 7:1). Worthy of classification as veritable epistles are the letters, under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, to the seven churches of Asia (Revelation 2:1 through 3:22). In fact, the entire Book of Revelation is markedly epistolary in form, beginning with the benedictory salutation of personal and apostolic address, and closing with the benediction common to the Pauline epistles. This again distinguishes the New Testament literature in spirit and form from all other sacred writings, being almost exclusively direct and personal, whether in vocal or written address. In this respect the gospels, histories and epistles are alike the product and exponent of a new spiritual era in the life of mankind.

7. EPISTLES AS DISTINGUISHED FROM LETTERS:

This survey of epistolary writing in the far East, and especially in the Old Testament and New Testament periods, is not intended to obscure the distinction between the letter and the epistle. A clear line of demarcation separates them, owing not merely to differences in form and substance, but to the exalted spiritual mission and character of the apostolic letters. The characterization of a letter as more distinctly personal, confidential and spontaneous, and the epistle as more general in aim and more suited to or intended for publication, accounts only in part for the classification. Even when addressed to churches Paul's epistles were as spontaneous and intimately and affectionately personal as the ordinary correspondence. While intended for general circulation it is doubtful if any of the epistolary writers of the New Testament ever anticipated such extensive and permanent use of their letters as is made possible in the modern world of printing. The epistles of the New Testament are lifted into a distinct category by their spiritual eminence and power, and have given the word

epistle a meaning and quality that will forever distinguish it from letter. In this distinction appears that Divine element usually defined as inspiration: a vitality and spiritual endowment which keeps the writings of the apostles permanently "living and powerful," where those of their successors pass into disuse and obscurity.

8. PATRISTIC EPISTLES:

Such was the influence of the New Testament Epistles on the literature of early Christianity that the patristic and pseudepigraphic writings of the next century assumed chiefly the epistolary form. In letters to churches and individuals the apostolic Fathers, as far as possible, reproduced their spirit, quality and style.

See LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC.

9. APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES:

Pseudo-epistles extensively appeared after the patristic era, many of them written and circulated in the name of the apostles and apostolic Fathers. *See APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES*. This early tendency to hide ambitious or possibly heretical writings under apostolic authority and Scriptural guise may have accounted for the anathema pronounced by John against all who should attempt to add to or detract from the inspired revelation ([66218]Revelation 22:18,19). It is hardly to be supposed that all the apostolic letters and writings have escaped destruction. Paul in his epistles refers a number of times to letters of his that do not now exist and that evidently were written quite frequently to the churches under his care ([46159]1 Corinthians 5:9; [47009]2 Corinthians 10:9,10; [49003]Ephesians 3:3); "in every epistle" ([53017]2 Thessalonians 3:17) indicates not merely the apostle's uniform method of subscription but an extensive correspondence. [51016]Colossians 4:16 speaks of an "epistle from Laodicea," now lost, doubtless written by Paul himself to the church at Laodicea, and to be returned by it in exchange for his epistle to the church at Colosse.

Dwight M. Pratt

EPISTLES, CAPTIVITY

See PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO.

EPISTLES, THE PASTORAL

See PASTORAL EPISTLES.

EPISTLES, SPURIOUS

<spu'-ri-us>.

See APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES.

EQUAL

<e'-kwal> [ἴσος, *isos*]): In Ezekiel (18:25; 29; 33:17,20), "The way of the Lord is not equal" translates Hebrew *yittakhen* for *takhan*, "to weigh," and means "is not adjusted to any fixed standard," "arbitrary," "fitful," and, therefore, "not equitable, fair, or impartial" Septuagint "is not set straight"). Compare same Hebrew word in [09013]1 Samuel 2:3, where the Lord is said to `weigh actions.' "Equal," therefore, is what will bear the closest investigation and strictest judgment. In [40012]Matthew 20:12, "made them equal" means "put them upon the same footing," i.e. regarded their brief service as though it were the very same as our long hours of toil. In [42036]Luke 20:36 the context restricts the equality to a particular relation. The precise meaning of *isos* in [43018]John 5:18, "making himself equal with God," is clearly defined by the preceding clause, for our Lord's opponents say that He has "called God his own Father" (Greek *idion patera*, i.e. His Father in a peculiar and exclusive sense; compare *idiou huiou* of [45032]Romans 8:32, applying the same adjective to the Son in His relation to the Father, i.e. His Son in a sense in which no one else can claim the title). They correctly interpreted the language of Jesus as declaring that He was the Son of God in a way that put Him on an equality with God. The charge against Him is not that He said that He was "like" (*homoios*), but that He was "equal" (*isos*), i.e. of the very same rank and authority.

H. E. Jacobs

EQUALITY

<e-kwol'-i-ti> ([ἰσότης, *isotes*]): In [47084]2 Corinthians 8:14, literally,. "out of equality," i.e. "in equal proportion" or "that there may be equality." In [50006]Philippians 2:6, it occurs in a paraphrase of Greek *to einai isa theo*, "the being on an equality with God." In this much-discussed passage, *isa*, according to a not unusual Attic idiom, is construed adverbially (see Meyer

on passage), meaning, therefore, not `the being equal' (the King James Version), which would require *ison*, but "the having equal prerogatives and privileges." The personal equality is one thing; the equality of attributes is another, and it is the latter which is here expressed (Lightfoot). The "being on an equality" and the "having equal prerogatives" are both deductions from the possession of "the form of God." The thought is that if He who had "the form of God" had under all circumstances exercised His Divine attributes, He would have been employing only what belonged to Him, and would in no way have derogated from what belongs only to God. We regard this as referring to the incarnate Son in His historical manifestation.

H. E. Jacobs

EQUITY

<ek'-wi-ti>: Is synonymous with "uprightness," which is found in ²⁰⁷²⁶Proverbs 17:26; ²⁵⁹¹⁴Isaiah 59:14; ³⁹⁰²⁶Malachi 2:6 in place of the King James Version "equity." ²¹⁰²¹Ecclesiastes 2:21 has "skilfulness" and the Revised Version, margin "success" for the King James Version "equity." The context favors this translation of [ˆwÔvKi *kishron*], which is derived from [rvEK; *kasher*], "to succeed."

Equity is the spirit of the law behind the letter; justice is the application of the spirit of equity; honesty is the general everyday use of justice or fairness, equity being the interior or abstract ideal. The Court of Equity overrides the Court of Common Law, deciding not upon terms, but the spirit of the deed.

M. O. Evans

ER

<ar> ([r[e`*er*], "watcher"; [ʺHp, *Er'*]):

(1) The eldest son of Judah, the son of Jacob, by Shua the Canaanite. Judah took for him a wife named Tamar. It is recorded that Er "was wicked in the sight of Yahweh; and Yahweh slew him" (⁰¹⁸⁰³Genesis 38:3,6,7; 46:12).
(2) "Er the father of Lecah" is mentioned among "the sons of Shelah the son of Judah" (¹³⁰²¹1 Chronicles 4:21).

(3) An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy in the 7th generation before Zerubbabel (⁴¹³²⁸Luke 3:28).

ERA

<e'-ra>: We find no definite era in use in Old Testament times, and such usage does not appear until we reach the period of the Maccabees. There are some references to important events that might have served as eras had they been generally accepted and constantly employed. Such was the Exodus; and this is referred to as the starting-point in fixing the date of the building of Solomon's temple (1 Kings 6:1), and also for the date of Aaron's death (Numbers 33:38). An earthquake is referred to by Amos (1:1) as a well-known event by which to date the beginning of his prophetic career; and Ezekiel in two passages refers to the captivity of Judah as a date for marking certain events in his life. Of these the Exodus would have been the most appropriate event to use as an era, since it marked the birth of the Hebrew nation; but the universal custom of antiquity was to date from the regnal years of the kings, as we see in the history of Egypt and Babylonia and Assyria; this custom was followed by the Israelites as soon as the kingdom was established, and was continued down to the Captivity. After the return of the Jews they naturally adopted the regnal years of the Persian kings, under whose rule they were, until the overthrow of the kingdom by Alexander. After this event, the era that prevailed most widely in Syria was that of the Seleucid kingdom, which began in 312 BC, and must have been familiar to the Jews, and we have evidence that they made use of it. When Simon the Maccabee secured the independence of the Jews from the Seleucid king, Demetrius II, in 141-140, they began to date their instruments and contracts from this event as is stated in 1 Macc 13:41,42; and we find that the year of their independence is fixed by reference to the Seleucid era, the first year of Simon being the 170th of that era (see Josephus, Ant, XIII, vi, 7). After this they used the era of Simon, dating by his regnal years; but whether they used this as a permanent era during the Asmonean Dynasty or dated simply from the accession of each king, we do not know. There is no doubt that the Seleucid era continued to be used throughout the country for several centuries after the downfall of the Seleucid kingdom, as we have abundant evidence from inscriptions. When the Romans took possession of Syria and Palestine, their era was of course employed by Roman officials, but this did not prevail among the people. The dynasty of the Herods sometimes employed their own regnal years and sometimes those of the emperors, as appears from their coins. The Jews must have been familiar with the eras employed by some of the Phoenician towns, such as Tyre and

Sidon. Tyre had a local era which began in 126 BC, and Sidon one beginning in 112 BC; and most of the towns on the coast used the era of Alexander, dating from the battle of Issus, until the establishment of the Seleucid era. The Jews would be familiar with these from their commercial connections with the coast towns, but we do not know that they used them. They did not adopt the era of the Creation until after the time of Christ. It was fixed at 4,000 years before the destruction of the later temple, or 3760 BC.

H. Porter

ERAN

<e'-ran> ([ˆר[ע`*eran*], "watcher," "watchful"; [᾿Εδέν, *Eden*]): The son of Ephraim's oldest son Shuthelah (Numbers 26:36). Eranites, the descendants of Eran (same place) .

ERASTUS

<e-ras'-tus> ([῎Εραστος, *Erastos*], "beloved"): The name occurs three times, each time denoting a companion of Paul.

(1) Erastus was sent with Timothy from Ephesus into Macedonia while Paul remained in Asia for a while. They are designated "two of them that ministered unto him" (Acts 19:22).

(2) "Erastus the treasurer of the city" sent greetings to the Christians in Rome (Romans 16:23). He was apparently an important person in the Corinthian community, and with Gaius probably represented that church in these fraternal relations with the Roman community.

(3) Erastus is one who, in 2 Timothy 4:20, "remained at Corinth."

We have no means of discovering whether one or more than one person is meant in these references. A. C. Headlam (HDB, under the word) thinks it improbable that one who held an office implying residence in one locality should have been one of Paul's companions in travel. On the other hand Paul may be designating Erastus (Romans 16:23) by an office he once held, but which he gave up to engage in mission work.

S. F. Hunter

ERECH

<e'-rek>, *<er'-ek>* ([Ëⲅa, *'erekh*]; ["Ορεχ, *Orech*]):

1. ETYMOLOGY OF THE NAME:

The second of the cities founded by Nimrod, the others being Babel, Accad and Calneh (Genesis 10:10). The derivation of the name is well known, Erech being the Semitic-Babylonian Uruk, from the Sumerian Unug, a word meaning "seat," probably in the sense of "residential city." The character with which it is written enters into the composition of the Babylonian names of Larsa and Ur of the Chaldees.

2. POSITION AND NATURE OF THE RUINS:

Its identification with Warka, on the left bank of the Euphrates, half-way between Hillah (Babylon) and Korna, is beyond a doubt. It is thought that the Euphrates must have flowed nearer to the city in ancient times, as the Gilgames legend relates that that hero and his companion Enkidu washed their hands in the stream after having killed the divine bull sent by the goddess Ishtar to destroy them. The shape of the ruin is irregular, the course of the walls of the Northeast having been seemingly determined by that of the Nile canal (Shatt-en-Nil), which flowed on that side. The extreme length of the site from North to South is over 3,000 yds., and its width about 2,800 yds. This space is very full of remains of buildings; and the foundations of the walls, with their various windings, gateways and defenses, are traceable even now.

3. ITS PATRON-DEITIES AND THEIR TEMPLES:

Two great deities, Ishtar and Nanaa, were worshipped in this city, the temple of the former being E-anna, "the house of heaven" (or "of Anu," in which case it is probable that the god of the heavens, Anu, was also one of the patrons of the city). The shrine dedicated to Ishtar is apparently now represented by the ruin known as Buwariyya or "reed-mats," and so called on account of the layers of matting at intervals of 4 or 5 ft. This is the great temple-tower (ziq-qurat) of the place, called E-gipar-imina, "the house of 7 enclosures." The remains are situated in a large courtyard measuring 350 ft. by 270 ft. As in the case of other Babylonian erections, the corners are directed toward the cardinal points, and its height is about 100 ft. above the desert-plain.

As Erech is mentioned with Babylon, Niffer (Calneh) and Eridu, as one of the cities created by Merodach (Nimrod), it is clear that it was classed with the oldest foundations in Babylonia. It was the city of Gilgames, the half-mythical king of the earliest period, who seems to have restored the walls and temples. Its earliest known ruler of historical times was Ensag-kus-anna, about 4,000 BC.

4. HISTORY OF THE CITY'S TEMPLES, ETC.:

The celebrated shrine of Ishtar was already in existence in the time of Lugal-zaggi-si, who came somewhat later. King Dungi (2600 BC) restored E-anna and built its great wall. This was in the time of the great Ur Dynasty, but later the city seems to have come under the dominion of the kings of Isin, Libit-Ishtar having apparently restored the sanctuary of Ishtar on E-gipara. Another great ruler of the early period was Sin-gasid, king of Erech, who was a patron of E-anna; and when he restored this shrine, he endowed it with grain, wool, oil and 1 shekel of gold. There seems also to have been a shrine to Nergal, god of war, which was restored by King Sin-gamil. About 2280 BC Kudur-Nanchunde, the Elamite king, plundered the city, and carried off the statue of the goddess Nanaa, which was only restored to its place by Assur-bani-apli, the Assyrian king, about 635 BC. Samsu-iluna seems to have surpassed his father Hammurabi (Amraphel) in the restoration of the city's temples, and other rulers who did not forget Erech were Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus.

5. LITERATURE REFERRING TO ERECH:

Many tablets have been found on the site, and give promise of interesting discoveries still to come. Having been the capital of the hero-king Gilgames, who saw the wonders of the wide world, spoke with the Babylonian Noah face to face, and almost attained immortality as a living man, it was always a place of romance. Poetical compositions concerning it exist, one of the most interesting being a lamentation possibly written after the invasion of Kudur-Nanchundi, when famine was rife in the city, blood flowed like water in E-ulbar, the house of Istar's oracle, and the enemy heaped up fire in all the goddess' lands as one heaps up embers.

6. THE CITY'S NUMEROUS NAMES:

The consideration in which the city was held is made plain by the geographical lists, from which it would seem that it had no less than 11

names, among them being Illab or Illag, Tir-anna, "the heavenly grove"; Ub-imina, "the 7 regions"; Uru-gipara-imina, "the city of the 7 enclosures"; and Uruk-supuri, "Erech of the folds" (the name which it always bears in the Gilgames legend), given to it either on account of its being a center where pastoral tribes gathered, or because of the flocks kept for sacrifice to its deities.

7. TABLETS AND TOMBS OF LATE DATE:

Besides the inscriptions of the kings already mentioned, tablets of the reigns of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadrezzar, Nabonidus, Cyrus, Darius and some of the Seleucids have been found on the site. In the ruins of the town and the country around, numerous glazed earthenware (slipper-shaped) coffins and other receptacles, used for and in connection with the burial of the dead, occur. These are mostly of the Parthian period, but they imply that the place was regarded as a necropolis, possibly owing to the sanctity attached to the site.

LITERATURE.

Schrader, KAT; Loftus, Chaldoea and Susiana, 162 ff; Fried. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 221 f; Zehnpfund, Babylonien in seinen wichtigsten Ruinenstatten, 48 ff.

T. G. Pinches

ERI; ERITES

<e'-ri>, *<e'-rits>* ([ץרי[ע`*eri*], "watcher"): The fifth of the seven sons of Gad (Genesis 46:16; Numbers 26:16). Patronymic, Erites (same place) , a clan of Gad.

ERI-AKU

<er-i-a-koo'>, *<e-ri-a-ku'>*:

1. THE NAME AND ITS ETYMOLOGY:

This is the probable Sumerian reading of the well-known Babylonian name written with the characters for "servant" (Sem wardu or ardu) and the group standing for the Moon-god Sin (written En-zu = Zu-en), otherwise Aku, the whole meaning "servant of the Moon-god." This ruler, who was

king of Larsa (*ELLASSAR* — compare that article), is generally identified with the *ARIOCH* (which see) of ◁01149▷Genesis 14:9. Several Assyriologists read the name with the Semitic Babylonian pronunciation of Warad-Sin; and, if this be correct, there would be a certain amount of doubt as to the generally received identification; though this, on the other hand, might simply prove that the ancient Hebrews obtained their transcription from a Sumerian source.

2. INSCRIPTIONS MENTIONING ERI-AKU:

In addition to a number of contract-tablets, the following inscriptions mentioning Eri-Aku or Warad-Sin are known:

(1) A dedication, by Kudur-mabuk, "father of Martu" (Amurru, the land of the Amorites), son of Simti-Silchak, of some sacred object to the Moon-god Nannar, for his own life and that of Eri-Aku, his son, the king of Larsa.

(2) A dedication, by Eri-Aku, to Ishtar of Challabu, for his own life and that of his father and begetter Kudur-mabuk. The text records the restoration of Istar's sanctuary.

(3) A dedication, by Eri-Aku, to the god Nannar, for the preservation of his own life and that of his father, Kudur-mabuk. The restoration of several temples is referred to.

(4) An inscription of Eri-Aku, "the powerful man," "the nourisher of Ur (of the Chaldees), the king of Larsa, the king of Sumer and Akkad; son of Kudur-mabuk, the father of Emutbala." The text records that he raised the wall of Ur, called "Nannar is the consolidator of the foundations of the land," high like a mountain.

(5) A dedication by Eri-Aku to Nin-insina (titles as above). It records the building of the temple E-u-namtila, for his own life, and the life of Kudurmabuk, the father his begetter.

3. THE NATIONALITY OF HIS FAMILY:

These inscriptions and others show that Eri-Aku belonged to an Elamite family which held the throne of Larsa, a state which, in common with Babylonia itself, acknowledged the suzerainty of Elam. Kudurmabuk would seem, from motives of policy, to have given his sons Sumerian and Semitic Babylonian names; and it is noteworthy that he did not retain the

rule of Larsa for himself, but delegated it to his offspring, keeping for himself the dominion of Emutbala and, as his own inscription shows, the land of the Amorites. With regard to these it may be noted, that the expression adda, "father," probably means simply "administrator."

4. ERI-AKU AND RIM-SIN:

Eri-Aku seems to have died while his father was still alive, and was succeeded by Rim-Sin, who, as Francois Thureau-Dangin points out, must have been his brother. As in the case of Eri-Aku, Kudur-mabuk inaugurated the reign of Rim-Sin by a dedication; but there seems to be no inscription in which Rim-Sin makes a dedication for the life of his father, implying that Kudur-mabuk died soon after his second son came to the throne.

And here the question of the identification of Eri-Aku with Eri-Eaku (var. -Ekua) claims consideration. This name occurs on certain tablets of late date from Babylonia, and is coupled with a name which may be read Kudur-lachgumal (for Kudurlachbgomar, i.e. Chedorlaomer), and Tud-chul,1 (NOTE: 1 Written Tudchula, but the syllabaries indicate the final a as silent.) the Biblical Tidal.

5. IS ERI-AKU TO BE IDENTIFIED WITH ERI-EAKU?:

These inscriptions are very mutilated, but from the smaller one it would seem that Eri-(E)aku had a son named Durmah-ilani, who ravaged some district, and there were floods at Babylon. (But) his son slaughtered him like a lamb, and old man and child (were slain) with the sword. Similar things seem to be said of Tudchul or Tidal. The larger fragment gives further details of the life of Durmach-ilani, who had usurped royal power and had been killed with the sword. If the events recorded belong to this period, they must have taken place after the death of Eri-Aku (-Eaku, -Ekua), but before that of Kudur-lachgumal. It is to be noted that, in accordance with Elamite usage, the crown did not pass to the eldest son after a king's death, but to the king's eldest brother. In Elam this led to endless conflicts, and the same probably took place in Larsa until incorporated with the states of Babylonia.

6. A HISTORICAL ROMANCE:

The fact that the history of Kudur-lachgumal (?) forms the subject of a poetical legend suggests that the texts mentioning these kings may have belonged to a kind of historical romance, of which Chedorlaomer (Amraphel), Arioch, and Tidal were the heroes — and, in truth, this is implied by their style. That they are utterly apocryphal, however, remains to be proved.

LITERATURE.

See *"Inscriptions and Records Referring to Babylonia and Elam," etc., Journal of the Victoria Institute, 1895-96 (also separately); and the articles CHEDORLAOMER and ELAM, section 12 (5).*

T. G. Pinches

ERR; ERROR

<ur>, *<er'-er>*:

To err is in the Old Testament the translation of [הגּע; *shaghah*], and [הָ[ּ,ת; *ta`ah*], both of which mean literally,. "to wander," "to go astray." We have *shaghah* in ⁽⁰⁹²⁶²⁾1 Samuel 26:21, "I have played the fool, and have erred"; ⁽¹⁸¹⁹⁰⁴⁾Job 19:4, "Mine error remaineth with myself," i.e. "is my own concern," or, perhaps, "only injures myself"; ⁽¹⁹⁸⁹¹¹⁸⁾Psalm 119:118; ⁽²³³⁰⁷⁾Isaiah 28:7 the King James Version (thrice); *ta`ah*, ⁽¹⁹⁵¹⁰⁾Psalm 95:10; ⁽²⁰⁴²²⁾Proverbs 14:22; ⁽²³⁵⁰⁸⁾Isaiah 35:8. It means also "to cause to err" (⁽²⁰³¹²⁾Isaiah 3:12; 30:28, "a bridle that causeth to err"; ⁽²⁴²³¹³⁾Jeremiah 23:13,12; "Their lies (i.e. the unreal deities, creatures of their own imagination) have caused them to err," ⁽³⁰¹⁰⁴⁾Amos 2:4).

In the New Testament the word is generally [πλανάομαι, *planaomai*], "to wander" (⁽⁴¹¹²²⁴⁾Mark 12:24,27; ⁽⁵⁰⁶³¹⁰⁾Hebrews 3:10; ⁽⁵⁹⁰⁵¹⁹⁾James 5:19); *astocheo*, "to miss the mark," "to swerve," occurs twice (⁽⁵⁴⁰⁶²¹⁾1 Timothy 6:21; ⁽⁵⁹²¹⁸⁾2 Timothy 2:18).

Error in the Old Testament represents various words: *sheghaghah*, "mistake," "oversight" (⁽²⁰⁶⁰⁶⁾Ecclesiastes 5:6; compare ⁽²⁰⁰²⁵⁾Proverbs 20:25 and *see INQUIRY*); *meshughah*, with the same meaning, "wandering" (⁽¹⁸¹⁹⁰⁴⁾Job 19:4; compare ⁽¹⁹⁰¹²⁾Psalm 19:12); *shal*, "rashness," "mistake" (⁽¹⁰⁰⁶⁰⁷⁾2 Samuel 6:7, "God smote him there for his error," the Revised Version, margin "rashness"); *shalu*, Aramaic "mistake" (⁽²⁷⁰⁶⁰⁴⁾Daniel 6:4); *to`ah*,

"injury" (⟨23306⟩Isaiah 32:6).

In the New Testament we have *plane*, "wandering" (⟨45027⟩Romans 1:27; ⟨59050⟩James 5:20; ⟨60046⟩1 John 4:6; ⟨65011⟩Jude 1:11, "the error of Balaam"); *agnoema*, "ignorance" (⟨58097⟩Hebrews 9:7, margin, Greek "ignorances"). For "is deceived" (⟨20000⟩Proverbs 20:1) the Revised Version (British and American) has "erreth," margin "or reeleth"; for "them that are out of the way" (⟨58052⟩Hebrews 5:2), "the ignorant and erring"; for "deceit" (⟨52003⟩1 Thessalonians 2:3), "error."

The English word "error" has the same original meaning as the Hebrew and Greek main words, being derived from erro, "to wander." "To err is human," but there are errors of the heart as well as of the head. The familiar phrase just quoted seems to have its equivalent in the marginal rendering of ⟨01003⟩Genesis 6:3, "in their going astray they are flesh." Errors through ignorance are in the Bible distinguished from errors of the heart and willful errors (⟨03018⟩Leviticus 5:18; ⟨04022⟩Numbers 15:22; ⟨26450⟩Ezekiel 45:20).

W. L. Walker

ESAIAS

<e-za'-yas>.

See ISAIAH.

ESARHADDON

<e-sar-had'-on > ([ˆDj " r‡" ae'*ecar-chaddon*]; Assyrian *Asur-ach-iddina*, "Ashur hath given a brother"): During his lifetime, Sennacherib, king of Assyria, made his favorite son, Esarhaddon (680-668 BC), the viceroy of Babylon; and although he was not the eldest son, he decreed that he should become the legal heir to the throne of Assyria. Sennacherib, having been slain in 681, apparently by two of his sons, who are called in the Old Testament Adrammelech and Sharezer (⟨12037⟩2 Kings 19:37), Esarhaddon proceeded to Nineveh, where the rebellion which followed the death of his father collapsed, having existed for about a month and a half. The Old Testament informs us that the murderers of his father fled to Armenia. This is corroborated by the inscriptions which say that at Melid, in the land of Hanirabbat, which can be said to be in Armenia, Esarhaddon fought the rebels and defeated them; whereupon he was proclaimed king. His father had been so displeased with Babylon that he had attempted to

annihilate the city by making it a swamp. Esarhaddon, however, having been infatuated with the ancient culture of the Babylonians, adopted a conciliatory attitude toward the people. Immediately he planned to restore the city on magnificent proportions. The foundations of his work were laid with impressive ceremonies, and in every way he endeavored to ameliorate the inhabitants by his gracious deeds. Even at Nippur evidences of his work in restoring the ancient shrine of Ellil are seen. The kings of the West who became his vassals, among them being Manasseh of Judah, were required to furnish building materials for his operations in Babylonia. His work in that land explains why the Judean king was incarcerated at Babylon ([44311]2 Chronicles 33:11) instead of Assyria.

Esarhaddon was first compelled to defend the kingdom against the inroads of the hordes from the North. The Gimirra (perhaps referring to Gomer of the Old Testament), who were called Manda, seemed to pour into the land. A decisive victory was finally gained over them, and they were driven back into their own country. Afterward, the Medes and the Chaldeans were also subjugated. He then directed his attentions toward the West. Sidon having revolted against Assyria, Esarhaddon laid siege to the city, which after three years was finally captured and destroyed. He built another city upon the same site, which he called Kar-Esarhaddon, and endeavored to revive its commerce. And, as is mentioned in [5002]Ezra 4:2; compare 10, he repopulated the city (Samaria) with captives from Elam and Babylonia. The capture of Tyre was also attempted, but, the city being differently situated, a siege from the land was insufficient to bring about submission, as it was impossible to cut off the commerce by sea. The siege, after several years, seems to have been lifted. Although on a great monolith Esarhaddon depicts Ba`al, the king of Tyre, kneeling before him with a ring through his lips, there is nothing in the inscriptions to bear this out.

His work in Canaan was preparatory to his conquest of Egypt. Tirhakah, the Ethiopian king of Egypt, was attacked on the borders, but no victory was gained. Several years later he crossed the borders and gained a decisive victory at Iskhupri. He then proceeded to lay siege to Memphis, which soon capitulated; and Egypt, to the confines of Nubia, surrendered to Assyria. Esarhaddon reorganized the government, and even changed the names of the cities. Necoh was placed over the 22 princes of the land. In 668, Egypt revolted and Esarhaddon, while on his way to put down the revolt, died. He had arranged that the kingdom be divided between two of his sons: Ashurbanipal was to be king of Assyria, and Shamash-shum-ukin

was to reign over Babylonia. The nobles decreed, however, that the empire should not be divided, but Shamash-shum-ukin was made viceroy of Babylonia.

A. T. Clay

ESAU

<e'-so> ([ᴡᴄ֑ʾ e̓`*esaw*], "hairy"; [ʾΗσαύ, *Esau*]): Son of Isaac, twin brother of Jacob. The name was given on account of the hairy covering on his body at birth: "all over like a hairy garment" (Genesis 25:25). There was a prenatal foreshadowing of the relation his descendants were to sustain to those of his younger brother, Jacob (Genesis 25:23). The moment of his birth also was signalized by a circumstance that betokened the same destiny (Genesis 25:26).

The young Esau was fond of the strenuous, daring life of the chase — he became a skillful hunter, "a man of the field" (*'ish sadheh*). His father warmed toward him rather than toward Jacob, because Esau's hunting expeditions resulted in meats that appealed to the old man's taste (Genesis 25:28). Returning hungry from one of these expeditions, however, Esau exhibited a characteristic that marked him for the inferior position which had been foretokened at the time of his birth. Enticed by the pottage which Jacob had boiled, he could not deny himself, but must, at once, gratify his appetite, though the calm and calculating Jacob should demand the birthright of the firstborn as the price (Genesis 25:30-34). Impulsively he snatched an immediate and sensual gratification at the forfeit of a future glory. Thus he lost the headship of the people through whom God's redemptive purpose was to be wrought out in the world, no less than the mere secular advantage of the firstborn son's chief share in the father's temporal possessions. Though Esau had so recklessly disposed of his birthright, he afterward would have secured from Isaac the blessing that appertained, had not the cunning of Rebekah provided for Jacob. Jacob, to be sure, had some misgiving about the plan of his mother (Genesis 27:12), but she reassured him; the deception was successful and he secured the blessing. Now, too late, Esau bitterly realized somewhat, at least, of his loss, though he blamed Jacob altogether, and himself not at all (Genesis 27:34,36). Hating his brother on account of the grievance thus held against him, he determined upon fratricide as soon as his father should pass away (Genesis 27:41); but the watchful Rebekah sent Jacob to Haran, there

to abide with her kindred till Esau's wrath should subside (⟨01742⟩Genesis 27:42-45).

Esau, at the age of forty, had taken two Hittite wives, and had thus displeased his parents. Rebekah had shrewdly used this fact to induce Isaac to fall in with her plan to send Jacob to Mesopotamia; and Esau, seeing this, seems to have thought he might please both Isaac and Rebekah by a marriage of a sort different from those already contracted with Canaanitish women. Accordingly, he married a kinswoman in the person of a daughter of Ishmael (⟨01806⟩Genesis 28:6,9). Connected thus with the "land of Seir," and by the fitness of that land for one who was to live by the sword, Esau was dwelling there when Jacob returned from Mesopotamia. While Jacob dreaded meeting him, and took great pains to propitiate him, and made careful preparations against a possible hostile meeting, very earnestly seeking Divine help, Esau, at the head of four hundred men, graciously received the brother against whom his anger had so hotly burned. Though Esau had thus cordially received Jacob, the latter was still doubtful about him, and, by a sort of duplicity, managed to become separated from him, Esau returning to Seir (⟨01312⟩Genesis 33:12-17). Esau met his brother again at the death of their father, about twenty years later (⟨01529⟩Genesis 35:29). Of the after years of his life we know nothing.

Esau was also called Edom ("red"), because he said to Jacob: "Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage" (⟨01250⟩Genesis 25:30). The land in which he established himself was "the land of Seir," so called from Seir, ancestor of the Horites whom Esau found there; and called also Edom from Esau's surname, and, it may be, too, from the red sandstone of the country (Sayce).

"Esau" is sometimes found in the sense of the descendants of Esau, and of the land in which they dwelt (⟨05015⟩Deuteronomy 2:5; Obidiah 1:6,8,18,19).

E. J. Forrester

ESAY

<e'-sa> ([ʾΗσαίας, *Esaias*]): the King James Version for Isaiah (2 Esdras 2:18; Ecclesiasticus 48:22).

ESCHATOLOGY, OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

<es-ka-tol'-o-ji>

Eschatology of the Old Testament (with Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Writings).

A) SCOPE OF ARTICLE:

By "eschatology," or doctrine of the last things, is meant the ideas entertained at any period on the future life, the end of the world (resurrection, judgment; in the New Testament, the *Parousia*), and the eternal destinies of mankind. In this article it is attempted to exhibit the beliefs on these matters contained in the Old Testament, with those in the Jewish apocryphal and apocalyptic writings that fill up the interval between the Old Testament and the New Testament.

B) DR. CHARLES' WORK:

The subject here treated has been dealt with by many writers (see "Literature" below); by none more learnedly or ably than by Dr. R. H. Charles in his work on Hebrew, Jewish and Christian eschatology (A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity). The present writer is, however, unable to follow Dr. Charles in many of his very radical critical positions, which affect so seriously the view taken of the literary evidence, and of the development of Israel's religion; is unable, therefore, to follow him in his interpretation of the religion itself. The subject, accordingly, is discussed in these pages from a different point of view from his.

C) INDIVIDUAL RELIGION IN ISRAEL.

One special point in which the writer is unable to follow Dr. Charles in his treatment, which may be noticed at the outset, is in his idea — now so generally favored — that till near the time of the Exile religion was not individual — that Yahweh was thought of as concerned with the well-being of the people as a whole, and not with that of its individual members. "The individual was not the religious unit, but the family or tribe" (op. cit., 58). How anyone can entertain this idea in face of the plain indications of the Old Testament itself to the contrary is to the present writer a mystery. There is, indeed, throughout the Old Testament, a solidarity of the individual with his family and tribe, but not at any period to the exclusion of a personal relation to Yahweh, or of individual moral and religious responsibility. The pictures of piety in the Book of Genesis are nearly all individual, and the narratives containing them are, even on the critical view,

older than the 9th century. Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, are all of them, to the writers of the history, individuals; Moses, Joshua, Caleb, are individuals; the deeds of individuals are counted to them for righteousness; the sins of others slay them. If there had been ten righteous persons in Sodom, it would have been spared (⟨01832⟩Genesis 18:32). It was as an individual that David sinned; as an individual he repented and was forgiven. Kings are judged or condemned according to their individual character. It is necessary to lay stress on this at the beginning; otherwise the whole series of the Old Testament conceptions is distorted.

I. Fundamental Ideas.

The eschatology of the Old Testament, as Dr. Charles also recognizes, is dependent on, and molded by, certain fundamental ideas in regard to God, man, the soul and the state after death, in which lies the peculiarity of Israel's religion. Only, these ideas are differently apprehended here from what they are in this writer's learned work.

1. Idea of God:

In the view of Dr. Charles, Yahweh (Yahweh), who under Moses became the God of the Hebrew tribes, was, till the time of the prophets, simply a national God, bound up with the land and with this single people; therefore, "possessing neither interest nor jurisdiction in the life of the individual beyond the grave. .... Hence, since early Yahwism possessed no eschatology of its own, the individual Israelite was left to his hereditary heathen beliefs. These beliefs we found were elements of Ancestor Worship" (op. cit., 52; compare 35). The view taken here, on the contrary, is, that there is no period known to the Old Testament in which Yahweh — whether the name was older than Moses or not need not be discussed — was not recognized as the God of the whole earth, the Creator of the world and man, and Judge of all, nations. He is, in both Genesis 1 and 2, the Creator of the first pair from whom the whole race springs; He judged the whole world in the Flood; He chose Abraham to be a blessing to the families of the earth (⟨01203⟩Genesis 12:3); His universal rule is acknowledged (⟨01825⟩Genesis 18:25); in infinite grace, displaying His power over Egypt, He chose Israel to be a people to Himself (⟨02903⟩Exodus 19:3-6). The ground for denying jurisdiction over the world of the dead thus falls. The word of Jesus to the Sadducees is applicable here: "Have ye not read .... I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not

the God of the dead, but of the living" (⁴⁰²³¹Matthew 22:31,32). The Old Testament instances of resurrection in answer to prayer point in the same direction (¹¹¹⁷²¹1 Kings 17:21 ff; ¹²⁰⁶³⁴2 Kings 4:34 ff; compare ¹⁹¹⁶¹⁰Psalm 16:10; 49:15, etc.; see further, below).

2. Idea of Man:

According to Dr. Charles, the Old Testament has two contradictory representations of the constitution of man, and of the effects of death. The older or pre-prophetic view distinguishes between soul and body in man (pp. 37 ff, 45 ff), and regards the soul as surviving death (this is not easily reconcilable with the other proposition (p. 37) that the "soul or nephesh is identical with the blood"), and as retaining a certain self-consciousness, and the power of speech and movement in Sheol (pp. 39 ff). This view is in many respects identical with that of ancestor worship, which is held to be the primitive belief in Israel (p. 41). The other and later view, which is thought to follow logically from the account in ⁰¹⁰²⁰⁷Genesis 2:7, supposes the soul to perish at death (pp. 41 ff). We read there that "Yahweh God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The "breath of life" (*nishmath chayyim*) is identified with the "spirit of life" (*ruach chayyim*) of ⁰¹⁰⁶¹⁷Genesis 6:17, and is taken to mean that the soul has no independent existence, but is "really a function of the material body when quickened by the (impersonal) spirit" (p. 42). "According to this view the annihilation of the soul ensues inevitably at death, that is, when the spirit is withdrawn" (p. 43). This view is held to be the parent of Sadduceeism, and is actually affirmed to be the view of Paul (pp. 43-44, 409) — the apostle who repudiated Sadduceeism in this very article (⁴⁴²⁰⁶Acts 23:6-9).

Body, Soul and Spirit.

The above view of man's nature is here rejected, and the consistency of the Old Testament doctrine affirmed. The Biblical view has nothing to do with ancestor worship (compare the writer's Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, 135-36). In ⁰⁰¹⁰²⁵Genesis 1:26,27 man is created in God's image, and in the more anthropomorphic narrative of ⁰¹⁰²⁰⁷Genesis 2:7, he becomes "a living soul" through a unique act of Divine inbreathing. The soul (nephesh) in man originates in a Divine inspiration (compare ¹⁸⁵²⁰⁸Job 32:8; 33:4; ²³⁴⁰⁵Isaiah 42:5), and is at once the animating principle of the body (the blood being its vehicle, ⁰³¹⁷¹¹Leviticus 17:11), with its appetites and desires, and the seat of the self-conscious personality, and source of rational and spiritual activities. It is these higher activities of the soul

which, in the Old Testament, are specially called "spirit" (*ruach*). Dr. Charles expresses this correctly in what he says of the supposed earlier view ("the *ruach* had become the seat of the highest spiritual functions in man," p. 46; see more fully the writer's God's Image in Man, 47 ff). There is no ground for deducing "annihilation" from Genesis 2:7. Everywhere in Genesis man is regarded as formed for living fellowship with God, and capable of knowing, worshipping and serving Him.

See SOUL; SPIRIT.

3. Sin and Death:

It follows from the above account that man is regarded in the Old Testament as a compound being, a union of body and soul (embracing spirit), both being elements in his one personality. His destiny was not to death, but to life — not life, however, in separation of the soul from the body (disembodied existence), but continued embodied life, with, perhaps, as its sequel, change and translation to higher existence (thus Enoch, Elijah; the saints at the *Parousia*). This is the true original idea of immortality for man (*see IMMORTALITY*). Death, accordingly, is not, as it appears in Dr. Charles, a natural event, but an abnormal event — a mutilation, separation of two sides of man's being never intended to be separated — due, as the Scripture represents it, to the entrance of sin (Genesis 2:17; 3:19,22; Romans 5:12; 1 Corinthians 15:21,22). It is objected that nothing further is said in the Old Testament of a "Fall," and a subjection of man to death as the result of sin. In truth, however, the whole picture of mankind in the Old Testament, as in the New Testament, is that of a world turned aside from God, and under His displeasure, and death and all natural evils are ever to be considered in relation to that fact (compare Dillmann, Alttest. Theol., 368, 376 ff; God's Image in Man, 198 ff, 249 ff). This alone explains the light in which death is regarded by holy men; their longing for deliverance from it (see below); the hope of resurrection; the place which resurrection — "the redemption of our body" (Romans 8:23) — after the pattern of Christ's resurrection (Philippians 3:21), has in the Christian conception of immortality.

II. Conceptions of the Future Life — Sheol.

Had Israel No Belief in a Future Life?:

It is usual to find it contended that the Israelites, in contrast with other peoples, had not the conception of a future life till near the time of the

Exile; that then, through the teaching of the prophets and the discipline of experience, ideas of individual immortality and of judgment to come first arose. There is, however, a good deal of ambiguity of language, if not confusion of thought, in such statements. It is true there is development in the teaching on a future life; true also that in the Old Testament "life" and "immortality" are words of pregnant meaning, to which bare survival of the soul, and gloomy existence in Sheol, do not apply. But in the ordinary sense of the expression "future life," it is certain that the Israelites were no more without that notion than any of their neighbors, or than most of the peoples and races of the world to whom the belief is credited.

1. Reserve on This Subject: Hopes and Promises Largely Temporal:

Israel, certainly, had not a developed mythology of the future life such as was found in Egypt. There, life in the other world almost over-shadowed the life that now is; in contrast with this, perhaps because of it, Israel was trained to a severer reserve in regard to the future, and the hopes and promises to the nation — the rewards of righteousness and penalties of transgression — were chiefly temporal. The sense of individual responsibility, as was shown at the commencement, there certainly was — an individual relation to God. But the feeling of corporate existence — the sense of connection between the individual and his descendants — was strong, and the hopes held out to the faithful had respect rather to multiplication of seed, to outward prosperity, and to a happy state of existence (never without piety as its basis) on earth, than to a life beyond death. The reason of this and the qualifications needing to be made to the statement will afterward appear; but that the broad facts are as stated every reader of the Old Testament will perceive for himself. Abraham is promised that his seed shall be multiplied as the stars of heaven, and that the land of Canaan shall be given them to dwell in (Genesis 12:1-3; 15); Israel is encouraged by abundant promises of temporal blessing (Deuteronomy 11:8 ff; 28:1-14), and warned by the most terrible temporal curses (Deuteronomy 28:15 ff); David has pledged to him the sure succession of his house as the reward of obedience (2 Samuel 7:11 ff). So in the Book of Job, the patriarch's fidelity is rewarded with return of his prosperity (chapter 42). Temporal promises abound in the Prophets (Hosea 2:14 ff; 14; Isaiah 1:19,26; 35, etc.); the Book of Proverbs likewise is full of such promises (3:13 ff, etc.).

2. A Future State not Therefore Denied:

All this, however, in no way implies that the Israelites had no conceptions of, or beliefs in, a state of being beyond death, or believed the death of the body to be the extinction of existence. This was very far from being the case. A hope of a future life it would be wrong to call it; for there was nothing to suggest hope, joy or life in the good sense, in the ideas they entertained of death or the hereafter. In this they resembled most peoples whose ideas are still primitive, but to whom it is not customary to deny belief in a future state. They stand as yet, though with differences to be afterward pointed out, on the general level of Semitic peoples in their conceptions of what the future state was. This is also the view taken by Dr. Charles. He recognizes that early Israelite thought attributed a "comparatively large measure of life, movement, knowledge and likewise power (?) to the departed in Sheol" (op. cit., 41). A people that does this is hardly destitute of all notions of a future state. This question of Sheol now demands more careful consideration. Here again our differences from Dr. Charles will reveal themselves.

Belief Non-Mythological.

It would, indeed, have been amazing had the Israelites, who dwelt so long in Egypt, where everything reminded of a future life, been wholly destitute of ideas on that subject. What is clear is that, as already observed, they did not adopt any of the Egyptian notions into their religion. The simplicity of their belief in the God of their fathers kept them then and ever after from the importation of mythological elements into their faith. The Egyptian Amenti may be said, indeed, to answer broadly to the Hebrew Sheol; but there is nothing in Israelite thought to correspond to Osiris and his assessors, the trial in the hall of judgment, and the adventures and perils of the soul thereafter. What, then, was the Hebrew idea of Sheol, and how did it stand related to beliefs elsewhere?

3. Survival of Soul, or Conscious Part:

That the soul, or some conscious part of man for which the name may be allowed to stand, does not perish at death, but passes into another state of existence, commonly conceived of as shadowy and inert, is a belief found, not only among the lower, so-called nature-peoples, but in all ancient religions, even the most highly developed. The Egyptian belief in Amenti, or abode of the dead, ruled over by Osiris, is alluded to above; the

Babylonian Arallu (some find the word "Sualu" = *she'ol*), the land of death, from which there is no return; the Greek Hades, gloomy abode of the shades of the departed, are outstanding witnesses to this conception (the various ideas may be seen, among other works, in Salmond, Christian Doctrine of Immortality, I (ideas of lower races, Indian, Egyptian Babylonian, Persian and Greek beliefs); in Sayce, Hibbert Lectures, Religion of Ancient Babylonians, and Gifford Lectures, Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia; Dr. Charles, Eschatology, chapter iii, on Greek conceptions). The Hebrew conception of Sheol, the gathering-place of the dead, is not in essentials dissimilar. "The resemblance," says Dr. Salmond, "between the Hebrew Sheol, the Homeric Hades, and Babylonian Arallu is unmistakable" (op. cit., 3rd edition, 173). As to its origin, Dr. Charles would derive the belief from ancestor worship. He supposes that "in all probability Sheol was originally conceived as a combination of the graves of the clan or nation, and as thus its final abode" (op. cit., 33). It is far from proved, however, that ancestor worship had the role he assigns to it in early religion; and, in any case, the explanation inverts cause and effect. The survival of the soul or shade is already assumed before there can be worship of ancestors. Far simpler is the explanation that man is conscious from the first of a thinking, active principle within him which disappears when death ensues, and he naturally thinks of this as surviving somewhere else, if only in a ghost-like and weakened condition (compare Max Muller, Anthropological Religion, 195, 281, 337-38). Whatever the explanation, it is the case that, by a sure instinct, peoples of low and high culture alike all but universally think of the conscious part of their dead as surviving. On natural grounds, the Hebrews did the same. Only, in the Scriptural point of view, this form of survival is too poor to be dignified with the high name of "immortality."

4. The Hebrew Sheol:

It is not necessary to do more than sketch the main features of the Hebrew *sheol* (*see SHEOL*). The word, the etymology of which is doubtful (the commonest derivations are from roots meaning "to ask" or "to be hollow," *sha'al*), is frequently, but erroneously, translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "grave" or "hell." It denotes really, as already said, the place or abode of the dead, and is conceived of as situated in the depths of the earth (Psalm 63:9; 86:13; Ezekiel 26:20; 31:14; 32:18,24; compare Numbers 16:30; Deuteronomy 32:22). The dead are there gathered in companies; hence, the frequently recurring expression,

"gathered unto his people" ([01258]Genesis 25:8; 35:29; 49:33; [04024]Numbers 20:24, etc.), the phrase denoting, as the context shows, something quite distinct from burial. Jacob, e.g. was "gathered unto his people"; afterward his body was embalmed, and, much later, buried ([01502]Genesis 50:2 ff). Poetical descriptions of Sheol are not intended to be taken with literalness; hence, it is a mistake, with Dr. Charles, to press such details as "bars" and "gates" ([18716]Job 17:16; 38:17; [19014]Psalm 9:14; [23810]Isaiah 38:10, etc.). In the general conception, Sheol is a place of darkness ([18021]Job 10:21,22; [19303]Psalm 143:3), of silence ([19417]Psalm 94:17; 115:17), of forgetfulness ([19812]Psalm 88:12; [21005]Ecclesiastes 9:5,6,10). It is without remembrance or praise of God ([19065]Psalm 6:5), or knowledge of what transpires on earth ([18421]Job 14:21). Even this language is not to be pressed too literally. Part of it is the expression of a depressed or despairing (compare [23810]Isaiah 38:10 ff) or temporarily skeptical (thus in Ecclesiastes; compare 12:7,13,14) mood; all of it is relative, emphasizing the contrast with the brightness, joy and activity of the earthly life (compare [18022]Job 10:22, "where the light is as midnight" — comparative). Elsewhere it is recognized that consciousness remains; in [23409]Isaiah 14:9 ff the shades (*repha'im*) of once mighty kings are stirred up to meet the descending king of Babylon (compare [26521]Ezekiel 32:21). If Sheol is sometimes described as "destruction" ([18206]Job 26:6 margin; 28:22; [20511]Proverbs 15:11 margin) and "the pit" ([19009]Psalm 30:9; 55:23), at other times, in contrast with the weariness and trouble of life, it is figured and longed for as a place of "rest" and "sleep" ([18017]Job 3:17 ff; 14:12,13). Always, however, as with other peoples, existence in Sheol is represented as feeble, inert, shadowy, devoid of living interests and aims, a true state of the dead (on Egyptian Babylonian and Greek analogies, compare Salmond, op. cit., 54-55, 73-74, 99 ff, 173-74). The idea of Dr. Charles, already commented on, that Sheol is outside the jurisdiction of Yahweh, is contradicted by many passages ([05022]Deuteronomy 32:22; [18206]Job 26:6; [20511]Proverbs 15:11; [19008]Psalm 139:8; [30902]Amos 9:2, etc.; compare above).

III. The Religious Hope — Life and Resurrection.

a) Nature and Grace — Moral Distinctions:

Such is Sheol, regarded from the standpoint of nature; a somewhat different aspect is presented when it is looked at from the point of view of grace. As yet no trace is discernible between righteous and wicked in Sheol; the element of retribution seems absent. Reward and punishment are in this world; not in the state beyond. Yet one must beware of drawing too

sweeping conclusions even here. The state, indeed, of weakened consciousness and slumbrous inaction of Sheol does not admit of much distinction, and the thought of exchanging the joys of life for drear existence in that gloomy underworld may well have appalled the stoutest hearts, and provoked sore and bitter complainings. Even the Christian can bewail a life brought to a sudden and untimely close. But even on natural grounds it is hardly credible that the pious Israelite thought of the state of the godly gathered in peace to their people as quite the same as those who perished under the ban of God's anger, and went down to Sheol bearing their iniquity. There is a pregnancy not to be overlooked in such expressions as, "The wicked shall be turned back unto Sheol" (Psalm 9:17), a "lowest Sheol" unto which God's anger burns (Deuteronomy 32:22), "uttermost parts of the pit" (Isaiah 14:15; Ezekiel 32:23) to which the proud and haughty in this life are consigned. Dr. Charles goes so far as to find a "penal character of Sheol" in Psalms 49 and 73 (op. cit., 74). Consolation breathes in such utterances as, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for there is a happy end to the man of peace" (Psalm 37:37), or (with reference to the being taken from the evil to come), "He entereth into peace; they rest in their beds, each one that walketh in his uprightness" (Isaiah 57:2; compare verse 21: "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked"). Even Balaam's fervent wish, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his" (Numbers 23:10), seems weakened when interpreted only of the desire for a green and blessed old age. It is possible to read too much into Old Testament expressions; the tendency at the present time would seem to be to read a great deal too little (P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, I, 173 ff, 422 ff, may profitably be consulted).

b) Religious Hope of Immortality:

To get at the true source and nature of the hope of immortality in the Old Testament, however, it is necessary to go much farther than the idea of any happier condition in Sheol. This dismal region is never there connected with ideas of "life" or "immortality" in any form. Writers who suppose that the hopes which find utterance in passages of Psalms and Prophets have any connection with existence in Sheol are on an altogether wrong track. It is not the expectation of a happier condition in Sheol, but the hope of deliverance from Sheol, and of restored life and fellowship with God, which occupies the mind. How much this implies deserves careful consideration.

1. Sheol, Like Death, Connected with Sin:

It has already been seen that, in the Old Testament, Sheol, like death, is not the natural fate of man. A connection with sin and judgment is implied in it. Whatever Sheol might be to the popular, unthinking mind, to the reflecting spirit, that really grasped the fundamental ideas of the religion of Yahweh, it was a state wholly contrary to man's true destiny. It was, as seen, man's dignity in distinction from the animal, that he was not created under the law of death. Disembodied existence, which is of necessity enfeebled, partial, imperfect existence, was no part of the Divine plan for man. His immortality was to be in the body, not out of it. Separation of soul and body, an after-existence of the soul in Sheol, belong to the doom of sin. Dr. Salmond fully recognizes this in his discussion of the subject. "The penal sense of death colors all that the Old Testament says of man's end. It is in its thoughts where it is not in its words" (op. cit., 159; see the whole passage; compare also Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, I, 242 ff, English translation; A. B. Davidson, Theology of the Old Testament, 432 ff, 439 ff). The true type of immortality is therefore to be seen in cases like those of Enoch (Genesis 5:24; compare Hebrews 11:5) and Elijah (2 Kings 2:11); of a bare "immortality of the soul," Scripture has nothing to say.

It is on all hands conceded that, so far as the hope of immortality, in any full or real sense, is found in the Old Testament, it is connected with religious faith and hope. It has not a natural, but a religious, root. It springs from the believer's trust and confidence in the living God; from his conviction that God — his God — who has bound him to Himself in the bonds of an unchanging covenant, whose everlasting arms are underneath him (Deuteronomy 33:27; compare Psalm 90:1), will not desert him even in Sheol — will be with him there, and will give him victory over its terrors (compare A. B. Davidson, Commentary on Job, 293-95; Salmond, op. cit., 175).

2. Religious Root of Hope of Immortality:

Life is not bare existence; it consists in God's favor and fellowship (Psalm 16:11; 30:5; 63:3). The relevant passages in Psalms and Prophets will be considered after. Only, it is contended by the newer school, this hope of immortality belongs to a late stage of Israel's religion — to a period when, through the development of the monotheistic idea, the growth of the sense of individuality, the acute feeling of the contradictions of life, this great "venture" of faith first became possible. One asks,

however, Was it so? Was this hope so entirely a matter of "intuitous ventures, and forecasts of devout souls in moments of deepest experience or keenest conflict," as this way of considering the matter represents? Not Necessarily Late.

That the hope of immortality could only exist for strong faith is self-evident. But did strong faith come into existence only in the days of the prophets or the Exile? Exception has already been taken to the assumption that monotheism was a late growth, and that individual faith in God was not found in early times. It is not to be granted without demur that, as now commonly alleged, the Psalms and the Book of Job, which express this hope, are post-exilian products. If, however, faith in a covenant-keeping God is of earlier date — if it is present in patriarchal and Mosaic days — the question is not, Why should it not give rise to similar hopes? but rather, How should it be prevented from doing so? If a patriarch like Abraham truly walked with God, and received His promises, could he, any more than later saints, be wholly distrustful of God's power to keep and deliver him in and from Sheol? It is hard to credit it. It is replied, there is no evidence of such hope. Certainly these ancient saints did not write psalms or speak with the tongues of prophets. But is there nothing in their quiet and trustful walk, in their tranquil deaths, in their sense of uncompleted promises, in their pervading confidence in God in all the vicissitudes of life, to suggest that they, too, were able to commit themselves into the hands of God in death, and to trust Him to see that it was, or would ultimately be, well with them in the future? Thus at least Jesus understood it (⟨40232⟩Matthew 22:32); thus, New Testament writers believed (⟨581113⟩Hebrews 11:13,14). Faith might falter, but in principle, this hope must have been bound up with faith from the beginning.

3. Hope of Resurrection:

This raises now the crucial question, What shape did this hope of immortality assume? It was not, as already seen, an immortality enjoyed in Sheol; it could only then be a hope connected with deliverance from the power of Sheol — in essence, whether precisely formulated or not, a hope of resurrection. It is, we believe, because this has been overlooked, that writers on the subject have gone so often astray in their discussions on immortality in the Old Testament. They have thought of a blessedness in the future life of the soul (thus Charles, op. cit., 76-77); whereas the redemption the Bible speaks of invariably embraces the whole personality

of man, body and soul together. Jesus, it may be remembered, thus interprets the words, "I am the God of Abraham," etc. (Matthew 22:32), as a pledge not simply of continued existence, but of resurrection. This accords with what has been seen of the connection of death with sin and its abnormality in the case of man. The immortality man would have enjoyed, had he not sinned, would have been an immortality of his whole person. It will be seen immediately that this is borne out by all the passages in which the hope of immortality is expressed in the Old Testament. These never contemplate a mere immortality of the soul, but always imply resurrection.

(1) Not a Late or Foreign Doctrine.

If the above is correct, it follows that it is a mistake to place the belief in resurrection so late as is often done, still more to derive it from Zoroastrianism (thus, Cheyne, Origin of Psalter, lecture viii) or other foreign sources. It was a genuine corollary from the fundamental Israelite beliefs about God, man, the soul, sin, death and redemption. Professor Gunkel emphasizes "the immeasurable significance" of this doctrine, and speaks of it as "one of the greatest things found anywhere in the history of religion," but thinks "it cannot be derived from within Judaism itself, but must take its origin from a ruling belief in the Orient of the later time" (Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstandniss des New Testament, 32-33; for criticism of Gunkel's positions see the writer's Resurrection of Jesus, 255 ff). To make good his theory, however, he has to discount all the evidences for the belief furnished by the earlier Old Testament writings, and this, it is believed, cannot be done successfully. It was before noted that cases of resurrection appear in the historical books (1 Kings 17:21 ff; 2 Kings 4:34 ff). It is not impossible that the reverent care of the patriarchs for their dead was, as with the Egyptians, inspired by some hope of this kind (Genesis 23; 50:5,25; Exodus 13:19; compare Hebrews 11:22). In any case an impartial survey of the evidence proves that the thought of resurrection colors all the later expressions of the hope of immortality (*see IMMORTALITY*; compare also the writer's appendix on the subject in Christian View of God, 2OO ff).

(2) The Psalms.

The passages in the Psalms in which faith rises to the hope of immortality are principally Psalm 16:8-11; 17:15; 49:14,15; 73:24. There are a few

others, but these are the chief, and so far as they are allowed to express a hope of immortality at all, they do so in a form which implies resurrection. Dr. Cheyne, believing them to be influenced by Zoroastrianism, formerly granted this (Origin of Psalter, lecture viii); now he reads the passages differently. There is no good reason for putting these psalms in post-exilian times, and, taken in their most natural sense, their testimony seems explicit. [19168]Psalm 16:8-11 (cited in [44124]Acts 2:24-31 as a prophecy of the resurrection of Christ) reads "My flesh also shall dwell in safety (or confidently, margin). For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption (or the pit, margin). Thou wilt show me the path of life," etc. In [19715]Psalm 17:15, the Psalmist, after describing the apparent prosperity of the wicked, says, "As for me, I shall behold thy face in rightousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with beholding thy form" (King James Version, the English Revised Version, "with thy likeness"). Cheyne (op. cit., 406) refers this to the resurrection (compare Delitzsch, Perowne, etc.). Yet more explicit is [19914]Psalm 49:14,15, "They (the wicked) are appointed as a flock for Sheol .... and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning. .... But God will redeem my soul from the power (hand, margin) of Sheol; for he will receive me." The last clause, literally,. "He will take me," has, as Perowne, Delitzsch, Cheyne (formerly), even Duhm, allow, allusion to cases like those of Enoch and Elijah. It cannot, however, contemplate actual bodily translation; it must therefore refer to resurrection. Similar in strain is [19724]Psalm 73:24, "Thou wilt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." Dr. Charles grants that, in Psalms 49 and 73, "God takes the righteous to Himself" in heaven (pp. 76-77), but fails to connect this with the doctrine of resurrection which he finds appearing about the same time (p. 78).

(3) The Book of Job.

Before looking at the prophets, a glance should be taken at the Book of Job, which, irrespective of date (it is quite unwarrantably made post-exilian), reflects patriarchal conditions. Ch 14 raises the question, "If a man die, shall he live again?" (14:14), and it is to be remarked that the form in which it does it, is the possibility of bodily revival. The appearances hostile to man's living again are enumerated (14:7-12), then faith, reasserting itself, flings itself on God to accomplish the apparently impossible: "Oh that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time and

remember me. .... Thou wouldest call and I would answer thee: thou wouldest have a desire to the work of thy hands" (14:13-15; margin reads "Thou shalt call," etc.). Dr. A. B. Davidson says, "To his mind this involves a complete return to life again of the whole man" (Cambridge Commentary on Job, in the place cited.). With this must be taken the splendid outburst in 19:25-27, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," etc., which, whatever doubts may attach to the precise rendering of certain clauses, undoubtedly expresses a hope not inferior in strength to that in the verse just quoted.

(4) The Prophets.

The presence of the idea of resurrection in the Prophets is not doubted, but the passages are put down to exilic or preexilic times, and are explained of "spiritual" or "national," not of individual, resurrection (compare Charles, op. cit., 128-29). It seems plain, however, that, before the figure of resurrection could be applied to the nation, the idea of resurrection must have been there; and it is by no means clear that in certain of the passages the resurrection of individuals is not included. Cheyne granted this regarding the passages in Isaiah (25:6-8; 26:19): "This prospect concerns not merely the church-nation, but all of its believing members, and indeed all, whether Jews or not, who submit to the true king, Yahweh" (op. cit., 402). There is no call for putting the remarkable passages in Hos — "After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him" (6:2); "I will ransom them from the power of Sheol: I will redeem them from death: O death, where are thy plagues? O Sheol, where is thy destruction?" (13:14) — later than the time of that prophet. In them the idea of resurrection is already fully present; as truly as in the picture in <2670>Ezekiel 37:1-10 of the valley of dry bones. The climax is, however, reached in <2906>Isaiah 25:6-8; 26:19, above referred to, from which the individual element cannot be excluded (compare Salmond, op. cit., 211-12: "The theme of this great passage, 26:19, therefore, is a personal, not a corporate resurrection").

(5) Daniel — Resurrection of Wicked.

Finally, in the Old Testament we have the striking statement in <7100>Daniel 12:2, "And many of them that sleep in the dust .... shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament," etc. The peculiarity of this passage is, that in it, for the first time, is announced a

resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous (compare in the New Testament ⟨4058⟩John 5:28,29; ⟨42415⟩Acts 24:15; ⟨6602⟩Revelation 20:12 ff). The word "many" is not to be understood in contrast with "all," though probably only Israel is in view. The event is connected with a "time of trouble" (⟨27201⟩Daniel 12:1) following upon the overthrow of Antiochus, here representative of Antichrist. The really difficult problem is, How did this conception of the resurrection of the wicked come about? The resurrection of the righteous, it has been seen, is a corollary from the covenant-faithfulness of Yahweh. But this does not apply to the wicked. Whence then does the idea come? It is given as a revelation, but even revelation connects itself with existing ideas and experiences. The resurrection of the wicked, certainly, does not arise, like that of the righteous, from the consciousness of an indissoluble union with God, but it may well arise from the opposite conviction of the judgment of God. As the sense of individuality grew strong — and it is granted that the teaching of the prophets did much to strengthen that feeling — and the certainty of moral retribution developed, it was inevitable that this should react on the conception of the future, in making it as certain that the wicked should be punished, as that the good should be rewarded, in the world to come. Naturally too, as the counterpart of the other belief, this shaped itself into the form of a resurrection to judgment. We are thus brought, as a last step, to consider the idea of judgment and its effects as found in the prophetic teaching.

IV. The Idea of Judgment — the Day of Yahweh.

Judgment a Present Reality:

It was seen that, under Mosaism, the promises and threatenings of God were mainly confined to the present life, and that the sense of distinctions in Sheol, though not absent, was vague and wavering. Through temporal dispensations men were trained to faith in the reality of moral retribution. Under the prophets, while the judgments of God on nations and individuals were still primarily viewed as pertaining to this life, there gradually shaped itself a further idea — that of an approaching consummation of history, or Day of Yahweh, when God's enemies would be completely overthrown, His righteousness fully vindicated and His kingdom established in triumph throughout the earth. The developments of this idea may now briefly be exhibited. In this relation, it need only be stated that the writer does not follow the extraordinary mangling of the prophetic texts by certain critics, accepted, though with some misgiving, by Dr. Charles.

1. Day of Yahweh:

The "Day of Yahweh," in the prophetic writings, is conceived of, sometimes more generally, as denoting any great manifestation of God's power in judgment or salvation (e.g. the locusts in Joel 2), sometimes more eschatologically, of the final crisis in the history of God's kingdom, involving the overthrow of all opposition, and the complete triumph of righteousness (e.g. Isaiah 2:2-5; Joel 3; Amos 9:11 ff; Zechariah 14, etc.). The two things are not unconnected; the one is the prelude, or anticipatory stage, of the other. That feature of prophetic vision sometimes spoken of as the absence of perspective is very conspicuous in the fact that chronology is largely disregarded, and the "Day of Yahweh" is seen looming up as the immediate background of every great crisis in which the nation may for the time be involved (Assyrian invasions; Babylonian captivity; Maccabean persecution). The one thing ever certain to the prophet's mind is that the "Day" is surely coming — it is the one great, dread, yet for God's people joyful, event of the future — but the steps by which the goal is to be reached are only gradually revealed in the actual march of God's providence.

(1) Relation to Israel.

The "Day" is in its primary aspect a day of judgment (Isaiah 2:12); not, however, to be thought of as a day of vengeance only on the adversaries of Israel (Amos 5:18 ff). Israel itself would be the first to experience the strokes of the Divine chastisement: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (Amos 3:2). God's judgments on Israel, while retributive, were also purifying and sifting; a "remnant" would remain, who would be the seed of a holier community (Isaiah 6:13; Amos 9:9; Zephaniah 3:13,10, etc.). The Book of Hosea beautifully exhibits this aspect of the Divine dealings.

(2) To the Nations.

Of wider scope is the relation of the "Day" to the Gentileworld. The nations are used as the instruments of God's judgments on Israel (Assyrians, Chaldeans, Persians), but they, too, would in turn be judged by Yahweh (compare the prophecies against the nations in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nahum, Habakkuk, etc.). The end would be, although this does not fully appear in every prophet, that a remnant of the heathen also would turn to Yahweh, and be rescued from the judgment (Zechariah 14:16).

More generally, an extension of the kingdom of God would take place till the earth was filled with God's glory (e.g. [2002]Isaiah 2:2-5, with [3004]Micah 4:1-5; [2304]Isaiah 42:4; 60; 66:3-6; [2424]Jeremiah 12:14-16; 16:19-21; [2663]Ezekiel 16:53,55,61, God will turn the captivity of Sodom and her daughters; [3091]Amos 9:11; [3524]Habakkuk 2:14; compare [19227]Psalm 22:27-31; 65:2,5; 86:9; 87). These events, in prophetic speech, belong to "the latter days" ([2002]Isaiah 2:2; [2487]Jeremiah 48:47; [2686]Ezekiel 38:16; [2805]Hosea 3:5; [3004]Micah 4:1). In Daniel's great prophecy of the four kingdoms, these are represented as broken in pieces by the kingdom of heaven, symbolized by a stone cut out of the mountain without hands ([2704]Daniel 2:44,45; compare 7:27). The kingdom is given by the Ancient of Days to one "like unto a son of man" ([2713]Daniel 7:13). Haggai and Zechariah, the post-exilian prophets, share in these glowing hopes ([3706]Haggai 2:6,7; [3810]Zechariah 2:10; 8:20-23; 14:16). In Malachi is found one of the noblest of all the prophetic utterances: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles," etc. (1:11); and prophecy closes with the announcement of Him, Yahweh's messenger, by whom this "great and terrible day of Yahweh" is to be brought in (Malachi 4).

2. Judgment beyond Death:

The purview, in what is said of the "Day of Yahweh," is thus seen to be confined to earth, though the references to resurrection, and the passages in the close of Isaiah (65:17; 66:22) about "new heavens and a new earth" imply a further vista. The hope of immortality — of resurrection life — in the case of the righteous has already been considered. But what of judgment after death in the case of the wicked? Only dim premonitions of retribution, it was seen, are found in the earlier doctrine of Sheol. There are frequent references to "judgment" in the Psalms, sometimes on the world (e.g. 96:13; 98:9; compare 50), sometimes on individuals (e.g. 1:5), but it is doubtful if any of them look beyond earth. Yet many things combined to force this problem on the attention.

(1) Incompleteness of Moral Administration.

There was the sharpening of the sense of individual responsibility in the prophetic age ([2629]Jeremiah 31:29,30; [2680]Ezekiel 18:2 ff), and the obvious fact of the incompleteness of the Divine moral administration in the present life, as respects the individual. The working of moral laws could be discerned, but this fell far short of exact individual retribution. Life was full

of moral anomalies and perplexities (compare JOB, BOOK OF).
(2) Prosperity of Wicked.

There was the special difficulty that the wicked did not always seem to meet with the punishment due to their misdeeds in time. On the contrary they often seemed to flourish, to have success in their schemes, to triumph over the godly, who were afflicted and oppressed. This was the enigma that so painfully exercised the minds of the psalmists (Pss 10; 17; 37; 49; 73, etc.). The solution they found was that the prosperity of the wicked did not endure. It came to a sudden end (Psalm 37:35,36; 73:18-20), while the righteous had a sure compensation in the future (Psalm 17:15; 49:15; 73:24, etc.). It was not, however, always the case that the wicked were thus visibly cut off. Besides, a sudden end hardly seemed an adequate punishment for a long career of triumphant iniquity, and, if the righteous were recompensed hereafter, the thought lay near that the wicked might be, and should be, also.
(3) Suffering of Righteous with Wicked.

There was the kindred fact that, in the calamities that overtook the wicked, the righteous were often the involuntary sharers. The wicked did not suffer by themselves; the godly were involved in the storm of judgment (war, captivity, plagues) that broke upon them. Here was something else calling for redress at the hands of a God of righteousness.

3. Retribution beyond Death:

From these causes the thought almost necessarily presented itself of the extension of retribution for the wicked into the state beyond death. Hence, as before seen, Sheol did come in the later age to assume something of a penal character for the unrighteous. There was a wrath of God that burned to the lowest Sheol (Deuteronomy 32:22; compare Charles, op. cit., 74). But this abode of the shades was not, for the evil any more than for the good, a fitting sphere for moral recompense. If, for the complete reward of the righteous, a resurrection-state was necessary, did not the same hold true for the wicked? It is questioned whether the very definite announcements of an individual judgment in Ecclesiastes 11:9; 12:14 refer to the state beyond death — it is probable that they do (compare Salmond, op. cit., 216-17). The first clear intimation of a resurrection of the wicked, however, is found, as already said, in Daniel 12:2, which likewise implies judgment. Perhaps a hint of the same idea is given in

[2624]Isaiah 66:24: "They shall go forth (the prophet is speaking of the times of the new heavens and the new earth, verse 22), and look upon the dead bodies of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Dr. Charles connects this with the idea of Gehenna as "a place of punishment for rebellious and apostate Jews," which he thinks also to be implied in [2501]Isaiah 50:11 (op. cit., 158). It is the same word "abhorrence" (*dera'on*), found in the above passage, which is rendered in [2712]Daniel 12:2 "contempt," and the punishment "is conceived of as eternal" (pp. 158-59).

It is hardly possible to carry the subject farther within the limits of the Old Testament. Further developments belong to the later Judaism.

V. Later Jewish Conceptions — Apocryphal, Apocalyptic, Rabbinical.

1. Sources:

The sources of our knowledge of the eschatological conceptions among the Jews in the immediately pre-Christian period are:

(1) Apocrypha.

The books of the Old Testament Apocrypha (*see* APOCRYPHA), taken over, with the exception of 2 Esdras, from the Septuagint. 2 Esdras, better known as 4 Esdras, is more properly classed with the apocalyptic writings. The original work consists only of chapters 3 through 14, with a passage in chapter 7 not found in the ordinary version. The book is post-Christian (circa 80-96 AD).

(2) Apocalyptic Literature.

(See article under that head, II, i, 1; II, ii.) The remains of this litereature consist of the Sibylline Oracles (oldest parts, Book III, from 2nd century BC), the Book Enoch (see below), the Psalms of Solomon (70-40 BC), with the Apocrypha Baruch (50-100 AD), the Book of Jubilees, and Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (see below), the Assumption of Moses (early 1st century AD), and the Ascension of Isaiah (before 50 AD). A good deal turns on the dating of some of these books. Several (Apocrypha Baruch, Assumption of Moses, Ascension of Isaiah, with 4 Esdras) are post-Christian. The Book of Jubilees and Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs have also usually been regarded as such, but Dr. Charles argues for dates going back to the close of the 2nd century BC for both. Late

Jewish and Christian additions are recognized in the latter. Formerly Dr. Charles dated Jubilees "before 10 AD." The chief dispute relates to (the "Similitudes") of the Book of Enoch chapters 37 through 70. These important sections are held by some (Dr. Stanton, etc.) to be post-Christian (end of 1st century AD) — a view to which we incline; Dr. Charles and others place them in the 1st century BC. Most of the remaining portions of the book are assigned to dates in the 2nd century BC. To the above should be added the notices of Jewish opinions in Josephus

(3) Rabbinical Writings.

For rabbinical ideas, we are chiefly dependent on the Talmudic writings and the Targums — sources whose late character makes their witness often doubtful (*see TALMUD; TARGUMS*).

2. Description of Views:

It is only possible to summarize very briefly the varying and frequently conflicting conceptions on eschatological subjects to be gleaned from this extensive literature. The representations are often wildly imaginative, and, so far as they are not genuine developments from Old Testament ideas, have value only as they may be supposed to throw light on the teachings of the New Testament. With one or two exceptions, little is to be gathered from the apocryphal books, and it will be best to treat the subject under headings.

(1) Less Definite Conceptions.

In the apocryphal Ecclesiasticus (Wisdom of the Son of Sirach) we remain still on the old ground of Sheol as a place in which there is no remembrance, thanksgiving or retribution (Sirach 17:27,28; 41:3,1, etc.; a somewhat different note is heard in 21:10). It is the same in Baruch (2:17) and Tobit (3:6). In 1 Macc we have simply the Old Testament phrases, "gathered to his fathers" (2:69), "gathered to his people" (14:30). In the Book of Wisdom, the influence of Greek ideas is seen in a doctrine of the immortality of the soul only (2:23; 3:1-4; 4:13,14; 15:3; not a resurrection), possibly of pre-existence (8:20). The wicked suffer punishment in Sheol (3:1-10; 5:1-14, etc.).

(2) Ideas of Sheol.

Generally, however, in the apocalyptic books, a marked change is seen in the ideas of Sheol. It is still the place of the dead, but is regarded more as a state intermediate between death and the resurrection for such as shall be raised; in which righteous and wicked are separated; in which the wicked suffer punishment. The Book of Enoch distinguishes four abodes for the departed — two for the righteous, and two for the wicked (21:1-13). One class of the wicked (those already punished in this life) remain there forever, while the others are raised, and pass to the torment of Gehenna (17:2). The righteous are in Paradise — "the garden of life" (61:12), "the garden of righteousness" (67:3). This character of Sheol as a place of punishment (intermediate or final) is met with frequently (Book of Jubilees 7:29; 22:22; 2 Macc 6:23; Psalter of Solomon 14:6; 15:11; 16:2, etc.). In certain places, Dr. Charles says, "Sheol has become an abode of fire, and therefore synonymous so far with Gehenna. .... In several passages in the Similitudes, and throughout Enoch 91-104, Sheol and Gehenna are practically identical" (op. cit., 237). Similar ideas are found in the Slavonic version of Enoch (ibid., 261 ff).

(3) The Fallen Angels.

Much prominence in the Book of Enoch is given to the fallen angels (those who sinned with women, ⁰¹⁰⁶²Genesis 6:2. They are consigned in the judgment to ever-burning fire (En 21:1-6; 90:20-25).

(4) Resurrection.

Ideas of the resurrection vary, In Enoch 22, the righteous and one class of the wicked are raised; elsewhere all the righteous are raised and none of the wicked (En 61:5; 90:33; Psalter of Solomon 3:16); sometimes there is to be a resurrection of all, just and unjust (En 51:1,2). 2 Macc dwells much on the resurrection, which seems to embrace all Israel (3:16; 13:9; 7:9,14,23, etc.). For the Gentiles there is no resurrection (7:14,36). In Enoch 90:38, the bodies of the righteous are described as "transformed" in the resurrection (compare in the "Similitudes," 39:7; 51:4; 62:15). The doctrine of the resurrection (universal) is taught in the Apocrypha Baruch 30:2-5; 50; 51, and in 4 Esdras 7:32-37. In Josephus the Pharisees are said to have believed in the resurrection of the righteous only (Ant., XVIII, i, 3). This does not coincide with Paul's statement in ⁴⁴²⁴⁵Acts 24:15.

(5) Judgment.

The reality of a final judgment, supervening upon the intermediate judgment in Sheol, is strongly affirmed in most of the apocalyptic books. The Book of Enoch speaks much of this final judgment. It describes it as "the great day," "the righteous judgment," "the great day of judgment" "the last judgment," "the judgment of all eternity" (10:6,12; 16:1; 19:1; 22:4,11; 25:4; 90:26,27, etc.). Wicked angels and men are judged, and sentenced to Gehenna — a doom without end.

The Messiah:

An interesting point is the relation of the Messiah to this judgment. With the exception of 4 Esd, the apocryphal books are silent on the Messiah. In the apocalyptic books the Messiah does appear, but not always in the same light. In the Sibylline Oracles **(3)**, Psalms of Solomon (17; 18), Apocrypha Baruch (39; 40) and in 4 Esdras (13:32 ff) the appearance of Messiah is associated with the overthrow and judgment of the ungodly worldly powers; in the older portions of Enoch (90:16-25) God Himself executes this judgment, and holds the great assize — the Messiah does not appear till after. In the section of Enoch, chapters 37 through 70, on the other hand, the Messiah appears definitely as the judge of the world, and titles resembling those in the New Testament, "the Righteous One" (38:2; 53:6), "the Elect One" (40:5; 45:3,4, etc.), above all, "the Son of Man" (46:2-4; 48:2, etc.), are given Him. It is these passages which suggest Christian influence, especially as the conception is not found elsewhere in pre-Christian Apocalypse, and the Book of Jubilees, which refers otherwise to Enoch, makes no mention of these passages. Yet another idea appears in later Apocalypse, that, namely, of a limited reign of Messiah, after which take place the resurrection and judgment. 4 Esdras has the extraordinary notion that, after a reign of 400 years, the Messiah dies (7:28,29). God in this case is the judge.

(6) The Messianic Age and the Gentiles.

The Messianic age, when conceived of as following the judgment (the older view), is unlimited in duration, has Jerusalem for its center, and includes in the scope of its blessing the converted Gentiles (Sibylline Oracles 3:698-726; Enoch 90:30,37; compare 48:5; 53:1; Psalms of Solomon 17:32-35). The righteous dead of Israel are raised to participate in the kingdom. Already in Enoch 90:28,29 is found the idea that the new Jerusalem is not the earthly city, but a city that comes down from heaven,

where, as in 4 Esdras, the Messianic reign is limited, the blessed life after resurrection is transferred to heaven.

(7) Rabbinical Ideas.

Little is to be added from the rabbinical conceptions, which, besides being difficult to ascertain precisely, are exceedingly confused and contradictory. Most of the ideas above mentioned appear in rabbinical teaching. With the destruction of the hostile world-powers is connected in later rabbinism the appearance of "Armilus" — an Antichrist. The reign of Messiah is generally viewed as limited in duration — 400 years (as in 4 Esdras), and 1,000 years being mentioned (compare Schurer, History of Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Div. II, Vol. II, 179, English translation). At its close takes place a renovation of the world, resurrection (for Israelites only, certain classes being excluded), judgment, and eternal heavenly happiness for the righteous. The punishments of the wicked appear mostly to be regarded as eternal, but the view is also met with of a limited duration of punishment (see authorities in Schurer, op. cit., 183; Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, appendix. XIX, and other works noted in "Literature" below).

LITERATURE.

R. H. Charles, D.D., A Crit. History of the Doctrine of a Future Life (1899); apocalyptic works translated and edited by same writer (Book of Enoch, Apocrypha Baruch, Book of Jubilees, Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, etc.; V. H. Stanton, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah (1886); S. D. F. Salmond, Christian Doct of Immortality (4th edition, 1901); A. Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, edition 1906 (especially appendix. XIX); E. Schurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (Div. II, Vol. II, English translation). Old Testament Theologies: Oehler, A. B. Davidson, etc.; articles in Dictionaries: Hastings, Encyclopedia Biblica, etc. For fuller lists, see Charles.

James Orr

ESCHATOLOGY, OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

<es-ka-tol'-o-ji>:

I. DOCTRINAL AND RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE.

The subject of eschatology plays a prominent part in New Testament teaching and religion. Christianity in its very origin bears an eschatological character. It means the appearance of the Messiah and the inauguration of His work; and from the Old Testament point of view these form part of eschatology. It is true in Jewish theology the days of the Messiah were not always included in the eschatological age proper, but often regarded as introductory to it (compare Weber, Judische Theol. 2, 371 ff). And in the New Testament also this point of view is to some extent represented, inasmuch as, owing to the appearance of the Messiah and the only partial fulfillment of the prophecies for the present, that which the Old Testament depicted as one synchronous movement is now seen to divide into two stages, namely, the present Messianic age and the consummate state of the future. Even so, however, the New Testament draws the Messianic period into much closer connection with the strictly eschatological process than Judaism. The distinction in Judaism rested on a consciousness of difference in quality between the two stages, the content of the Messianic age being far less spiritually and transcendentally conceived than that of the final state. The New Testament, by spiritualizing the entire Messianic circle of ideas, becomes keenly alive to its affinity to the content of the highest eternal hope, and consequently tends to identify the two, to find the age to come anticipated in the present. In some cases this assumes explicit shape in the belief that great eschatological transactions have already begun to take place, and that believers have already attained to at least partial enjoyment of eschatological privileges. Thus the present kingdom in our Lord's teaching is one in essence with the final kingdom; according to the discourses in John eternal life is in principle realized here; with Paul there has been a prelude to the last judgment and resurrection in the death and resurrection of Christ, and the life in the Spirit is the first-fruits of the heavenly state to come. The strong sense of this may even express itself in the paradoxical form that the eschatological state has arrived and the one great incision in history has already been made (Hebrews 2:3,1; 9:11; 10:1; 12:22-24). Still, even where this extreme consciousness is reached, it nowhere supersedes the other more common representation, according to which the present state continues to lie this side of the eschatological crisis, and, while directly leading up to the latter, yet remains to all intents a part of the old age and world-order. Believers live in the "last days," upon them "the ends of the ages are come," but "the last day," "the consummation of

the age," still lies in the future (⟨4039⟩Matthew 13:39,40,49; 24:3; 28:20; ⟨4069⟩John 6:39,44,54; 12:48; ⟨4601⟩1 Corinthians 10:11; ⟨5001⟩2 Timothy 3:1; ⟨5002⟩Hebrews 1:2; 9:26; ⟨5003⟩James 5:3; ⟨6005⟩1 Peter 1:5,20; ⟨6008⟩2 Peter 3:3; ⟨6218⟩1 John 2:18; ⟨6018⟩Jude 1:18).

The eschatological interest of early believers was no mere fringe to their religious experience, but the very heart of its inspiration. It expressed and embodied the profound supernaturalism and soteriological character of the New Testament faith. The coming world was not to be the product of natural development but of a Divine interposition arresting the process of history. And the deepest motive of the longing for this world was a conviction of the abnormal character of the present world, a strong sense of sin and evil. This explains why the New Testament doctrine of salvation has grown up to a large extent in the closest interaction with its eschatological teaching. The present experience was interpreted. in the light of the future. It is necessary to keep this in mind for a proper appreciation of the generally prevailing hope that the return of the Lord might come in the near future. Apocalyptic calculation had less to do with this than the practical experience that the earnest of the supernatural realities of the life to come was present in the church, and that therefore it seemed unnatural for the full fruition of these to be long delayed. The subsequent receding of this acute eschatological state has something to do with the gradual disappearance of the miraculous phenomena of the apostolic age.

II. GENERAL STRUCTURE.

New Testament eschatology attaches itself to the Old Testament and to Jewish belief as developed on the basis of ancient revelation. It creates on the whole no new system or new terminology, but incorporates much that was current, yet so as to reveal by selection and distribution of emphasis the essential newness of its spirit. In Judaism there existed at that time two distinct types of eschatological outlook. There was the ancient national hope which revolved around the destiny of Israel. Alongside of it existed a transcendental form of eschatology with cosmical perspective, which had in view the destiny of the universe and of the human race. The former of these represents the original form of Old Testament eschatology, and therefore occupies a legitimate place in the beginnings of the New Testament development, notably in the revelations accompanying the birth of Christ and in the earlier (synoptical) preaching of John the Baptist.

There entered, however, into it, as held by the Jews, a considerable element of individual and collective eudaemonism, and it had become identified with a literalistic interpretation of prophecy, which did not sufficiently take into account the typical import and poetical character of the latter. The other scheme, while to some extent the product of subsequent theological development, lies prefigured in certain later prophecies, especially in Dnl, and, far from being an importation from Babylonian, or ultimately Persian, sources, as some at present maintain, represents in reality the true development of the inner principles of Old Testament prophetic revelation. To it the structure of New Testament eschatology closely conforms itself. In doing this, however, it discards the impure motives and elements by which even this relatively higher type of Jewish eschatology was contaminated. In certain of the apocalyptic writings a compromise is attempted between these two schemes after this manner, that the carrying out of the one is merely to follow that of the other, the national hope first receiving its fulfillment in a provisional Messianic kingdom of limited duration (400 or 1,000 years), to be superseded at the end by the eternal state. The New Testament does not follow the Jewish theology along this path. Even though it regards the present work of Christ as preliminary to the consummate order of things, it does not separate the two in essence or quality, it does not exclude the Messiah from a supreme place in the coming world, and does not expect a temporal Messianic kingdom in the future as distinguished from Christ's present spiritual reign, and as preceding the state of eternity. In fact the figure of the Messiah becomes central in the entire eschatological process, far more so than is the case in Judaism. All the stages in this process, the resurrection, the judgment, the life eternal, even the intermediate state, receive the impress of the absolute significance which Christian faith ascribes to Jesus as the Christ. Through this Christocentric character New Testament eschatology acquires also far greater unity and simplicity than can be predicated of the Jewish schemes. Everything is practically reduced to the great ideas of the resurrection and the judgment as consequent upon the Parousia of Christ. Much apocalyptic embroidery to which no spiritual significance attached is eliminated. While the overheated fantasy tends to multiply and elaborate, the religious interest tends toward concentration and simplification.

III. COURSE OF DEVELOPMENT.

In New Testament eschatological teaching a general development in a well-

defined direction is traceable. The starting-point is the historico-dramatic conception of the two successive ages. These two ages are distinguished as *houtos ho aion, ho nun aion, ho enesios aion*, "this age," "the present age" (⟨40232⟩Matthew 12:32; 13:22; ⟨21608⟩Luke 16:8; ⟨51122⟩Romans 12:2; ⟨46020⟩1 Corinthians 1:20; 2:6,8; 3:18; ⟨47004⟩2 Corinthians 4:4; ⟨48004⟩Galatians 1:4; ⟨49021⟩Ephesians 1:21; 2:2; 6:12; ⟨54017⟩1 Timothy 6:17; ⟨55040⟩2 Timothy 4:10; ⟨56012⟩Titus 2:12), and *ho aion ekeinos, ho aion mellon, ho aion erchomenos*, "that age," "the future age" (⟨40232⟩Matthew 12:32; ⟨21830⟩Luke 18:30; 20:35; ⟨49017⟩Ephesians 2:7; ⟨58065⟩Hebrews 6:5). In Jewish literature before the New Testament, no instances of the developed antithesis between these two ages seem to be found, but from the way in which it occurs in the teaching of Jesus and Paul it appears to have been current at that time. (The oldest undisputed occurrence is a saying of Johanan ben Zaqqay, about 80 AD.) The contrast between these two ages is (especially with Paul) that between the evil and transitory, and the perfect and abiding. Thus, to each age belongs its own characteristic order of things, and so the distinction passes over into that of two "worlds" in the sense of two systems (in Hebrew and Aramaic the same word `*olam*, `*olam*, does service for both, in Greek *aion* usually renders the meaning "age," occasionally "world" (⟨58012⟩Hebrews 1:2; 11:3), *kosmos* meaning "world"; the latter, however, is never used of the future world). Compare Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, I, 132-46. Broadly speaking, the development of New Testament eschatology consists in this, that the two ages are increasingly recognized as answering to two spheres of being which coexist from of old, so that the coming of the new age assumes the character of a revelation and extension of the supernal order of things, rather than that of its first entrance into existence. Inasmuch as the coming world stood for the perfect and eternal, and in the realm of heaven such a perfect, eternal order of things already existed, the reflection inevitably arose that these two were in some sense identical. But the new significance which the antithesis assumes does not supersede the older historicodramatic form. The higher world so interposes in the course of the lower as to bring the conflict to a crisis. The passing over of the one contrast into the other, therefore, does not mark, as has frequently been asserted, a recession of the eschatological wave, as if the interest had been shifted from the future to the present life. Especially in the Fourth Gospel this "de-eschatologizing" process has been found, but without real warrant. The apparent basis for such a conclusion is that the realities of the future life are so vividly and intensely felt to be existent in heaven and from there operative in the believer's life, that the distinction between what is now and

what will be hereafter enjoyed becomes less sharp. Instead of the supersedure of the eschatological, this means the very opposite, namely, its most real anticipation. It should further be observed that the development in question is intimately connected and keeps equal pace with the disclosure of the preexistence of Christ, because this fact and the descent of Christ from heaven furnished the clearest witness to the reality of the heavenly order of things. Hence, it is especially observable, not in the earlier epistles of Paul, where the structure of eschatological thought is still in the main historico-dramatic, but in the epistles of the first captivity (⁴⁹⁰¹⁰³Ephesians 1:3,10-22; 2:6; 3:9,10; 4:9,10; 6:12; ⁵⁰⁴⁴⁵Philippians 2:5-11; 3:20; ⁵¹⁰¹⁵Colossians 1:15,17; 3:2; further, in ⁵⁸⁰¹⁰²Hebrews 1:2,3; 2:5; 3:4; 6:5,11; 7:13,16; 9:14; 11:10,16; 12:22,23). The Fourth Gospel marks the culmination of this line of teaching, and it is unnecessary to point out how here the contrast between heaven and earth in its christological consequences determines the entire structure of thought. But here it also appears how the last outcome of the New Testament progress of doctrine had been anticipated in the highest teaching of our Lord. This can be accounted for by the inherent fitness that the supreme disclosures which touch the personal life of the Saviour should come not through any third person, but from His own lips.

IV. GENERAL AND INDIVIDUAL ESCHATOLOGY.

In the Old Testament the destiny of the nation of Israel to such an extent overshadows that of the individual, that only the first rudiments of an individual eschatology are found. The individualism of the later prophets, especially Jeremiah and Ezekiel, bore fruit in the thought of the intermediate period. In the apocalyptic writings considerable concern is shown for the ultimate destiny of the individual. But not until the New Testament thoroughly spiritualized the conceptions of the last things could these two aspects be perfectly harmonized. Through the centering of the eschatological hope in the Messiah, and the suspending of the individual's share in it on his personal relation to the Messiah, an individual significance is necessarily imparted to the great final crisis. This also tends to give greater prominence to the intermediate state. Here, also, apocalyptic thought had pointed the way. None the less the Old Testament point of view continues to assert itself in that even in the New Testament the main interest still attaches to the collective, historical development of events. Many questions in regard to the intermediate period are passed by in silence. The Old Testament prophetic foreshortening of the perspective,

immediately connecting each present crisis with the ultimate goal, is reproduced in New Testament eschatology on an individual scale in so far as the believer's life here is linked, not so much with his state after death, but rather with the consummate state after the final judgment. The present life in the body and the future life in the body are the two outstanding illumined heights between which the disembodied state remains largely in the shadow. But the same foreshortening of the perspective is also carried over from the Old Testament into the New Testament delineation of general eschatology. The New Testament method of depicting the future is not chronological. Things lying widely apart to our chronologically informed experience are by it drawn closely together. This law is adhered to doubtless not from mere limitation of subjective human knowledge, but by reason of adjustment to the general method of prophetic revelation in Old Testament and New Testament alike.

V. THE PAROUSIA.

1. Definition:

The word denotes "coming," "arrival." It is never applied to the incarnation of Christ, and could be applied to His second coming only, partly because it had already become a fixed Messianic term, partly because there was a point of view from which the future appearance of Jesus appeared the sole adequate expression of His Messianic dignity and glory. The explicit distinction between "first advent" and "second advent" is not found in the New Testament. It occurs in Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Abraham 92:16. In the New Testament it is approached in <58028>Hebrews 9:28 and in the use of *epiphaneia* for both the past appearance of Christ and His future manifestation (<50018>2 Thessalonians 2:8; <54064>1 Timothy 6:14; <55010>2 Timothy 1:10; 4:1; <56021>Titus 2:11,13). The Christian use of the word parousia is more or less colored by the consciousness of the present bodily absence of Jesus from His own, and consequently suggests the thought of His future abiding presence, without, however, formally coming to mean the state of the Saviour's presence with believers (<50047>1 Thessalonians 4:17). Parousia occurs in <40403>Matthew 24:3,17,39; <46523>1 Corinthians 15:23; <52019>1 Thessalonians 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; <53001>2 Thessalonians 2:1,8; <59007>James 5:7,8; <61016>2 Peter 1:16; 3:4,12; <62028>1 John 2:28. A synonymous term is *apokalupsis*, "revelation," probably also of pre-Christian origin, presupposing the pre-existence of the Messiah in hidden form previous to His manifestation, either in heaven or on earth

(compare Apocrypha Baruch 29:3; 30:1; 4 Ezra (2 Esdras) 7:28; Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Levi 18; [43727]John 7:27; [60120]1 Peter 1:20). It could be adopted by Christians because Christ had been withdrawn into heaven and would be publicly demonstrated the Christ on His return, hence used with special reference to enemies and unbelievers ([42730]Luke 17:30; [44321]Acts 3:21; 1 Corinthians 17; [53107]2 Thessalonians 1:7,8; [60113]1 Peter 1:13,10; 5:4). Another synonymous term is "the day of the (Our) Lord," "the day," "that day," "the day of Jesus Christ." This is the rendering of the well-known Old Testament phrase. Though there is no reason in any particular passage why "the Lord" should not be Christ, the possibility exists that in some cases it may refer to God (compare "day of God" in [61312]2 Peter 3:12). On the other hand, what the Old Testament with the use of this phrase predicates of God is sometimes in the New Testament purposely transferred to Christ. "Day," while employed of the parousia generally, is, as in the Old Testament, mostly associated with the judgment, so as to become a synonym for judgment (compare [44198]Acts 19:38; [46403]1 Corinthians 4:3). The phrase is found in [40722]Matthew 7:22; 24:36; [41332]Mark 13:32; [42102]Luke 10:12; 17:24; 21:34; [44020]Acts 2:20; [45132]Romans 13:12; [46108]1 Corinthians 1:8; 3:13; 5:5; [47014]2 Corinthians 1:14; [50106]Philippians 1:6; 2:16; [52052]1 Thessalonians 5:2,4 (compare 5:5,8); [53022]2 Thessalonians 2:2; [55012]2 Timothy 1:12,18; 4:8; [58025]Hebrews 10:25; [61310]2 Peter 3:10.

2. Signs Preceding the Parousia:

The parousia is preceded by certain signs heralding its approach. Judaism, on the basis of the Old Testament, had worked out the doctrine of "the woes of the Messiah," *chebhele ha-mashiach*, the calamities and afflictions attendant upon the close of the present and the beginning of the coming age being interpreted as birth pains of the latter. This is transferred in the New Testament to the parousia of Christ. The phrase occurs only in [40408]Matthew 24:8; [41308]Mark 13:8, the idea, in [45082]Romans 8:22, and allusions to it occur probably in [46026]1 Corinthians 7:26; [52003]1 Thessalonians 3:3; 5 Besides these general "woes," and also in accord with Jewish doctrine, the appearance of the Antichrist is made to precede the final crisis. Without Jewish precedent, the New Testament links with the parousia as preparatory to it, the pouring out of the Spirit, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the conversion of Israel and the preaching of the gospel to all the nations. The problem of the sequence and interrelation of these several precursors of the end is a most difficult and complicated

one and, as would seem, at the present not ripe for solution. The "woes" which in our Lord's eschatological discourse (Matthew 24; Mark 13; Luke 21) are mentioned in more or less close accord with Jewish teaching are:

(1) wars, earthquakes and famines, "the beginning of travail";

(2) the great tribulation;

(3) commotions among the heavenly bodies; compare ^{⁶⁰⁶²}Revelation 6:2-17. For Jewish parallels to these, compare Charles, Eschatology, 326, 327. Because of this element which the discourse has in common with Jewish apocalypses, it has been assumed by Colani, Weiffenbach, Weizsacker, Wendt, et al., that here two sources have been welded together, an actual prophecy of Jesus, and a Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse from the time of the Jewish War 68-70 (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 5, 3). In the text of Mark this so-called "small apocalypse" is believed to consist of 13:7,8,14-20,24-27,30,31. But this hypothesis mainly springs from the disinclination to ascribe to Jesus realistic eschatological expectations, and the entirely unwarranted assumption that He must have spoken of the end in purely ethical and religious terms only. That the typically Jewish "woes" bear no direct relation to the disciples and their faith is not a sufficient reason for declaring the prediction of them unworthy of Jesus. A contradiction is pointed out between the two representations, that the parousia will come suddenly, unexpectedly, and that it will come heralded by these signs. Especially in ^{⁴¹³⁰}Mark 13:30,32 the contradiction is said to be pointed. To this it may be replied that even after the removal of the assumed apocalypse the same twofold representation remains present in what is recognized as genuine discourse of Jesus, namely, in ^{⁴¹³⁸}Mark 13:28,29 as compared with 13:32,33-37 and other similar admonitions to watchfulness. A real contradiction between 13:30 and 13:32 does not exist. Our Lord could consistently affirm both: "This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished," and "of that day or that hour knoweth no one." To be sure, the solution should not be sought by understanding "this generation" of the Jewish race or of the human race. It must mean, according to ordinary usage, then living generation. Nor does it help matters to distinguish between the prediction of the parousia within certain wide limits and the denial of knowledge as to the precise day and hour. In point of fact the two statements do not refer to the same matter at all. "That day or that hour" in 13:32 does not have "these things" of 13:30 for its antecedent. Both by the demonstrative pronoun "that" and by "but" it is marked as an absolute self-explanatory conception. It simply signifies

as elsewhere the day of the Lord, the day of judgment. Of "these things," the exact meaning of which phrase must be determined from the foregoing, Jesus declares that they will come to pass within that generation; but concerning the parousia, "that (great) day," He declares that no one but God knows the time of its occurrence. The correctness of this view is confirmed by the preceding parable, ⁴¹³²⁸Mark 13:28,29, where in precisely the same way "these things" and the parousia are distinguished. The question remains how much "these things" (verse 29; ⁴²¹³¹Luke 21:31), "all these things" (⁴²⁴⁶³Matthew 24:33,14, ⁴¹¹³⁰Mark 13:30), "all things" (⁴²¹³²Luke 21:32) is intended to cover of what is described in the preceding discourse. The answer will depend on what is there represented as belonging to the precursors of the end, and what as strictly constituting part of the end itself; and on the other question whether Jesus predicts one end with its premonitory signs, or refers to two crises each of which will be heralded by its own series of signs. Here two views deserve consideration. According to the one (advocated by Zahn in his Commentary on Mt, 652-66) the signs cover only ⁴¹²⁰⁴Matthew 24:4-14. What is related afterward, namely, "the abomination of desolation," great tribulation, false prophets and Christs, commotions in the heavens, the sign of the Son of Man, all this belongs to "the end" itself, in the absolute sense, and is therefore comprehended in the parousia and excepted from the prediction that it will happen in that generation, while included in the declaration that only God knows the time of its coming. The destruction of the temple and the holy city, though not explicitly mentioned in ⁴¹²⁰⁴Matthew 24:4-14, would be included in what is there said of wars and tribulation. The prediction thus interpreted would have been literally fulfilled. The objections to this view are:

> **(1)** It is unnatural thus to subsume what is related in 24:15-29 under "the end." From a formal point of view it does not differ from the phenomena of 24:4-14 which are "signs."

(2) It creates the difficulty, that the existence of the temple and the temple-worship in Jerusalem are presupposed in the last days immediately before the parousia. The "abomination of desolation" taken from ²⁷⁰⁸³Daniel 8:13; 9:27; 11:31; 12:11; compare Sirach 49:2 — according to some, the destruction of the city and temple, better a desecration of the temple-site by the setting up of something idolatrous, as a result of which it becomes desolate — and the flight from Judea, are put among events which, together with the parousia, constitute the end of the world. This would

seem to involve chiliasm of a very pronounced sort. The difficulty recurs in the strictly eschatological interpretation of ⟨3008⟩2 Thessalonians 2:3,1, where "the man of sin" (*see SIN, MAN OF*) is represented as sitting in "the temple of God" and in ⟨6610⟩Revelation 11:1,2, where "the temple of God" and "the altar," and "the court which is without the temple" and "the holy city" figure in an episode inserted between the sounding of the trumpet of the sixth angel and that of the seventh. On the other hand it ought to be remembered that eschatological prophecy makes use of ancient traditional imagery and stereotyped formulas, which, precisely because they are fixed and applied to all situations, cannot always bear a literal sense, but must be subject to a certain degree of symbolical and spiritualizing interpretation. In the present case the profanation of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes may have furnished the imagery in which, by Jesus, Paul and John, anti-Christian developments are described of a nature which has nothing to do with Israel, Jerusalem or the temple, literally understood.

(3) It is not easy to conceive of the preaching of the gospel to all the nations as falling within the lifetime of that generation. It is true ⟨4501⟩Romans 1:13; 10:18; 15:19-24; ⟨5100⟩Colossians 1:6; ⟨5416⟩1 Timothy 3:16; ⟨5504⟩2 Timothy 4:17 might be quoted in support of such a view. In the statement of Jesus, however, it is definitely predicted that the preaching of the gospel to all the nations not only must happen before the end, but that it straightway precedes the end: "Then shall the end come" (⟨4024⟩Matthew 24:14). To distinguish between the preaching of the gospel to all the nations and the completion of the Gentilemission, as Zahn proposes, is artificial. As over against these objections, however, it must be admitted that the grouping of all these later phenomena before the end proper avoids the difficulty arising from "immediately" in ⟨4029⟩Matthew 24:29 and from "in those days" in ⟨4113⟩Mark 13:24.

The other view has been most lucidly set forth by Briggs, Messiah of the Gospels, 132-65. It makes Jesus' discourse relate to two things:

(1) the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple;

(2) the end of the world. He further assumes that the disciples are informed with respect to two points:

(1) the time;

(2) the signs. In the answer to the time, however, the two things are not sharply distinguished, but united into one prophetic perspective, the

parousia standing out more conspicuously. The definition of the time of this complex development is:

(a) negative (⁽⁴¹³⁰⁵⁾Mark 13:5-8);
(b) positive (⁽⁴¹³⁰⁹⁾Mark 13:9-13).
On the other hand in describing the signs Jesus discriminates between

   (a) the signs of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (⁽⁴¹³¹⁴⁾Mark 13:14-20);

(b) the signs of the parousia (⁽⁴¹³²⁴⁾Mark 13:24-27). This view has in its favor that the destruction of the temple and the city, which in the question of the disciples figured as an eschatological event, is recognized as such in the answer of Jesus, and not alluded to after a mere incidental fashion, as among the signs. Especially the version of ⁽⁴²¹²⁰⁾Luke 21:20-24 proves that it figures as an event. This view also renders easier the restriction of ⁽⁴¹¹³⁰⁾Mark 13:30 to the first event and its signs. It places "the abomination of desolation" in the period preceding the national catastrophe. The view that the two events are successively discussed is further favored by the movement of thought in ⁽⁴¹³³²⁾Mark 13:32 ff. Here, after the Apocalypse has been brought to a close, the application to the disciples is made, and, in the same order as was observed in the prophecy, first, the true attitude toward the national crisis is defined in the parable of the Fig Tree and the solemn assurance appended that it will happen in this generation (13:28-31); secondly, the true attitude toward the parousia is defined (13:32-37). The only serious objection that may be urged against this view arises from the close concatenation of the section relating to the national crisis with the section relating to the parousia (⁽⁴⁰²²⁹⁾Matthew 24:29: "immediately after .... those days"; ⁽⁴¹³²⁴⁾Mark 13:24: "in those days"). The question is whether this mode of speaking can be explained on the principle of the well-known foreshortening of the perspective of prophecy. It cannot be a priori denied that this peculiarity of prophetic vision may have here characterized also the outlook of Jesus into the future which, as ⁽⁴¹³³²⁾Mark 13:32 shows, was the prophetic outlook of His human nature as distinct from the Divine omniscience. The possibility of misinterpreting this feature and confounding sequence in perspective with chronological succession is in the present case guarded against by the statement that the gospel must first be preached to all the nations (compare ⁽⁴⁴⁰³¹⁹⁾Acts 3:19,25,26; ⁽⁴⁵¹¹²⁵⁾Romans 11:25; ⁽⁶⁶⁰⁶⁰²⁾Revelation 6:2) before the end can come, that no one knows the

time of the parousia except God, that there must be a period of desolation after the city shall have been destroyed, and that the final coming of Jesus to the people of Israel will be a coming not of judgment, but one in which they shall hail Him as blessed (Matthew 23:38,39; Luke 13:34,35), which presupposes an interval to account for this changed attitude (compare Luke 21:24: "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled"). It is not necessary to carry the distinction between the two crises joined together here into the question as put by the disciples in Matthew 24:3, as if "when shall these things be?" related to the destruction of the temple exclusively, as the other half of the question speaks of the coming of Jesus and the end of the world. Evidently here not the two events, but the events (complexly considered) and the signs are distinguished. "These things" has its antecedent not exclusively in 24:2, but even more in 23:38,39. The disciples desired to know not so much when the calamitous national catastrophe would come, but rather when that subsequent coming of the Lord would take place, which would put a limit to the distressing results of this catastrophe, and bring with it the reacceptance of Israel into favor. This explains also why Jesus does not begin His discourse with the national crisis, but first takes up the question of the parousia, to define negatively and positively the time of the latter, and that for the purpose of warning the disciples who in their eagerness for the ultimate issue were inclined to foreshorten the preceding calamitous developments. That Jesus could actually join together the national and the cosmical crises appears from other passages, such as Matthew 10:23, where His interposition for the deliverance of the fugitive disciples is called a "coming" of the Son of Man (Matthew 16:28; Mark 9:1; Luke 9:27, where a coming of the Son of Man in His kingdom (Matthew), or a coming of the kingdom of God with power (Mark), or a seeing of the kingdom of God (Luke) is promised to some of that generation). It is true these passages are frequently referred to the parousia, because in the immediately preceding context the latter is spoken of. The connection of thought, however, is not that the parousia and this promised coming are identical. The proximate coming is referred to as an encouragement toward faithfulness and self-sacrifice, just as the reward at the parousia is mentioned for the same purpose. The conception of an earlier coming also receives light from the confession of Jesus at His trial (Matthew 26:64; where the "henceforth" refers equally to the coming on the clouds of heaven and to the sitting at the right hand of God; compare Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69). The point of the declaration is, that He who now is condemned will in the near future

appear in theophany for judgment upon His judges. The closing discourses of John also have the conception of the coming of Jesus to His disciples in the near future for an abiding presence, although here this is associated with the advent of the Spirit (John 14:18,19,21,23; 16:16,19,22,23). Finally the same idea recurs in Rev, where it is equally clear that a preliminary visitation of Christ and not the parousia for final judgment can be meant (John 2:5,16; 3:3,10; compare also the plural "one of the days of the Son of man" in Luke 17:22).

3. Events Preceding the Parousia:

(1) **The Conversion of Israel:**

To the events preceding the parousia belongs, according to the uniform teaching of Jesus, Peter and Paul, the conversion of Israel (Matthew 23:39; Luke 13:35; Acts 1:6,7; 3:19,21; where the arrival of "seasons of refreshing" and "the times of restoration of all things" is made dependent on the (eschatological) sending of the Christ to Israel), and this again is said to depend on the repentance and conversion and the blotting out of the sins of Israel; Romans 11, where the problem of the unbelief of Israel is solved by the twofold proposition:

(1) that there is even now among Israel an election according to grace;

(2) that in the future there will be a comprehensive conversion of Israel (11:5,25-32).

(2) **The Coming of the Antichrist:**

Among the precursors of the parousia appears further the Antichrist. The word is found in the New Testament in 1 John 2:18,22; 4:3; 2 John 1:7 only, but the conception occurs also in the Synoptics, in Paul and in Revelation. There is no instance of its earlier occurrence in Jewish literature. Anti may mean "in place of" and "against"; the former includes the latter. In John it is not clear that the heretical tendencies or hostile powers connected with the anti-Christian movement make false claim to the Messianic dignity. In the Synoptics the coming of false Christs and false prophets is predicted, and that not merely as among the nearer signs (Mark 13:6), but also in the remote eschatological period (Mark 13:22). With Paul, who does not employ the word, the conception is clearly the developed one of the counter-Christ. Paul ascribes to him an apokalupsis as he does to Christ (2 Thessalonians 2:6,8); his manner of working and its pernicious effect are set over against the manner in which

the gospel of the true Christ works (2 Thessalonians 9-12). Paul does not treat the idea as a new one; it must have come down from the Old Testament and Jewish eschatology and have been more fully developed by New Testament prophecy; compare in [2008]Daniel 7:8,20; 8:10,11 the supernaturally magnified figure of the great enemy. According to Gunkel (Schopfung und Chaos, 1895) and Bousset (Der Antichrist in der Uberlieferung des Judenthums, des New Testament und der allen Kirche, 1875) the origin of the conception of a final struggle between God and the supreme enemy must be sought in the ancient myth of Chaos conquered by Marduk; what had happened at the beginning of the world was transferred to the end. Then this was anthropomorphized, first in the form of a false Messiah, later in that of a political tyrant or oppressor. But there is no need to assume any other source for the idea of a last enemy than Old Testament eschatological prophecy (Ezekiel and Daniel and Zechariah). And no evidence has so far been adduced that the Pauline idea of a counter-Messiah is of pre-Christian origin. This can only be maintained by carrying back into the older period the Antichrist tradition as found later among Jews and Christians. It is reasonable to assume in the present state of the evidence that the combination of the two ideas, that of the great eschatological enemy and that of the counter-Messiah, is a product of Christian prophecy. In fact even the conception of a single last enemy does not occur in pre-Christian Jewish literature; it is found for the first time in Apocrypha Baruch 40:1,2, which changes the general conception of 4 Ezra to this effect. Even in the eschatological discourse of Jesus the idea is not yet unified, for false Christs and false prophets in the plural are spoken of, and the instigator of "the abomination of desolation," if any is presupposed, remains in the background. In the Epistle of John the same plural representation occurs ([62218]1 John 2:18,22; [60107]2 John 1:7), although the idea of a personal Antichrist in whom the movement culminates is not only familiar to the author and the reader ([62218]1 John 2:18, "as ye heard that antichrist cometh"), but is also accepted by the writer ([60403]1 John 4:3, "This is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already"; compare [53207]2 Thessalonians 2:7, "The mystery of lawlessness doth already work").

Various views have been proposed to explain the concrete features of the Pauline representation in 2 Thessalonians 2 and that of Revelation 13 and 17. According to Schneckenburger, JDT, 1859, and Weiss, SK, 1869, Paul has in mind the person whom the Jews will acclaim as their Messiah. The idea would then be the precipitate of Paul's experience of hostility and

persecution from the part of the Jews. He expected that this Jewish Messianic pretender would, helped by Satanic influence, overthrow the Roman power. The continuance of the Roman power is "that which restraineth," or as embodied in the emperor, "one that restraineth now" (⟨5006⟩2 Thessalonians 2:6,7). (For an interesting view in which the roles played by these two powers are reversed, compare Warfield in The Expositor, 3rd series, IV, 30-44.) The objection to this is that "the lawless one," not merely from Paul's or the Christian point of view, but in his own avowed intent, opposes and exalts himself against all that is called God or worshipped. This no Jewish pretender to the Messiahship could possibly do: his very Messianic position would preclude it. And the conception of a counter-Christ does not necessarily point to a Jewish environment, for the idea of Messiahship had in Paul's mind been raised far above its original national plane and assumed a universalistic character (compare Zahn, Einleitung in das NT**(1)**, I, 171). Nor does the feature that according to ⟨5004⟩2 Thessalonians 2:4, "the lawless one" will take his seat in the temple favor the view in question, for the desecration of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes and later similar experiences may well have contributed to the figure of the great enemy the attribute of desecrator of the temple. It is not necessary to assume that by Paul this was understood literally; it need mean no more than that the Antichrist will usurp for himself Divine honor and worship. Patristic and later writers gave to this feature a chiliastic interpretation, referring it to the temple which was to be rebuilt in the future. Also the allegorical exegesis which understands "the temple" of the Christian church has found advocates. But the terms in which "the lawless one" is described exclude his voluntary identification with the Christian church. According to a second view the figure is not a Jewish but a pagan one. Kern, Baur, Hilgenfeld and many others, assuming that 2 Thessalonians is post-Pauline, connect the prophecy with the at-one-time current expectation that Nero, the great persecutor, would return from the East or from the dead, and, with the help of Satan, set up an anti-Christian kingdom. The same expectation is assumed to underlie ⟨6608⟩Revelation 13:3,12,14 (one of the heads of the beast smitten unto death and his death stroke healed); 17:8,10,11 (the beast that was, and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss; the eighth king, who is one of the seven preceding kings). As to Paul's description, there is nothing in it to make us think of a Nero reappearing or redivivus. The parousia predicated of the lawless one does not imply it, for parousia as an eschatological term means not "return" but "advent." The Antichrist is not depicted as a persecutor,

and Nero was the persecutor paragraph excellence. Nor does what is said about the "hindering" or the "hinderer" suit the case of Nero, for the later Roman emperors could not be said to hold back Nero's reappearance. As to Revelation, it must be admitted that the role here ascribed to the beast would be more in keeping with the character of Nero. But, as Zahn has well pointed out (Einleitung in das NT**(1)**, II, 617-26), this interpretation is incompatible with the date of Revelation. This book must have been written at a date when the earlier form of the expectation that Nero would reappear still prevailed, namely, that he would return from the East to which he had fled. Only when too long an interval had elapsed to permit of further belief in Nero's still being alive, was this changed into the superstition that he would return from the dead. But this change in the form of the belief did not take place until after Revelation must have been written. Consequently, if the returning Nero did figure in Revelation, it would have to be in the form of one reappearing from the East. As a matter of fact, however, the beast or the king in which Nero is found is said by Revelation 13:1; 17:8 to have been smitten unto death and healed of the death stroke, to come up out of the sea or the abyss, which would only suit the later form of the expectation. It is therefore necessary to dissociate the description of the beast and its heads and horns entirely from the details of the succession of the Roman empire; the prophecy is more grandly staged; the description of the beast as partaking of several animal forms in Revelation 13:2 refers back to Daniel, and here as there must be understood of the one world-power in its successive national manifestations, which already excludes the possibility that a mere succession of kings in one and the same empire can be thought of. The one of the heads smitten unto death and the death stroke healed must refer to the world-power to be made powerless in one of its phases, but afterward to revive in a new phase. Hence, here already the healing of the death stroke is predicated, not merely of one of the heads, but also of the beast itself (compare Revelation 13:3 with 13:12). And the same interpretation seems to be required by the mysterious statements of Revelation 17, where the woman sitting upon the beast is the metropolis of the world-power, changing its seat together with the latter, yet so as to retain, like the latter in all its transformations, the same character whence she bears the same name of Babylon (17:5). Here as in Revelation 13 the beast has seven heads, i.e. passes through seven phases, which idea is also expressed by the representation that these seven heads are seven kings (17:10), for, as in Daniel 7, the kings stand not for individual rulers, but for

kingdoms, phases of the world-power. This explains why in ⁽⁶⁷¹⁾Revelation 17:11 the beast is identified with one of the kings. When here the further explanation, going beyond Revelation 13, is added, that the beast was and is not and is about to come up out of the abyss (13:8), and in 13:10,11 that of the seven kings five are fallen, one is, the other is not yet come, and when he comes must continue a little while, to be followed by the eighth, who is identical with the beast that was and is not, and with one of the seven, the only way to reconcile these statements lies in assuming that "the beast," while in one sense a comprehensive figure for the world-power in all its phases, can also in another sense designate the supreme embodiment and most typical manifestation of the world-power in the past; in respect to this acute phase the beast was and is not and is to appear again, and this acute phase was one of seven successive forms of manifestation, and in its reappearance will add to this number the eighth. Although a certain double sense in the employment of the figures thus results, this is no greater than when on the other view Nero is depicted both as "the beast" and as one of the heads of "the beast." Which concrete monarchies are meant by these seven phases is a matter of minor importance. For a suggestion compare Zahn, op. cit., II, 624:

(1) Egypt;

(2) Assyria;

(3) Babylon;

(4) the Medo-Persian power;

(5) the Greco-Alexandrian power;

(6) the Roman power;

(7) a short-lived empire to succeed Rome;

(8) the eighth and last phase, which will reproduce in its acute character the fifth, and will bring on the scene the Antichrist, the counterpart and, as it were, reincarnation of Antiochus Epiphanes.

The seer evidently has his present in the Roman phase of the power of the beast, and this renders it possible for him to give in ⁽⁶⁷⁹⁾Revelation 17:9 another turn to the figure of the seven heads, interpreting it of the seven mountains on which the woman sits, but this apocalyptic looseness of handling of the imagery can furnish no objection to the view just outlined,

since on any view the two incongruous explanations of the seven heads as seven mountains and seven kings stand side by side in ⟨66709⟩Revelation 17:9 and 10. Nor should the mysterious number of 666 in 13:18 be appealed to in favor of the reference of the beast to Nero, for on the one hand quite a number of other equally plausible or implausible solutions of this riddle have been proposed, and on the other hand the interpretation of Nero is open to the serious objection, that in order to make out the required number from the letters of Nero's name this name has to be written in Hebrew characters and that with scriptio defectiva of *Qesar* (*Neron Qesar*) instead of *Qeisar*, the former of which two peculiarities is out of keeping with the usage of the book elsewhere (compare Zahn, op. cit., II, 622, 624, 625, where the chief proposed explanations of the number 666 are recorded). Under the circumstances the interpretation of the figure of the beast and its heads must be allowed to pursue its course independently of the mystery of the number 666 in regard to which no certain conclusion appears attainable.

The following indicates the degree of definiteness to which, in the opinion of the writer, it is possible to go in the interpretation of the prophecy. The terms in which, Paul speaks remind of Daniel's description of the "little horn." Similarly Revelation attaches itself to the imagery of the beasts in Daniel. Both Paul and Revelation also seem to allude to the self-deification of rulers in the Hellenistic and Roman world (compare Zeitsehrift fur neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1904, 335 ff). Both, therefore, appear to have in mind a politically organized world-power under a supreme head. Still in both cases this power is not viewed as the climax of enmity against God on account of its political activity as such, but distinctly on account of its self-assertion in the religious sphere, so that the whole conception is lifted to a higher plane, purely spiritual standards being applied in the judgment expressed. Paul so thoroughly applies this principle that in his picture the seductive, deceptive aspect of the movement in the sphere of false teaching is directly connected with the person of "the lawless one" himself (⟨53009⟩2 Thessalonians 2:9-12), and not with a separate organ of false prophecy, as in ⟨66311⟩Revelation 13:11-17 (the second beast). In Revelation, as shown above, the final and acute phase of anti-Christian hostility is clearly distinguished from its embodiment in the Roman empire and separated from the latter by an intermediate stage. In Paul, who stands at a somewhat earlier point in the development of New Testament prophecy, this is not so clearly apparent. Paul teaches that the "mystery of lawlessness" is already at work in his day, but this does not necessarily

involve that the person of "the lawless one," subsequently to appear, must be connected with the same phase of the world-power, with which Paul associates this mystery already at work, since the succeeding phases being continuous, this will also insure the continuity between the general principle and its personal representative, even though the latter should appear at a later stage. It is impossible to determine how far Paul consciously looked beyond the power of the Roman empire to a later organIzation as the vehicle for the last anti-Christian effort. On the other hand, that Paul must have thought of "the lawless one" as already in existence at that time cannot be proven. It does not follow from the parallelism between his "revelation" and the parousia of Christ, for this "revelation" has for its correlate simply a previous hidden presence for some time somewhere, not an existence necessarily extending to Paul's time or the time of the Roman empire, far less a pre-existence, like unto Christ's, in the supernatural world. Nor is present existence implied in what Paul says of "the hindering power." This, to be sure, is represented as asserting itself at that very time, but the restraint is not exerted directly upon "the lawless one"; it relates to the power of which he will be the ultimate exponent; when this power, through the removal of the restraint, develops freely, his revelation follows. According to 13:9 his "parousia is according to the working of Satan," but whether this puts a supernatural aspect upon the initial act of his appearance or relates more to his subsequent presence and activity in the world, which will be attended with all powers and signs and lying wonders, cannot be determined with certainty. But the element of the supernatural is certainly there, although it is evidently erroneous to conceive of "the lawless one" as an incarnation of Satan, literally speaking. The phrase "according to the working of Satan" excludes this, and "the lawless one" is a true human figure, "the man of sin" (or "the man of lawlessness," according to another reading; compare the distinction between Satan and "the beast" in Revelation 20:10), Revelation 13:3. The "power" and "signs" and "wonders" are not merely "seeming"; the genitive pseudous is not intended to take them out of the category of the supernatural, but simply means that what they are intended to accredit is a lie, namely, the Divine dignity of "the lawless one." Most difficult of all is the determination of what Paul means by the hindering power or the hinderer in 13:7. The most common view refers this to the Roman authority as the basis of civil order and protection, but there are serious objections to this. If Paul at all associated the Antichrist in any way with the Roman power, he cannot very well have sought the opposite

principle in the same quarter. And not only the hindering power but also the hindering person seems to be a unit, which latter does not apply to the Roman empire, which had a succession of rulers. It is further difficult to dismiss the thought that the hindering principle or person must be more or less supernatural, since the supernatural factor in the work of "the lawless one" is so prominent. For this reason there is something attractive in the old view of von Hofmann, who assumed that Paul borrowed from Dnl, besides other features, also this feature that the historical conflict on earth has a supernatural background in the world of spirits (compare Daniel 10). A more precise definition, however, is impossible. Finally it should be noticed that, as in the eschatological discourse of Jesus "the abomination of desolation" appears connected with an apostasy within the church through false teaching (Mark 13:22,23), so Paul joins to the appearance of "the lawless one" the destructive effect of error among many that are lost (2 Thessalonians 2:9-12). The idea of the Antichrist in general and that of the apostasy in particular reminds us that we may not expect an uninterrupted progress of the Christianization of the world until the parousia. As the reign of the truth will be extended, so the forces of evil will gather strength, especially toward the end. The universal sway of the kingdom of God cannot be expected from missionary effort alone; it requires the eschatological inter-position of God.

4. The Manner of the Parousia:

In regard to the manner and attending circumstances of the parousia we learn that it will be widely visible, like the lightning (Matthew 24:27; Luke 17:24; the point of comparison does not lie in the suddenness); to the unbelieving it will come unexpectedly (Matthew 24:37-42; Luke 17:26-32; 1 Thessalonians 5:2,3). A sign will precede, "the sign of the Son of Man," in regard to the nature of which nothing can be determined. Christ will come "on the clouds," "in clouds," "in a cloud," "with great power and glory" (Matthew 24:30; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27); attended by angels (Matthew 24:31 (compare Matthew 13:41; 16:27; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26); Mark 13:27; 2 Thessalonians 1:7).

VI. THE RESURRECTION.

The resurrection coincides with the parousia and the arrival of the future neon (Luke 20:35; John 6:40; 1 Thessalonians 4:16). From 1 Thessalonians 3:13; 4:16 it has been inferred that the dead rise before the

descent of Christ from heaven is completed; the sounds described in the later passage are then interpreted as sounds accompanying the descent (compare ⁰²¹⁹¹⁶Exodus 19:16; ²³²⁷¹³Isaiah 27:13; ⁴⁰²⁴³¹Matthew 24:31; ⁴⁶¹⁵⁵²1 Corinthians 15:52; ⁵⁸¹²¹⁹Hebrews 12:19; ⁶⁶¹⁰⁰⁷Revelation 10:7; 11:15; "the trump of God" = the great eschatological trumpet). The two words for the resurrection are *egeirein*, "to wake," and *anistanai*, "to raise," the latter less common in the active than in the intransitive sense.

1. Its Universality:

The New Testament teaches in some passages with sufficient clearness that all the dead will be raised, but the emphasis rests to such an extent on the soteriological aspect of the event, especially in Paul, where it is closely connected with the doctrine of the Spirit, that its reference to non-believers receives little notice. This was already partly so in the Old Testament ²³²⁶¹⁹Isaiah 26:19; ²⁷¹²⁰²Daniel 12:2). In the intervening Jewish literature the doctrine varies; sometimes a resurrection of the martyrs alone is taught (Enoch 90); sometimes of all the righteous dead of Israel (Psalms of Solomon 3:10 ff; Enoch 91 through 94.); sometimes of all the righteous and of some wicked Israelites (Enoch 1 through 36); sometimes of all the righteous and all the wicked (4 Ezra (2 Esdras) 5:45; 7:32; Apocrypha Baruch 42:8; 50:2). Josephus ascribes to the Pharisees the doctrine that only the righteous will share in the resurrection. It ought to be noticed that these apocalyptic writings which affirm the universality of the resurrection present the same phenomena as the New Testament, namely, that they contain passages which so exclusively reflect upon the resurrection in its bearing upon the destiny of the righteous as to create the appearance that no other resurrection was believed in. Among the Pharisees probably a diversity of opinion prevailed on this question, which Josephus will have obliterated. our Lord in His argument with the Sadducees proves only the resurrection of the pious, but does not exclude the other (⁴¹¹²²⁶Mark 12:26,27); "the resurrection of the just" in ⁴²¹⁴¹⁴Luke 14:14 may suggest a twofold resurrection. It has been held that the phrase, *he anastasis he ek nekron* (⁴²²⁰³⁵Luke 20:35; ⁴⁴⁰⁴⁰²Acts 4:2), always describes the resurrection of a limited number from among the dead, whereas *he anastasisis ton nekron* would be descriptive of a universal resurrection (Plummer, Commentary on ⁴²²⁰³⁵Luke 20:35), but such a distinction breaks down before an examination of the passages.

The inference to the universality of the resurrection sometimes drawn from the universality of the judgment is scarcely valid, since the idea of a

judgment of disembodied spirits is not inconceivable and actually occurs. On the other hand the punishment of the judged is explicitly affirmed to include the body (Matthew 10:28). It cannot be proven that the term "resurrection" is ever in the New Testament eschatologically employed without reference to the body, of the quickening of the spirit simply (against, Fries, in ZNTW, 1900, 291 ff). The sense of our Lord's argument with the Sadducees does not require that the patriarchs were at the time of Moses in possession of the resurrection, but only that they were enjoying the covenant-life, which would in due time inevitably issue in the resurrection of their bodies. The resemblance (or "equality") to the angels (Mark 12:25) does not consist in the disembodied state, but in the absence of marriage and propagation. It has been suggested that Hebrews contains no direct evidence for a bodily resurrection (Charles, Eschatology, 361), but compare 11:22,35; 12:2; 13:20. The spiritualism of the epistle points, in connection with its Pauline type of teaching, to the conception of a pneumatic heavenly body, rather than to a disembodied state.

2. The Millennium:

The New Testament confines the event of the resurrection to a single epoch, and nowhere teaches, as chiliasm assumes, a resurrection in two stages, one, at the parousia, of saints or martyrs, and a second one at the close of the millennium. Although the doctrine of a temporary Messianic kingdom, preceding the consummation of the world, is of pre-Christian Jewish origin, it had not been developed in Judaism to the extent of assuming a repeated resurrection; the entire resurrection is always placed at the end. The passages to which this doctrine of a double resurrection appeals are chiefly Acts 3:19-21; 1 Corinthians 15:23-28; Philippians 3:9-11; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18; 2 Thessalonians 1:5-12; Revelation 20:1-6. In the first-named passage Peter promises "seasons of refreshing," when Israel shall have repented and turned to God. The arrival of these coincides with the sending of the Christ to the Jews, i.e. with the parousia. It is argued that Peter in Acts 3:21, "whom the heavens must (present tense) receive until the times of restoration of all things," places after this coming of Jesus to His people a renewed withdrawal of the Lord into heaven, to be followed in turn, after a certain interval, by the restoration of all things. The "seasons of refreshing" would then constitute the millennium with Christ present among His people. While this interpretation is not grammatically impossible, there is no room for it in the general scheme of the Petrine eschatology, for the parousia of

Christ is elsewhere represented as bringing not a provisional presence, but as bringing in the day of the Lord, the day of judgment (⁴⁰²¹⁷Acts 2:17-21). The correct view is that "the seasons of refreshing" and "the times of restoration of all things" are identical; the latter phrase relates to the prospects of Israel as well as the former, and should not be understood in the later technical sense. The present tense in ⁴⁴⁰³²¹Acts 3:21 "must receive" does not indicate that the reception of Christ into heaven still lies in the future, but formulates a fixed eschatological principle, namely, that after His first appearance the Christ must be withdrawn into heaven till the hour for the parousia has come.

In ⁴⁶¹⁵²³1 Corinthians 15:23-28 two *tagmata*, "orders," of the resurrection are distinguished, and it is urged that these consist of "believers" and "non-believers." But there is no reflection here upon non-believers at all, the two "orders" are Christ, and they that are Christ's. "The end" in 15:24 is not the final stage in the resurrection, i.e. the resurrection of non-believers, but the end of the series of eschatological events. The kingdom of Christ which comes to a close with the end is not a kingdom beginning with the parousia, but dates from the exaltation of Christ; it is to Paul not future but already in operation.

In ⁵⁰⁴¹³1 Thessalonians 4:13-18 the presupposition is not that the readers had worried about a possible exclusion of their dead from the provisional reign of Christ and from a first resurrection, but that they had sorrowed even as the Gentiles who have no hope whatever, i.e. they had doubted the fact of the resurrection as such. Paul accordingly gives them in 4:14 the general assurance that in the resurrection of Jesus that of believers is guaranteed. The verb "precede" in 4:15 does not imply that there was thought of precedence in the enjoyment of glory, but is only an emphatic way of affirming that the dead will not be one moment behind in inheriting with the living the blessedness of the parousia. In 4:17, "so shall we ever be with the Lord," the word "ever" excludes the conception of a provisional kingdom. ⁵⁰⁰⁵2 Thessalonians 1:5-12 contains merely the general thought that sufferings and glory, persecution and the inheritance of the kingdom are linked together. There is nothing to show that this glory and kingdom are aught else but the final state, the kingdom of God (⁵⁰⁰⁵2 Thessalonians 1:5).

In ⁵⁰⁸⁰⁹Philippians 3:9-11, it is claimed, Paul represents attainment to the resurrection as dependent on special effort on his part, therefore as something not in store for all believers. Since the general resurrection

pertains to all, a special grace of resurrection must be meant, i.e. inclusion in the number of those to be raised at the parousia, at the opening of the millennial kingdom. The answer to this is, that it was quite possible to Paul to make the resurrection as such depend on the believer's progress in grace and conformity to Christ, seeing that it is not an event out of all relation to his spiritual development, but the climax of an organic process of transformation begun in this life. And in verse 20 the resurrection of all is joined to the parousia (compare for the Pauline passages Vos, "The Pauline Eschatology and Chiliasm," PTR, 1911, 26-60).

The passage ⬩Revelation 20:1-6 at first sight much favors the conception of a millennial reign of Christ, participated in by the martyrs, brought to life in a first resurrection, and marked by a suspension of the activity of Satan. And it is urged that the sequence of visions places this millennium after the parousia of Christ narrated in Revelation 19. The question of historic sequence, however, is in Revelation difficult to decide. In other parts of the book the principle of "recapitulation," i.e. of cotemporaneousness of things successively depicted, seems to underlie the visions, and numbers are elsewhere in the book meant symbolically. These facts leave open the possibility that the thousand years are synchronous with the earlier developments recorded, and symbolically describe the state of glorified life enjoyed with Christ in heaven by the martyrs during the intermediate period preceding the parousia. The terms employed do not suggest an anticipated bodily resurrection. The seer speaks of "souls" which "lived" and "reigned," and finds in this the first resurrection. The scene of this life and reign is in heaven, where also the "souls" of the martyrs are beheld (⬩Revelation 6:9). The words "this is the first resurrection" may be a pointed disavowal of a more realistic (chiliastic) interpretation of the same phrase. The symbolism of the thousand years consists in this, that it contrasts the glorious state of the martyrs on the one hand with the brief season of tribulation passed here on earth, and on the other hand with the eternal life of the consummation. The binding of Satan for this period marks the first eschatological conquest of Christ over the powers of evil, as distinguished from the renewed activity to be displayed by Satan toward the end in bringing up against the church still other forces not hitherto introduced into the conflict. In regard to a book so enigmatical, it were presumptuous to speak with any degree of dogmatism, but the uniform absence of the idea of the millennium from the eschatological teaching of the New Testament elsewhere ought to render the exegete cautious before affirming its presence here (compare Warfield, "The Millennium and the

Apocalypse," PTR, 1904, 599-617).

3. The Resurrection of Believers:

The resurrection of believers bears a twofold aspect. On the one hand it belongs to the forensic side of salvation. On the other hand it belongs to the pneumatic transforming side of the saving process. Of the former, traces appear only in the teaching of Jesus (Matthew 5:9; 22:29-32; Luke 20:35,36). Paul clearly ascribes to the believer's resurrection a somewhat similar forensic significance as to that of Christ (Romans 8:10,23; 1 Corinthians 15:30-32,55-58). Far more prominent with him is, however, the other, the pneumatic interpretation. Both the origin of the resurrection life and the continuance of the resurrection state are dependent on the Spirit (Romans 8,10,11; 1 Corinthians 15:45-49; Galatians 6:8). The resurrection is the climax of the believer's transformation (Romans 8:11; Galatians 6:8). This part ascribed to the Spirit in the resurrection is not to be explained from what the Old Testament teaches about the Spirit as the source of physical life, for to this the New Testament hardly ever refers; it is rather to be explained as the correlate of the general Pauline principle that the Spirit is the determining factor of the heavenly state in the coming eon. This pneumatic character of the resurrection also links together the resurrection of Christ and that of the believer. This idea is not yet found in the Synoptics; it finds expression in John 5:22-29; 11:25; 14:6,19. In early apostolic teaching a trace of it may be found in Acts 4:2. With Paul it appears from the beginning as a well-established principle. The continuity between the working of the Spirit here and His part in the resurrection does not, however, lie in the body. The resurrection is not the culmination of a pneumatic change which the body in this life undergoes. There is no preformation of the spiritual body on earth. Romans 8:10,11; 1 Corinthians 15:49; 2 Corinthians 5:1,2; Philippians 3:12 positively exclude this, and 2 Corinthians 3:18; 4:7-18 do not require it. The glory into which believers are transformed through the beholding (or reflecting) of the glory of Christ as in a mirror is not a bodily but inward glory, produced by illumination of the gospel. And the manifestation of the life of Jesus in the body or in the mortal flesh refers to the preservation of bodily life in the midst of deadly perils. Equally without support is the view that at one time Paul placed the investiture with the new body immediately after death. It has been assumed that this, together with the view just criticized, marks the last stage in a protracted development of Paul's eschatological belief. The initial stage of

this process is found in 1 Thessalonians: the resurrection is that of an earthly body. The next stage is represented by 1 Corinthians: the future body is pneumatic in character, although not to be received until the parousia. The third stage removes the inconsistency implied in the preceding position between the character of the body and the time of its reception, by placing the latter at the moment of death (2 Corinthians, Romans, Colossians), and by an extreme flight of faith the view is even approached that the resurrection body is in process of development now (Teichmann, Charles). This scheme has no real basis of fact. 1 Thessalonians does not teach an unpneumatic eschatology (compare 4:14,16). The second stage given is the only truly Pauline one, nor can it be shown that the apostle ever abandoned it. For the third position named finds no support in 2 Corinthians 5:1-10; Romans 8:19; Colossians 3:4. The exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:1-10 is difficult and cannot here be given in detail. Our understanding of the main drift of the passage, put into paraphrase, is as follows: we feel assured of the eternal weight of glory (4:17), because we know that we shall receive, after our earthly tent-body shall have been dissolved (aorist subjunctive), a new body, a supernatural house for our spirit, to be possessed eternally in the heavens. A sure proof of this lies in the heightened form which our desire for this future state assumes. For it is not mere desire to obtain a new body, but specifically to obtain it as soon as possible, without an intervening period of nakedness, i.e. of a disembodied state of the spirit. Such would be possible, if it were given us to survive till the parousia, in which case we would be clothed upon with our habitation from heaven (= supernatural body), the old body not having to be put off first before the new can be put on, but the new body being superimposed upon the old, so that no "unclothing" would have to take place first, what is mortal simply being swallowed up of life (5:2,4). And we are justified in cherishing this supreme aspiration, since the ultimate goal set for us in any case, even if we should have to die first and to unclothe and then to put on the new body over the naked spirit, since the ultimate goal, I say, excludes under all circumstances a state of nakedness at the moment of the parousia (5:3). Since, then, such a new embodied state is our destiny in any event, we justly long for that mode of reaching it which involves least delay and least distress and avoids intermediate nakedness. (This on the reading in 5:3 of *ei ge kai endusamenoi ou gumnoi heurethesometha*. If the reading *ei ge kai ekdusamenoi* be adopted the rendering of 5:3 will have to be: "If so be that also having put off (i.e. having died), we shall not at the end be found

naked." If *eiper kai ekdusamenoi* be chosen it will be: "Although even having put off (i.e. having died) we shall not at the end be found naked." These other readings do not materially alter the sense.) The understanding of the passage will be seen to rest on the pointed distinction between being "clothed upon," change at the parousia without death (5:2,4), to be "unclothed," loss of the body in death with nakedness resulting (5:4), and "being clothed," putting on of the new body after a state of nakedness (5:3). Interpreted as above, the passage expresses indeed the hope of an instantaneous endowment with the spiritual body immediately after this life, but only on the supposition that the end of this life will be at the parousia, not for the case that death should intervene before, which latter possibility is distinctly left open. In [5089]Romans 8:19 what will happen at the end to believers is called a "revealing of the sons of God," not because their new body existed previously, but because their status as sons of God existed before, and this status will be revealed through the bestowal upon them of the glorious body. [5088]Colossians 3:3,1 speaks of a "life .... hid with Christ in God," and of the "manifestation" of believers with Christ in glory at the parousia, but "life" does not imply bodily existence, and while the "manifestation" at the parousia presupposes the body, it does not imply that this body must have been acquired long before, as is the case with Christ's body. In conclusion it should be noted that there is ample evidence in the later epistles that Paul continued to expect the resurrection body at the parousia ([4750]2 Corinthians 5:10; [5082]Philippians 3:20,21).

4. The Resurrection-Body:

The main passage informing us as to the nature of the resurrection body is [4655]1 Corinthians 15:35-58. The difficulty Paul here seeks to relieve does not concern the substance of the future body, but its kind (compare [4655]1 Corinthians 15:35 "With what manner of body do they come?"). Not until [4650]1 Corinthians 15:50 is the deeper question of difference in substance touched upon. The point of the figure of "sowing" is not that of identity of substance, but rather this, that the impossibility of forming a concrete conception of the resurrection body is no proof of its impossibility, because in all vegetable growth there appears a body totally unlike that which is sown, a body the nature and appearance of which are determined by the will of God. We have no right to press the figure in other directions, to solicit from it answers to other questions. That there is to be a real connection between the present and the future body is implied rather than directly affirmed. [4656]1 Corinthians 15:36 shows that the distinction

between the earthly body and a germ of life in it, to be entrusted with it to the grave and then quickened at the last day, does not lie in the apostle's mind, for what is sown is the body; it dies and is quickened in its entirety. Especially the turn given to the figure in 15:37 — that of a naked grain putting on the plant as a garment — proves that it is neither intended nor adapted to give information on the degree of identity or link of continuity between the two bodies. The "bare grain" is the body, not the spirit, as some would have it (Teichmann), for it is said of the seed that it dies; which does not apply to the *Pneuma* (compare also 15:44). The fact is that in this entire discussion the subjective spirit of the believer remains entirely out of consideration; the matter is treated entirely from the standpoint of the body. So far as the *Pneuma* enters into it, it is the objective Spirit, the Spirit of Christ. As to the time of the sowing, some writers take the view that this corresponds to the entire earthly life, not to the moment of burial only (so already Calvin, recently Teichmann and Charles). In 15:42,43 there are points of contact for this, inasmuch as especially the three last predicates "in dishonor," "in weakness," "a natural body," seem more applicable to the living than to the dead body. At any rate, if the conception is thus widened, the act of burial is certainly included in the sowing. The objection arising from the difficulty of forming a conception of the resurrection body is further met in 15:39-41, where Paul argues from the multitude of bodily forms God has at His disposal. This thought is illustrated from the animal world (15:39); from the difference between the heavenly and the earthly bodies (15:40); from the difference existing among the heavenly bodies themselves (15:41). The structure of the argument is indicated by the interchange of two words for "other," *allos* and *heteros*, the former designating difference of species within the genus, the latter difference of genus, a distinction lost in the English version. In all this the reasoning revolves not around the substance of the bodies but around their kind, quality, appearance (*sarx* in 15:39 = *soma*, "body," not = "flesh"). The conclusion drawn is that the resurrection body will differ greatly in kind from the present body. It will be *heteros*, not merely *allos*. The points of difference are enumerated in 15:42,43. Four contrasts are named; the first three in each case appear to be the result of the fourth. The dominating antithesis is that between the *soma psuchikon* and the *soma pneumatikon*. Still Paul can scarcely mean to teach that "corruption," "dishonor," "weakness" are in the same sense necessary and natural results of the "psychical" character of the earthly body, as the corresponding opposites are necessary and natural concomitants of the pneumatic

character of the resurrection body. The sequel shows that the "psychical body" was given man at creation, and according to 15:53 corruption and death go together, whereas death is not the result of creation but of the entrance of sin according to Paul's uniform teaching elsewhere. Hence, also the predicate *sarkikos* is avoided in 15:46,47, where the reference is to creation, for this word is always associated in Paul with sin. The connection, therefore, between the "natural (psychical, margin) body" and the abnormal attributes conjoined with it, will have to be so conceived, that in virtue of the former character, the body, though it need not of itself, yet will fall a prey to the latter when sin enters. In this lies also the explanation of the term "psychical body." This means a body in which the *psuche*, the natural soul, is the vitalizing principle, sufficient to support life, but not sufficient to that supernatural, heavenly plane, where it is forever immune to death and corruption. The question must be asked, however, why Paul goes back to the original state of man's body and does not content himself with contrasting the body in the state of sin and in the state of eternal life. The answer is found in the exigency of the argument. Paul wished to add to the argument for the possibility of a different body drawn from analogy, an argument drawn from the typical character of the original creation-body. The body of creation, on the principle of prefiguration, pointed already forward to a higher body to be received in the second stage of the world-process: `if there exists a psychical body, there exists also a pneumatic body' (15:44). The proof lies in Genesis 2:7. Some think that Paul here adopts the Philonic doctrine of the creation of two men, and means 1 Corinthians 15:45b as a quotation from Genesis 1:27. But the sequence is against this, for Paul's spiritual man appears on the scene last, not first, as in Philo. Nor can the statement have been meant as a correction of Philo's sequence, for Paul cannot have overlooked that, once a double creation were found in Genesis 1 and 2, then Philo's sequence was the only possible one, to correct which would have amounted to correcting Scripture. If Paul does here correct Philo, it must be in the sense that he rejects the entire Philonic exegesis, which found in Genesis a twofold creation (compare 1 Corinthians 11:7). Evidently for Paul, Genesis 2:7 taken by itself contains the proof of his proposition, that there is both a psychical and a pneumatic body. Paul regarded the creation of the first Adam in a typical light. The first creation gave only the provisional form in which God's purpose with reference to man was embodied, and in so far looked forward to a higher embodiment of the same idea on a higher pneumatic plane (compare Romans 5:14): "The first man is of the earth,

earthy: the second man is of heaven" ([46154]1 Corinthians 15:47); "of" or "from heaven" does not designate heavenly material, for even here, by not giving the opposite to *choikos*, "earthly," Paul avoided the question of substantiality. A "pneumatic" body is not, as many assume, a body made out of *pneuma* as a higher substance, for in that case Paul would have had *pneumatikon* ready at hand as the contrast to *choikon*. Only negatively the question of substance is touched upon in [46150]1 Corinthians 15:50: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," but the apostle does not say what will take their place. Compare further, for the non-substantial meaning of *pneumatikos*, [5127]Romans 15:27; [4691]1 Corinthians 9:11; 10:3,1; [49108]Ephesians 1:3; 5:19; 6:12; [51109]Colossians 1:9. The only positive thing which we learn in this direction is formal, namely, that the resurrection body of the believer will be the image of that of Christ ([46159]1 Corinthians 15:49).

VII. THE CHANGE OF THOSE LIVING AT THE PAROUSIA.

This is confined to believers. Of a change in the body of non-believers found living or raised at the parousia the New Testament nowhere speaks. The passages referring to this subject are [46155]1 Corinthians 15:51-53; [47050]2 Corinthians 5:1-5; [50030]Philippians 3:20,21. The second of these has already been discussed: it represents the change under the figure of a putting-on of the heavenly body over the earthly body, in result of which what is mortal is swallowed up so as to disappear by life. This representation starts with the new body by which the old body is absorbed. In 1 Corinthians 15 and Philippians 3, on the other hand, the point of departure is from the old body which is changed into a new. The difference between the resurrection and the charge of the living is brought out in [47050]2 Corinthians 5:1-5 in the two figures of "putting on" and "putting on over" endusasthai and ependusasthai. Some exegetes find in [46155]1 Corinthians 15:51-53 the description of a process kept in such general terms as to be equally applicable to those raised and to those transformed alive. If this be adopted it yields new evidence for the continuity between the present body and the resurrection body. Others, however, find here the expectation that Paul and his readers will "all" survive until the parousia, and be changed alive, in which case no light is thrown on the resurrection-process. The more plausible exegesis is that which joins the negative to "all" instead of to the verb, and makes Paul affirm that "not all" will die, but that all, whether dead or surviving, will be changed at the parousia; the difficulty of the exegesis is reflected in the early attempts to change the reading. In

[5080]Philippians 3:20,21 there are no data to decide whether the apostle conceives of himself and his readers as living at the moment of the parousia or speaks generally so as to cover both possibilities.

VIII. THE JUDGMENT.

The judgment takes place on a "day" ([4072]Matthew 7:22; 10:15; 24:36; [2102]Luke 10:12; 21:34; [4608]1 Corinthians 1:8; 3:13; [5408]2 Timothy 4:8; [6667]Revelation 6:17), but this rests on the Old Testament conception of "the day of Yahweh," and is not to be taken literally, whence also "hour" interchanges with "day" ([4132]Mark 13:32; [6407]Revelation 14:7). While not confined to an astronomical day the judgment is plainly represented as a definitely circumscribed transaction, not as an indefinite process. It coincides with its parousia. Of a judgment immediately after death, the New Testament nowhere speaks, not even in [5827]Hebrews 9:27,28. Its locality is the earth, as would seem to follow from its dependence on the parousia ([4134]Matthew 13:41,42; [4136]Mark 13:26,27), although some infer from [5047]1 Thessalonians 4:17 that, so far as believers are concerned, it will take place in the air. But this passage does not speak of the judgment, only of the parousia and the meeting of believers with Christ. The judge is God ([4064]Matthew 6:4,6,14,18; 10:28,32 ff = [2108]Luke 12:8 ff; 21:36; [4402]Acts 10:42; 17:30,31; [5002]Romans 2:2,3,5,16; 14:10; [4603]1 Corinthians 4:3-5; 5:13; [5825]Hebrews 12:25; 13:4; [6017]1 Peter 1:17; 2:23; [6660]Revelation 6:10; 14:7), but also Christ, not only in the great scene depicted in [4253]Matthew 25:31-46, but also in [4138]Mark 8:38; 13:26 ff; [4072]Matthew 7:22 = [2135]Luke 13:25-27; [4173]Acts 17:31; [4710]2 Corinthians 5:10; [6691]Revelation 19:11, whence also the Old Testament conception of "the day of Yahweh" is changed into "the day of the Lord" ([4605]1 Corinthians 5:5; [4714]2 Corinthians 1:14; [5052]1 Thessalonians 5:2; [6180]2 Peter 3:10). In the sense of the final assize the judgment does not in earlier Jewish eschatology belong to the functions of the Messiah, except in Enoch 51:3; 55:4; 61:8 ff; 62:1 ff; 63. Only in the later apocalypses the Messiah appears as judge (4 Ezra (2 Esdras) 13; Apocrypha Baruch 72:2 (compare Sibylline Oracles 3 286)). In the more realistic, less forensic, sense of an act of destruction, the judgment forms part of the Messiah's work from the outset, and is already assigned to Him by the Baptist and still more by Paul ([4080]Matthew 3:10,11,12 = [2086]Luke 3:16,17; [5308]2 Thessalonians 2:8,10,12). The one representation passes over into the other. Jesus always claims for Himself the judgment in the strictly forensic sense. Already in His present state He exercises the right to forgive sin

(⁴⁰⁰⁵Mark 2:5,10). In the Fourth Gospel, it is true, He denies that His present activity involves the task of judging (⁴⁰⁸¹⁵John 8:15; 12:47). That this, however, does not exclude His eschatological judgeship appears from ⁴³⁰⁵²John 5:22,27 (notice the article in 5:22 "the whole judgment," which proves the reference to the last day). But even for the present, though not directly, yet indirectly by His appearance and message, Christ according to John effects a judgment among men (8:16; 9:39), which culminates in His passion and death, the judgment of the world and the Prince of the world (12:31; 14:30; 16:11). A share of the judgment is assigned to angels and to the saints (⁴⁰¹³⁹Matthew 13:39,41,49; 16:27; 24:31; 25:31; ⁵²⁸¹³1 Thessalonians 3:13; ⁵³⁰⁰⁷2 Thessalonians 1:7; ⁶⁵⁰¹⁴Jude 1:14 f). In regard to the angels this is purely ministerial; of believers it is affirmed only in ⁴⁶⁰⁶¹1 Corinthians 6:1-3 that they will have something to do with the act of judgment itself; passages like ⁴⁰¹⁹²⁸Matthew 19:28; 20:23; ⁴²²³⁰Luke 22:30; ⁶⁶⁰²¹Revelation 3:21 do not refer to the judgment proper, but to judging in the sense of "reigning," and promise certain saints a preeminent position in the kingdom of glory. The judgment extends to all men, Tyre, Sidon, Sodom, as well as the Galilean cities (⁴⁰¹²²Matthew 11:22,24); all nations (⁴¹²⁵²Matthew 25:32; ⁴³⁰⁵²⁹John 5:29; ⁴⁴¹⁷³⁰Acts 17:30,31; ⁵⁰¹⁶Romans 2:6,16; ⁴⁷⁰⁵¹⁰2 Corinthians 5:10). It also includes the evil spirits (⁴⁶⁰⁶³1 Corinthians 6:3; ⁶¹⁰⁰⁴2 Peter 2:4; ⁶⁵⁰⁰⁶Jude 1:6). It is a judgment according to works, and that not only in the case of non-believers; of believers also the works will come under consideration (⁴¹²⁵³⁴Matthew 25:34 ff; ⁴⁶⁰⁴⁵1 Corinthians 4:5; ⁴⁷⁰⁵¹⁰2 Corinthians 5:10; ⁶⁶²²¹²Revelation 22:12). Side by side with this, however, it is taught already in the Synoptics that the decisive factor will be the acknowledgment of individuals by Jesus, which in turn depends upon the attitude assumed by them toward Jesus here, directly or indirectly (⁴⁰⁷²³Matthew 7:23; 19:28; 25:35-45; ⁴¹⁰⁸³⁸Mark 8:38). By Paul the principle of judgment according to works is upheld, not merely hypothetically as a principle preceding and underlying every soteriological treatment of man by God (Romans 2), and therefore applying to non-Christians for whose judgment no other standard is available, but also as remaining in force for Christians, who have already, under the soteriological regime of grace, received absolute, eternal acquittal in justification. This raises a twofold problem:

(a) why justification does not render a last judgment superfluous;

(b) why the last judgment in case of Christians saved by grace should be based on works. In regard to

(a) it ought to be remembered that the last judgment differs from justification in that it is not a private transaction in foro conscientiae, but public, in foro mundi. Hence, Paul emphasizes this element of publicity (Romans 2:16; 1 Corinthians 3:13; 2 Corinthians 5:10). It is in accordance with this that God the Father is always the author of justification, whereas as a rule Christ is represented as presiding at the assize of the last day. As to (b), because the last judgment is not a mere private but a public transaction, something more must be taken into account than that on which the individual eternal destiny may hinge. There can be disapproval of works and yet salvation (1 Corinthians 3:15). But the trial of works is necessary for the sake of the vindication of God. In order to be a true theodicy the judgment must publicly exhibit and announce the complete overthrow of sin in man, and the complete working out in him of the idea of righteousness, including not merely his acquittal from the guilt, but also his deliverance from the power, of sin, not merely his imputed righteousness, but also his righteousness of life. In order to demonstrate this comprehensively, the judgment will have to take into account three things: faith (Galatians 5:5), works done in the Christian state, sanctification. Besides this the works of the Christian appear as the measure of gracious reward (Matthew 5:12,46; 6:1; 10:41,42; 19:28; 20:1-16; 25:14-45; Mark 9:41; Luke 6:23,15; 1 Corinthians 3:8,14; 9:17,18; Colossians 2:18; 3:24; Hebrews 10:35). These works, however, are not mechanically or commercially appraised, as in Judaism, for Paul speaks by preference of "work" in the singular (Romans 2:7,15; 1 Corinthians 3:13; 9:1; Galatians 6:4; Ephesians 4:12; Philippians 1:6,22; 1 Thessalonians 1:3; 2 Thessalonians 1:11). And this one organic product of "work" is traced back to the root of faith (1 Thessalonians 1:3; 2 Thessalonians 1:11 where the genitive *pisteos* is a gen. of origin), and Paul speaks as a rule not of *poiein* but of *prassein*, i.e. of the practice, the systematic doing, of that which is good.

The judgment assigns to each individual his eternal destiny, which is absolute in its character either of blessedness or of punishment, though admittedly of degrees within these two states. Only two groups are recognized, those of the condemned and of the saved (Matthew 25:33,14; John 5:29); no intermediate group with as yet undetermined destiny anywhere appears. The degree of guilt is fixed according to the knowledge of the Divine will possessed in life (Matthew 10:15; 11:20-24; Luke 10:12-15; 12:47,48; John 15:22,24; Romans 2:12;

ᵂ⁶⁰²⁰2 Peter 2:20-22). The uniform representation is that the judgment has reference to what has been done in the embodied state of this life; nowhere is there any reflection upon the conduct or product of the intermediate state as contributing to the decision (ᵂ⁴⁷⁵⁰2 Corinthians 5:10). The state assigned is of endless duration, hence described as *aionios*, "eternal." While this adjective etymologically need mean no more than "what extends through a certain eon or period of time," yet its eschatological usage correlates it everywhere with the "coming age," and, this age being endless in duration, every state or destiny connected with it partakes of the same character. It is therefore exegetically impossible to give a relative sense to such phrases as pur aionion, "eternal fire" (ᵂ⁴⁰⁸⁸Matthew 18:8; 25:41; ᵂ⁶⁵⁰⁰⁷Jude 1:7), *kolasis aionios*, "eternal punishment" (ᵂ⁴²⁵⁴⁶Matthew 25:46),*olethros aionios*, "eternal destruction" (ᵂ⁵³⁰⁰⁹2 Thessalonians 1:9), *krisis aionios or krima aionion*, "eternal judgment" (ᵂ⁴¹⁰⁸⁹Mark 3:29; ᵂ⁵⁸⁰⁶²Hebrews 6:2). This is also shown by the figurative representations which unfold the import of the adjective: the "unquenchable fire" (ᵂ⁴⁰⁸²Matthew 3:12), "the never-dying worm" (ᵂ⁴¹⁰⁹⁸⁸Mark 9:43-48), "The smoke of their torment goeth up for ever and ever" (ᵂ⁶⁶⁴¹¹Revelation 14:11), "tormented day and night forever and ever" (ᵂ⁶⁶²⁰⁰Revelation 20:10). The endless duration of the state of punishment is also required by the absolute eternity of its counterpart, *zoe aionios*, "eternal life" (ᵂ⁴²⁵⁴⁶Matthew 25:46). In support of the doctrine of conditional immortality it has been urged that other terms descriptive of the fate of the condemned, such as *apoleia*, "perdition," *phthora*, "corruption," *olethros*, "destruction," *thanatos*, "death," point rather to a cessation of being. This, however, rests on an unscriptural interpretation of these terms, which everywhere in the Old Testament and the New Testament designate a state of existence with an undesirable content, never the pure negation of existence, just as "life" in Scripture describes a positive mode of being, never mere existence as such. Perdition, corruption, destruction, death, are predicated in all such cases of the welfare or the ethical spiritual character of man, without implying the annihilation of his physical existence. No more support can be found in the New Testament for the hypothesis of an *apokatastasis panton*, "restoration of all things," i.e. absolute universalism implying the ultimate salvation of all men. The phrase occurs only in ᵂ⁴⁴⁸²¹Acts 3:21, where, however, it has no cosmical reference but relates to the fulfillment of the promises to Israel. Josephus uses it of the restoration of the Jews to their land after the Captivity, Philo of the restoration of inheritances in the year of jubilee (compare ᵂ³⁹⁰⁰⁶Malachi 4:6; ᵂ⁴⁰¹⁷¹⁵Matthew 17:11; ᵂ⁴¹⁰⁹²Mark 9:12; ᵂ⁴⁴⁰⁰⁶Acts 1:6).

Absolute universalism has been found in ^{45:5:18}Romans 5:18; ^{46:15:22}1 Corinthians 15:22,28; ^{49:1:10}Ephesians 1:10; ^{51:1:20}Colossians 1:20, but in all these passages only a cosmical or national universalism can be found, not the doctrine of the salvation of all individuals, which latter would bring the statements in question in direct contradiction to the most explicit deliverances of Paul elsewhere on the principle of predestination and the eternity of the destiny of the wicked.

IX. THE CONSUMMATE STATE.

Side by side with "the future age," and characterizing it from a less formal point of view, the phrase "kingdom of God" designates the consummate state, as it will exist for believers after the judgment. Jesus, while making the kingdom a present reality, yet continues to speak of it in accordance with its original eschatological usage as "the kingdom" which lies in the future (^{40:13:43}Matthew 13:43; 25:34; 26:29; ^{41:9:47}Mark 9:47; ^{42:12:32}Luke 12:32; 13:28,29; 21:31). With Paul the phrase bears preponderatingly an eschatological sense, although occasionally he uses it of the present state of believers (^{45:14:17}Romans 14:17; ^{46:4:20}1 Corinthians 4:20; 6:9,10; 15:24,50; ^{48:5:21}Galatians 5:21; ^{49:5:5}Ephesians 5:5; ^{51:1:13}Colossians 1:13; 4:11; ^{52:2:12}1 Thessalonians 2:12; ^{53:1:5}2 Thessalonians 1:5; ^{55:4:1}2 Timothy 4:1,18). Elsewhere in the New Testament the eschatological use occurs in ^{58:12:28}Hebrews 12:28; ^{59:2:5}James 2:5; ^{61:1:11}2 Peter 1:11; ^{66:11:15}Revelation 11:15. The idea is universalistic, unpolitical, which does not exclude that certain privileges are spoken of with special reference to Israel. Although the eschatological kingdom differs from the present kingdom largely in the fact that it will receive an external, visible embodiment, yet this does not hinder that even in it the core is constituted by those spiritual realities and relations which make the present kingdom. Still it will have its outward form as the doctrine of the resurrection and the regenerated earth plainly show. Hence, the figures in which Jesus speaks of it, such as eating, drinking, reclining at table, while not to be taken sensually, should not on the other hand be interpreted allegorically, as if they stood for wholly internal spiritual processes: they evidently point to, or at least include, outward states and activities, of which our life in the senses offers some analogy, but on a higher plane of which it is at present impossible to form any concrete conception or to speak otherwise than in figurative language. Equivalent to "the kingdom" is "life." But, unlike the kingdom, "life" remains in the Synoptics an exclusively eschatological conception. It is objectively conceived: the state of blessedness the saints will exist in; not

subjectively as a potency in man or a process of development (⁴⁰⁷¹⁴Matthew 7:14; 18:8,9; 19:16,29; 25:46; ⁴¹⁰⁸⁰Mark 10:30). In John "life" becomes a present state, and in connection with this the idea is subjectivized, it becomes a process of growth and expansion. Points of contact for this in the Synoptics may be found in ⁴⁰⁸²²Matthew 8:22 (= ⁴⁰⁹⁶⁰Luke 9:60); ⁴²¹⁵²⁴Luke 15:24; 20:38. When this eschatological life is characterized as aionios, "eternal," the reference is not exclusively to its eternal duration, but the word has, in addition to this, a qualitative connotation; it describes the kind of life that belongs to the consummate state (compare the use of the adjective with other nouns in this sense: ⁴⁷⁰⁵⁰¹2 Corinthians 5:1; ⁵⁵²¹⁰2 Timothy 2:10; ⁵⁰⁵⁰⁹Hebrews 5:9; 9:12,15; ⁶⁰⁰¹¹¹2 Peter 1:11, and the unfolding of the content of the idea in ⁶⁰¹⁰⁴1 Peter 1:4). With Paul "life" has sometimes the same eschatological sense (⁴⁵⁰²⁰⁷Romans 2:7; 5:17; ⁵⁶⁰¹²Titus 1:2; 3:7), but most often it is conceived as already given in the present state, owing to the close association with the Spirit (⁴⁵⁰⁶¹¹Romans 6:11; 7:4,8,11; 8:2,6; ⁴⁸²¹⁹Galatians 2:19; 6:8; ⁴⁹⁰⁴¹⁸Ephesians 4:18). In its ultimate analysis the Pauline conception of "life," as well as that of Jesus, is that of something dependent on communion with God (⁴⁰²²³²Matthew 22:32 = ⁴¹²²⁷Mark 12:27 = ⁴²²⁰³⁸Luke 20:38; ⁴⁵⁰⁸⁰⁶Romans 8:6,7; ⁴⁹⁰⁴¹⁸Ephesians 4:18). Another Pauline conception associated with the consummate state is that of doxa, "glory." This glory is everywhere conceived as a reflection of the glory of God, and it is this that to the mind of Paul gives it religious value, not the external radiance in which it may manifest itself as such. Hence, the element of "honor" conjoined to it (⁴⁵⁰¹²³Romans 1:23; 2:7; 8:21; 9:23; ⁴⁶¹⁵⁴³1 Corinthians 15:43). It is not confined to the physical sphere (⁴⁷⁰³¹⁸2 Corinthians 3:18; 4:16,17). The outward *doxa* is prized by Paul as a vehicle of revelation, an exponent of the inward state of acceptance with God. In general Paul conceives of the final state after a highly theocentric fashion (⁴⁶¹⁵²⁸1 Corinthians 15:28); it is the state of immediate vision of and perfect communion with God and Christ; the future life alone can bring the perfected sonship (⁴⁵⁰⁶¹⁰Romans 6:10; 8:23,19; compare ⁴²²⁰³⁶Luke 20:36; ⁴⁷⁰⁰⁴⁴2 Corinthians 4:4; 5:6,7,8; 13:4; ⁵⁰¹²³Philippians 1:23; ⁵¹⁰²¹³Colossians 2:13; 3:3,1; ⁵²⁰⁴¹⁷1 Thessalonians 4:17).

The scene of the consummate state is the new heaven and the new earth, which are called into being by the eschatological *palingenesia* "regeneration" (⁴⁰⁰⁵¹⁸Matthew 5:18; 19:28; 24:35; ⁴⁶⁰⁷³¹1 Corinthians 7:31; ⁵⁸⁰¹²Hebrews 1:12; 12:26,27; ⁶¹⁰⁸¹⁰2 Peter 3:10; ⁶²¹²¹⁷1 John 2:17; ⁶⁶²¹⁰¹Revelation 21:1, in which last passage, however, some exegetes understand the city to be a symbol of the church, the people of God). An

annihilation of the substance of the present world is not taught (compare the comparison of the future world-conflagration with the Deluge in ⟨6006⟩2 Peter 3:6). The central abode of the redeemed will be in heaven, although the renewed earth will remain accessible to them and a part of the inheritance (⟨4055⟩Matthew 5:5; ⟨6402⟩John 14:2,3; ⟨5088⟩Romans 8:18-22; and the closing visions of the Apocalypse).

X. THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

In regard to the state of the dead, previously to the parousia and the resurrection, the New Testament is far less explicit than in its treatment of what belongs to general eschatology. The following points may here briefly be noted:

(1) The state of death is frequently represented as a "sleeping," just as the act of dying as a "falling asleep" (⟨4024⟩Matthew 9:24; ⟨6904⟩John 9:4; 11:11; ⟨4079⟩1 Corinthians 7:39; 11:30; 15:6,18,20,51; ⟨5043⟩1 Thessalonians 4:13,15; ⟨6004⟩2 Peter 3:4). This usage, while also purely Greek, rests on the Old Testament. There is this difference, that in the New Testament (already in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books) the conception is chiefly used with reference to the righteous dead, and has associated with it the thought of their blessed awaking in the resurrection, whereas in the Old Testament it is indiscriminately applied to all the dead and without such connotation. With Paul the word always occurs of believers. The representation applies not to the "soul" or "spirit," so that a state of unconsciousness until the resurrection would be implied. It is predicated of the person, and the point of comparison is that as one who sleeps is not alive to his surroundings, so the dead are no longer en rapport with this earthly life. Whatever may have been the original implications of the word, it plainly had become long before the New Testament period a figurative mode of speech, just as *egeirein*, "to wake," was felt to be a figurative designation of the act of the resurrection. Because the dead are asleep to our earthly life, which is mediated through the body, it does not follow that they are asleep in every other relation, asleep to the life of the other world, that their spirits are unconscious. Against the unconsciousness of the dead compare ⟨4263⟩Luke 16:23; 23:43; ⟨4325⟩John 11:25,26; ⟨4079⟩Acts 7:59; ⟨4558⟩1 Corinthians 15:8; ⟨5023⟩Philippians 1:23; ⟨6069⟩Revelation 6:9-11; 7:9. Some have held that the sleep was for Paul a euphemism employed in order to avoid the terms "death" and "to die," which the apostle restricted to Christ. ⟨5046⟩1 Thessalonians 4:16 shows that this is unfounded.

(2) The New Testament speaks of the departed after an anthropomorphic fashion as though they were still possessed of bodily organs (Luke 16:23,14; Revelation 6:11; 7:9). That no inference can be drawn from this in favor of the hypothesis of an intermediate body appears from the fact that God and angels are spoken of in the same manner, and also from passages which more precisely refer to the dead as "souls," "spirits" (Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59; Hebrews 12:23; 1 Peter 3:19; Revelation 6:9; 20:4).

(3) The New Testament nowhere encourages the living to seek converse with the dead. Its representation of the dead as "sleeping" with reference to the earthly life distinctly implies that such converse would be abnormal and in so far discountenances it, without explicitly affirming its absolute impossibility. Not even the possibility of the dead for their part taking knowledge of our earthly life is affirmed anywhere. Hebrews 12:1 does not necessarily represent the Old Testament saints as "witnesses" of our race of faith in the sense of spectators in the literal sense, but perhaps in the figurative sense, that we ought to feel, having in memory their example, as if the ages of the past and their historic figures were looking down upon us (Luke 16:29; Acts 8:9; 13:6 ff; 19:13 ff).

(4) As to the departed saints themselves, it is intimated that they have mutual knowledge of one another in the intermediate state, together with memory of facts and conditions of the earthly life (Luke 16:9,19-31). Nowhere, however, is it intimated that this interest of the departed saints in our earthly affairs normally expresses itself in any act of intercession, not even of intercession spontaneously proffered on their part.

(5) The New Testament does not teach that there is any possibility of a fundamental change in moral or spiritual character in the intermediate state. The doctrine of a so-called "second probation" finds in it no real support. The only passages that can with some semblance of warrant be appealed to in this connection are 1 Peter 3:19-21 and 4:6. For the exegesis of the former passage, which is difficult and much disputed, compare *SPIRITS IN PRISON*. Here it may simply be noted that the context is not favorable to the view that an extension of the opportunity of conversion beyond death is implied; the purport of the whole passage points in the opposite direction, the salvation of the exceedingly small number of eight of the generation of Noah being emphasized (1 Peter 3:20). Besides this it would be difficult to understand why this exceptional opportunity should have been granted to this peculiar group of the dead, since the contemporaries of Noah figure in Scripture as examples of extreme wickedness. Even if the idea of a

gospel-preaching with soteriological purpose were actually found here, it would not furnish an adequate basis for building upon it the broad hypothesis of a second probation for all the dead in general or for those who have not heard the gospel in this life. This latter view the passage is especially ill fitted to support, because the generation of Noah had had the gospel preached to them before death. There is no intimation that the transaction spoken of was repeated or continued indefinitely. As to the second passage (⟨60046⟩1 Peter 4:6), this must be taken by itself and in connection with its own context. The assumption that the sentence "the gospel (was) preached even to the dead" must have its meaning determined by the earlier passage in ⟨60319⟩1 Peter 3:19-21, has exercised an unfortunate influence upon the exegesis. Possibly the two passages had no connection in the mind of the author. For explaining the reference to "the dead" the connection with the preceding verse is fully sufficient. It is there stated that Christ is "ready to judge the living and the dead." "The living and the dead" are those who will be alive and dead at the parousia. To both the gospel was preached, that Christ might be the judge of both. But that the gospel was preached to the latter in the state of death is in no way indicated. On the contrary the telic clause, "that they might be judged according to men in the flesh," shows that they heard the gospel during their lifetime, for the judgment according to men in the flesh that has befallen them is the judgment of physical death. If a close connection between the passage in 1 Peter 3 and that in chapter 4 did exist, this could only serve to commend the exegesis which finds in the earlier passage a gospel-preaching to the contemporaries of Noah during their lifetime, since, on that view, it becomes natural to identify the judgment in the flesh with the Deluge.

(6) The New Testament, while representing the state of the dead before the parousia as definitely fixed, nevertheless does not identify it, either in degree of blessedness or punishment, with the final state which follows upon the resurrection. Although there is no warrant for affirming that the state of death is regarded as for believers a positively painful condition, as has been mistakenly inferred from ⟨46130⟩1 Corinthians 11:30; ⟨52043⟩1 Thessalonians 4:13, nevertheless Paul shrinks from it as from a relatively undesirable state, since it involves "nakedness" for the soul, which condition, however, does not exclude a relatively high degree of blessedness in fellowship with Christ (⟨47052⟩2 Corinthians 5:2-4,6,8; ⟨50123⟩Philippians 1:23). In the same manner a difference in the degree or mode of punishment between the intermediate state and the age to come is

plainly taught. For on the one hand the eternal punishment is related to persons in the body ([40028]Matthew 10:28), and on the other hand it is assigned to a distinct place, Gehenna, which is never named in connection with the torment of the intermediate state. This term occurs in [40522]Matthew 5:22,29,30; 10:28 = [42125]Luke 12:5; 18:9; 23:33; [41093]Mark 9:43,15,47; [59306]James 3:6. Its opposite is the eschatological kingdom of God ([41047]Mark 9:47). The term abussos differs from it in that it is associated with the torment of evil spirits ([42083]Luke 8:31; [45107]Romans 10:7; [66901]Revelation 9:1,2; 11:7; 20:1), and in regard to it no such clear distinction between a preliminary and final punishment seems to be drawn (compare also the verb *tartaroun*, "to bind in Tartarus"; of evil spirits in [60204]2 Peter 2:4). Where the sphere of the intermediate state is locally conceived, this is done by means of the term *Hades*, which is the equivalent of the Old Testament *She'ol*. The passages where this occurs are [40123]Matthew 11:23; 16:18; [42163]Luke 16:23; [44027]Acts 2:27,31; [46155]1 Corinthians 15:55 (where others read "death"); [66018]Revelation 1:18; 6:8; 20:13,14). These passages should not be interpreted on the basis of the Greek classical usage, but in the light of the Old Testament doctrine about *She'ol*. Some of them plainly employ the word in the non-local sense of the state of death ([40618]Matthew 16:18; possibly [44027]Acts 2:27,31; [46155]1 Corinthians 15:55 (personified); [66018]Revelation 1:18; 6:8 (personified); 20:13 (personified)). The only passage where the conception is local is [42163]Luke 16:23, and this occurs in a parable, where aside from the central point in comparison, no purpose to impart topographical knowledge concerning the world beyond death can be assumed, but the imagery is simply that which was popularly current. But, even if the doctrine of *Hades* as a place distinct from *Gehenna* should be found here, the terms in which it is spoken of, as place of torment for Dives, prove that the conception is not that of a general abode of neutral character, where without blessedness or pain the dead as a joint-company await the last judgment, which would first assign them to their separate eternal habitations. The parable plainly teaches, whether Hades be local and distinct from Gehenna or not, that the differentiation between blessedness and punishment in its absolute character ([42166]Luke 16:26) is begun in it and does not first originate at the judgment (see further, HADES).

LITERATURE.

Besides the articles on the several topics in the Bible Dictionaries and in Cremer's Lexicon of New Testament Greek, and the corresponding chapters in the handbooks on New Testament Theology, the following

works and articles may be consulted: Bousset, Die Religion des Judenthums2, 1906, especially 233-346; id, Der Antichrist in der Ueberlieferung des Judenthums, des New Testament und der alten Kirche, 1895; Bruston, Lamentations vie future d'apres Paul, 1895; Charles, Eschatology Hebrew, Jewish and Christian: A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, 1899; Cremer, Ueber den Zustand nach dem Tode3, 1892; Grimm, "Ueber die Stelle 1 Kor 15:20-28," ZWT, 1873; Haupt, Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synoptischen Evangelien, 1895; Kabisch, Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhangen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus, 1893; Kennedy, Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, 1904; Kliefoth, Christliche Eschatologie, 1886; Klopper, "Zur Paulinischen Lehre von der Auferstehung: Auslegung von 2 Kor 5:1-6," JDT, 1862 (the author modified his views in his commentary on 2 Cor); Kostlin, "Die Lehre des Apostels Paulus von der Auferstehung," JDT, 1877; Luthardt, Lehre von den letzten Dingen3, 1885; Muirhead, The Eschatology of Jesus, 1904; Oesterley, The Doctrine of the Last Things, 1908; Philippi, Die biblische und kirchliche Lehre vom Antichrist, 1877; Rinck, Vom Zustande nach dem Tode, 1885; Salmond, The Christian Doctrine of Immortality5, 1901; Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode, 1892; Sharman, The Teaching of Jesus about the Future According to the Synoptic Gospels, 1909; Stahelin, "Zur Paulinischen Eschatologie," JDT, 1874; Teichmann, Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht, 1896; Volz, Judische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, 1903; Waitz, "Ueber 2 Kor 5:1-4," JPT, 1882; Wetzel, "Ueber 2 Kor 5:1-4," SK, 1886; Wendt, Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch, 1878.

Geerhardus Vos

ESCHEW

<es-choo'> ([ךוֹs, *cur*]; [ἐκκλίνω, *ekklino*]): Only 4 times in the King James Version (Job 1:1,8; 2:3; 1 Peter 3:11), in all of which the American Standard Revised Version renders by the appropriate form of "turn away from."

ESDRAELON, PLAIN OF

<es-dra-e'-lon>, ([ל a[rziy, *yizre`e'l*]; in Apocrypha the name varies: [Ἐσδρηλών, *Esdrelon*], [Ἐσδραηλών, *Esdraelon*], [Ἐσδρηλώμ, *Esdrelom*], [Ἐσρηλών, *Esrelon*], [Ἐσρηχών, *Esrechon*]):

1. THE NAME:

The Greek name of the great plain in Central Palestine (Judith 3:9; 7:3, etc.). It is known in Scripture by the Hebrew name "valley of Jezreel" (06176 Joshua 17:16; 07063 Judges 6:33, etc.). It is called `emeq in 05615 Judges 5:15, which properly denotes "a depression," or "deepening," and is used more commonly of the vale running eastward between Gilboa and Little Hermon. *Biq`ah* is the term usually employed (44522 2 Chronicles 35:22, etc.), which accurately describes it, "an opening," a level space surrounded by hills. The modern name is Merj ibn `Amr, "meadow of the son of Amr."

2. POSITION AND DESCRIPTION:

It lies between Gilboa and Little Hermon on the East, and Mt. Carmel on the West. It is enclosed by irregular lines drawn from the latter along the base of the foothills of Nazareth to Tabor; from Tabor, skirting Little Hermon and Gilboa to Jenin, and from Jenin along the North edge of the Samaritan uplands to Carmel. These sides of the triangle are, respectively, about 15, 15 and 20 miles in length. North of Jenin a bay of the plain sweeps eastward, hugging the foot of Mt. Gilboa. An offshoot passes down to the Jordan valley between Gilboa and Little Hermon; and another cuts off the latter hill from Tabor. The average elevation of the plain is 200 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean. The Vale of Jezreel between Zer`in and Beisan, a distance of about 12 miles, descends nearly 600 ft., and then sinks suddenly to the level of the Jordan valley. The chief springs supplying water for the plain are those at Jenin and at Megiddo. The former are the most copious, and are used to create a "paradise" on the edge of the plain. Those at Megiddo drive mills and serve for irrigation, besides forming extensive marshes. The springs near Zer`in, three in number, `Ain Jalud, possibly identical with the well of Harod, being the most copious, send their waters down the vale to the Jordan. The streams from the surrounding heights are gathered in the bed of the Kishon, a great trench which zigzags through the plain, carrying the water through the gorge at Carmel to the sea. For the most of its course this sluggish stream is too low to be available for irrigation. The deep, rich soil, however, retains the moisture from the winter rains until far on in the year, the surface only, where uncovered by crops, being baked to brick in the sun. When winter sets in it quickly absorbs the rain, great breadths being turned to soft mud. This probably happened in the battle with Sisera: the northern cavalry, floundering in the morass, would be an easy prey to the active,

lightly armed foot-soldiers. The fertility of the plain is extraordinary: hardly anywhere can the toil of the husbandman find a greater reward. The present writer has ridden through crops of grain there, when from his seat on the saddle he could no more than see over the tops of the stalks. Trees do not flourish in the plain itself, but on its borders, e.g. at Jenin, the palm, the olive and other fruit trees prosper. The oak covers the slopes of the hills North of Carmel.

3. PART PLAYED IN HISTORY:

This wide opening among the mountains played a great part in the history of the land. This was due to the important avenues of communication between North and South that lay across its ample breadths. The narrow pass between the promontory of Carmel and the sea was not suitable for the transport of great armies: the safer roads over the plain were usually followed. So it happened that here opposing hosts often met in deadly strife. Hardly an equal area of earth can so often have been drenched with the blood of men. No doubt many conflicts were waged here in far-off times of which no record remains. The first battle fought in the plain known to history was that in which Sisera's host was overthrown (⁰⁷⁶⁵⁰Judges 5:20). The children of the East were surprised and routed by Gideon's 300 chosen men in the stretches North of Zer`in (Judges 7). Near the same place the great battle with the Philistines was fought in which Saul and his sons, worsted in the plain, retired to perish on the heights of Gilboa (1 Samuel 31). In the bed of the Kishon at the foot of Carmel Elijah slaughtered the servants of Baal (¹¹⁸⁴⁰1 Kings 18:40). Dark memories of the destruction of Ahab's house by the furiously driving Jehu linger round Jezreel. Ahaziah, fleeing from the avenger across the plain, was overtaken and cut down at Megiddo (2 Kings 9). In the vale by Megiddo Josiah sought to stay the northward march of Pharaoh-necoh, and himself fell wounded to death (¹²²⁹⁰2 Kings 23:30; ⁴⁴⁸⁵⁰2 Chronicles 35:20 ff). The army of Holofernes is represented as spreading out over all the southern reaches of the plain (Judith 7:18,19). Much of the fighting during the wars of the Jews transpired within the circle of these hills. It is not unnatural that the inspired seer should place the scene of war in "the great day of God" in the region so often colored crimson in the history of his people — the place called in the Hebrew tongue "Har-Magedon" (⁶⁶¹⁶⁴Revelation 16:14,16).

Esdraelon lay within the lot of Issachar (⁰⁶¹⁹¹⁷Joshua 19:17). The Canaanite inhabitants were formidable with their chariots of iron (⁰⁶¹⁷¹⁶Joshua

17:16,18). The tribe does not appear to have prosecuted the conquest with vigor. Issachar seems to have resumed the tent life (Deuteronomy 33:18), and ignobly to have secured enjoyment of the good things in the land by stooping to "taskwork" (Genesis 49:14 f).

4. ARAB RAIDS:

Through many centuries the plain was subject to raids by the Arabs from the East of the Jordan. The approach was open and easy, and the rich breadths of pasture irresistibly attracted these great flock masters. The Romans introduced some order and security; but with the passing of the eastern empire the old conditions resumed sway, and until comparatively recent times the alarm of an Arab invasion was by no means infrequent.

The railway connecting Haifa with Damascus and Mecca crosses the plain, and enters the Jordan valley near Beisan.

W. Ewing

ESDRAS, THE FIRST BOOK OF

<ez'-dras>, *<es'-dras>*:

1. NAME:

In some of the Greek uncials (Codex Vaticanus, etc.) of the Septuagint the book is called [Ἔσδρας, *Esdras*, Codex Alexandrinus] (or [Πρῶτον, *Proton*]); so in the editions of Fritzsche, Tischendorf, Nestle and Swete. It is absent from Codex Sinaiticus and in Codex Alexandrinus its name is [Ὁ Ἱερεύς, *Hosea Hiereus*] = The Priest, i.e. Ezra, who is emphatically the priest. It is also called 1 Esdras in the old Latin and Syriac VSS, as well as in the English, Welsh and other modern translations. In the English and other Protestant Bibles which generally print the Apocrypha apart, this book stands first in the Apocrypha under the influence partly of its name, and in part on account of its contents, as it seemed a suitable link between the canonical and the apocryphal writings. The English 2 Esdras is the apocalyptic Esdras and stands immediately after the English and Greek 1 Esdras. The Vulgate, following Jerome's version, gave the names 1, 2 and 3 Esdras to our Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Esdras, respectively, and in editions of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) down to that of Pope Sixtus (died 1590) these three books appear in that order. The name 3 Esdras is, therefore, that current in the Roman church, and it has the

sanction of the 6th article of the Anglican Creed and of Miles Coverdale who in his translation follows the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) in naming the canonical Ezra, Nehemiah and the apocryphal 1 Esdras, 1, 2 and 3 Esdras, respectively. Other reformers adhered to these titles. In Fritzsche's commentary on the Apocrypha 3 Esdras is preferred and he treats this book first. In Kautzsch's German edition of the Apocrypha and in most recent German works the Latin designation 3 is revived. The English commentators Bissell (Lange) and Wace (Speaker's Commentary) follow the custom of the Bible and speak of 1 Esdras, placing the book first in the collection, and this is the prevailing custom among English Protestant theologians. The name 2 Esdras has also been given to this book, the canonical Ezra and Nehemiah being then counted as one — 1 Esdras. See Origen quoted by HE, V, 25; Zunz, Der Gottesdienst, Vortrage Berlin, 1832, 15.

2. CONTENTS:

With the exception of 1 Esdras 3:1 through 5:6 — the incident of the royal banquet and the contest for a prize of the three young men — the present books agree in everything essential, down to the minutest details, with the canonical Ezra and part of 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah. Before discussing the relation between 1 Esdras and the Biblical books named (see next section), it will be advantageous to give an outline of the book now specially under consideration, with reference to the parallel passages in the corresponding parts of the Canon. It will be seen that practically the whole of Ezra is concerned, and for explanations of the parts common to this book and to Nehemiah reference may be made to the Century Bible Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther.

1. 1 Esdras 1 = [4850]2 Chronicles 35:1 through 36:21 and maybe analyzed thus: 1 Esdras 1:1-20 = [4850]2 Chronicles 35:1-19: Josiah's great Passover. 1 Esdras 1:21 f has no exact parallel. 1 Esdras 1:23-31 = [4450]2 Chronicles 35:20-27: The death of Josiah. This took place on the battlefield at Megiddo according to [12239]2 Kings 23:29, but 1 Esdras 1:31 and [4524]2 Chronicles 35:24 say he died at Jerusalem. 1 Esdras 1:32-58 = [4860]2 Chronicles 36:1-21, closing years of the monarchy followed by the exile in Babylon.
2. 1 Esdras 2:1-15 = [5010]Ezra 1:1-11: The return from Babylon through the edict of Cyrus.
3. 1 Esdras 2:16-26 = [5047]Ezra 4:7-24. Certain Persian officials in Samaria

induced King Artaxerxes I (died 424 BC) to stop the work of rebuilding the temple, which is not resumed until the second year of the reign of Darius Hystaspis (519 BC).

4. 1 Esdras 3:1 through 5:6 has no parallel in any part of the Old Testament.

King Darius (Hystaspis?) makes a great feast, after which he returns to his bedchamber but finds sleeping very difficult. Three young men belonging to his bodyguard resolve each to make a sentence to be written down and placed under the king's pillow, so that upon rising from his bed he might hear the three sayings read to him. The question which each one seeks to answer is, What in this world is strongest? The first says it is "wine," the second, that it is "the king." The reply of the third is "woman, though strongest of all is truth" (from this arose the Latin saying Magna dst veritas et prevalebit). The third is declared the best, and as a reward the king offers him whatever he might wish. This young man happened to be Zerubbabel (Zorobabel), and the request that he makes is that King Darius might perform the vow which he made on coming to the throne to rebuild Jerusalem and its temple and to restore the sacred vessels removed to Babylon. This request is at once granted, and there follows an account of the home-coming of Jews exiled in Babylon and the protection accorded them by the Persian government similar to what we read of in 1 Esdras 1 as taking place in the reign of Cyrus. But many things in this narrative are striking and indeed odd. Zerubbabel is called a young man. Among those mentioned in 1 Esdras 5:5 Zerubbabel is not named, though his son Joakim is. In the very next verse (5:6) this Joakim is identified with the young man (Zerubbabel) who won the king's prize for writing the wisest sentence, though the sense is not quite clear; perhaps Zerubbabel is meant in 1 Esdras 5:6. Fritzsche argues that Joakim can alone be meant. This whole episode stands in no organic connection with the rest of 1 Esdras, and if it is omitted the narrative is continuous. Besides this the account given of the return from Babylon contradicts what is said in 1 Esdras 1 and the corresponding part of Ezr. We must regard 1 Esdras 3:1 through 5:6 as a Jewish [haggadah] which at an early time was written in the margin as supplying illustrative matter and then got incorporated into the text. Nevertheless, from a literary point of view this part of the book is the gem of the whole.

5. 1 Esdras 5:7-73 = Ezra 2 through 4:1-5: The names of those who returned with number of animals (horses, etc.) (1 Esdras 5:7-43); altar of

burnt offering erected (1 Esdras 5:48); sacrifices offered on it (1 Esdras 5:50). Foundation of the temple laid (1 Esdras 5:56 f). The Jews refuse the offer of the Samaritan party to help in the rebuilding of the temple, with the result that this party had the work stopped (1 Esdras 5:66-73). [546] Ezra 4:6-24 finds its parallel in 1 Esdras 2:16-30 (see above). 1 Esdras 2:30 and 5:73 are evidently duplicates.

6. 1 Esdras 6:1 through 7:15 = [550] Ezra 5:1 through 6:22: Building of the temple resumed through the preaching of Haggai and Zechariah (1 Esdras 6:1 f). Persian officials unsuccessfully oppose the work (1 Esdras 6:3-34) which is soon completed, the temple being then dedicated (1 Esdras 7:1-11). Observance of the Passover (1 Esdras 7:12-15).

Between 1 Esdras 7 and 8 there is an interval of some 60 years, for chapter 8 begins with the arrival of Ezra (458 BC).

7. 1 Esdras 8:1-67 = [570] Ezra 7:1 through 8:36: Journey of Ezra and his party from Babylon to Jerusalem bearing letters of authority from King Artaxerxes I (died 424 BC) (1 Esdras 8:1-27); list of those who return (1 Esdras 8:28-40); gathering together of the party by the river Ahava; incidents of the journey; the arrival (1 Esdras 8:41).

> **8.** 1 Esdras 8:68-90 = Ezra 9: Ezra's grief on hearing of the marriage of some Jews with foreign wives (1 Esdras 8:68-73). His confession and prayer (1 Esdras 8:74-90).

> **9.** 1 Esdras 8:91 through 9:36 = Ezra 10: The means used to end the mixed marriages; lists of the men (priests and others) who had married strange wives.

10. 1 Esdras 9:37-55 = [673] Nehemiah 7:73b through 8:12: The reforms of Ezra. In the Canonical Scriptures [673] Nehemiah 7:73b through 10 gives the history of Ezra, not that of Nehemiah — the two never labored or lived together at Jerusalem. (The name Nehemiah in [689] Nehemiah 8:9 and 10:1 is an evident interpolation.) In 1 Esdras Nehemiah is not once mentioned in this section. In 1 Esdras 9:49 (parallel [689] Nehemiah 8:9) "Attharates" is the word used, and as a proper name (see 1 Esdras 5:40, "Nehemiah and Attharates"). The majority of modern scholars assign this section to Ezra, adding it to Ezra 10, or incorporating it into the Ezra narrative. So Ewald, Wellhausen, Schrader, Klostermann, Baudissin, Budde and Ryssel. The present writer defends this view in the Century Bible in Ezra- Nehemiah-Esther, 242 f. In this case 1 Esdras borrows from Chronicles and Ezra alone and not from Nehemiah. It should be remembered however that

Ezra-Nehemiah formed originally but one book. Some will say that Chronicles preceded Ezra-Nehemiah as a single book, but for this there is no evidence (see Century Bible, 4). The last verse of 1 Esdras in all manuscripts ends in the middle of a sentence: "And they assembled ...." showing that the closing part of the book has been lost. The present writer suggests that the missing part is Nehemiah 8:13 through 10, which begins, "And on the second day were gathered together (assembled) the heads of fathers' houses," etc., the same verb being used in the Septuagint Greek of both passages with a very slight difference ([ἐπισυνήχθησαν, *episunechthesan*], and [συνήχθησαν, *sunechthesan*], in Ezra and Esdras respectively).

3. THE RELATION TO CHRONICLES, EZRA, NEHEMIAH:

Since Nehemiah 7:73b through 8:12 belongs to the Book of Ezra (see above) describing the work of Ezra, not that of Nehemiah, the contents of 1 Esdras are parallel with those of Ezra alone with the exception of chapter 1 which agrees with 2 Chronicles 35:1 through 36:21. Various explanations have been offered, the following being the principal:

(1) that 1 Esdras is a compilation based on the Septuagint of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah: so Keil, Bissell and formerly Schurer (GJV, II, ii, 179 f; Herzog2, I, 496); the arguments for this opinion are well marshaled by Bissell in his Commentary on the Apocrypha (Lange);

(2) that 1 Esdras is an independent Greek translation from a now lost Hebrew (or Aramaic) origin in many respects superior to our Massoretic Text: so Whiston, Pohlmann, Herzfeld, Fritzsche, Ginsburg, Cheyne, Thackeray, Nestle, Howarth, Torrey and Bertholet. Most of these writers hold that the original 1 Esdras included the whole of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah;

(3) the bulk of those who support view 2 argue that the original 1 Esdras formed the real Septuagint version of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, what exists in our present Septuagint being another Greek translation, probably by Theodotion (fl, about 150 AD), just as we now know that what up to 1772 (the date of the publication in Rome of the Codex Chisianus) was considered as the Septuagint of Daniel is really Theodotion's version. Howarth (see articles in the Academy, 1893; PSBA, XXIX, etc.), and Torrey (Ezra Studies) stoutly champion this view. The evidence offered is of two kinds, external and internal:

(1) External Evidence.

(a) Josephus uses this version as his source for the period, though for other Old Testament books he follows the Septuagint.

(b) In the foreword to the Syriac version of 1 Esdras in Walton's Polyglot it is said that this version follows the Septuagint, which surely counts for nothing since copies of the Septuagint known to us contain both 1 Esdras and the Greek translation reckoned up to recently as the true Septuagint.

(c) Howarth maintains, but without proof, that in Origen's Hexapla, 1 Esdras takes the place of our Septuagint version, and that the same is true of the Virus Itala.

(2) Internal Evidence.

(a) It is said by Dr. Gwyn, Thackeray and Howarth that the Greek of the true Septuagint of Daniel and that of 1 Esdras are very similar in character, which however only goes to prove that one man translated both.

(b) Howarth holds that the Greek of Daniel and Ezra in the orthodox Septuagint version is very literal, as was all Theodotion's translation work. But such statements have to be received with very great caution, as in judging of style so much depends on the personal equation. The present writer has compared carefully parts ascribed with confidence to Theodotion and the Septuagint without reaching the above conclusions. At the most the matter has not been set at rest by any facts or reasoning as yet supplied. It must be admitted that 1 Esdras and Josephus preserve the true sequence of the events chronicled in [40773]Nehemiah 7:73b through 10, the Massoretic Text and the Greek version based on it having gone wrong at this point, probably through the mixing of Hebrew skins or leaves. Those who see in 1 Esdra the true Septuagint agree almost to a man that 1 Esdras 3:1 through 5:6 is a late interpretation, never having had a Hob original. This may account in a large degree for the vigor and elegance of the Greek Howarth, however, parts company with his friends Torrey, Bertholet, etc., by arguing strenuously for this part. (See more fully in Century Bible, Ezra, etc., 27 ff.)

4. VERSIONS:

1 Esdras exists in the following ancient versions in addition to the Greek text which may or may not be a translation (see 3 above):

(1) Latin:

(a) Jerome.

(b) Vulgate.

(2) Syriac:

(a) The Peshitta.

The Peshitta, given in Walton's Polyglot and with a critically revised text by Lagarde (Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocrypha Syriace, 1861).

(b) The Hexaplar Syriac version.

For details of manuscripts, etc., see "Literature" below.

5. DATE AND AUTHORSHIP:

Nothing is known or can be conjectured as to the author or translator of 1 Esdras, nor can anything be positively affirmed as to the date. If the work be the genuine Septuagint text this would give it an earlier origin than the view which makes it depend on the Septuagint. But this is to say but little. As Josephus (died 95 AD) used this book it must have been written some years before he wrote his history (say 67 AD). We must assume that it existed some time before the beginning of our era. Ewald, on account of some resemblances to the earliest of the Sibylline Books, dates 1 Esdras about 190 BC. But admitting dependence in this matter — which is doubtful — it is impossible to say which is dependent and which is independent in such cases.

LITERATURE.

The most important books have been named at the end of the general article on APROCRYPHA (which see). Recent contributions by Howarth and Torrey have been mentioned in the course of the foregoing article.

T. Witton Davies

ESDRAS, FOURTH BOOK OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, II, i, 5.

ESDRAS, SECOND BOOK OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, II, i, 5.

ESDRAS, THE SECOND (FOURTH) BOOK OF

Or The Apocalyptic Esdras:

This book was not received by the Council of Trent as canonical, nor has it ever been acknowledged as such by the Anglican church.

1. NAME:

The book is not found in the Septuagint and no complete copy of the Greek text is known, though at one time it did exist. The oldest extant name is "The Prophet Ezra" ([Ἔσδρας ὁ προφήτης, *Esdras ho prophetes*]; see Clement of Alexandria, Strom., iii.16): It has been often called the Latin Esdras because it exists more completely in that language; compare the name Greek Esdras for 1 Esdras.

3 Esdras is the designation in old editions of the Vulgate, 1 Esdras being Ezra and Neh, 2 Esdras denoting what in English is called 1 Esdras. But in editions of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) later than the Council of Trent, and also in Walton's Polyglot, Ezra is called 1 Esdras, Nehemiah, 2 Esdras, 1 Esdras = 3 Esdras, the present book (the Latin Esdras) being known as 4 Esdras. In authorized copies of the Vulgate, i.e. in those commonly used, this book is lacking. On account of its contents, Westcott, following the example of Anastasius Sinaita (bishop of Antioch from 559 AD), called the book the "Apocalypse of Esdras." But as Tischendorf in 1866 edited a later and inferior work with this title the present writer suggests the name "The Apocalyptic Esdras." Of all the Jewish apocalypses this is the sublimest and most pleading.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, II, 1, 5.

2. CONTENTS:

The original work consists of 2 Esdras 3 through 14, chapters 1 f and 15 f being late additions. The entire book of 16 chapters exists in the Latin version only, the other versions containing chapters 3 through 14 only. The real 2nd (apocalyptic) Esdras, consisting of chapters 3 through 14, is made up of 7 visions given to Ezra in exile 30 years after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. The drift of these visions is, How can a just and loving God allow His own people to suffer so much? The problem thus raised is fully and beautifully dealt with. For lack of space the present writer must refer for a fuller analysis to the article *APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE*, I, 5, and the literature there cited. For 2 Esdras 1 ff and 15 ff see under ESDRAS 5 AND 6.

3. LANGUAGE:

Though no complete text even of 2 Esdras 3 through 14 has survived, a careful examination of the Latin shows that it has been made from a Greek original.

(1) Some fragments of the Greek can be traced, as 5:35 in Clement of Alexandria and 8:23 in the Apostolical Constitutions.

(2) The order of the twelve prophets in 1:39 f follows that in the Septuagint.

(3) The Latin version bears throughout clear traces of Greek idiom. Thus the gen. is used with the comparative (5:3; 11:29); we have the genitive (not ablative) absolute in 10:9, the double negative and the use of [de] (Greek [ἀπό, *apo*]) and *ex* (Greek [ἐκ, *ek*]) with the genitive in various parts. But there are cogent reasons for concluding that the Greek version implied in the Latin itself implies a Hebrew original, and the proof is similar to that of a Greek version as the basis of the Latin In the Greek there are idioms which are Hebrew, not Greek, not even in their frequency Hellenistic Greek. The participle used to strengthen the finite verb is the regular Hebrew idiom of the absolute with the finite verb: see 4:2 (excedens excessit); 5:30 (odiens odisti). For other examples see Gunkel (in Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen u. Pseud. des Altes Testament, 332 f); R. H. Charles (Enc Brit, X, 106). Ewald was the first to defend a Hebrew original, but in 1866 he was followed by

his distinguished pupil Wellhausen and also by R. H. Charles (Apoc Bar, lxxii).

4. VERSIONS:

(1) Latin.

The Latin version is far the most important and on it the English Versions of the Bible depends. But all published editions of the Latin text (those of Fabricius, Hilgenfeld, Fritzsche, etc.) go back to one and the same MS, the so-called Codex Sangermanensis (date 822), which omits a large part of the text between 2 Esdras 7:36 and 7:37 Any reader of the English text can see the lack of continuity between these verses. In 1875 Bensly published the missing fragment with an Introduction and critical notes. In 1895 Bensly and James published a critical edition of The Fourth Book of Ezra in Latin, restoring the missing fragment and correcting with the aid of the best-known manuscripts.

(2) Other Versions.

There are Syriac (Peshitta), Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian and yet other VSS, but all depend on the lost Greek except one of the two extant Arabic translations. The number and variety of versions show that 2 Esdras was widely circulated. By the Greek and Latin Fathers it was quoted as a genuine prophetical work. Its importance in the estimation of the medieval Roman church is vouched for by the fact that it has reached us in a number of wellknown manuscripts of the Scriptures, and that it was added to the authorized Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) as an appendix.

5. ORIGIN OF THE BOOK:

Two main views may briefly be noted:

(1) That of Kabisch (Das vierte Buch Esra, 1889) who holds that the editor of the book freely used a goodly number of sources, subtracting, adding and altering to suit his purpose. He gives a list of probable sources. R. H. Charles (Enc Brit, X, 107) is inclined to adopt this analysis.

(2) Gunkel (loc. cit.) maintains and tries to prove that the book is the production of a single writer. Yet he admits that the book contains a large number of inconsistencies which he explains by assuming that the

editor made free use of oral and written traditions. The two views do not therefore stand very far apart, for both take for granted that several sources have been used. It is simply a question of more or less.

Wellhausen is probably right in saying that the author of 2 (4) Esdras had before him the Apocrypha of Baruch, written under the impression awakened by the destruction of Jerusalem in 71 AD.

6. DATE:

The opinion of the best modern scholars is that the book was written somewhere in the East in the last decade of the 1st century of our era. This conclusion rests mainly on the most likely interpretation of the vision of the Eagle and the Lion in 2 Esdras 11:1 through 12:51; but also on the fact that Clement of Alexandria (died 217 AD) quotes the Greek of 5:35.

LITERATURE.

Besides the literature referred to above see Schurer, A Hist of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, iii, 93 ff (Ger. edition 4, III, 315 ff); the articles in HDB (Thackeray) and Encyclopedia Biblica (James); the New Sch-Herz under the word "Pseudepigrapha, Old Testament" (G. Beer), and in the present work under *APOCRYPHA* and *APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE*.

T. Witton Davies

ESDRAS 5 AND 6

(or 4 Ezr): These names have been applied respectively to the first two and the last two chapters of 2 (4) Esdras in the Latin Bible of 1462. In matter these chapters, which are of Christian origin, agree in the main with the genuine parts of 2 (4) Esdras. See foregoing article.

ESDRIS

<ez'-dris>, *<es'-dris>* ([Ἔσδρις, *Esdris*]): A leader mentioned in 2 Macc 12:36 in best texts and adopted in the Revised Version (British and American) for Gorgias of the King James Version. Grotius conjectured "men of Ephron" from 12:27.

ESEBON

<es'-e-bon> (Judith 5:15) = *HESHBON* (Revised Version (British and American)), the chief city of the Ammonites.

ESEBRIAS

<es-e-bri'-as>, *<e-se'-bri-as>*.

See ESEREBIAS; SHEREBIAH.

ESEK

<e'-sek> ([קֶשֶׂע, *eseq*]; Septuagint [Ἀδικία, *Adikia*]): The name given by Isaac to a well dug by his servants, for the use of which the herdsmen of Gerar strove with them — "contention" (Genesis 26:20). It lay in the neighborhood of Rehoboth and Gerar: but the site is not identified.

ESEREBIAS

<es-er-e-bi'-as> ([Ἐσερεβίας, *Eserebias*]): One of the chiefs of the priests (1 Esdras 8:54).

ESHAN

<e'-shan> ([אֶשְׁעָן, *'esh`an*]; [Ἐσάν, *Esan*]; the King James Version Eshean): A town of Judah in the uplands of Hebron (Joshua 15:52). No satisfactory identification has yet been suggested. Some think the name may be a corruption of Beersheba (Encyclopaedia Biblica, which see).

ESHBAAL

<esh'-ba-al>.

See ISHBOSHETH.

ESHBAN

<esh'-ban> ([אֶשְׁבָּן, *'eshban*]; perhaps "thoughtful," "intelligent"; [Ἀσβάν, *Asban*]): Name of a chief of the Horites (Genesis 36:26; 1 Chronicles 1:41).

ESHCOL (1)

<esh'-kol> ([l Kʊ̣ʰ, *'eshkol*], "cluster"; [ʾΕσχώλ, *Eschol*]): The brother of Mamre and Aner, the Amorite allies of Abraham who took part with him in the pursuit and defeat of Chedorlaomer's forces ([01413]Genesis 14:13,14). He lived in the neighborhood of Hebron ([01318]Genesis 13:18), and may have given his name to the valley of Eshcol, which lay a little North of Hebron ([04323]Numbers 13:23).

ESHCOL (2)

<esh'-kol> ([l Kʊ̣ʰ, *'eshkol*]; [Φάραγξ βότρυος, *Pharagx botruos*]), "a cluster of grapes"): The spies came to Hebron "and they came unto the valley of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes" ([04323]Numbers 13:23,14; 32:9; [05124]Deuteronomy 1:24). It was a valley near Hebron rich in vineyards. Fruitful vineyards are still the most characteristic feature of the environs of Hebron, especially on the North. No particular valley can be identified, though popular tradition favors the wide and fertile valley, near the traditional site of "Abraham's oak," a little to the West of the carriage road just before it enters the outskirts of Hebron.

E. W. G. Masterman

ESHEAN

<esh'-e-an>, *<e'-she-an>*.

See *ESHAN.*

ESHEK

<e'-shek> ([qv.[ə`*esheq*], "oppressor"): A descendant of Jonathan, son of Saul, first king of Israel ([13089]1 Chronicles 8:39).

ESHKALONITE

<esh'-ka-lon-it>.

See *ASKELONITE.*

ESHTAOL

<esh'-ta-ol> ([l w∂T∨à, *'eshta'ol*]; [᾽Ασταώλ, *Astaol*]): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named next to Zorah ([06553]Joshua 15:33; 19:41). Between these two cities lay Mahaneh-dan (the camp of Dan) where the Spirit of the Lord began to move Samson ([07325]Judges 13:25), and where he was buried ([07761]Judges 16:31). A contingent from Eshtaol formed part of the 600 Danites who captured Laish ([07782]Judges 18:2,11). It is probably represented by the modern Ashu`a, about a mile and a half East of Zorah, the modern Car`ah.

ESHTAOLITES; ESHTAULITES

<esh'-ta-ol-its>, *<eshta-u'-lits>* ([yl àŪ∨àh; *ha'eshta'uli*], literally, "the Eshtaolite"; the King James Version): Inhabitants of Eshtaol, named among the descendants of Shobal, the son of Caleb ([13253]1 Chronicles 2:53).

ESHTEMOA

<esh-te-mo'-a>, *<esh'-te-mo-a>* ([[ѡ⊙T∨à, *'eshtemoa`*]): A Levitical city in the hill country of Judah ([06214]Joshua 21:14; [13067]1 Chronicles 6:57); Eshtemoh ([hm⊙∨à, *'eshtemoh*], [06550]Joshua 15:50). In Ch 4:17,19, Eshtemoa is said to be a Maacathite and "son" of Ishbah. David after routing the Amalekites sent a present to his friends in (among other places) Eshtemoa ([09028]1 Samuel 30:28). It is now es-Semu`a, a considerable village of evident antiquity some 8 miles South of Hebron.

ESHTEMOH

<esh'-te-mo>.

See *ESHTEMOA.*

ESHTON

<esh'-ton> ([ˆѡᛮ∨à, *'eshton*], "uxorious"): A name found in the genealogical table of Judah ([13042]1 Chronicles 4:12).

ESLI

<es'-li> ([Ἐσλεί, *Eslei*], [Ἐσλί, *Esli*]; probably for Hebrew [אֲצַלְיָהוּ] *'atsalyahu*]): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy, the 10th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Luke 3:25).

ESORA

<e-so'-ra>.

See AESORA.

ESPOUSAL; ESPOUSE

<es-pouz'-al>, *<es-pouz'>*: In the King James Version these words, following English usage of an earlier day, are used to signify either marriage or betrothal, while the American Standard Revised Version discriminates, and uses them only for marriage. For example, in 2 Samuel 3:14, "I espoused to me" (Hebrew *'erasti li*) becomes "I betrothed to me." So also, in Matthew 1:18; Luke 1:27; 2:5 which refer to the relation between Joseph and Mary before the birth of Jesus, "espoused" ([μνηστεύω, *mnesteuo*]) becomes "betrothed." On the other hand, "espoused" is retained in Song 3:11 ("the day of his espousals" — that is, day of marriage); in Jeremiah 2:2 ("the love of thine espousals" — that is, the love of married state); and in 2 Corinthians 11:2 ("I espoused ([ἡρμοσάμην, *hermosamen*]) you to one husband").

E. J. Forrester

ESPY

<es-pi'>: "Espy" in modern English means "to catch sight of," rather than "to explore secretly." the Revised Version (British and American) therefore retains it in Genesis 42:27, "He espied his money" (Hebrew [רָאָה; *ra'ah*], "see"), while in Joshua 14:7 "espy out the land" (the King James Version) becomes "spy out the land." the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "watch" for "espy" in Jeremiah 48:19, and "searched out" for "espied" in Ezekiel 20:6, with a gain in accuracy of rendering (compare the context).

ESRIL

<es'-ril>, <ez'-ril>: the Revised Version (British and American) EZRIL (which see).

ESROM

<es'-rom>, <ez'-rom> ([Ἐσρώμ, *Esrom*]): the King James Version, the Greek form of Hezron (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Matthew 1:3; Luke 3:33).

ESSENES, THE

<es-senz'>, ([Ἐσσηνοί, *Essenoi*], [Ἐσσαῖοι, *Essaioi*]):

When Josephus describes the sects of the Jews, he devotes most of his time and attention to the third of these sects, the Essenes. Strangely enough, although there are frequent references in the New Testament to the other two sects, the Sadducees and Pharisees, no reference has been found to the Essenes. Notwithstanding this silence of the Gospels, the prominence of this third sect is undeniable. Even in Egypt they are known. Philo, the Jewish philosopher, gives an account of these Essenes in terms that, while in the main resembling those used in Josephus, yet differ enough to prove him clearly an independent witness. Another contemporary, Pliny the Naturalist, also mentions these Essenes. Approximately a century later we have a long account of the habits and tenets of these sectaries in Hippolytus' Refutation of All Heresies. A century and a half later still Epiphanius describes these under various titles. Despite the fact that no reference to the Essenes can be found in the Gospels or the Acts, at all events under that name, there can be no doubt of their existence. Would one understand the Palestine in which our Lord's ministry was carried on, he must comprehend the place occupied by the Essenes.

I. THE NAME.

This assumes several forms in different authors — indeed sometimes two forms appear in the same author. Josephus uses most frequently the form of the name which stands at the head of this article, but sometimes he speaks of individuals as "Essaeans" (BJ, II, vii, 3; viii, 4). This latter form is that preferred by Philo, a form that is adopted by Hegesippus as quoted by Eusebius, IV, 22. Pliny in his Natural History, v.15 writes "Essaeans."

Hippolytus also has "Essenus." Epiphanius has mixed his information so that this sect appears with him under several names as "Ossaei" and "Jessaei."

Forms It Assumes — Etymology, Origin:

It is clear that the name is not primarily Greek — it has passed into Greek from another tongue, since none of the forms has any easy derivation in Greek. Notwithstanding, there have been attempts to derive it from some Greek root, but all are preposterous as etymologies. The etymology must be sought either in Hebrew or its cognate, Aramaic The usage in regard to the translation of proper names is our only guide. Reasoning from the practice as seen in the Greek translation of the Scriptures and in Josephus, we can deduce that the first letter of the original word must have been one of the gutturals אה‎ח ע. That the second letter was a sibilant is certain, and the last was probably אי, for the final "n" in the common form of the name is due to the desire to render the word suitable for Greek accidence. We may say that to us the two most likely derivations are [עשׂע, *`asiya'*], "doers" or [אסיא, *'aciya'*], "healers." Our preference is for the latter, as one of the characteristics of the Essenes dwelt upon by Josephus is the fact that they were healers by means of herbs and incantations (BJ, II, viii, 6). This view is held by the great mass of investigators, as Bellerman, Gfrorer, Hamburger, Herzfeld, Dahm, etc. The name "Therapeutae" given by Philo to the kindred sect in Egypt supports this etymology, as it would be in one of its senses a translation of it. Lightfoot's objection that it is improbable that the ordinary name of the sect "should have been derived from a pursuit which was merely secondary and incidental" does not follow analogy. The term "Methodist" was derived from a purely temporary characteristic of the society that gathered round Wesley. The extreme probability, from the fact that the name is not found in the New Testament, is that it was the nature of a nickname, like "Quakers" applied to the Society of Friends. The multitude that followed Our Lord affords evidence of the influence that a reputation for healing gave to one.

II. THE AUTHORITIES FOR THE TENETS OF THE ESSENES.

Philo and Josephus, as contemporaries and Jews, are necessarily our principal sources of information.

Next is Pliny, though a contemporary of the sect, yet as a Roman, of necessity receiving his information secondhand. There is next in point of date Hippolytus in his work Refutation of All Heresies, written more than a century after the fall of the Jewish state and the disappearance of the Essenes. One point in his favor as an authority is his habit of quoting from sources that would be reckoned good even now. He seems to have founded to some extent on Josephus, but he appears to have made use of some other source or sources as well. Slightly later is Porphyry. He avowedly draws all his information from Josephus The latest of the ancients who may be reckoned as authorities is Epiphanius. Writing in the 4th century, and naturally of a somewhat confused intellect, any statement of his unsupported by other authority is to be received with caution.

1. Philo:

In estimating the evidence that Philo gives concerning the Essenes, we must remember that he was living in Alexandria, not shut up in a Ghetto, but mingling to some extent with the scholars and philosophers of that city. The Jewish community there appears to have been more completely Hellenized than any other assemblage of Jews. The object of Philo's numerous works seems to have been the twofold one of commending Jewish religious thought to the Greek philosophic society in which he mingled, and of commending Greek philosophy to his Jewish kinsmen. The geographic distance from Palestine may be to some degree neglected from the frequent communications between it and Egypt. The work in which Philo devotes most attention to the Essenes is his early work, Quod Omnis Probus Liber, "that every good man is free." This treatise is intended for a Gentile audience — the "Lawgiver of the Jews" is introduced casually first, and then more emphatically, till he is named. The Essenes are brought forward as the very flower and perfection of Mosaism.

(1) **Description from Quod Omnis Probus Liber.**

"There is a portion of that people called Essenes — over four thousand in my opinion. They are above all servants (*therapeutai*) of God. They do not sacrifice animals but study to preserve the sanctity of life. They live in villages, avoiding all cities on account of the lawlessness of those that inhabit them. Some of these men cultivate the soil, others live by peaceful arts and so benefit themselves and all their neighbors. They do not lay up treasures of gold or silver for themselves, judging contentment and

frugality the great riches. With them are no makers of arms or of military engines and no one is occupied with anything connected with war. They all avoid commerce and navigation, thinking that these employments make for covetousness. They possess no slaves, holding all men to be free and all are expected to aid one another as real (*gnesiois*) brethren. They devote their attention to the moral part of philosophy — to the neglect of logic — using, as instructors, the laws of their country which it would have been impossible for the human mind to devise save by Divine inspiration. They abstain from all work on the seventh day, which they look on as sacred. On it they assemble in sacred buildings which are called synagogues and, seated in order according to age, they hear the Scriptures (tas biblous) read and expounded. They are thus taught to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong. They use a threefold criterion — love of God, love of virtue, love of man. They carefully avoid oaths and falsehood — they regard God as the author of all good. They all dwell in companies, so that no one has a dwelling absolutely his own. They have everything in common, their expenses, their garments, their food. When they work for wages they do not retain these for themselves, but bring it into the common stock. The sick are not neglected when they are unable to contribute to the common store. They respect their seniors as if they were their parents. Such men never can be enslaved. As a proof of this none of the many oppressors of their land were able to bring any accusation against the Holy Essenes."

The above is a very much condensed summary of the passage on the Essenes in Philo, QOPL. No one can fail to be struck with the resemblance all this has in the first place to the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount and the practice of the early church. Although celibacy is not mentioned it is implied in the picture here presented of the Essenes.

There is another account in a passage quoted from Philo by Eusebius, Preparatio Evangelica, VIII, 11:

(2) **Description from Quotation in Eusebius, Preposition Evang.**

"Our lawgiver trained (eleipsen, "anointed") ten thousands of his followers and formed them into a community called Essenes from their holiness. They dwell as numerous communities in many cities and villages of Judea." It will be observed that this contradicts the statement above that there were only 4,000 Essenes and that they avoided cities. "This sect is not

hereditary. There are no children nor youths among the Essenes as such persons are unstable. No one among them has property of his own. They regard all possessions as part of a common stock. They all dwell in the same place, forming themselves into clubs and societies. They do everything for the benefit of the whole society, but different members take up different employments, laboring ceaselessly despite cold or heat. Before sunrise they go to their work and do not quit it till sunset. Some are tillers of the soil, some shepherds, some tend bees, some are artisans. These men when they have received their wages give them up to the general manager who purchases what is necessary. Those who live together eat at the same table day after day. Their dress also is common. In winter they have thick cloaks, in summer light mantles. Each takes what he wants. When anyone falls sick he is cured from their common resources. Old men, even if they happen to be childless, are as if they had a numerous offspring of affectionate children. They repudiate marriage because they look on woman as a selfish creature and specially addicted to jealousy and hypocrisy, thus likely to dissolve their brotherhood. A man bound to a woman is hampered by his affection, is no longer a free man but a slave" (compare ◁᷁᷄▷1 Corinthians 7:1. Paul mentions the same difficulties in regard to wedlock).

(3) **Description of Therapeutae from Deuteronomy Vita Contemplativa:**

In his Treatise Deuteronomy Vita Contemplativa Philo, commencing with a reference to the Essenes, passes on to describe a similar class of coenobites who have their settlements near the Moerotic Lake. These he calls Therapeutae, or in the feminine, Therapeutrides, a title which he interprets as "healers." While there are many points of resemblance, there are also not a few features of difference. We shall give as full an extract as in the previous instances.

It is related that they have separate houses and only come together for worship or for feasts. They have parallel societies for men and for women. As in the case of the Essenes there is a reading of ancient sacred books and an exposition of the passage read. The name Therapeutae, with the explanation of the name given by Philo, affords a link, as said above, with the Essenes, if the etymology of their name which we have seen reason to prefer be the true one. There seems also to be some connection between these Jewish monks and the Christian monks of some three centuries later. It ought to be remarked that many suspicions have been thrown on the

authenticity of Deuteronomy Vita Contemplativa. Although critical names of authority may be named on that side, yet it may be doubted whether the reasons are sufficient. Lucius, who is the main opponent, does so mainly to invalidate the existence of the Therapeutae. He thinks Deuteronomy Vita Contemplativa was composed by a Christian to give an antiquity to the Christian monks. To prove a practice to have been Jewish would be far from commending it to Christians. But more, the resemblance to the Christian monks, although close on some points, in others of importance the difference is equally prominent. While the common feast suggests the Agapae of the early church, we must remember that this was not a monastic peculiarity. The fact that a female community existed alongside of the male and joined with them in worship is out of harmony with what we know of early monasticism. The feast of the 50th day has no parallel in Christianity.

2. Josephus:

Like Philo, Josephus wrote for a non-Jewish audience. In Rome the philosophic ideas held in the Hellenic world were prevalent, so he, as much as Philo, had a temptation to be silent on any subject which might shock the sensibilities or provoke the ridicule of his masters. In particular, in describing the habits and tenets of the Essenes, for whom he professed so high an admiration, he would need to be specially careful to avoid causes of offense, as in such a case he would be liable to be involved in their condemnation. In dealing with the notices he gives of the Essenes we would consider the descriptions at length first, and then the incidental notices of individual Essenes.

(1) **Description from Antiquities of the Jews, XVIII, i, 5**

The description which comes earliest in history — not, however, the earliest written — is in Antiquities of the Jews, XVIII, in connection with the census and survey under Quirinius (Cyrenius) and the resistance to it by Judas of Gamala.

He there (Ant., XVIII, i, 5) begins by referring to their theological position, that they believed in the most absolute preordination. They teach the immortality of souls and a state of rewards and punishments. Although they dedicated gifts to the temple they offered no sacrifices, presumably bloody sacrifices, as they have offerings of their own. A singular statement is made that "they are on this account excluded from the common court"

(*koinou temenismatos*). They occupy themselves with husbandry. "They excel in justice all other men." They have all things in common. They neither marry wives nor keep slaves. He says, as does Philo, that they number over four thousand men. They appoint "good men priests who should receive the fruits of their labor for the sake of corn and food."

(2) Description from Wars of the Jews, II, viii, 2-13

A much fuller account is found in the earlier written treatise on the Wars of the Jews, II, viii, 3. In this work he emphasizes the ascetic side of Essenism.

"The Essenes," he says, "reject pleasures as vice. They despise marriage though they do not absolutely repudiate it, but are suspicious of women. They despise riches and have all things in common. They think oil a defilement. They wear white garments. They elect overseers (*epimeletai*) to manage their common affairs, much as the Christian bishops did those of the churches under them. They have no one city but many of them dwell in every city." It may be observed that this statement is a contradiction of Philo's statement and that of Josephus himself above, that they were only 4,000. "When any of them go from one city to another they find the houses of those of their sect open to them as if they were their own." It is probable that as the apostles, when sent out by our Lord to preach, were on entering a city to ask who in it was worthy, the traveling Essenes would inquire who in it were Essenes. Like the apostles they took nothing with them when they traveled save weapons for defense against robbers, just as the apostles had at the time of the Last Supper two swords with which they had likely provided themselves for similar reasons. "They get up before sunrise and offer up prayers which they have received from their ancestors. They are then dismissed to their several employments to the fifth hour, they bathe in cold water, put on white linen garments and enter the refectory as if into a temple. Food is set before each." Much like the Christian grace before meat, a priest offers up prayer. Again, as grace after meat, when the meal is finished the priest again prays. "Both before and after their refection they sing praise to God. As Christ commanded His disciples and said, `Swear not at all,' they avoid oaths, indeed esteem them worse than perjury. New members were admitted to the society by baptism, and oaths were laid upon them that they were to be submissive to those in authority in the society. They were to keep the doctrines of the sect secret. They kept the Sabbath with greater strictness than did any other section of the

Jews. Heinous sins were punished by expulsion from the order which, as they felt their oaths still binding on them, amounted to death. Judicial sentences are arrived at with the utmost care; decisions are come to by an assembly of not less than a hundred who are chosen to be judges. When once the sentence has been pronounced it stands fixed. They regard the bodies as corruptible but the souls are immortal. They believe in a Paradise resembling the Islands of the Blest." One thing is to be observed: "they are bound by oath to preserve the sacred books of their sect, ta haireseos auton biblia, and the names of the angels." They utter predictions by means of their sacred books, which predictions are generally fulfilled. There is, however, another sort of Essenes who do not avoid marriage.

The philosopher Porphyry mentions that Josephus had an account of the Essenes in the second book against the Gentiles. If this means Contra Apienem, no such passage is to be found in that work now. It may, however, be some work of Josephus which has not come down to us, which Porphyry has misnamed, though this is unlikely.

(3) **Incidental Notices:**

This is not, however, the whole of the information concerning the Essenes which we can gather from Josephus. The earliest of these incidental notices occurs under the reign of Jonathan (Ant., XIII, v, 9), when the historian mentions the three sects of the Jews, when the only peculiarity he assigns to the Essenes is that they believe that everything happens according to fate. Next, in relating the fate of Antigenus, he tells how Judas, an Essene teaching in the temple, when he saw Antigonus, declared that he was proved a false prophet, as he had foretold that Antigonus was to die that day at Struto's tower (Caesarea), and he was now six hundred furlongs off from there. Here the statement that the Essenes were excluded from the temple seems directly contradicted. In the days of Herod (XV, x, 4,5) Josephus relates that while Herod demanded oaths of submission from others he excused the Essenes, from the favor he had to them on account of one Menahem, a member of this sect, who foretold his reign. This Essene seems to have been about the court and to have nothing of the coenobitic agriculturist about him. The Essenian fame for prediction and the interpretation of dreams is related in regard to Archelaus, the son of Herod (BJ, II, vii, 3). Archelaus had a dream, and applied to an Essene, Simon or Simeon, who foretold the end of his reign. In singular contrast to what had been said by Philo of the objection the Essenes had in regard to

everything connected with war, one of the leading generals of the Jews when they rebelled against the Romans was John the Essene, who was made governor of certain toparchies in the North (BJ, II, xx, 4). He was killed in the battle near Ascalon with which the war began, which ended in the capture of Jerusalem by Titus (BJ, III, ii, 1). There is also mention of a gate of the Essenes in Jerusalem, which seems to imply that a number of them permanently resided there.

3. Pliny:

Pliny speaks of the Essenes in his Natural History (v.17) in somewhat rhetorical terms. They dwell on the west side of the Dead Sea — "a wonderful race without women, without money, associates of the palms." They are recruited by those wearied of life, broken in fortunes. "Thus a race is eternal through thousands of ages (seculorum) in which no one is born; so fruitful to them is repentance of life in others." He refers to the fertility of Engedi and adds, "now burned up."

4. Hegesippus:

There is an enigmatical passage quoted by Eusebius from Hegesippus in which the Essaeans (Essenes), the Galileans, Hemerobaptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans and Pharisees are declared to hold different opinions about circumcision among the sons of Israel "against the tribe of Judah and of Christ" (kata tes phules Iouda kai Christou).

5. Porphyry:

Porphyry's note regarding the Essenes is simply taken from Josephus

6. Hippolytus: — Uses Josephus, but to Some Extent Independent

In the great work of the mysterious bishop, Hippolytus, discovered some sixty years ago, there is a description of the Essenes. Although the work is a Refutation of All Heresies, implying that the opinions maintained were erroneous and required to be refuted, the author does nothing to exhibit the erroneousness of the Essene tenets or habits. In regard to the Gnostic heresies Hippolytus endeavored to reach original sources; presumably he did so in the present case. Although there is no doubt of his indebtedness to Josephus, yet for the features where he differs from Josephus, or supplements him, we may assume that he has behind his statements some authority which he regarded as valid. In some cases there may be a

suspicion that in his eagerness to show that certain heresies were derived from this or that heathen philosophical system he has modified the heresy to suit the derivation he has supposed. This, however, does not apply to the Essenes.

In the ninth book of his Refutation of All Heresies, Hippolytus takes up Jewish sects (*haireseis*) which, following Josephus, he reckons as three. The first he discusses is the Essenes. They are very devotional and temperate and eschew matrimony. They despise wealth, and from sharing with the destitute they do not turn away (compare Matthew 5:42; the verb used is the same). Anyone joining the sect must sell all that he has (compare Matthew 19:21; the same words are used in Acts 4:32,37). Overseers *epimeletai* are chosen by show of hands *cheirotonein* (Acts 14:23). They do not stay in one city but many settle in every city. They dress always in white, but do not own two cloaks or two pairs of shoes, much as our Lord's instructions to His apostles when He sent them out two and two (Matthew 10:10). Their daily course of conduct is described very much in the same terms as those used by Josephus Before dawn they begin their day by prayer and singing a hymn. They return from their work before midday, at the fifth hour, and bathemselves in cold water and clothemselves in garments of white linen. After that they repair into the common apartment. They seat themselves in silence; the cook places food before each individual. The priest prays and pronounces a blessing on the food. At the end of the meal the priest again prays, and those who have partaken join in singing a hymn of thanksgiving. They lay aside their white linen garments, and resume their ordinary clothing and betake themselves again to their occupations. Supper at sunset is conducted in a similar manner. All obey the president (*proestos*) in whatever he enjoins. No one amongst them is in the habit of swearing. They are careful to read the law and the prophets. Other works of faithful men they also study. All that join the sect are put on probation. The entrant receives a white robe and a linen girdle, and is supplied with an axe for the purposes mentioned in Deuteronomy 23:13. He has to take solemn oaths to worship God, to be just, not to hate anyone who injures him, but to pray for him (compare Matthew 5:44). He promises also to show respect to all in authority, as all authority is from God (1 Peter 2:13). He is not to divulge the secret doctrines of the society. There follows a description of the fate of those expelled from the society and the mode of conducting trials, borrowed from Josephus Hippolytus proceeds to give an account of four different

subsects of the Essenes, all seeming of more than even the wonted fanaticism of the Essenes. One sect would not use coins because of the image of the Emperor on them, inasmuch as this was of the nature of idolatry. Others were prepared to enforce circumcision at the point of the sword. According to Hippolytus the Zealots were Essenes. Later he mentions the class that were freer and did not abjure marriage. A very marked point of difference between the tenets of the Essenes, as described by Philo and Josephus, and those attributed to them by Hippolytus, is in regard to the doctrine of the resurrection. Hippolytus affirms that they did believe in the resurrection of the body. The others, while not in terms denying that they did believe in it, ignore it in such a way as might lead the reader, as indeed it did Bishop Lightfoot, to think that they denied it altogether. The treatment Paul received at Athens when he preached the resurrection showed how incongruous this doctrine seemed to the Greeks. Philo and Josephus wrote for Greek audiences — for the Romans, so far as culture went, were Greeks — and had to consider their taste. Another point held in abeyance by both those writers was the Messianic hopes that we know from the New Testament were so prevalent. Hippolytus says "all sections look for the Messiah," but held that He was to be merely man born in the ordinary way. The reason of Philo's silence and that of Josephus is easily understood. They had commended the Essenes so highly; if they mentioned that they had treasonable hopes of a Messiah who should rule the world, their own personal loyalty would become doubtful. For our part we should regard all the positive elements in Hippolytus' description as worthy of acceptance.

7. Epiphanius — Confused Account:

The last authority to whom we would refer is Epiphanius. In his anxiety to make up the number of heresies, the Essenes figure repeatedly under different names. He declares the Essenes to be a sect of the Samaritans closely associated with the Sebuans and Gortheni. Among the Jews he has three sects whom he calls Hemerobaptistae, Nazaraei and Osseni. Besides he has a sect called Sampseans, evidently also Essenes, which he mixes up with the followers of Elkaisa. He does not seem to have any clear idea about their tenets or habits. The Samaritan sects differ about the three Jewish feasts, but he does not make it clear in what they differ. The Sebuans seem to have reversed the order of the Jewish feasts, but whether the Essenes and Gortheni did so likewise is not clear. That the Essenes whom we are considering were not Samaritans appears to be as certain as

anything about this enigmatic sect can be. The obscure sentence quoted by Eusebius from Hegesippus might be interpreted as supporting this statement of Epiphanius, but it is too enigmatic to be pressed. As to the three Jewish sects the first named — Hemerobaptistae — suits the daily washings of the Essenes, but he asserts that they agree with the Sadducees in denying the resurrection. The Nazareans or Nazarenes are not to be confounded with a Christian sect of nearly the same name. They resided in the district East of Jordan. They held with the Jews in all their customs, believing in the patriarchs, but did not receive the Pentateuch, though they acknowledged Moses. The Osseni are the likest to the Essenes, as they are said to dwell near the Dead Sea, only it is on the side opposite to Engedi. Epiphanius leaves them to denounce Elxai and his brother Jexais, of which latter nothing further is known.

III. DEDUCTIONS AND COMBINATIONS.

From the characteristics so many, so confusing, indeed, in some respects so contradictory, it is difficult to get a consistent picture. They are said to be only four thousand, yet they are many ten thousands. They reside in Engedi, a company of coenobites. They dwell in villages and avoid towns, yet they dwell many in every city and in populous communities. They avoid everything connected with war, yet one of their number is one of the trusted generals of the Jews in their rebellion against the Romans. They keep away from the Temple, yet one of them, Judas, is teaching in the Temple when he sees Antigonus, whose death he had foretold. The only way in which any consistency can be brought into these accounts is by taking advantage of what Josephus and Hippolytus say about the subsections into which the Essenes were distinguished.

A parallel the present writer has elsewhere used of the Methodists is illuminative. While the most prominent body of Methodists are Arminians, there are the Calvinistic Methodists. While Wesleyan Methodists do not allow women to preach, the Primitive Methodists do. This is so far confirmed by the fact that while the abjuring of marriage is a marked feature in the representation of Philo, yet the latter says that one class of the Essenes not only do not themselves oppose matrimony but regard those that do oppose it as enemies of the human race. The residents in Engedi formed but a small proportion of the Essenes. It is probable that of them the statement, found alike in Philo and Josephus, that they were 4,000, applies. All the features of the picture of the daily common meals, rising

before sunrise, joint devotions, may be true in their fullness only of the community by the Dead Sea. What Philo says (quoted by Eusebius, Preposition Evan., VIII, 11), that among the Essenes "there are no youths or persons just entering on manhood, only men already declining towards old age," would indicate that the settlement at Engedi was an asylum for those who, having borne the burden and heat of the day, now retired to enjoy repose.

1. Government:

They had communities apparently all over Palestine, if not also beyond its bounds, over each of which there was a president appointed (Hip., IX, 15). This would mean that in towns of any size they would have a synagogue. They appear to have had houses of call, though it may have been that every member of the Essene community kept open house for all members of their sect who might be traveling. The traveler, when he came to a city, would inquire for any that were Essenes, as the apostles were commanded by their Lord, in similar circumstances, to inquire ("search out") who in a city were "worthy." The common meals might to some extent be observed in these different scattered communities, probably at intervals, not daily as at Engedi. At these the secret sacred books, read and studied with so great regularity at Engedi, would also be read. In this synagogue not only would the canonical books be preserved but also those other books which gave them the names of the angels, as now in the synagogues of Palestine the library preserved in the synagogue may be used by those connected with it throughout the week. The head of the community at Engedi might have some suzerainty over all the different communities, but in regard to this we have no information. One external feature which would at once make the Essenes known to each other was the fact that they always dressed in white linen. They had priests probably in every one of their communities. The Jewish exorcists in Ephesus, in whom Bishop Lightfoot (Col, 93) recognizes Essenes, were the sons of one Sceva, a high priest (*archiereus*, ⁴⁴¹⁹¹⁴Acts 19:14). The high-priesthood was evidently not connected with the temple at Jerusalem, for no such name appears in the list of high priests. It thus most probably was an Essenian high-priesthood.

2. Doctrines:

In regard to their tenets, their belief in the absolute preordination by God of everything appears the feature in the doctrinal position which most

appealed to Josephus Hippolytus affirms in terms their belief in the resurrection of the body. This point, as above noted, Philo and Josephus ignore. The passage in Hippolytus is the more striking from the fact that the latter portion so closely resembles the parallel passage in Josephus. Josephus as we have suggested above, avoided crediting the Essenes with belief in resurrection because of the ridicule to which it would expose not only the Essenes, his proteges, but also himself. Hippolytus, writing with information other than what might be got from Josephus or Philo and as, writing for Christian readers, without the fear of ridicule, in regard to the resurrection of the body, boldly and in terms ascribes that doctrine to them. The silence of our two main witnesses as to the Essenes cherishing any Messianic hopes cannot be pressed, as their silence may be explained as above mentioned by fear of the suspicions of Rome in regard to any such hopes. The statement of Hippolytus that all the Jews had these expectations may be said to cover this case. The abjuring of marriage and the shunning of everything connected with war seem to be prominent opinions in some sections of the Essenes, but not held by others.

IV. HISTORY AND ORIGIN.

There is much in Essenism that is difficult to understand. We have seen contradictory features assigned to the Essenes by different authorities; but even in the case of those features concerning which there is least dubiety the new difficulty emerges as to how it appeared as a characteristic of a Jewish sect. This is especially the case in regard to abstinence from marriage. Easterners always have an earnest desire to have sons to keep their memory green, for on a death many of them had and still have ceremonies which only the son of the dead can perform. Yet despite this they avoided marriage. The Jews with their Messianic hopes desired children, as no one knew but that his child might prove the child of promise, the Christ of God.

1. Essenes and Chasidhim:

The earliest note of the existence of the Essenes, as of the Pharisees and Sadducees, is under the pontificate of Jonathan, the successor of Judas Maccabeus (Ant., XIII, v, 9). Josephus says "at this time there were three sects of the Jews," and proceeds to name them. If this, however, were precisely true, it is singular that there is no mention of any of these sects in either of the books of the Maccabees. The only sect named is the

Hasideans (*chacidhim*) who are called (1 Macc 2:42) "mighty men of Israel, every one that offered himself willingly for the law" (the King James Version "voluntarily devoted himself to the law"; Greek *hekousiazomenos*). These again are not mentioned by Josephus The meaning of the word is "saints," and in this sense it appears frequently in the Psalms. A parallel in modern history to their warlike activity and their claim to saintliness may be found in the Cameronians of "society folk" in Scotland toward the end of the 17th century. They were Peden's "praying folk," yet they fought and won battles. When William of Orange came they formed the Cameronian regiment which helped to quell the clans and checked their advance after Killiecrankie. Some have identified these Hasideans with the Pharisees (as W. Robertson Smith, article "Assidaeans," Encyclopedia Biblica, and others). Hitzig would regard their successors as the Essenes. The great resemblance there was between the Pharisees and the Essenes renders it not improbable that originally they were really one sect and split off. If Josephus is to be trusted this division must have occurred, if not before the Maccabean struggle, at least early during its continuance. The Saducean authors of 1 Maccabees may have grouped them together. According to Josephus, John Hyrcanus was a Pharisee, from which it may be presumed that Judas Maccabeus and his brethren belonged to the same sect of the Jews. The Assideans deserted Maccabeus, so that it would seem at least possible that by that time the separation had become complete, so that the Hasideans are now to be regarded as Essenes. It would seem as if they deserted the Maccabeans when they — the Maccabeans — made alliances with heathen powers like Rome. Then they objected to the high-priestly family being passed over for the Hasmoneans, hence their foolish surrender to Bacchides because Alcimus (called by Josephus Jacimus = Jehoiakim) was with him, a descendant of the race of the high priests. All this is utterly unlike the quiet contemplative lives of the coenobites in Engedi. It would seem that the thousand who died in the wilderness themselves, their wives, their children and their cattle (1 Macc 1:29-38), were more like the inhabitants of Engedi. Before leaving the Hasideans it must be said that the representation of the connection of the Hasideans with Judas Maccabeus put in the mouth of Alcimus by the writer of 2 Macc 14:6 is not trustworthy. After this desertion of the Maccabeans the more religious of them retired to Engedi, while the rest of the party were scattered over the country in the various cities and villages.

2. Position of Essenes in Josephus:

As above mentioned the earliest mention of Essenes is by Josephus (Ant., XIII, v, 9) while Jonathan was high priest. The next is the story of Judas the Essene seated in the Temple surrounded by his scholars "who attended him (*paremenon*) in order to learn the art of foretelling," thinking that the appearance of Antigonus in the Temple courts proved his prophecy false that he was that day to die in Strato's tower (Caesarea). Judas is evidently a resident in Jerusalem and meets his pupils in the Temple courts. This would imply that he had no horror of the Temple nor was debarred from its courts. He had no repugnance for residence in cities. Menahem, the next figure that presents itself, shows a man who is mingling in court circles. He inflicts on Herod, the son of the favorite counselor of the high priest, a playful domestic chastisement and prophesies his future greatness. Herod, as we are told, always favored the Essenes in consequence. Later Archelaus consults Simon or Simeon, an Essene, as to the interpretation of a dream. He is at all events resident in Jerusalem and known in the court circles. He may have been Simeon of Luke 2:25-35. It must, however, be observed that the name is one of the commonest among the Jews at that time. After this they disappear, unless Hippolytus' identification of the Zealots with a section of the Essenes is admitted. Those in Engedi were aside from the course of the war, though if Pliny's representation is to be taken as accurate the vines and palm trees of Engedi had been burned and the settlement had been rendered desolate. They may have betaken themselves to Pella like the Christians, so as not to be involved in the destruction of the city and the Temple. The communities of the sect in Asia Minor disappear also. To all appearance they are absorbed in the church.

3. Doctrinal Affinities:

Owing to the fact that so many of the doctrines and practices attributed to the Essenes have no resemblance to anything else in Judaism the question of origin has a special meaning in regard to them. Although like all Easterners the Jews have a desire for progeny — indeed the man who has no child occupies a secondary place in social esteem — yet the Essenes, or at all events some of them, shunned marriage. Despite the elaborate system of animal sacrifices that claimed to originate with Moses whom they venerated, they abjured bloody sacrifices. Although the seed of Aaron were anointed priests, they set up priests of their own. Their habit of morning and evening prayer, timed by the rising and setting of the sun, suggested

sun-worship. The external resemblance of these tenets of the Essenes to those of the Pythagoreans impressed Josephus, and was emphasized by him all the more readily, since thus he brought himself and his nation into line with Greek thought. This suggestion of Josephus has led some, e.g. Zeller, to the deduction that they were Jewish neo-Pythagoreans. The features of resemblance are formidable when drawn out in catalogue. He shows (Philos. der Griechen, I. Theil, II, 239-92) that like the Pythagoreans the Essenes regarded asceticism a means of holiness. Both abstained from animal food and bloody sacrifices, admired celibacy and, dressing in white linen garments, had frequent washings. Both prohibited oaths; both formed a corporate body into which admission was had by act of initiation and after probation. Community of goods was the custom in both. Both believed in transmigration of souls. The value of this formidable list is lessened by the fact that there is something of uncertainty on both sides as to the precise views and customs. Philo and Josephus unquestionably Hellenized the views of the Essenes when they presented them before readers educated in Greek culture; further the views of Pythagoras have come down to us in a confused shape.

4. Essenes and Pythagoras:

As to the assertion that the Pythagoreans dressed in white linen, Diogenes Laertius says that linen was not yet invented. Zeller has no sufficient evidence that the Essenes avoided the flesh of animals as food, and Diogenes Laertius expressly says that Pythagoras ate fish, though rarely (VIII, 18). While there seems no doubt as to the Pythagorean belief in the transmigration of souls, it seems certain that this was not a doctrine of the Essenes. Neither Philo nor Josephus attribute this view to them. This is the more striking that, immediately after dealing with the Essenes, Josephus proceeds to take up the doctrines of the Pharisees to whom he does attribute that view. Moreover the distinctive views of the Pythagoreans as to numbers and music have no sign of being held by the Essenes. On the other hand the fact that Pythagoras had a wife seems to throw doubt on their alleged preference for celibacy. Another chronological difficulty has to be met. The Pythagoreans as a society were put down in the 5th century before Christ. They may be regarded as having disappeared, till in the 2nd century AD they reappear as prominent neo-Pythagoreans. It is true that Cicero and Seneca mention Pythagoreans, but only as individuals who would claim to be the followers of Pythagoras, and not as members of a sect: they were without influence even in Italy.

5. Buddhism and Essenism:

Chronology is equally against the view favored by Hilgenfeld that the influence of Buddhism may be traced in Essenism. As late as the end of the 2nd century AD, Clement of Alexandria, although acquainted with the name Buddha, is ignorant of his tenets and of divisions of his followers. The Alexandria which Hilgenfeld identified with Alexandria of Egypt, in which there was a Buddhist settlement, was really to be found in Bactria, where a Buddhist settlement was likely.

6. Parseeism and Essenism:

There is more to be alleged in favor of Parsee influence being traceable. Neither geography nor chronology protests against this influence. The Jews were for centuries under the domination of the Persians, who were followers of Zoroaster. They seem on the whole to have been favored by the Persian rulers, a state of matters that would make the Jews all the more ready to view with sympathy the opinions and religion of these masters. Moreover the Persian worship had spread away to the west, far beyond Syria. At the same time it is easy to exaggerate the points of resemblance. The dualism alleged to be a leading feature in Essenism is more a matter of deduction than of distinct statement. Indeed the proofs alleged by Zeller are almost ludicrous in their insufficiency, since Philo says that the Essenes shun marriage because women are selfish (*philautos*), and Josephus, that they do so because women are addicted to excess (*aselgeia*); that therefore they regard the female generally as under the dominion of the evil principle, the fact being that this is really a part of the Hellenizing which the Essene views underwent at the hands of Philo and Josephus. The alleged sun-worship is scarcely more worthy of credit: it is a deduction not even plausible. When carefully looked at the evidence points the other way. Their first prayer is offered not at sunrise but before it (BJ, II, viii, 5); in other words, they work while it is day. Their evening orisons are offered after the sun has set. At the same time their elaborate angelology seems to be due to the influence of the Zend-Avesta, but in this the Essenes merely shared with the rest of the Jews. We know that the Jews brought the names of the angels with them from Babylon.

7. Essenism Mainly Jewish:

The most singular feature in Essenism is really a feature of Judaism emphasized out of proportion. It was unlike the Jews to shun marriage, yet

in seasons when special holiness was required intercourse between the sexes was forbidden (Exodus 19:15; 1 Samuel 21:5). The whole act of sexual intercourse was regarded as unclean (Leviticus 15:16-18). In the Pauline Epistles uncleanness is used as equivalent to fornication (Romans 1:24; 6:19, etc.). So also in 2 Peter 2:10. Such a view naturally led to the idea which soon became regnant in Christianity that the state of virginity was one of special sanctity (Revelation 14:4). The respect they gave to the unmarried state may be exaggerated. If Philo's representation (quoted in Euseb., Preposition Evan., VIII, 11) be correct, men were not admitted until maturity was attained and passed, when, therefore, such desires had begun to die down. Their avoidance of marriage is a matter of less importance. Their extreme reverence for the Sabath is of a piece with their celibacy. Their avoidance of the Temple sacrifices, so far as they did so, may well be due to something of more than contempt for the religion of the Sadducean high-priestly party. Moreover the long residence of Israel in Babylon, when the Temple worship had to be in abeyance, and the consequent prevalence of synagogue worship, tended to lessen the importance of the sacrifices of the Temple. Thus it would seem that the Essenes were really a Jewish sect that had retained more of the Zoroastrian elements than had the rest of the Jews.

V. RELATION TO THE APOCALYPTIC BOOKS.

Among the features of Essenism which seem to have impressed Josephus most was the fact that they had sacred books of their sect which they preserved, as also the names of the angels, thus bringing the Essenian special books into connection with angelology. These books their proselytes were bound by oath to preserve (BJ, II, viii, 7). Concerning the kindred sect of the Therapeutae, Philo says, "They have also writings of ancient men" (Deuteronomy Vita Contemp., III). On the other hand we have a mass of writings the same in character, dependent on one another, all apparently proceeding from one school of Jewish thought. Of the three sects of the Jews from which alone they could have proceeded the Sadducees are excluded because, while the apocalyptic books are full of angels, they believe neither in angel nor spirit (Acts 23:8). While doctrinally the Pharisees might suit, the fact that practically there is no reference to any of these books in the Talmud, which proceeded from the Pharisaic school, renders them unlikely to have been the authors. The Essenes seem to us to have been the school from which these apocalyptic works proceeded. The sect, at the fall of the Jewish state, disappeared in

Christianity, and in the Christian church these books are preserved.

1. Reasons for Holding the Essenes to Be the Writers of the Apocalypses:

The section of the Essenes who dwelt as coenobites beside the Dead Sea were in circumstances specially liable to see visions and to have distorted views of morality, so that the composition of pseudonymous writings, literary forgeries, might seem right. As seen in the study of the apocalyptic books there is the undue prominence given to sexual sin — a prominence that seems to be symptomatic of the unhealthy mental state engendered by celibacy. These writings are the product of a school that professed to have secret sacred books. In 2 (4) Esdras 14:45,46 we have an account of how, while 24 of the sacred books were published to the multitude, 70 were retained for the "worthy," that is, for some inner circle, some brotherhood like the Essenes. In the Assumption of Moses, Joshua is commanded to place the revelations given him "in certain vessels and anoint them with oil of cedar." Such an order would be held as explaining at once the disappearance of the book for the years succeeding Moses and its opportune reappearance. On the one hand we have a sect that professes to have secret sacred books, and on the other we have sacred books that have been composed by a school that must have had many features which we recognize as Essenian. Further, the Essenes disappeared in the Christian church, and in the Christian church and not among the Jews are these books preserved.

2. Objections Answered:

The main objection to this ascription is the prominence of the Messianic hope in the apocalyptic books, and the absence of any notice in Josephus and Philo that the Essenes had this hope. But from neither of these writers could be discovered that any of the Jews cherished this hope. Yet from the New Testament we know that this hope was a prominent feature in national aspirations. Philo, associating perpetually with Greeks, would be sensitive to the ridicule to which such views would expose him, and how it would undo much of his laborious efforts to commend Judaism to the Greeks as a higher philosophy. Josephus had not only that motive, but the more serious one of personal safety. To have enlarged on Messianic hopes and declared these hopes to have been cherished by these Essenes whom he had praised so much would be liable to bring him under suspicion of disloyalty to Rome. The silence of these two writers proves nothing because it proves too much; and further we have easy explanation of this

silence. The assumption of Dr. Charles that the Essenian ideal was ethical and individualistic is pure assumption. There is another objection that while the doctrine of resurrection is recognized in these books we know nothing of the Essenes holding it. That the Greeks and their scholars in philosophy, the Romans, looked at the idea of resurrection from the dead as a subject for ridicule would be reason sufficient for Philo and Josephus to suppress such a feature in their description of the Essenes. From them it could not be learned that the Pharisees ever had any such belief. It is also objected that while the Essenes held the pre-existence of souls, there is no trace of this belief in the apocalyptic books. Josephus, however, does not really assert that they believed in the prior existence of individual souls, but rather in a soul-stuff from which individual souls were separated. Thus both positively and negatively we think there is a strong case for the Essenes being regarded as the authors of the apocalyptic books. Further objections are brought forward by Dr. Charles as applicable to the Assumption of Moses specially. One is the interest manifested in the Temple by the writer while, so says Dr. Charles, "the Essene was excluded from its courts," and refers to Josephus, Ant, XVIII, i, 5. He must have forgotten, while penning this sentence, Ant, XIII, xi, 2, in which Judas, the Essene, is represented as teaching in the Temple. His objection that Josephus credits the Essenes with a belief in a paradise beyond the ocean like the Greek Islands of the Blest, appears to us to lay too much stress on what is in both cases figurative language. Moreover, in Enoch the description of Paradise (chapters 24 through 26) would almost seem to be the original from which Josephus (BJ, II, viii, 11) drew his picture. He seems to regard our ignorance of how far the Essenes agreed with the rest of their countrymen in considering the enemies of Israel "the wicked," as evidence that they disagreed with them on that point.

VI. THE ESSENES AND CHRISTINAITY.

1. Resemblances between Essenism and Christianity:

That there were many points of resemblance between the Essenes and the church in its earliest form cannot be denied. The Essenes, we are told, maintained a community of goods and required anyone who joined their society to sell all he had and present it to the community (Hippolytus, Adv. Heret., ix; x; Josephus, BJ, II, viii, 3), just as so many of the primitive Christians did in Jerusalem ([4067]Acts 4:37). Another peculiarity of the Essenes — noted by Josephus (BJ, II, viii, 4) — that they moved about

from city to city, and wherever they went found accommodation with members of their order, although perfect strangers, may be compared with our Lord's instructions to His disciples when He sent them forth (Matthew 10:11): "Into whatsoever city or village ye shall enter, search out who in it is worthy." When one thinks of who those worthy persons could be, and what was the evidence by which their worthiness was expected to be established, one is almost obliged to suppose that it was some specially easily recognized class that was so designated. If the worthiness in question was the moral quality, there are so many ideas of moral worth that when the apostles inquired, on entering a city, who was worthy, before they could act on the answer they would need to discover what was the criterion of worthiness in the mind of him from whom they had inquired. If, however, this term was the private designation of the members of a sect, one by which they, in speaking of each other, indicated that they were co-members, as the "Quakers" speak of each other as "Friends," the inquiry for those who were worthy would be simple enough. If the Essenes were "the worthy," then identification would be complete, but we cannot assume that. The majority of the points in which the Essenes resembled the primitive Christians are noted above in connection with each feature as it appears in the passage or passages of the authorities that record it, and to these we refer our readers.

2. Points of Difference:

At the same time, although there are thus many points of likeness, it is not to be denied that there are also many features in Essenism which are at variance with the practice of the early church and the teaching of our Lord and His apostles. The most prominent of these is the difference of attitude toward marriage and the female sex. Our Lord sanctified marriage by His presence at the marriage at Cana of Galilee, although He himself never married. He used the festivities of marriage again and again as illustrations. He drew women to Him and had none of the contempt of the sex which Josephus and Philo attribute to the Essenes. The apostles assume the marriage relationship as one into which Christians may be expected in due course to enter, and give exhortations suited to husbands and wives (1 Peter 3:1-7; Ephesians 5:22-33; Colossians 3:18,19). The apostle Paul uses the relation of husband and wife as the symbol of the relation of Christ to His church (Ephesians 5:32). The writer of the Epistle to the He declares, "Marriage is honorable in all" (Hebrews 13:4 the King James Version).

Another point in which the Essenes differed from the practice of our Lord and His disciples was the exaggerated reverence the former gave to the Sabbath, not even moving a vessel from one place to another on the seventh day. our Lord's declaration, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mark 2:27), cuts at the feet of that whole attitude. The point of His conflict with the Pharisees was His disregard of the Sabbath as fenced by their traditions. The Essenes shrank from contact with oil, which our Lord certainly did not do. On the contrary He rebuked the Pharisee for his neglect (Luke 7:46). He was twice anointed by women, and in both cases commended the deed. The purely external and material bulked largely in the opinions of the Essenes. our Lord emphasized the internal and spiritual. Many have held and do hold that our Lord was an Essene. If at the beginning of His career He belonged to this sect He must have broken with it long before the end of His ministry.

Why our Lord Never Meets the Essenes.

There are some phenomena which, irrespective of these resemblances and differences, have a bearing on the relation between Essenism and Christianity. The first is the fact that our Lord, who met so many different classes of the inhabitants of Palestine — Pharisees and Sadducees, Zealots and Herodians, publicans, Samaritans, Greeks — never is recorded to have met an Essene. The common answer, which satisfied even Bishop Lightfoot, is that they were so few and lived so retired that it was no marvel that He never encountered any of them. They had little or no effect on the national life. This mistaken answer is due to forgetting that though both Josephus and Philo say the Essenes were 4,000 they also declare that they were "many in every city," that there were "ten thousands of them." our Lord must have met them; but if the name "Essene" was a designation given from without like "Quakers," then they may appear in the Gospels under another name. There is a class of persons three times referred to — those "that waited for the consolation of Israel" (Luke 2:25 the King James Version), "looking for the redemption" (Luke 2:38), "waited for the kingdom of God" (Mark 15:43 the King James Version; Luke 23:51 the King James Version). There are thus Simeon and Anna at the beginning of His earthly life, and Joseph of Arimathea at the end, connected with this sect. If, then, this sect were the Essenes under another name, the difficulty would be removed. If, further, in any sense our Lord belonged, or had belonged, to the Essenes, then as He would be perpetually meeting and associating with them, these meetings would not

be chronicled. A man cannot meet himself. If they are the authors of the apocalyptic books, as we contend, then the title "waiters for the kingdom of God" would be most suitable, full as these books are of Messianic hopes. If this opinion is correct our Lord's assumption of the title "Son of Man" is significant, taken in connection with the prominence given to that title in the Enoch books.

3. Disappearance of Essenism in Christianity:

Another significant phenomenon is the disappearance of Essenism in Christianity. Bishop Lightfoot, in his dissertation on the Colossian Heresy (Comm. on Col, 21-111), proves that it was Essenism. These Essenes must have been baptized into Christ, or they could not have got entry into the Christian communities which had been drawn to Christ from heathenism. But that is not the only heresy that is connected with the Essenes. The Ebionites seem to have been Essenes who had passed over into Christianity. In the Apostolical Constitutions the Ebionites and Essenes are brought into very close connection. Epiphanius, in his confused way, mixes up the various names under which the Essenes appear in his works with a certain Elkaisa, a connection also to be found in Hippolytus, an earlier and better authority. But Elkaisa claimed to be a Christian. His leading follower, Alcibiades, appeared in Rome and was resisted by Hippolytus. The Clementine Homilies, a religious novel of which Peter is the hero, has many Essenian features. It is assumed to be Ebionite, but that only makes the evidence that the Essenes had become Christians all the more convincing. The Ebionites were Christians, if defective in their views, and the presence of Essenian features in a work proceeding from them emphasizes the identity.

See EBIONISM.

4. Monachism:

There is another phenomenon, more extensive and important than those we have considered above — the presence of Monachism in the church. Notwithstanding that our Lord prayed "not that" the disciples be taken "out of the world," but that they be kept "from the evil" (^{43715}John 17:15), implying that they were not to retire into solitude, and that the apostle Paul regards it as demonstrating the falsity of our possible interpretation of an exhortation of his that it would imply that the disciples "must needs go out of the world" (^{46510}1 Corinthians 5:10); yet the monks did retire from the

world and regarded themselves as all the holier for so doing, and were regarded so by others. The apostle Paul declares the "forbidding to marry" one of "the doctrines of demons," yet very soon asceticism set in and virginity was regarded as far holier than the married state. Retirement from the world and asceticism were the two cardinal characteristics of Monachism. Despite that these were in antagonism to the teachings of Christ and His apostles, within little more than a century after our Lord's ascension Monachism began to appear, and prevailed more and more and continues to this day. These characteristics, retirement from the world and asceticism, especially forbidding to marry, were marked features of Essenism. The wholesale entrance of the Essene sect into the church would explain this. On the other hand this wholesale passing over into Christianity of so intensely Jewish a sect implies a historic connection or affinity. It is true that the catechetic school of Alexandria praises the contemplative life, so admired by their contemporaries, the neo-Platonists, and that philosophy which had been looked at askance by the church was, so to say, taken under their protection by the Alexandrian school, and the retirement of solitaries into the deserts or the formation of monasteries served to promote this contemplation. This led to all the extravagances of the monks being regarded as heights of philosophy. Such views were a cause, but as certainly were they also effects. The cause of these effects as it seems to us was to some extent the admiration extended by Philo, the Alexandrian, to the Essenes and Therapeutae, and the influence of Philo on his Christian successors in Alexandria.

LITERATURE.

Sources:

Philo, Josephus, Pliny, Hegesippus, Porphyry, Hippolytus, Epiphanius.

Secondary Literature:

Besides works specially on the Essenes, the following are mentioned: Frankel, Die Essaer; Lucius, Der Essenismus; Ginsburg, Essenes; and portions of books, as Delaunay, Moines et Sibylles, 1-88; Thomson, Books Which Influenced our Lord, 74-122; Ritschl, Die Entstehung der alt-katholischen Kirche, 179-203; Lightfoot, Commentary on Col, 7-111, 347-417.

There are in histories of the Jews discussions of the questions in order. Of these may be noted: Ewald, Hist of Israel, V, 370-71; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, III, 657-63; Schurer, The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, ii, 188-218, translation. This opens with a fairly full account of the literature up to the date of the 2nd German edition; Zeller, Geschichte der Philos. der Griechen, III, ii, 2, pp. 235-93. There are also articles in various Bible and theological dictionaries, as Smith and Wace, Dict. of Eccles Biography; Smith and Fuller, Dict. of the Bible; HDB; Jewish Encyclopedia;RE; Schenkel, Bibel-Lexikon; M'Clintock, Theological Dict.

At the same time, while submitting these as a sample, and only as a sample, of the vast literature of the subject, we agree in the advice given by F. C. Conybeare — in HDB, under the word: "The student may be advised to study for himself the very limited documentary sources relating to the Essenes and then to draw his own conclusions." We feel the importance of this advice all the more that perusal has shown us that most of these secondary writers have considered exclusively the coenobite community at Engedi to the neglect of the wider society. After the student has formed opinions from a careful study of the sources he may benefit by these secondary works.

J. E. H. Thomson

ESTATE

<es-tat'>: While the King James Version uses both "estate" and "state" with the meaning of "condition," the American Standard Revised Version distinguishes, using "state" for the idea of condition, "estate" for position; and replaces "estate" of the King James Version by more definite expressions in many cases. Compare [51007]Colossians 4:7 the King James Version, "All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you," but 4:8, the King James Version "might know your estate" the Revised Version (British and American) "may know our state"; [42048]Luke 1:48 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "the low estate" (of the Lord's hand-maiden); [41021]Mark 6:21, the King James Version "chief estates" the Revised Version (British and American) "chief men"; [27107]Daniel 11:7,20,21,38, the King James Version "his estate," the Revised Version (British and American) "his place," both with margin "his office."

F. K. Farr

ESTEEM

<es-tem'> ([בְשַׁ֫ j ; *chashabh*]; [ἡγέομαι, *hegeomai*]): "To esteem" means sometimes simply "to think" or "reckon"; in other connections it means "to regard as honorable" or "valuable." We have examples of both senses in the Bible. The word most often so translated in the Old Testament is *chashabh*, meaning perhaps originally, "to bind," hence, "combine," "think," "reckon" (⟨18427⟩Job 41:27 the King James Version; ⟨23916⟩Isaiah 29:16,17; 53:4; ⟨29042⟩Lamentations 4:2). In ⟨23503⟩Isaiah 53:3 we have the word in the higher sense, "We esteemed him not." This sense is expressed also by `*arakh*, "to set in array," "in order" (⟨18369⟩Job 36:19, the King James Version "Will he esteem thy riches?" the English Revised Version "Will thy riches suffice?" margin "Will thy cry avail?" which the American Standard Revised Version adopts as the text); also by *tsaphan*, "to hide," "to conceal" (⟨18232⟩Job 23:12, the King James Version "I have esteemed the words of his mouth," the Revised Version (British and American) "treasured up"); *qalah*, "to be light," is translated "lightly esteemed" (⟨09823⟩1 Samuel 18:23, "I am a poor man, and lightly esteemed"), also *qalal*, same meaning (⟨09230⟩1 Samuel 2:30, "They that despise me shall be lightly esteemed"). In the New Testament, *hegeomai*, "to lead out," is used in the sense of "counting honorable," etc. (⟨50808⟩Philippians 2:3 the Revised Version (British and American) "counting"; ⟨51513⟩1 Thessalonians 5:13; perhaps ⟨58126⟩Hebrews 11:26, but the Revised Version (British and American) has simply "accounting"); *krino*, "to judge," is used in the sense of "to reckon" (⟨45405⟩Romans 14:5 twice); also *logizomai*, "to reckon" (⟨45414⟩Romans 14:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "accounteth"); *hupselos*, "high," "exalted," is rendered "highly esteemed" in ⟨42615⟩Luke 16:15 the King James Version, but in the Revised Version (British and American) "exalted"; *exoutheneo*, "to think nothing of," is translated "least esteemed" (⟨46604⟩1 Corinthians 6:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "of no account").

The following changes in the Revised Version (British and American) are of interest: for "He that is despised and hath a servant, is better than he that honoreth himself and lacketh bread" (⟨20129⟩Proverbs 12:9), "Better is he that is lightly esteemed"; for "Better is he than both they, which hath not yet been" (⟨21043⟩Ecclesiastes 4:3), "Better than them both did I esteem him," margin "Better than they both is he"; for "Surely your turning of things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay" (⟨23916⟩Isaiah 29:16), "Ye turn things upside down!" (margin, "Oh your perversity!"), "Shall the

potter be esteemed (the English Revised Version "counted") as clay," etc. — in this connection a forcible assertion of the necessary possession of knowledge by the Creator of man.

W. L. Walker

ESTHER

<es'-ter> ([רְתֵסְא, *'ecter*], akin to the Zend tstara, the Sanskrit stri, the Greek [ἀστήρ, *aster*], "a star," [Ἐσθήρ, *Esther*]): Esther was a Jewish orphan, who became the queen of Xerxes, in some respects the greatest of the Persian kings. She was brought up at Susa by her cousin Mordecai, who seems to have held a position among the lower officials of the royal palace. Vashti, Xerxes' former queen, was divorced; and the most beautiful virgins from all the provinces of the empire were brought to the palace of Susa that the king might select her successor. The choice fell upon the Jewish maiden. Soon after her accession a great crisis occurred in the history of the Jews. The entire people was threatened with destruction. The name of Esther is forever bound up with the record of their deliverance. By a course of action which gives her a distinguished place among the women of the Bible, the great enemy of the Jews was destroyed, and her people were delivered. Nothing more is known of her than is recorded in the book which Jewish gratitude has made to bear her name.

CHANGE OF NAME:

The change in the queen's name from Hadassah [הַסַּדְּ ה, *hadacah*], "a myrtle," to Esther, "a star," may possibly indicate the style of beauty for which the Persian queen was famous. The narrative displays her as a woman of clear judgment, of magnificent self-control, and capable of the noblest self-sacrifice.

See ESTHER, BOOK OF.

John Urquhart

ESTHER, BOOK OF

This book completes the historical books of the Old Testament. The conjunction w, "and," with which it begins, is significant. It shows that the book was designed for a place in a series, the w linking it on to a book immediately preceding, and that the present arrangement of the Hebrew

Bible differs widely from what must have been the original order. At present Esther follows Ecclesiastes, with which it has no connection whatever; and this tell-tale "and," like a body-mark on a lost child, proves that the book has been wrenched away from its original connection. There is no reason to doubt that the order in the Septuagint follows that of the Hebrew Bible of the 3rd or the 4th century BC, and this is the order of the Vulgate, of the English Bible, and other VSS: The initial waw is absent from Genesis, Deuteronomy, 1 Chronicles and Nehemiah. The historical books are consequently arranged, by the insertion and the omission of W, into these four divisions: Genesis to Numbers; Deuteronomy to 2 Kings; 1 Chronicles to Ezra; Nehemiah and Esther.

1. THE CANONICITY OF ESTHER:

Of the canonicity of the book there is no question. That there was a distinct guardianship of the Canon by the Jewish priesthood has figured less in recent discussions than it should. Josephus shows that there was a Temple copy which was carried among the Temple spoils in the triumph of Vespasian. The peculiarities of the Hebrew text also prove that all our manuscripts are representatives of one standard copy. In the Jewish Canon Esther had not only a recognized, but also a distinguished, place. The statement of Junilius in the 6th century AD that the canonicity of Esther was doubted by some in his time has no bearing on the question. The high estimation of the book current among the ancient Jews is evident from its titles. It is usually headed "Megillath Esther" (the volume of Esther), and sometimes "Megillah" (the volume). Maimonides says that the wise men among the Jews affirm that the book was dictated by the Holy Spirit, and adds: "All the books of the Prophets, and all the Hagiographa shall cease in the days of the Messiah, except the volume of Esther; and, lo, that shall be as stable as the Pentateuch, and as the constitutions of the oral law which shall never cease."

2. ITS AUTHORSHIP:

By whom was the book written? This is a point in regard to which no help is afforded us either by the contents of the book or by any reliable tradition. Mordecai, whose claims have been strongly urged by some, is excluded by the closing words (Est 10:3), which sum up his life work and the blessings of which he had been the recipient. The words imply that when the book was written, that great Israelite had passed away.

3. ITS DATE:

Light is thrown upon the date of the book by the closing references to Ahasuerus (Est 10:2): "And all the acts of his power and of his might, ... are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia?" The entire history, therefore, of Xerxes was to be found in the state records when the book was written. In other words, Xerxes had passed away before it saw the light. That monarch was assassinated by Artabanus in 465 BC. This gives us, say 460 BC, as the highest possible date. The lowest possible date is the overthrow of the Persian empire by Alexander in 332 BC; for the royal records of the Median and Persian kings are plainly in existence and accessible, which they would not have been had the empire been overthrown. The book must have been written, therefore, some time within this interval of 128 years. There is another fact which narrows that interval. The initial waw shows that Esther was written after Neh, that is, after 430 BC. The interval is consequently reduced to 98 years; and, seeing that the Persian dominion was plainly in its pristine vigor when Esther was written, we cannot be far wrong if we regard its date as about 400 BC.

4. ITS CONTENTS:

The book is characterized by supreme dramatic power. The scene is "Shushan the palace," that portion of the ancient Elamitic capital which formed the fortified residence of the Persian kings. The book opens with the description of a high festival. All the notabilities of the kingdom are present, together with their retainers, both small and great. To grace the occasion, Vashti is summoned to appear before the king's guests; and, to the dismay of the great assembly, the queen refuses to obey. A council is immediately summoned. Vashti is degraded; and a decree is issued that every man bear rule in his own house (Est 1). To find a successor to Vashti, the fairest damsels in the empire are brought to Shushan; and Hadassah, the cousin and adopted daughter of Mordecai, is of the number. Esther (2) closes with a notice of two incidents:

(1) the coronation of Hadassah (now and henceforth named "Esther") as queen;

(2) Mordecai's discovery of a palace plot to assassinate the king. Chapter 3 introduces another leading personage, Haman, the son of Hammedatha, whose seat the king had set "above all the princes that

were with him." All the king's servants who are at the king's gates prostrate themselves before the powerful favorite. Mordecai, who is not a trained courtier but a God-fearing Jew, refrains. Though expostulated with, he will not conform. The matter is brought to Haman's notice for whose offended dignity Mordecai is too small a sacrifice. The whole Jewish people must perish. Lots are cast to find a lucky day for their extermination. The king's consent is obtained, and the royal decree is sent into all the provinces fixing the slaughter for the 13th day of the 12th month.

The publication of the decree is followed by universal mourning among the Jews (Est 4). News of Mordecai's mourning is brought to Esther, who, through the messengers she sends to him, is informed of her own and her people's danger. She is urged to save herself and them. She eventually decides to seek the king s presence at the risk of her life. She presents herself (chapter 5) before the king and is graciously received. Here we breathe atmosphere of the place and time. Everything depends upon the decision of one will — the king's. Esther does not attempt too much at first: she invites the king and Haman to a banquet. Here the king asks Esther what her petition is, assuring her that it shall be granted. In reply she requests his and Haman's presence at a banquet the following day. Haman goes forth in high elation. On his way home he passes Mordecai, who "stood not up nor moved for him." Haman passes on filled with rage, and unbosoms himself to his wife and all his friends. They advise that a stake, fifty cubits high, be prepared for Mordecai's impalement; that on the morrow he obtain the royal permission for Mordecai's execution; and that he then proceed with a merry heart to banquet with the queen. The stake is made ready.

But (Est 6) that night Xerxes cannot sleep. The chronicles of the kingdom are read before him. The reader has come to Mordecai's discovery of the plot, when the king asks what reward was given him. He is informed that the service had received no acknowledgment. It is now early morn, and Haman is waiting in the court for an audience to request Mordecai's life. He is summoned to the king's presence and asked what should be done to the man whom the king desires to honor. Believing that the king can be thinking only of him, he suggests that royal honors be paid him. He is appalled by the command to do so to Mordecai. Hurrying home from his lowly attendance upon the hated Jew, he has hardly time to tell the mournful story to his wife and friends when he is summoned to Esther's

banquet. There, at the king's renewed request to be told her desire, she begs life for herself and for her people (Est 7). The king asks in astonishment, who he is, and where he is, who dared to injure her and them. The reply is that Haman is the adversary. Xerxes, filled with indignation, rises from the banquet and passes into the palace garden. He returns and discovers that Haman, in the madness of his fear, has thrown himself on the queen's couch, begging for his life. That act seals his doom. He is led away to be impaled upon the very stake he had prepared for the Jew. The seal of the kingdom is transferred to Mordecai (Est 8). Measures are immediately taken to avert the consequence of Haman's plot (Est 9 through 10). The result is deliverance and honor for the Jews. These resolve that the festival of Purim should be instituted and be ever after observed by Jews and proselytes. The decision was confirmed by letters from Esther and Mordecai.

5. THE GREEK ADDITIONS:

The Septuagint, as we now have it, makes large additions to the original text. Jerome, keeping to the Hebrew text in his own translation, has added these at the end. They amount to nearly seven chapters. There is nothing in them to reward perusal. Their age has been assigned to 100 BC, and their only value consists in the indication they afford of the antiquity of the book. That had been long enough in existence to perplex the Hebrew mind with the absence of the name of God and the omissions of any reference to Divine worship. Full amends are made in the additions.

6. THE ATTACKS UPON THE BOOK:

The opponents of the Book of Esther may undoubtedly boast that Martin Luther headed the attack. In his Table-Talk he declared that he was so hostile "to the Book of Esther that I would it did not exist; for it Judaizes too much, and has in it a great deal of heathenish naughtiness." His remark in his reply to Erasmus shows that this was his deliberate judgment. Referring to Esther, he says that, though the Jews have it in their Canon, "it is more worthy than all" the apocryphal books "of being excluded from the Canon." That repudiation was founded, however, on no historical or critical grounds. It rested solely upon an entirely mistaken judgment as to the tone and the intention of the book. Luther's judgment has been carried farther by Ewald, who says: "We fall here as if from heaven to earth; and, looking among the new forms surrounding us, we seem to behold the Jews,

or indeed the small men of the present day in general, acting just as they now do." Nothing of all this, however, touches the historicity of Esther.

The modern attack has quite another objective. Semler, who is its real fens et origo, believed Esther to be a work of pure imagination, and as establishing little more than the pride and arrogance of the Jews. DeWette says: "It violates all historical probability, and contains striking difficulties and many errors with regard to Persian manners, as well as just references to them." Dr. Driver modifies that judgment. "The writer," he says, "shows himself well informed on Persian manners and institutions; he does not commit anachronisms such as occur in Tobit or Judith; and the character of Xerxes as drawn by him is in agreement with history." The controversy shows, however, no sign of approaching settlement. Th. Noldeke (Encyclopaedia Biblica) is more violent than Deuteronomy Wette. "The story," he writes, "is in fact a tissue of improbabilities and impossibilities." We shall look first of all at the main objections urged by him and others and then at the recent confirmations of the historicity of Esther.

7. SOME OF THE OBJECTIONS:

(1) "There is something fantastic, but not altogether unskillful," says Noldeke, "in the touch whereby Mordecai and Haman are made to inherit an ancient feud, the former being a member of the family of King Saul, the latter a descendant of Agag, king of Amalek." It is surely unworthy of a scholar to make the book responsible for a Jewish fable. There is absolutely no mention in it of either King Saul or Agag, king of Amalek, and not the most distant allusion to any inherited feud. "Kish, a Benjamite" is certainly mentioned (Est 2:5) as the great-grandfather of Mordecai; but if this was also the father of Saul, then the first of the Israelite kings was a sharer in the experiences of the Babylonian captivity, a conception which is certainly fantastic enough. One might ask also how an Amalekite came to be described as an Agagite; and how a childless king, who was cut in pieces, became the founder of a tribe. But any semblance of a foundation which that rabbinic conceit ever had was swept away years ago by Oppert's discovery of "Agag" in one of Sargon's inscriptions as the name of a district in the Persian empire. "Haman the son of Hammedatha the Agagite" means simply that Haman or his father had come from the district of Agag.

(2) The statement that Est 2:5,6 represents Mordecai as having been carried away with Jeconiah from Jerusalem, and as being therefore of an impossible age, is unworthy of notice. The relative "who" (2:6) refers to Kish, his great-grandfather.

(3) "Between the 7th and the 12th years of his reign, Xerxes' queen was Amestris, a superstitious and cruel woman (Herod. vii.114; ix.112), who cannot be identified with Esther, and who leaves no place for Esther beside her" (Driver). Scaliger long ago identified Esther with Amestris, an identification which Prideaux rejected on account of the cruelty which Herodotus has attributed to that queen. Dr. Driver has failed to take full account of one thing — the striking fact that critics have leveled this very charge of cruelty against the heroine of our book. It is quite possible that Esther, moving in a world of merciless intrigue, may have had to take measures which would form a foundation for the tales recorded by the Greek historian.

(4) The aim of the book is said to be the glorification of the Jews. But, on the contrary, it is merely a record of their being saved from a skillfully planned extirpation.

(5) The description of the Jews (Est 3:8) as "dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of" the kingdom is said to be inapplicable to the Persian period. That argument is based upon an ignorance of the ancient world which investigation is daily correcting. We now know that before the time of Est Jews were settled both in Eastern and in Southern Egypt, that is, in the extreme west of the Persian empire. In the troubles at the end of the 7th and of the 6th centuries BC, multitudes must have been dispersed, and when, at the latter period, the ties of the fatherland were dissolved, Jewish migrations must have vastly increased.

(6) The Hebrew of the book is said to belong to a much later period than that of Xerxes. But it is admitted that it is earlier than the Hebrew of Chronicles; and recent discoveries have shown decisively that the book belongs to the pers period.

(7) The suggestion is made (Driver) "that the danger which threatened the Jews was a local one," and consequently, that the book, though possessed of a historical basis, is a romance. But against that are the facts that the observance of the feast has from the first been universal,

and that it has not been observed more fully or more enthusiastically in any one place than in the others.

(8) There is no reference to it, it is urged, by Chronicles, Ezra or Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus). But Chronicles ends with the proclamation of Cyrus, granting permission to the Jews to return and to rebuild the Temple. There is little to be wondered at that it contains no reference to events which happened 60 years afterward. In Ezra, which certainly covers the period of Esther, reference to the events with which she was connected is excluded by the plan of the work. It gives the history of the return, the first part under Zerubbabel in 536 BC, the second under Ezra himself, 458 BC. The events in Esther (which were embraced within a period of a few months) fell in the interval and were connected with neither the first return nor the second. Here again the objector is singularly oblivious of the purpose of the book to which he refers. There is quite as little force in the citation of Ecclesiasticus. In dealing with this time Ben Sira's eye is upon Jerusalem. He magnifies Zerubbabel, "Jesus the son of Josedek," and Nehemiah (49:11-13). Even Ezra, to whom Jerusalem and the new Jewish state owed so much, finds no mention. Why, then, should Esther and Mordecai be named who seem to have had no part whatever in rebuilding the sacred city?

(9) The book is said to display ignorance of the Persian empire in the statement that it was divided into 127 provinces, whereas Herodotus tells us that it was partitioned into 20 satrapies. But there was no such finality in the number, even of these great divisions of the empire. Darius in his Behistun inscriptions gives the number as 21, afterward as 23, and in a third enumeration as 29. Herodotus himself, quoting from a document of the time of Xerxes, shows that there were then about 60 nations under the dominion of Persia. The objector has also omitted to notice that the [medhinah] ("province") mentioned in Est (1:1) is not a satrapy but a subdivision of it. Judea is called a [medhinah] in ^{◁5001▷}Ezra 2:1, and that was only a small portion of the 5th satrapy, that, namely, of Syria. But the time is past for objections of this character. Recent discoveries have proved the marvelous accuracy of the book. "We find in the Book of Esther," says Lenormant (Ancient History of the East, II, 113), "a most animated picture of the court of the Persian kings, which enables us, better than anything contained in the classical writers, to penetrate the internal life and the details of the organization of the central government established by

Darius."

8. CONFIRMATIONS OF THE BOOK:

These discoveries have removed the discussion to quite another plane —
or rather they have ended it. Since Grotefend in 1802 read the name of
Xerxes in a Persian inscription and found it to be, letter for letter, the
Ahasuerus of Eat, research has heaped up confirmation of the historical
character of the book. It has proved, to begin with that the late date
suggested for the book cannot be maintained. The language belongs to the
time of the Persian dominion. It is marked by the presence of old Persian
words, the knowledge of which had passed away by the 2nd century BC,
and has been recovered only through the decipherment of the Persian
monuments. The Septuagint translators were unacquainted with them, and
consequently made blunders which have been repeated in our own the King
James Version and in other translations. We read (Est 1:5,6 the King James
Version) that "in the court of the garden of the king's palace," "were
white, green, and blue hangings, fastened with cords of fine linen and
purple," etc. As seen in the ruins of Persepolis, a marked feature in the
Persian palace of the period was a large space occupied by pillars which
were covered with awnings. It may be noted in passing that these were
situated, as the book says, in the court of the palace garden. But our
knowledge of the recovered Persian compels us now to read: "where was
an awning of fine white cotton and violet, fastened with cords of fine white
linen and purple." White and blue (or violet) were the royal Persian colors.
In accord with this we are told that Mordecai (Est 8:15) "went forth from
the presence of the king in royal apparel of blue and white." The highly
organized postal system, the king's scribes, the keeping of the chronicles of
the kingdom, the rigid and elaborate court customs, are all characteristic of
the Persia of the period. We are told of the decree obtained by Haman that
"in the name of King Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king's
ring" (or signet). It was not signed but sealed. That was the Persian
custom. The seal of Darius, Xerxes' father, has been found, and is now in
the British Museum. It bears the figure of the king shooting arrows at a
lion, and is accompanied by an inscription in Persian, Susian and Assyrian:
"I, Darius, Great King." The identification of Ahasuerus, made by
Grotefend and which subsequent discoveries amply confirmed, placed the
book in an entirely new light. As soon as that identification was assured,
previous objections were changed into confirmations. In the alleged
extravagances of the monarch, scholars saw then the Xerxes of history.

The gathering of the nobles of the empire in "the third year of his reign" (Est 1:3) was plainly the historical assembly in which the Grecian campaign was discussed; and "the seventh year," in which Esther was made queen, was that of his return from Greece. The book implies that Susa was the residence of the Persian kings, and this was so. The proper form of the name as shown by the inscriptions was "Shushan"; "Shushan the Palace" indicates that there were two Susas, which was the fact, and birah ("palace") is a Persian word meaning fortress. The surprisingly rigid etiquette of the palace, to which we have referred, and the danger of entering unbidden the presence of the king have been urged as proof that the book is a romance. The contrary, however, is the truth. "The palace among the Persians," says Lenormant, "was quite inaccessible to the multitude. A most rigid etiquette guarded all access to the king, and made it very difficult to approach him. .... He who entered the presence of the king, without having previously obtained permission, was punished with death" (Ancient History of the East, II, 113-14; compare Herodotus i.99). But a further, and peculiarly conclusive, testimony to the historical character of the book is afforded by the recovery of the palace of Xerxes and Esther. An inscription of Artaxerxes Mnemon found at Susa tells us that it was destroyed by fire in the days of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the son and successor of Xerxes. Within some 30 years, therefore, from the time of Esther, that palace passed from the knowledge of men. Nevertheless, the references in the book are in perfect accord with the plan of the great structure as laid bare by the recent French excavations. We read (Est 4) that Mordecai, clad in sackcloth, walked in "the broad palace of the city, which was before the king's gate." The ruins show that the House of the Women was on the East side of the palace next to the city, and that a gate led from it into "the street of the city." In Est 5:1, we read that Esther "stood in the inner court of the king's house, over against the king's house." "The king," we also read, "sat upon his royal throne in the royal house, over against the entrance of the house," and that from the throne he "saw Esther the queen standing in the court." Every detail is exact. A corridor led from the House of the Women to the inner court; and at the side of the court opposite to the corridor was the hall, or throne-room of the palace. Exactly in the center of the farther wall the throne was placed and from that lofty seat the king, overlooking an intervening screen, saw the queen waiting for an audience. Other details, such as that of the king's passing from the queen's banqueting-house into the garden, show a similarly exact acquaintance with the palace as it then was. That is a

confirmation the force of which it is hard to overestimate. It shows that the writer was well informed and that his work is characterized by minute exactitude.

The utter absence of the Divine name in Esther has formed a difficulty even where it has not been urged as an objection. But that is plainly part of some Divine design. The same silence is strictly maintained throughout in regard to prayer, praise and every approach toward God. That silence was an offense to the early Jews; for, in the Septuagint additions to the book, there is profuse acknowledgment of God both in prayer and in praise. But it must have struck the Jews of the time and the official custodians of the canonical books quite as painfully; and we can only explain the admission of Esther by the latter on the ground that there was overwhelming evidence of its Divine origin and authority. Can this rigid suppression be explained? In the original arrangement of the Old Testament canonical books (the present Hebrew arrangement is post-Christian), Esther is joined to Nehemiah. In 1895 I made a suggestion which I still think worthy of consideration: More than 60 years had passed since Cyrus had given the Jews permission to return. The vast majority of the people remained, nevertheless, where they were. Some, like Nehemiah, were restrained by official and other ties. The rest were indifferent or declined to make the necessary sacrifices of property and of rest. With such as these last the history of God's work in the earth can never be associated. In His providence He will watch over and deliver them: but their names and His will not be bound together in the record of the labor and the waiting for the earth's salvation.

John Urquhart

ESTHER, THE REST OF

INTRODUCTORY.

The Book of Esther in the oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint (B,A,N, etc.) contains 107 verses more than in the Hebrew Bible. These additions are scattered throughout the book where they were originally inserted in order to supply the religious element apparently lacking in the Hebrew text. In Jerome's version and in the Vulgate, which is based on it, the longest and most important of these additions are taken out of their context and put together at the end of the canonical book, thus making them to a large

extent unintelligible. In English, Welsh and other Protestant versions of the Scriptures the whole of the additions appear in the Apocrypha.

1. Name:

In the English Versions of the Bible the full title is "The Rest of the Chapters of the Book of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew, nor in the Chaldee." Since in the Septuagint, including the editions by Fritzsche, Tischendorf and Swete, these chapters appear in their original context, they bear no separate title. The same is true of Brereton's English translation of the Septuagint; but in Thompson's translation the whole of the Apocrypha is omitted, so that it is not strictly a translation of the whole Septuagint.

2. Contents:

In Swete's edition of the Septuagint the interpretations constituting "the Rest of Esther" (sometimes given as "Additions to Esther") are designated by the capital letters of the alphabet, and in the following enumeration this will be followed. The several places in the Greek Bible are indicated in each case.

A (Latin, English, Ad Est 11:2 through 12:6): Mordecai's dream; how he came to honor. Precedes Est 1:1.

B (Latin, English, Ad Est 13:1-7): Letter of Artaxerxes. Follows Est 3:13.

C (Latin, English, Ad Est 13:8 through 14:19): The prayers of Mordecai and Esther. Follows Est 4:17.

D (Latin, Ad Est 15:4-19; English, 16:1-16): Esther visits the king and wins his favor. Follows C, preceding immediately Est 5.

E (Latin, English, Ad Est 16:1-24): Another letter of Artaxerxes. Follows Est 8:12.

F (Latin, English, Ad Est 10:4 through 11): Epilogue describing the origin of the Feast Purim. Follows Est 10:3.

But besides the lengthy interpolations noticed above there are also in the Septuagint small additions omitted from the Latin and therefore from the

English, Welsh, etc., Apocrypha. These short additions are nearly all explanatory glosses.

In the Century Bible (Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther) the exact places where the insertions occur in the Septuagint are indicated and described in the notes dealing with the relevant passages of the canonical text. With the help thus given any English reader is able to read the additions in their original setting. Unless they are read in this way they are pointless and even in most cases senseless.

3. Original Language:

All scholars agree that "The Rest of Esther" was written originally in Greek Both external and internal evidence bears this out. But the Greek text has come down to us in two recensions which differ considerably.

(1) The commonly received text supported by the manuscripts B,A,N, and by Josephus (Ant., XI, i).

(2) A revision of (1) contained in the manuscripts 19, 93a and 108b. In the last two manuscripts both recensions occur. This revised text has been ascribed by many recent scholars (Lagarde, Schurer, R. H. Charles) to Lucian. In his Libr. Vet. Test. Canon. Graece, Pars Prior, 1833 (all published), Lagarde gives on parallel pages both recensions with critical notes on both.

4. Versions:

The two Greek texts are also given by Fritzsche (1871) and Swete (1891) in their editions of the Septuagint, and also by Scholz in his German Commentary on the Book of Esther (1892).

For the ancient versions see "Esther Versions."

5. Date:

Practically all modern scholars agree in holding that "The Rest of Esther" is some decades later than the canonical book. In his commentary on Est (Century Bible) the present writer has given reasons for dating the canonical Est about 130 BC. One could not go far astray in fixing the date of the original Greek of the Additions to Esther at about 100 BC. It is evident that we owe these interpolations to a Jewish zealot who wished to give the Book of Est a religious character. In his later years John Hyrcanus

(135-103 BC) identified himself with the Sadducean or rationalistic party, thus breaking with the Pharisee or orthodox party to which the Maccabeans had hitherto belonged. Perhaps we owe these additions to the zeal aroused among orthodox Jews by the rationalizing temper prevailing in court circles. R. H. Charles (Encyclopedia Brit, XI, 797b) favors a date during the early (?) Maccabean period; but this would give the Ad Esther an earlier date than can be ascribed to the canonical Esther.

LITERATURE.

See the literature cited above, and in addition note the following: Fritzsche, Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen (1851), 67-108; Schurer, History of the Jewish People, II, iii, 181 ff (Ger. edition 4, III, 449 ff); Ryssel (in Kautzsch, Apocrypha, 193 ff); Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 257 if; the articles in the principal Bible Dictionaries, including Jewish Encyclopedia and Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition).

See also under ESTHER.

T. Witton Davies

ESTIMATE; ESTIMATION

<es'-ti-mat>, *<es-ti-ma'-shun>* ([Ër″ [; `arakh], [Ër[ę`erekh]): These words, meaning "to set in order," "valuation," are used in connection with the priestly services in ⁦⁦⁦⁦⁦Leviticus 5:15,18; 6:6; 27:14, and frequently; ⁦⁦⁦⁦⁦Numbers 18:16.

ESYELUS

<e-si-e'-lus> ([᾽Ησυήλ, *Esuel*], [᾽Ησύλος, *Esuelos*]; the King James Version Syelus): One of the governors of the Temple in the time of Josiah (1 Esdras 1:8); called "Jehiel" in ⁦⁦⁦⁦⁦2 Chronicles 35:8.

ETAM

<e'-tam> [μƒy[ę`eTam]; Codex Alexandrinus, [Απάν, *Apan*], Codex Vaticanus, [Αἰτάν, *Aitan*]):

(1) Mentioned in Septuagint along with Tekoa, Bethlehem and Phagor (⁦⁦⁦⁦⁦Joshua 15:59). In ⁦⁦⁦⁦⁦2 Chronicles 11:6 it occurs, between Bethlehem and Tekoa, as one of the cities built "for defense in Judah" by Rehoboam.

Josephus writes that "there was a certain place, about 50 furlongs distant from Jerusalem which is called Ethan, very pleasant it is in fine gardens and abounding in rivulets of water; whither he (Solomon) used to go out in the morning" (Ant., VIII, vii, 3). Mention of `Ain `Aitan, which is described as the most elevated place in Palestine, occurs in the Talmud (Zebhachim 54b), and in the Jer. Talmud (Yoma' 3 fol 41) it is mentioned that a conduit ran from `Atan to the Temple.

The evidence all points to `Ain `Atan, the lowest of the springs supplying the aqueduct running to Solomon's pools. The gardens of Solomon may very well — by tradition, at any rate — have been in the fertile valley below `Urtas. The site of the ancient town Etam is rather to be looked for on an isolated hill, with ancient remains, a little to the East of `Ain `Atan. <1908>1 Chronicles 4:3 may also have reference to this Etam.

(2) A town assigned to Simeon (<1042>1 Chronicles 4:32). Mentioned with *EN-RIMMON* (which see), identified by Conder with Khurbet `AiTun in the hills Northwest of Beersheba.

(3) The rock of Etam, where Samson took up his dwelling after smiting the Philistines "hip and thigh with a great slaughter" (<0758>Judges 15:8,11), was in Judah but apparently in the low hill country (same place) . The rocky hill on which lies the village of Beit `Atab, near Sur`ah (Zorah), was suggested by Conder, but unless (3) is really identical width (1), which is quite possible, the cavern known as `Arak Isma`in, described by Hanauer (PEFS, 1886, 25), suits the requirements of the story better. The cavern, high up on the northern cliffs of the Wady Isma`in, is a noticeable object from the railway as the train enters the gorge.

E. W. G. Masterman

ETERNAL

<e-tur'-nal> ([מֵל שְׁדַ, *`olam*]; [αἰώνιος, *aionios*], from [αἰών, *aion*]): The word "eternal" is of very varying import, both in the Scriptures and out of them.

1. `OLAM:

In the Old Testament, the Hebrew word *`olam* is used for "eternity," sometimes in the sense of unlimited duration, sometimes in the sense of a cycle or an age, and sometimes, in later Hebrew, in the signification of world. The Hebrew *`olam* has, for its proper New Testament equivalent, *aion*, as signifying either time of particular duration, or the unending

duration of time in general. Only, the Hebrew term primarily signified unlimited time, and only in a secondary sense represented a definite or specific period. Both the Hebrew and the Greek terms signify the world itself, as it moves in time.

2. AION, AIONIOS:

In the New Testament, *aion* and *aionios* are often used with the meaning "eternal," in the predominant sense of futurity. The word *aion* primarily signifies time, in the sense of age or generation; it also comes to denote all that exists under time-conditions; and, finally, superimposed upon the temporal is an ethical use, relative to the world's course. Thus *aion* may be said to mean the subtle informing spirit of the world or cosmos — the totality of things. By Plato, in his Timaeus, aion was used of the eternal Being, whose counterpart, in the sense-world, is Time. To Aristotle, in speaking of the world, *aion* is the ultimate principle which, in itself, sums up all existence.. In the New Testament, *aion* is found combined with prepositions in nearly three score and ten instances, where the idea of unlimited duration appears to be meant. This is the usual method of expressing eternity in the Septuagint also. The *aionios* of [47018]2 Corinthians 4:18 must be eternal, in a temporal use or reference, else the antithesis would be gone.

3. AIDIOS:

In [45020]Romans 1:20 the word *aidios* is used of Divine action and rendered in the King James Version "eternal" (the Revised Version (British and American) "everlasting"), the only other place in the New Testament where the word occurs being [65006]Jude 1:6, where the rendering is "everlasting," which accords with classical usage. But the presence of the idea of eternal in these passages does not impair the fact that *aion* and *aionios* are, in their natural and obvious connotation, the usual New Testament words for expressing the idea of eternal, and this holds strikingly true of the Septuagint usage also. For, from the idea of aeonian life, there is no reason to suppose the notion of duration excluded. The word *aionios* is sometimes used in the futurist signification, but often also, in the New Testament, it is concerned rather with the quality, than with the quantity or duration, of life. By the continual attachment of *aionios* to life, in this conception of the spiritual or Divine life in man, the aeonian conception was saved from becoming sterile.

4. ENLARGEMENT OF IDEA:

In the use of *aion* and *aionios* there is evidenced a certain enlarging or advancing import till they come so to express the high and complex fact of the Divine life in man. In Greek, *aiones* signifies ages, or periods or dispensations. The *aiones* of ^{〈3002〉}Hebrews 1:2, and 11:3, is, however, to be taken as used in the concrete sense of "the worlds," and not "the ages," the world so taken meaning the totality of things in their course or flow.

5. ETERNAL LIFE:

Our Lord decisively set the element of time in abeyance, and took His stand upon the fact and quality of life — life endless by its own nature. Of that eternal life He is Himself the guarantee — "Because I live, ye shall live also" (〈43149〉John 14:19). Therefore said Augustine, "Join thyself to the eternal God, and thou wilt be eternal."

See ETERNITY.

James Lindsay

ETERNITY

<e-tur'-ni-ti> ([μl ₪℗, *olam*]; Greek equivalent, [αἰών, *aion*]):

1. CONTRAST WITH TIME:

Eternity is best conceived, not in the merely negative form of the non-temporal, or immeasurable time, but positively, as the mode of the timeless self-existence of the Absolute Ground of the universe. The flux of time grows first intelligible to us, only when we take in the thought of God as eternal — exalted above time. Timeless existence — being or entity without change — is what we here mean by eternity, and not mere everlastingness or permanence through time. God, in His internal being, is raised above time; in His eternal absoluteness, He is throned above temporal development, and knows, as the Scriptures say, no changeableness. The conception of eternity, as without beginning or ending, leaves us with but a negation badly in need of filling out with reality. Eternity is not a mere negative idea; to make of eternity merely a blank and irrelevant negation of temporality would not satisfy any proper theory of being; it functions as the positive relation to time of that eternal God, who is King of all the eons.

2. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In the Old Testament, God's eternity is only negatively expressed, as implying merely indefinitely extended time (⟨02133⟩Genesis 21:33; ⟨05327⟩Deuteronomy 33:27), though ⟨24008⟩Isaiah 40:28 takes more absolute form. Better is the view of eternity, objectively considered, as a mode of being of God in relation to Himself. For He was eternal, while as yet the world and time were not. But even in the New Testament, the negative form of expression prevails.

3. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

Time, with its succession of events, helps to fill out such idea as we can form of the eternal, conceived as an endless progress. But, as finite beings, we can form no positive idea of eternity. Time is less contradictory of eternity, than helpful in revealing what we know of it. Plato, in his Timaeus, says that time is the "moving image of eternity," and we may allow that it is its type or revelation. Not as the annulment of time, though it might be held to be in itself exclusive of time, is eternity to be taken, but rather as the ground of its reality.

4. THE ETERNAL "NOW":

Eternity might, no doubt, be taken as just time no longer measured by the succession of events, as in the finite universe. But, on a strict view, there is something absurd in an eternity that includes time, and an eternity apart from time is a vain and impossible conception. Eternity, as a discharge from all time limits, is purely negative, though not without importance. Eternity, absolutely taken, must be pronounced incommensurable with time; as Aquinas said, non sunt mensurae unius generis. Eternity, that is to say, would lose its character as eternal in the very entering into relations with the changeful or becoming. Eternity, as in God, has, since the time of Augustine and the Middle Ages, been frequently conceived as an eternal Now. The Schoolmen were wont to adopt as a maxim that "in eternity is one only instant always present and persistent." This is but a way of describing eternity in a manner characteristic of succession in time; but eternal Deity, rather than an eternal Now, is a conception far more full of meaning for us.

5. DEFECT OF THIS VIEW:

To speak of God's eternity as an eternal Now — a present in the time-sense — involves a contradiction. For the eternal existence is no more described by the notion of a present than by a past or a future. Such a Now or present presupposes a not-now, and raises afresh the old time-troubles, in relation to eternity. Time is certainly not the form of God's life, His eternity meaning freedom from time. Hence, it was extremely troublesome to theology of the Middle Ages to have a God who was not in time at all, supposed to create the world at a particular moment in time.

6. PHILOSOPHICAL VIEWS:

Spinoza, in later times, made the eternity of God consist in His infinite — which, to Spinoza, meant His necessary — existence. For contingent or durational existence would not, in Spinoza's view, be eternal, though it lasted always. The illusoriness or unreality of time, in respect of man's spiritual life, is not always very firmly grasped. This wavering or uncertain hold of the illusiveness of time, or of higher reality as timeless, is still very prevalent; even so strong-souled a poet as Browning projects the shadow of time into eternity, with rarely a definite conception of the higher life as an eternal and timeless essence; and although Kant, Hegel and Schopenhauer may have held to such a timeless view, it has by no means become a generally adopted doctrine so far, either of theologians or of philosophers. If time be so taken as unreal, then eternity must not be thought of as future, as is done by Dr. Ellis McTaggart and some other metaphysicians today. For nothing could, in that case, be properly future, and eternity could not be said to begin, as is often done in everyday life.

The importance of the eternity conception is seen in the fact that neo-Kantian and neo-Hegelian thinkers alike have shown a general tendency to regard time-conceptions as unfit, in metaphysics, for the ultimate explanation of the universe.

7. TIME-CONCEPTIONS INADEQUATE:

Eternity, one may surely hold, must span or include, for God's eternal consciousness, the whole of what happens in time, with all of past, present or future, that lies within the temporal succession. But we are by no means entitled to say, as does Royce, that such wholeness or totality of the temporal constitutes the eternal, for the eternal belongs to quite another

order, that, namely, of timeless reality. Eternity is not to be defined in terms of time at all. For God is to us the supra-temporal ens perfectissimum, but One whose timeless self-sufficiency and impassable aloofness are not such as to keep Him from being strength and helper of our temporal striving. Our metaphysical convictions must not here be of barren and unfruitful sort for ethical results and purposes.

8. ALL SUCCESSION PRESENT IN ONE ACT TO DIVINE CONSCIOUSNESS:

Eternity is, in our view, the form of an eternal existence, to which, in the unity of a single insight, the infinite series of varying aspects or processes are, together-wise, as a totum simul, present. But this, as we have already shown, does not imply that the eternal order is nowise different, essentially, from the temporal; time is not to be treated as a segment of eternity, nor eternity regarded as interminable duration; the eternal cannot pass over into the temporal; for, an eternal Being, who should think all things as present, and yet view the time-series as a succession, must be a rather self-contradictory conception. For the Absolute Consciousness, time does not exist; the future cannot, for it, be thought of as beginning to be, nor the past as having ceased to be.

9. YET CONNECTION BETWEEN ETERNITY AND TIME:

After all that has been said, however, eternity and time are not to be thought of as without connection. For the temporal presupposes the eternal, which is, in fact, its positive ground and its perpetual possibility. These things are so, if only for the reason that the Divine mode of existence does not contradict or exclude the human mode of existence. The continuity of the latter — of the temporal — has its guaranty in the eternal. The unconditioned eternity of God brings into harmony with itself the limitations and conditions of the temporal. For time is purely relative, which eternity is not. No distinctions of before and after are admissible in the eternity conception, hence, we have no right to speak of time as a portion of eternity. Thus, while we maintain the essential difference between eternity and time, we at the same time affirm what may perhaps be called the affinity between them. The metaphysics of eternity and its time-relations continue to be matter of proverbial difficulty, and both orders — the eternal and the temporal — had better be treated as concrete, and not left merely to abstract reflection. Our idea of the eternal will best be

developed, in this concrete fashion, by the growth of our God-idea, as we more completely apprehend God, as actualized for us in His incarnate Son.

10. THE RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE TO ETERNITY:

Thus, then, it is eternity, not as immeasurable time, but rather as a mode of being of the immutable God, who is yet progressively revealing Himself in time, which we have here set forth. This is not to say that the religious consciousness has not its own need of the conception of God as being "from everlasting to everlasting," as in [0902]Psalm 90:2, and of His kingdom as "an everlasting kingdom" ([2003]Daniel 4:3). Nor is it to make us suppose that the absolute and self-existent God, who so transcends all time-dependence, is thereby removed far from us, while, on the contrary, His very greatness makes Him the more able to draw near unto us, in all the plenitude of His being. Hence, it is so truly spoken in [2575]Isaiah 57:15, "Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite." Hence, also the profound truthfulness of sayings like that in [4472]Acts 17:27,28, "He is not far from each one of us: for in him we live, and move, and have our being." After all that has been said, our best knowledge of eternity, as it exists in God, is not developed in any metaphysical fashion, but after the positive and timeless modes of the spiritual life — the modes of trust and love.

LITERATURE.

H. Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek, English edition, 1880; G. B. Winer, Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3rd edition, 1882; R. C. French, Synonyms of the New Testament, 9th edition, 1880; E. H. Plumptre, The Spirits in Prison, 3rd edition, 1885; J. Orr, Christian View of God and the World, lst edition, 1893; I. A. Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, English edition, 1885; J. H. Stirling, Philosophy and Theology, 1890; J. Lindsay, Studies in European Philosophy, 1909; The Fundamental Problems of Metaphysics, 1910.

James Lindsay

ETHAM

<e'-tham> ([מתאף 'etham]; [ʾΟθώμ, *Othom*], [0130]Exodus 13:20; [Βουθάν, *Bouthan*], [0506]Numbers 33:6,7; in 33:8 the Septuagint has a

different reading, "in their wilderness" showing another pointing for the word): The name used to be explained as the Coptic Atium, "border of the Sea" (Gesenius, Lexicon, under the word) which would agree with the Hebrew (⁰⁸⁰⁸Numbers 33:8) where the "wilderness of Etham" is noticed instead of that of Shur (⁰⁵⁵²Exodus 15:22) East of the Red Sea (*see SHUR*). At Etham (⁰⁸³⁰Exodus 13:20), the Hebrews camped in the "edge," or at "the end," of the desert West of the sea that they were to cross (*see EXODUS*). This camp was probably near the North end of the Bitter Lakes, a march from Succoth. Brugsch (Hist. Egypt, II, 359) would compare Etham with the Egyptian Khetam ("fort"), but the Hebrew word has no guttural. The word Khetam is not the name of a place (see Pierret, Vocab. hieroglyph., 453), and more than one such "fort" seems to be noticed (*see PITHOM*). In the reign of Seti II a scribe's report mentions the pursuit of two servants, apparently from Zoan, to the fortress of I-k-u southward, reaching Khetam on the 3rd day; but if this was the "Khetam of Rameses II," or even that "of Minepthah," it would not apparently suit the position of Etham.

See MIGDOL.

C. R. Conder.

ETHAN

<e'-than> ([ˆtyae*'ethan*], "firm," "enduring"; [Γαιθάν, *Gaithan*]):

(1) A wise man with whom Solomon is compared (¹⁰⁶¹1 Kings 4:31). Called there "Ethan the Ezrahite," to whom the title of Psalm 89 ascribes the authorship of that poem.

(2) A "son of Kishi," or "Kishaiah," of the Merari branch of the Levites, and, along with Heman and Asaph, placed by David over the service of song (¹⁰⁶⁴1 Chronicles 6:44; 15:17,19).

See JEDUTHUN.

(3) An ancestor of Asaph of the Gershomite branch of the Levites (¹⁰⁶²1 Chronicles 6:42).

ETHANIM

<eth'-a-nim> ([μynita e*'ethanim*]): The seventh month of the Jewish year (¹⁰⁸²1 Kings 8:2). The word is of Phoenician origin and signifies

"perennial," referring to living streams. It corresponds to September-October.

See CALENDAR; TIME.

ETHANUS

<e-tha'-nus>, the King James Version Ecanus (Apocrypha): One of the scribes who wrote for forty days at the dictation of Ezra (2 Esdras 14:24).

ETHBAAL

<eth-ba'-al>, *<eth'-ba-al>* ([l [B″ t׆, *'ethba`al*], "with Baal"): "King of the Sidonians," and father of Jezebel whom Ahab king of Israel took to wife (⁽¹¹⁶¹⁾1 Kings 16:31).

ETHER

<e'-ther> ([rt[, *`ether*]; [Ἀθέρ, *Ather*]): A town in Judah (⁽⁰⁶⁵²⁾Joshua 15:42), near Libnah, assigned to Simeon (⁽⁰⁶⁹⁰⁷⁾Joshua 19:7). Kh. el `Atr (identical in spelling with Ether) is possibly the site. It is near Beit Jibrin and is described as "an ancient site: cisterns, foundations, quarried rock and terraces" (PEF, III, 261, 279).

ETHICS

<eth'-iks>:

In this article, which proposes to be of a general and introductory character, we shall first deal with the nature and function of ethics generally, showing its difference from and relation to other cognate branches of inquiry. Secondly, we shall sketch briefly the history of ethics in so far as the various stages of its development bear upon and prepare the way for Christian ethics, indicating also the subsequent course of ethical speculation. Thirdly, we shall give some account of Biblical ethics; treating first of the main moral ideas contained in the Old Testament, and enumerating, secondly, the general principles and leading characteristics which underlie the ethical teaching of the New Testament.

I. NATURE AND FUNCTION OF ETHICS.

Ethics is that branch of philosophy which is concerned with human character and conduct. It deals with man, not so much as a subject of

knowledge, as a source of action. It has to do with life or personality in its inward dispositions, outward manifestations and social relations. It was Aristotle who first gave to this study its name and systematic form. According to the Greek signification of the term, it is the science of customs ([ἠθικά, *ethika*], from [ἦθος, *ethos*], "custom," "habit," "disposition"). But inasmuch as the words "custom" and "habit" seem to refer only to outward manners or usages, the mere etymology would limit the nature of the inquiry. The same limitation exists in the Latin designation, "moral," since mores concerns primarily manners.

1. Rise of Ethics:

Men live before they reflect, and act before they examine the grounds of action. So long as there is a congruity between the habits of an individual or a people and the practical requirements of life, ethical questions do not occur. It is only when difficulties arise and new problems appear as to right and duty in which the existing customs of life offer no solution, that doubt awakes, and with doubt reflection upon the actual morality which governs life. It is when men begin to call in question their past usages and institutions and to read-just their attitude to old traditions and new interests that ethics appears. Ethics is not morality but reflection upon morality. When, therefore, Aristotle, following Socrates and Plato, employed the term, he had in view not merely a description of the outward life of man, but rather the sources of action and the objects as ends which ought to guide him in the proper conduct of life. According to the best usage the names Moral Philosophy and Ethics are equivalent and mean generally the rational explanation of our nature, actions and relations as moral and responsible beings. Ethics therefore may be defined as the systematic study of human character, and its function is to show how human life must be fashioned to realize its end or purpose.

2. Ethics as a Science:

But accepting this general definition, how, it may be asked, can we speak of a science of conduct at all? Has not science to do with necessary truths, to trace effects from causes, to formulate general laws according to which these causes act, and to draw inevitable and necessary consequences? But is not character just that concerning which no definite conclusions can be predicted? Is not conduct, dependent as it is on the human will, just that which cannot be explained as the resultant of calculable forces? If the will

is free then you cannot decide beforehand what line it will take, or predict what shape character must assume. The whole conception of a science of ethics, it is contended, must fall to the ground if we admit an invariable and calculable element in conduct. But this objection is based partly upon a misconception of the function of science and partly upon a too narrow classification of the sciences. Science has not only to do with cause and effect and the laws according to which phenomena actually occur. Science seeks to deal systematically with all truths that are presented to us; and there is a large class of truths not belonging indeed to the realm of natural and physical events which, however, may be studied and correlated. Ethics is not indeed concerned with conduct, as a natural fact, as something done here and now following from certain causes in the past and succeeded by certain results in the future. It is concerned with judgments upon conduct — the judgment that such conduct is right or wrong as measured by a certain standard or end. Hence, a distinction has been made between the physical sciences and what are called normative sciences.

3. A Normative Science:

The natural or physical sciences are concerned simply with phenomena of Nature or mind, actual occurrences which have to be analyzed and classified. The normative sciences, on the other hand, have to do not with mere facts in time or space, but with judgments about these facts, with certain standards or ends (norms, from norma, "a rule") in accordance with which the facts are to be valued. Man cannot be explained by natural law. He is not simply a part of the world, a link in the chain of causality. When we reflect upon his life and his relation to the world we find that he is conscious of himself as an end and that he is capable of forming purposes, of proposing new ends and of directing his thoughts and actions with a view to the attainment of these ends, and making things subservient to him. Such an end or purpose thus forms a norm for the regulation of life; and the laws which must be observed for the attainment of such an end form the subjects of a normal or normative science. Ethics therefore has to do with the norm or standard of right or wrong, and is concerned primarily with the laws which regulate our judgments and guide our actions.

4. Relation to Cognate Sciences:

Man is of course a unity, but it is possible to view his self-consciousness in three different aspects, and to regard his personality as constituted of an

intellectual, sentient and volitional element. Roughly corresponding to these three aspects, one in reality but separable in thought, there arise three distinct though interdependent mental sciences: metaphysics, which has to do with man's relation to the universe of which he forms a part; psychology, which deals with the nature, constitution and evolution of his faculties and feelings as a psychical being; and ethics, which treats of him as a volitional being, possessing will or determining activity.

(1) **Ethics and Metaphysics.**

Ethics, though distinct from, is closely connected with metaphysics on the one hand, and psychology on the other. If we take metaphysics in its widest sense as including natural theology and as positing some ultimate end to the realization of which the whole process of the world is somehow a means, we may easily see how it is a necessary presupposition or basis of ethical inquiry. The world as made and governed by and for an intelligent purpose, and man as a part of it, having his place and function in a great teleological cosmos, are postulates of the moral life and must be accepted as a basis of all ethical study. The distinction between ethics and metaphysics did not arise at once. In early Greek philosophy they were closely united. Even now the two subjects cannot be completely dissociated. Ethics invariably runs back into metaphysics, or at least into theology, and in every philosophical system in which the universe is regarded as having an ultimate end or good, the good of human beings is conceived as identical with or included in the universal good (see Ziegler, Gesch. der christlichen Ethik; also Sidgwick, History of Ethics).

(2) **Ethics and Psychology.**

On the other hand ethics is closely associated with, though distinguishable from, psychology. Questions of conduct inevitably lead to inquiries as to certain states of the agent's mind, for we cannot pronounce an action morally good or bad until we have investigated the qualities of intention, purpose, motive and disposition which lie at the root of the action. Hence, all students of ethics are agreed that the main object of their investigation must belong to the psychical side of human life, whether they hold that man's ultimate end is to be found in the sphere of pleasure or they maintain that his well-being lies in the realization of virtue. Questions as to existence, evolution and adequacy of a moral faculty (*see CONSCIENCE*); as to the relation of pleasure and desire; as to the meaning of validity of

voluntary action; as to the historical evolution of moral customs and ideals, and man's relation at each stage of his being to the social, political and religious institutions, belong indeed to a science of ethics, but they have their roots in psychology as a study of the human soul.

The very existence of a science of ethics depends upon the answers which psychology gives to such questions. If, for example, we decide that there is no such faculty in man as conscience and that the moral sense is but a natural manifestation which has gradually evolved with the physical and social evolution of man (Darwin, Spencer); or if we deny the self-determining power of human beings and assume that the freedom of the will is a delusion, or in the last resort a negligible element, and treat man as one of the many phenomena of a physical universe, then indeed we may continue to speak of a science of the moral life as some naturalistic writers do, but such a science would not be a science of ethics as we understand it. Whatever be our explanation of conscience and freedom, no theory as to these powers must depersonalize man, and we may be justly suspicious of any system of psychology which undermines the authority of the moral sense or paves the way for a complete irresponsibility.

The "Ought."

Ethics is based on the assumption that man is a person possessing rights and having duties — responsible therefore for his intentions as well as his actions. The idea of personality involves not only a sense of accountability but carries with it also the conception of a law to which man is to conform, an ideal at which he is to aim. The end of life with all its implications forms the subject of ethics. It is concerned not simply with what a man is or does, but more particularly with what he should be and do. Hence, the word "ought" is the most distinctive term of ethics. The "ought" of life constitutes at once the end or ideal and the law of man. It comprises end, rule and motive of action. Thus the problem of ethics comes to be regarded as the highest good of man, the [τὸ ἀγαθόν, *to agathon*], of the Greeks, the summum bonum of Latin philosophy.

5. Relation of Christian Ethics to Moral Philosophy:

If ethics generally is based upon the postulates of philosophy and psychology, and at each stage of human consciousness grounds its principles of life upon the view of the world and of man to which it has attained, Christian ethics presupposes the Christian view of life as revealed

by Christ, and its definition must be in harmony with the Christian ideal. Christian ethics is the science of morals conditioned by Christianity, and the problems which it discusses are the nature, laws and duties of the moral life as dominated by the Supreme Good which Christians believe to have been revealed in and through the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Christian ethics is thus a branch or particular application of general ethics. So far from being opposed to moral philosophy it is the inevitable outcome of the evolution of thought. For if the revelation of God through Christ is true, then it is a factor, and the greatest in life and destiny, which must condition man's entire outlook and give a new value to his aims and duties.

(1) **Not an Opposition.**

In Christianity we are confronted with the motive power of a great Personality entering into the current of human history, and by His preeminent spiritual force giving a direction to the moral life of man. This means that the moral life can only be understood by reference to the creative power of this Personality. If there is any place at all for a distinct science of Christian ethics, that place can be indicated only by starting from the ethical ideal embodied in Christ, and working out from that point a code of morality for the practical guidance of the Christian life. But while this truth gives to Christian ethics its distinctive character and preeminent worth, it neither throws discredit upon philosophical ethics nor separates the two sciences by any hard-and-fast lines. They have much in common. A large domain of conduct is covered by both. The so-called pagan virtues have their worth for Christian character and are in the line of Christian virtues. Man even in his natural state is constituted for the moral life and is not without some knowledge of right and wrong (Romans 1:20). The moral attainments of the ancients are not simply "splendid vices." Duty may differ in content, but it is of the same kind under every system. Purity is purity, and benevolence benevolence, and both are excellences, whether manifested in a heathen or a Christian. While therefore Christian ethics takes its point of departure from the revelation of God and the manifestation of man's possibilities in Christ, it accepts and uses the results of moral philosophy in so far as they throw light upon the fundamental facts of human nature. As a system of morals Christianity claims to be inclusive. It takes cognizance of all the data of consciousness, and assumes all ascertained truth as its own. It completes what is lacking in other systems in so far as their conclusions are based on an incomplete survey of facts. Christian morals, in short, deal with personality in its highest ranges

of moral power and spiritual consciousness, and seek to interpret life by its greatest possibilities and loftiest attainments as they have been revealed in Christ.

(2) **Philosophical Postulates.**

As illustrating what has just been said two distinctive features of Christian morals may be noted, of which philosophical ethics takes little or no account:

(a) Christian ethics assumes a latent spirituality in man awaiting the Spirit of God to call it forth. "Human nature," says Newman Smyth, "has its existence in an ethical sphere and for moral ends of being." There is a natural capacity for ethical life to which man's whole constitution points. Matter itself may be said to exist ultimately for spirit, and the spirit of man for the Holy Spirit (compare Rothe, Theologische Ethik, I, 459). No theory of man's physical beginning can interfere with the assumption that man stands upon a moral plane and is capable of a life which shapes itself to spiritual ends. Whatever be man's history and evolution, he has from the beginning been made in God's image, and he bears the Divine impress in all the lineaments of his body and soul. His degradation cannot wholly obliterate his nobility, and his actual corruption bears witness to his possible holiness. Christian morality is therefore nothing else than the morality prepared from all eternity, and is but the highest realization of that which heathen virtue was striving after. This is the Pauline view of human nature. Jesus Christ, according to the apostle, is the end and consummation of the whole creation. Everywhere there is a capacity for Christ. Man is not simply what he now is, but all that he is yet to be (<46154>1 Corinthians 15:47-49).

(b) Connected with this peculiarity is another which further differentiates Christian ethics from philosophical — the problem of the re-creation of character. Speculative systems do not advance beyond the formation of moral requirements; they prescribe what ought ideally to be done or avoided. Christianity, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with the question, By what power can I achieve the right and the good? (compare Ottley, Christian Ideas and Ideals, 22). It regards human nature as in need of renewal and recovery. It points to a process by which character can be restored and transformed. It claims

to be the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth
(⁴⁵⁰¹⁶Romans 1:16). Christian ethics thus makes the twofold assumption,
and in this its contrast to philosophical ethics is disclosed, that the ideal
of humanity has been revealed in Jesus Christ and that in Him also there
is supplied a power by which man may become his true self, all that his
natural life gives promise of and potentially is.

(3) **Method.**

Passing from a consideration of the data of Christian ethics to its method,
we find that here again there is much that is common to philosophy and
Christian morals. The method in both is the rational method. The Christian
ideal, though given in Christ, has to be examined, analyzed and applied by
the very same faculties as man employs in regard to speculative problems.
All science must be furnished with facts, and its task is to give a consistent
explanation of them. While the speculative thinker finds his facts in the
constitution of the moral world at large, the Christian discovers his in
Scripture, and more particularly in the teachings of Christ. But it is
sufficient to point out that while the New Testament is largely occupied
with ethical matters, there is no attempt at a scientific formulation of them.
The materials of systematic treatment are there, but the task of
coordinating and classifying principles is the work of the expositor. The
data are supplied but these data require to be interpreted, unified and
applied so as to form a system of ethics. Consequently in dealing with his
facts, the same method must be employed by the Christian expositor as by
the student of science. That is the method of rational inquiry and inductive
procedure — the method imposed upon all mental problems by the
essential nature of the mind itself. The authority to which Christian ethics
appeals is not an external oracle which imposes its dictates in a mechanical
way. It is an authority embodied in intelligible forms and appealing to the
reasoning faculties of man. Christian ethics is not a cut-and-dried, ready-
made code. It has to be thought out by man and brought to bear, through
the instrumentality of his thinking powers, upon all the relationships of life.
According to the Protestant view, at least, ethics is no stereotyped
compendium of rules which the Bible or the church supplies to save a man
from the trouble of thinking. It is a complete misapprehension of the nature
of Scripture and of the purpose of Christ's example and teaching to assume
that they afford a mechanical standard which must be copied or obeyed in a
slavish way. Christ appeals to the rational nature of man, and His words
are life and spirit only as they are apprehended in an intelligent way and

become by inner conviction and personal appropriation the principles of thought and action:

6. Relation of Christian Ethics to Dogmatics:

Within the domain of theology the two main constituents of Christian of teaching are dogmatics and ethics, or doctrine and morals. Though it is convenient to treat these separately, they really form a whole, and are but two sides of one subject. It is difficult to define their limits, and to say where dogmatics ends and ethics begins.

The distinction has sometimes been expressed by saying that dogmatics is a theoretic, while ethics is a practical science. It is true that ethics stands nearer to everyday life and deals with methods of practical conduct, while dogmatics is concerned with beliefs and treats of their origin and elucidation. But on the other hand ethics discusses thoughts as well as actions, and is interested in inner judgments not less than outward achievements. There is a practical side to all doctrine; and there is a theoretic side of all morals. In proportion as dogmatic theology becomes divorced from practical interest there is a danger that it may become mere pedantry. Even the most theoretic of sciences, metaphysics, while, as Novalis said, it bakes no bread, has its justification in its bearing upon life. On the other hand, ethics would lose all scientific value and would sink into a mere enumeration of duties if it had no dogmatic basis and did not draw its motives from beliefs. The common statement that dogmatics shows what we should believe and ethics what we should do is only approximately true and is inadequate. For moral laws and precepts are also objects of faith, and what we should believe involves a moral requirement and has a moral character.

(1) **The Connection.**

Schleiermacher has been frequently charged with ignoring the differences between the two disciplines, but with scant justice; for while he regards the two studies as but different branches of Christian doctrine and while emphasizing their intimate connection, he by no means neglects their differences (compare Schleiermacher, Christliche Lehre, 1-24). Recent Christian moralists (Dorner, Martensen, Wuttke, Haering, Lemme) tend to accentuate the distinction and claim for them a separate discussion. The ultimate connection cannot indeed be overlooked without loss to both. It leads only to confusion to talk of a creedless morality, and the attempt to

deal with moral questions without reference to their dogmatic implication will not only rob Christian ethics of its distinctive character and justification, but will reduce the exposition to a mere system of emotionalism. Dogmatics and ethics may be regarded as interdependent and mutually serviceable. On the one hand, ethics saves dogmatics from evaporating into unsubstantial speculation, and, by affording the test of life and workableness, keeps it upon the solid foundation of fact. On the other hand, dogmatics supplies ethics with its formative principles and normative standards, and preserves the moral life from degenerating into the vagaries of fanaticism or the apathy of fatalism.

(2) **The Distinction.**

While both sciences form the complementary sides of theology, and stand in the relation of mutual service, ethics presupposes dogmatics and is based upon its postulates. Dogmatics presents the essence, contents and object of the religious consciousness; ethics presents this consciousness as a power determining the human will (Wuttke). In the one, the Christian life is regarded from the standpoint of dependence on God; in the other, from the standpoint of human freedom. Dogmatics deals with faith in relation to God, and as the receptive organ of Divine grace; ethics considers it rather in its relation to man as a human activity, and as the organ of conduct (compare Lemme, Christliche Ethik, I, 15). Doctrine shows us how our adoption into the kingdom of God is the work of Divine love; ethics shows us how this knowledge of salvation manifests itself in love to God and our neighbor and must be worked out through all the relationships of life (compare Haering).

(3) **Theological Postulates.**

From this point of view we may see how dogmatics supplies to ethics certain postulates which may briefly be enumerated.

(a) The Christian Idea of God:

God is not merely a force or even a creator as He is presented in philosophy. Divine power must be qualified by what we term the moral attributes of God. We do not deny His omnipotence, but we look beyond it to "the love that tops the power, the Christ in God." Moreover we recognize a gradation in God's moral qualities:

(a) benevolence or kindness;

(b) more deeply ethical and in seeming contrast to His benevolence, Divine justice — not mere blind benevolence but a kindness which is wise and discriminating (compare Butler);

(c) highest in the scale of Divine attributes, uniting in one comprehensive quality kindness and justice, stands Divine love or grace. The God whom dogmatics postulates to ethics is God in Christ.

(b) The Christian Doctrine of Sin.

It is not the province of ethics to discuss the origin of evil or propound a theory of sin. But it must see to it that the view it takes is consistent with the truths of revelation and in harmony with the facts of life. A false or inadequate conception of sin is as detrimental for ethics as it is for dogmatics, and upon our doctrine of evil depends very largely our view of life as to its difficulties and purposes, its trials and triumphs. Three views of sin have been held. According to some (e.g. the ancient Greeks) sin is simply a defect or shortcoming, a missing of the mark ([ἁμαρτία, *hamartia*], the active principle, or [ἁμάρτημα, *hamartema*], the result); according to others, it is a disease, a thing latent in the constitution or at least an infirmity or limitation inherent in the flesh and resulting from heredity and environment (*see EVOLUTION*).

While there is truth in both of these views, by themselves, each separately, or both in combination, is defective. They do not sufficiently take account of the personal self-determinative element in all sin. It is a misfortune, a fate from which the notion of guilt is absent. The Christian view implies these conceptions, but it adds its own distinctive note which gives to them their value. Sin is not merely a negative thing, it is something positive, an inward dominating force. It is not merely an imperfection, or want; it is an excess, a trespass. It is not simply an inherited and inherent malady; it is a self-chosen perversion. It is not inherent in the flesh or animal impulses and physical passions: it belongs rather to the mind and will. Its essence lies in selfishness. It is the deliberate choice of self in preference to God. It is personal and willful rebellion. It is to be overcome, therefore, not by the suppression of the body or the excision of the passions, but by the acceptance of a new principle of life and a transformation of the whole man. There are of course degrees and stages of wrongdoing, and there are compensating circumstances which must be taken into account in estimating the significance of evil; but in its last resort Christian ethics

postulates the fact of sin and regards it as personal rebellion against the holiness of God, as the deliberate choice of self and the willful perversion of all the powers of man into instruments of unrighteousness.

(c) The Responsibility of Man:

A third postulate arises as a consequence from the Christian view of God and the Christian view of sin, namely, the responsibility of man. Christian ethics treats every man as accountable for his thoughts and actions, and therefore capable of choosing the good as revealed in Christ. While not denying the sovereignty of God or minimizing the mystery of evil and clearly recognizing the universality of sin, Christianity firmly maintains the doctrine of human freedom and accountability. An ethic would be impossible if, on the one side, grace were absolutely irresistible, and if, on the other, sin were necessitated, if at any single point wrongdoing were inevitable. Whatever be our doctrine on these subjects, ethics demands that freedom of the will be safeguarded.

At this point an interesting question emerges as to the possibility, apart from a knowledge of Christ, of choosing the good. Difficult as this question is, and though it was answered by Augustine and many of the early Fathers in the negative, the modern, and probably the more just, view is that we cannot hold mankind responsible unless we accord to all men the larger freedom. If non-Christians are fated to do evil, then no guilt can be imputed. History shows that a love for goodness has sometimes existed, and that many isolated acts of purity and kindness have been done, among people who have known nothing of the historical Christ. The New Testament recognizes degrees of depravity in nations and individuals and a measure of noble aspiration and earnest effort in ordinary human nature. Paul plainly assumes some knowledge and performance on the part of the heathen, and though he denounces their immorality in unsparing terms he does not affirm that pagan society was so utterly corrupt that it had lost all knowledge of moral good.

II. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF ETHICS.

A comprehensive treatment of our subject would naturally include a history of ethics from the earliest times to the present. For ethics as a branch of philosophical inquiry partakes of the historical development of all thought, and the problems which it presents to our day can be rightly appreciated only in the light of certain categories and concepts — such as end, good,

virtue, duty, pleasure, egoism and altruism — which have been evolved through the successive stages of the movement of ethical thoughts. All we can attempt here, however, is the baldest outline of the different epochs of ethical inquiry as indicating the preparatory stages which lead up to and find their solution in the ethics of Christianity.

1. Greek Philosophy:

(1) Sophists.

All the great religions of the world — of India, Persia and Egypt — have had their ethical implicates, but these have consisted for the most part of loosely connected moral precepts or adages. Before the golden age of Greek philosophy there were no ethics in the strict sense. The moral consciousness of the Greeks takes its rise with the Sophists, and particularly with Socrates, who were the first to protest against the long-established customs and traditions of their land. The so-called "wise men" were in part moralists, but their sayings are but isolated maxims presenting no unity or connection. Philosophy proper occupied itself primarily with purely metaphysical or ontological questions as to the nature of being, the form and origin and primal elements of the world. It was only when Greek religion and poetry had lost their hold upon the cultured and the beliefs of the past had come to be doubted, that questions as to the meaning of life and conduct arose.

(2) Socrates.

Already the Sophists had drawn attention to the vagueness and inconsistency of common opinion, and had begun to teach the art of conduct, but it was Socrates who, as it was said, first brought philosophy down from heaven to the sphere of the earth and directed men's minds from merely natural things to human life. He was indeed the first moral philosopher, inasmuch as, while the Sophists talked about justice and law and temperance, they could not tell, when pressed, what these things were. The first task of Socrates, therefore, was to expose human ignorance. All our confusion and disputes about good arise, says. Socrates, from want of clear knowledge. He aimed, therefore, at producing knowledge, not merely for its own sake, but because he believed it to be the ground of all right conduct. Nobody does wrong willingly. Let a man know what is good, that is, what is truly beneficial, and he will do it. Hence, the famous Socratic dictum, "Virtue is knowledge and vice is ignorance." With all his

intellectualism Socrates was really a hedonist, believing that pleasure was the ultimate end of life. For it must not be imagined that he conceived of knowledge of virtue as distinct from interest. Everyone naturally seeks the good because the good is really identified with his happiness. The wise man is necessarily the happy man, and hence, "to know one's self" is to learn the secret of well-being.

(3) **Plato.**

While Socrates was the first to direct attention to the nature of virtue, his one-sided and fragmentary conception of it received a more systematic treatment from Plato, who attempted to define the nature and end of man by his place in the cosmos. Plato thus brought ethics into intimate connection with metaphysics. He conceived an ideal world in which everything earthly and human had its prototype. The human soul is derived from the world-soul and, like it, is a mixture of two elements. On the one side, in virtue of reason, it participates in the world of ideas, or the life of God; and on the other, by virtue of its animal impulses, it partakes of the world of decay, the corporeal world. These two dissimilar parts are connected by an intermediate element, which Plato calls [θυμός, *thumos*], embracing courage, the love of honor and the affections of the heart — a term which may be translated by the will. The constitution of the inner man is manifested in his outward organization. The head is the seat of reason, the breast of the heart and the affections, and the lower part of the body of the organs of animal desire. If we ask, Who is the just man? Plato answers, The man in whom the three elements just mentioned harmonize. We thus arrive at the scheme of the so-called "cardinal virtues" which have persisted through all ages and have given direction to all ethical discussion — wisdom, courage, temperance which, in combination, give us justice. It will thus be observed that virtue is no longer simply identified with knowledge; but another form of bad conduct besides ignorance is assumed, namely, the internal disorder and conflict of the soul, in which the lower impulses war with the higher. This, it will be seen, is a distinct advance on the one-sided position of Socrates; but in his attempt to reconcile the two movements in the conflict of life, Plato does not succeed in overcoming the duality. The inner impulses are ever dragging man down, and man's true well-being lies in the attainment of the life of reason. But though there are gleams of a higher solution in Plato, as a rule he falls back upon the idea that virtue is to be attained only by the suppression of the animal passions and the mortifying of the lower life. Plato affords us also the primal

elements of social ethics. Morality as conceived by him is not something belonging merely to the individual, but has its full realization in the state. Man is indeed but-a type of the larger cosmos, and it is not as an individual but as a citizen that he is capable of realizing his true life.

(4) **Aristotle.**

The ethics of Aristotle, while it completes, does not essentially differ from that of Plato. He is the first to treat of the subject formally as a science, which assumes in his hands a division of politics. For, as he says, man is really "a social animal"; and, even more decisively than Plato, he treats of man as a part of society. Aristotle begins his great work on ethics with the discussion of the chief good, which he declares to be happiness or well-being. Happiness does not consist, however, in sensual pleasure, or even in the pursuit of honor, but in a life of well-ordered contemplation, "an activity of the soul in accordance with reason" (Nic. Eth., I, chapter v). But to reach the goal of right thinking and right doing, both favorable surroundings and proper instruction are required. Virtue is not virtue until it is a habit, and the only way to become virtuous is to practice virtue. It will thus be seen that Aristotle balances the one-sided emphasis of Socrates and Plato upon knowledge by the insistence upon habit. Activity must be combined with reason. The past and the present, environment and knowledge, must both be acknowledged as elements in the making of life. The virtues are thus habits, but habits of deliberate choice. Virtue is therefore an activity which at every point seeks to strike the mean between two opposite excesses. Plato's list of virtues had the merit of simplicity, but Aristotle's, though fuller, lacks system and consists generally of right actions which are determined in reference to two extremes. One defect which strikes a modern is that among the virtues benevolence is not recognized except obscurely as a form of liberality; and in general the gentler self-sacrificing virtues so prominent in Christianity have no place. The virtues. are chiefly aristocratic and are impossible for a slave. Again while Aristotle did well, in opposition to previous philosophy, to recognize the function of habit, it must be pointed out that habit of itself cannot make a man virtuous. Mere habit may be a hindrance and not a help to higher attainment. You cannot reduce morality to a succession of customary acts. But the main defect of Aristotle's treatment of virtue is that he regards the passions as wholly irrational and immoral. He does not see that passion in this sense can have no mean. If you may have too much of a good thing, you cannot have even a little of a bad thing. In man the desires and

impulses are never purely irrational. Reason enters into all his appetites and gives to the body and all the physical powers an ethical value and a moral use. We do not become virtuous by curbing the passions but by transfiguring them into the vehicle of good. Aristotle, not less than Plato, is affected by the Greek duality which makes an antithesis between reason and impulse, and imparts to the former an external supremacy.

(5) **Stoics and Epicureans.**

The two conflicting elements of reason and impulse which neither Plato nor Aristotle succeeded in harmonizing ultimately gave rise to two opposite interpretations of the moral life. The Stoics selected the rational nature as the true guide to an ethical system, but they gave to it a supremacy so rigid as to threaten the extinction of the affections. The Epicureans, on the other hand, seizing the doctrine that happiness is the chief good, so accentuated the emotional side of nature as to open the door for all manner of sensual enjoyment. Both agree in determining the happiness of the individual as the final goal of moral conduct. It, is not necessary to dwell upon the particular tenets of Epicurus and his followers. For though both Epicureanism and Stoicism, as representing the chief tendencies of ethical inquiry, have exercised incalculable influence upon speculation and practical morals of later ages, it is the doctrines of Stoicism which have more specially come into contact with Christianity.

(6) **Stoicism.**

Without dwelling upon the stoic conception of the world, according to which the universe was a whole, interpenetrated and controlled by an inherent spirit, and the consequent view of life as proceeding from God and being in all its parts equally Divine, we may note that the Stoics, like Plato and Aristotle, regarded the realization of man's natural purpose as the true well-being or highest good. This idea they formulated into a principle: "Life according to Nature." The wise man is he who strives to live in agreement with his rational nature in all the circumstances of life. The law of Nature is to avoid what is hurtful and strive for what is appropriate; and pleasure arises as an accompaniment when a being obtains that which is fitting. Pleasure and pain are, however, to be regarded as mere accidents or incidents of life and to be met by the wise man with indifference. He alone is free, the master of himself and the world, who acknowledges the absolute supremacy of reason and makes himself independent of earthly

desires. This life of freedom is open to all, for all men are equal, members of one great body. The slave may be as free as the consul and each can make the world his servant by living in harmony with it.

There is a certain sublimity in the ethics of Stoicism. It was a philosophy which appealed to noble minds and "it inspired nearly all the great characters of the early Roman empire and nerved every attempt to maintain the dignity and freedom of the human soul" (Lecky, History of European Morals, I, chapter ii). We cannot, however, be blind to its defects. With all their talk of Divine immanence and providence, it was nothing but an impersonal destiny which the Stoics recognized as governing the universe. "Harmony with Nature" was simply a sense of proud self-sufficiency. Stoicism is the glorification of reason, even to the extent of suppressing all emotion. It has no real sense of sin. Sin is un-reason, and salvation lies in the external control of the passions, in indifference and apathy begotten of the atrophy of desire. The great merit of the Stoics is that they emphasized inner moral integrity as the one condition of all right action and true happiness, and in an age of degeneracy insisted on the necessity of virtue. In its preference for the joys of the inner life and its scorn of the delights of sense; in its emphasis upon duty and its advocacy of a common humanity, together with its belief in the direct relation of each human soul to God, Stoicism, as revealed in the writings of a Seneca, a Marcus Aurelius and an Epictetus, not only showed how high paganism at its best could reach, but proved in a measure a preparation for Christianity with whose practical tenets, in spite of its imperfections, it had much in common.

(7) **Stoicism and Paul.**

That there are remarkable affinities between Stoicism and Pauline ethics has frequently been pointed out. The similarity both in language and sentiment can scarcely be accounted for by mere coincidence. There were elements in Stoic philosophy which Paul would not have dreamed of assimilating, and features with which he could have no sympathy. The pantheistic view of God and the material conception of the world, the self-conscious pride, the absence of all sense of sin and need of pardon, the temper of apathy and the unnatural suppression of feelings — these were features which could not but rouse in the apostle's mind strong antagonism. But on the other hand there were certain well-known characteristics of a nobler order in Stoic morality which we may believe Paul found ready to his hand, ideas which he did not hesitate to incorporate

in his teaching and employ in the service of the gospel. Without enlarging upon this line of thought (compare Alexander, Ethics of Paul), of these we may mention the immanence of God as the pervading cause of all life and activity; the idea of wisdom or knowledge as the ideal of man; the conception of freedom as the prerogative of the individual; and the notion of brotherhood as the goal of humanity.

2. *Scholasticism:*

It will be possible only to sketch in a few rapid strokes the subsequent development of ethical thought. After the varied life of the early centuries had passed, Christian ethic (so prominent in the Gospels and Epistles), like Christian theology, fell under the blight of Gnostieism (Alexandrian philosophy; compare Hatch, Hibbert Lectures) and latterly, of Scholasticism. Christian truth stiffened into a cumbrous catalogue of ecclesiastical observances. In the early Fathers (Barnabas, Clement, Origen, Gregory), dogmatic and ethical teaching were hardly distinguished. Cyprian discussed moral questions from the standpoint of church discipline.

The first real attempt at a Christian ethic was made by Ambrose, whose treatise on the Duties is an imitation of Cicero's work of the same title. Even Augustine, notwithstanding his profound insight into the nature of sin, treats of moral questions incidentally. Perhaps the only writers among the schoolmen, except Alcuin (Virtues and Vices), who afford anything like elaborate moral treatises, are Abelard (Ethica, or Scito te Ipsum), Peter Lombard (Sentences), and, above all, Thomas Aquinas (Summa, II).

3. *Reformation:*

Emancipation from a legal dogmatism first came with the Reformation which was in essence a moral revival. The relation of God and man came to be re-stated under the inspiration of Biblical truth, and the value and rights of man as man, so long obscured, were disclosed. The conscience was liberated and Luther became the champion of individual liberty.

Descartes and Spinoza.

The philosophical writers who most fully express in the domain of pure thought the protestant spirit are Descartes and Spinoza, with whom speculation with regard to man's distinctive nature and obligations took a new departure. Without following the fortunes of philosophy on the

continent of Europe, which took a pantheistic form in Germany and a materialistic tone in France (though Rousseau directed the thought of Europe to the constitution of man), we may remark that in England thought assumed a practical complexion, and on the basis of the inquiries of Locke, Berkeley and Hume into the nature and limits of the human understanding, the quest. ions as to the source of moral obligation and the faculty of moral judgment came to the front.

4. English Moralists:

British moralists may be classified mainly cording to their views on this subject. Beginning with Hobbes, who maintained that man was naturally selfish and that all his actions were self-regarding, Cudworth, More, Wallaston, Shaftesbury, Hutchison, Adam Smith and others discussed the problem, with varying success, of the relation of individual and social virtues, agreeing generally that the right balance between the two is due' to moral sense which, like taste or perception of beauty, guides us in things moral. All these intuitional writers fall back upon a native selfish instinct. Selfishness, disguise it as we may, or, as it came to be called, utility, is really the spring and standard of action. Butler in his contention for the supremacy and uniqueness of conscience took an independent but scarcely more logical attitude. Both he and all the later British moralists, Paley, Bentham, Mill, suffer from a narrow, artificial psychology which conceives of the various faculties as separate and independent elements lying in man.

5. Utilitarianism:

Utilitarianism is a scheme of consequences which finds the moral quality of conduct in the effects and feelings created in the subject. With all their differences of detail the representatives of theory are at one in regarding the chief end of man as happiness. Bentham and Mill made the attempt to deduce benevolence from the egoistic startingpoint. "No reason can be given," says Mill (Utilitarianism, chapter iv), "why the general happiness is desirable except that each person .... desires his own happiness .... and the general happiness therefore is a good to the aggregate of all persons." Late utilitarians, dissatisfied with this non-sequitur and renouncing the dogma of personal pleasure, maintain that we ought to derive universal happiness because reason bids us (compare Sidgwick, Methods of Ethics, III, xiii). But what, we may ask, is this reason, and why should I listen to her voice?

6. Evolutionary Ethics:

The intuitional theory has more recently allied itself with the hypothesis of organic evolution. "These feelings of self-love and benevolence are really," says Spencer, "the products of development. The natural instincts and impulses to social good, though existent in a rudimentary animal form, have been evolved through environment, heredity and social institutions to which man through his long history has been subject." But this theory only carries the problem farther back, for, as Green well says (Proleg. to Ethics), "that countless generations should have passed during which a transmitted organism was progressively modified by reaction on its surroundings till an eternal consciousness could realize itself .... might add to the wonder, but it could not alter the results."

7. Kant:

The great rival of the pleasure-philosophy is that which has been styled "duty for duty's sake." This position was first taken by Kant whose principle of the "Categorical Imperative" utterly broke down theory of "pleasure for pleasure's sake." For Kant, conscience is simply practical reason; and its laws by him are reduced to unity. Reason, though limited in its knowledge of objects to phenomena of the senses, in the region of practice transcends the phenomenal and attains the real. The autonomy of the will carries us beyond the phenomenal into the supersensible world. Here the "Categorical Imperative" or moral law utters its "thou shalt" and prescribes' a principle of conduct irrespective of desire or ulterior end. In accordance with the nature of the Categorical Imperative, the formula of all morality is, "Act from a maxim at all times fit for law universal" (Kritik d. praktischen Vernunft and Grundlage zur Metaphysik der Sitten).

This principle is, however, defective. For while it determines the subjective or formal side of duty, it tells us nothing of the objective side, of the content of duty. We may learn from Kant the grandeur of duty in the abstract and the need of obedience to it, but we do not learn what duty is. Kant's law remains formal, abstract and contentless, without relation to the matter of practical life.

8. German Idealists:

To overcome this abstraction, to give content to the law of reason and find its realization in the institutions and relationships of life and society, has been the aim of the later idealistic philosophy which starts from Kant.

(1) **Hegel.**

Following Fichte, for whom morality is action according to the ideas of reason — selfconsciousness finding itself in and through a world of deeds — Hegel starts with the Idea as the source of all reality, and develops the conception of Conscious Personality which, by overcoming the antithesis of impulse and thought, gradually attains to the full unity and realization of self in the consciousness of the world and of God. The law of Right or of all ethical ideal is, "Be a person and respect others as persons" (Hegel, Philosophic des Rechtes, section 31). These views have been worked out in recent British and American works of speculative ethics by Green, Bradley, Caird, McTaggart, Harris, Royce, Dewey, Watson.

Man as a self is rooted in an infinite self or personality. Our individual self-consciousness is derived from and maintained by an infinite eternal and universal self-consciousness. Knowledge is, therefore, but the gradual discovery of mind in things, the progressive realization of the world as the self-manifestation of an infinite Personality with whom the finite intelligence of man is one. Hence, morality is the gradual unfolding of an eternal purpose whose whole is the perfection of man.

(2) **Watchwords: Pleasure and Duty.**

We have thus seen that in the history of ethics two great rival watchwords have been sounded — pleasure and duty, or, to put it another way, egoism and altruism. Both have their justification, yet each taken separately is abstract and one-sided. The problem of ethics is how to harmonize without suppressing these two extremes, how to unite social duty and individual right in a higher unity. We have seen that philosophical ethics has sought a synthesis of these conflicting moments in the higher and more adequate conception of human personality — a personality whose ideals and activities are identified with the eternal and universal personality of God. Christianity also recognizes the truth contained in the several types of ethical philosophy which we have passed under review, but it adds

something which is distinctively its own, and thereby gives a new meaning to happiness and to duty, to self and to others.

Christian synthesis:

Christianity also emphasizes the realization of personality with all that it implies as the true goal of man; but while Christ bids man "be perfect as God is perfect," He shows us that we only find ourselves as we find ourselves in others; only by dying do we live; and only through profound self-surrender and sacrifice do we become ourselves and achieve the highest good.

III. PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF BIBLICAL ETHICS.

The sketch of the history of ethics just offered, brief as it necessarily is, may serve to indicate the ideas which have shaped modern thought and helped toward the interpretation of the Christian view of life which claims to be the fulfillment of all human attempts to explain the highest good. We now enter upon the third division of our subject which embraces a discussion generally of Biblical ethics, dealing first with the ethics of the Old Testament and next with the leading ideas of the New Testament.

1. Ethics of the Old Testament:

The gospel of Christ stands in the closest relation with Hebrew religion, and revelation in the New Testament fulfils and completes the promise given in the Old Testament. We have seen that the thinkers of Greece and Rome have contributed much to Christendom, and have helped to interpret Bible teaching with regard to truth and duty; but there is no such inward relation between them as that which connects Christian ethics with Old Testament morality. Christ himself, and still more the apostle Paul, assumed as a substratum of his teaching the revelation which had been granted to the Jews. The moral and religious doctrines which were comprehended under the designation of "the Law" formed for them, as Paul said (Galatians 3:24,25), a [παιδαγωγός, *paidagogos*], or servant whose function it was to lead them to the school of Christ. In estimating the special character of Old Testament ethics, we are not concerned with questions as to authenticity and dates of the various books, nor with the manifold problems raised by modern Biblical criticism. While not forgetting the very long period which these books cover, involving changes of belief

and life and embracing successive stages of political society, it is possible to regard the Old Testament simply as a body of writings which represent the successive ethical ideas of the Hebrews as a people.

(1) **Religious Characteristics of Hebrew Ethics.**

At the outset we are impressed by the fact that the moral ideal of Judaism was distinctly religious. The moral obligations were conceived as Divine commands and the moral law as a revelation of the Divine will. The religion was monotheistic. At first Yahweh may have been regarded merely as a tribal Deity, but gradually this restricted view gave place to a wider conception of God as the God of all men; and as such He was presented by the later prophets. God was for the Jew the supreme source and author of the moral law, and throughout his history duty was embodied in the Divine will. Early in the Pentateuch the note of law is struck, and the fundamental elements of Jewish morality are embedded in the story of Eden and the Fall. God's commandment is the criterion and measure of man's obedience. Evil which has its source and head in a hostile though subsidiary power consists in violation of Yahweh's will.

(a) The Decalogue:

First among the various stages of Old Testament ethic must be mentioned the Mosaic legislation centering in the Decalogue (Exodus 20; Deuteronomy 5). Whether the Ten Commandments issue from the time of Moses, or are a later summary of duty, they hold a supreme and formative place in the moral teaching of the Old Testament. All, including even the 4th, are purely moral enactments. But they are largely negative, only the 5th rising to positive duty. They are also chiefly external, regulative of outward conduct, forbidding acts but not taking note of intent and desire. The 6th and 7th commandments protect the rights of persons, while the 8th guards outward property. Though these laws may be shown to have their roots and sanctions in the moral consciousness of mankind and as such are applicable to all times and all men, it is clear that they were at first conceived by the Israelites to be restricted in their scope and practice to their own tribes.

(b) Civil Laws:

A further factor in the ethical education of Israel arose from the civil laws of the land. The Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20 through 23), as

revealing a certain advance in political legislation and jurisprudence, may be regarded as of this kind. Still the hard legal law of retaliation — "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" — discloses a barbarous conception of right. But along with the more primitive enactments of revenge and stern justice there are not wanting provisions of a kindlier nature, such as the law of release, the protection of the fugitive, the arrangements for the gleaner and the institution of the Year of Jubilee.

(c) Ceremonial Laws:

Closely connected with the civil laws must be mentioned the ceremonial laws as an element in the moral life of Israel. If the civil laws had reference to the relation of man to his fellows, the ceremonial laws referred rather to the relation of man to God. The prevailing idea with regard to God, next to that of sovereign might, was holiness or separateness. The so-called Priestly Code, consisting of a number of ceremonial enactments, gradually took its place alongside of the Mosaic law, and was established to guard the being of God and the persons of the worshippers from profanation. These had to do

(a) with sacrifices and offerings and forms of ritual which, while they typified and preshadowed the ideas of spiritual sanctity, often degenerated into superstitious practices (compare [3055]Amos 5:25,26; [2066]Hosea 6:6; [2011]Isaiah 1:11-13);

(b) commands and prohibitions with regard to personal deportment — "meats and drinks and divers washings." Some of these had a sanitary significance; others guarded the habits of daily life from heathen defilement.

(d) Prophecy:

The dominant factor of Old Testament ethics lay in the influence of the prophets. They and not the priests were the great moralists of Israel. They are the champions of righteousness and integrity in political life, not less than of purity in the individual. They are the witnesses for God and the ruthless denouncers of all idolatry and defection from Him. They comment upon the social vices to which a more developed people is liable. They preach a social gospel and condemn wrongs done by man to man. Government and people are summoned to instant amendment and before the nation is held up a lofty ideal. The prophets are not only the, preachers, but also the philosophers of the people, and they direct men's minds to the

spiritual and ideal side of things, inveighing against worldliness and materialism.

Under their reflection, theories as to the origin and nature of evil begin to emerge, and the solemnity and worth of life are emphasized. While on the one hand the sense of individual responsibility is dwelt upon, on the other the idea of a hereditary taint of soul is developed, and it is shown that the consequences of sin may affect even the innocent. A man may inherit suffering and incur penalties, not apparently through any fault of his own, but simply by reason of his place in the solidarity of the race. Problems like these awaken deep perplexity which finds a voice not only in the Prophets but also in the Book of Job and in many of the Psalms. The solution is sought in the thought that God works through evil, and by its effects evolves man's highest good. These conceptions reach their climax in the Second Isa, and particularly in chapter 53. God is constantly represented as longing to pardon and reinstate man in His favor; and the inadequacy of mere ceremonial as well as the failure of all material means of intercourse with Yahweh are repeatedly dwelt upon as preparing the way for the doctrine of salvation. In the Book of Pss — the devotional manual of the people reflecting the moral and religious life of the nation at various stages of its development — the same exalted character of God as a God of righteousness and holiness, hating evil and jealous for devotion, the same profound scorn of sin and the same high vocation of man are prevalent.

   (e) Books of Wisdom:

Without dwelling at length on the ethical ideas of the other writings of the Old Testament — the Books of Wisdom, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes — we may remark that the teaching is addressed more to individuals than prophecy is; while not being particularly lofty it is healthy and practical, shrewd, homely common sense. While the motives appealed to are not always the highest and have regard frequently to earthly prosperity and worldly policy, it must not be overlooked that moral practice is also frequently allied with the fear of God, and the fight choice of wisdom is represented as the dictate of piety not less than of prudence.

It is to the sapiential books (canonical and apocryphal) that we owe the most significant ethical figures of the Old Testament — the wise man and the fool. The wise man is he who orders his life in accordance with the laws of God. The fool is the self-willed man, whose life, lacking principle,

fails of success. The nature of wisdom lies not in intellectual knowledge so much as in the control of passion and the prudent regulation of desire. The idea of human wisdom is connected in these books with the sublime conception of Divine wisdom which colors both them and the Psalms. In some of the finest passages, Wisdom is personified as the counselor of God in the creation of the world (Proverbs 8; The Wisdom of Solomon 10; Job 28), or the guide which guards the destinies of man (The Wisdom of Solomon 10:15 ff).

If the sapiential books are utilitarian in tone the Book of Ecclesiastes is pessimistic. The writer is impressed with the futility of life. Neither pursuit of knowledge nor indulgence in pleasure affords satisfaction. All is vanity. Yet there is an element of submission in this book which only escapes despair by a grim and stolid inculcation of obedience to Divine command.

(f) Apocryphal Books:

In an article on the Ethics of the Bible some allusion ought to be made to the spirit of the apocryphal books, reflecting as they do the ideas of a considerable period of Jewish history immediately before and contemporaneous with the advent of Christ. While in general there is a distinct recognition of true moral life and a high regard for the moral law, there is no system of ethics nor even a prevailing ethical principle in these books. The collection presents the ideas of no one man or party, or even of one period or locality. The moral ideas of each book require to be considered separately (see special articles), and they ought to be studied in connection with the philosophy of Philo and generally with the speculation of Alexandria, upon which they exercised considerable influence. The Wisdom of Solomon is supposed by Pfieiderer and others to have affected the Hellenic complexion of Paul's thought and also to have colored the stoic philosophy.

The apocryphal books as a whole do not give prominence to the idea of an ancient covenant and are not dominated by the notion of a redemptive climax to which the other Old Testament books bear witness. As a consequence their moral teaching lacks the spirituality of the Old Testament; and there is an insistence upon outward works rather than inward disposition as essential to righteousness. While wisdom and justice are commended, there is a certain self-satisfaction and pride in one's own virtue, together with, on the part of the few select spirits which attain to

virtue, a corresponding disparagement of and even contempt for the folly of the many. In Sirach especially this tone of self-righteous complacency is observable. There is a manifest lack of humility and sense of sin, while the attainment of happiness is represented as the direct result of personal virtue (Sirach 14:14 ff).

The Book of The Wisdom of Solomon shows traces of neo-Platonic influences and recognizes the four Platonic virtues (8:7) and while admitting the corruption of all men (9:12 ff) attributes the causes of evil to other sources than the will, maintaining the Greek dualism of body and soul and the inherent evil of the physical nature of man. The Book of Judith presents in narrative form a highly questionable morality. On the whole it must be recognized that the moral teaching of the Apocrypha is much below the best teaching of the Old Testament. While Sirach gives expression to a true piety, it manifests its want of depth in its treatment of sin and in the inculcation of merely prudential motives to goodness. In general the essence of love is unknown, and the moral temper is far inferior to the ethics of Jesus. It is a mundane morality that is preached. Hope is absent and righteousness is rewarded by long life and prosperity (Tobit). Legalism is the chief characteristic (Baruch), and Pharisaic ceremonialism on the one hand, and Sadducaic rationalism on the other are the natural and historical consequences of apocryphal teachings.

(2) **Limitations of Old Testament Ethics.**

In estimating the ethics of the Old Testament as a whole the fact must not be forgotten that it was preparatory, a stage in the progressive revelation of God's will. We are not surprised, therefore, that, judged by the absolute standard of the New Testament, the morality of the Old Testament comes short in some particulars. Both in intent and extent, in spirit and in scope, it is lacking.

(a) As to intent:

The tendency to dwell upon the sufficiency of external acts rather than the necessity of inward disposition, may be remarked; though as time went on, particularly in the later Prophets and some of the Psalms, the need of inward purity is insisted upon. While the ideal both for the nation and the individual is an exalted one — "Be ye holy for I am holy" — the aspect in which the character of God is represented is sometimes stern if not repellent (Exodus 24; <04448>Numbers 14:18; Genesis 18; <02417>2 Samuel 24:17).

But at the same time there are not wanting more tender features ([20117]Isaiah 1:17; [3068]Micah 6:8), and the Divine Fatherhood finds frequent expression. Even though the penal code is severe and the ceremonial law stern, a gentler spirit shines through many of its provisions, and protection is afforded to the wage-earner, the poor and the dependent, while the regulations regarding slaves and foreigners and even lower animals are merciful ([5244]Deuteronomy 24:14,15; [24213]Jeremiah 22:13,17; [30805]Malachi 3:5; [5254]Deuteronomy 25:4).

Material motives:

Again we have already remarked that the motives to which the Old Testament appeals are often mercenary and material. Material prosperity plays an important part as an inducement to moral conduct, and the good which the pious patriarch contemplates is earthly plenty, something which will enrich himself and his family. At the same time we must not forget that the revelation of God's purpose is progressive, and His dealing with men educative. There is naturally therefore a certain accommodation of the Divine law to the various stages of moral apprehension of the Jewish people, and on the human side a growing sense of the meaning of life as well as an advancing appreciation of the nature of righteousness. Gradually the nation is being carried forward by the promise of material benefits to the spiritual blessings which they enshrine. If even in the messages of the prophets there is not wanting some measure of threats and penalties, we must remember the character of the people they were dealing with — a people wayward and stubborn, whose imaginations could scarcely rise above the material and the temporal. We must judge prophecy by its best, and we shall see that these penalties and rewards which undoubtedly occupy a prominent place in Old Testament ethics were but goads to spur the apathetic. They were not ends in themselves, nor mere arbitrary promises or threats, but instruments subservient to higher ideals.

(b) As to extent:

With regard to the extent or application of the Hebrew ideal it must be acknowledged that here also Old Testament ethics is imperfect as compared with the universality of Christianity. God is represented as the God of Israel and not as the God of all men. It is true that a prominent commandment given to Israel is that which our Lord endorsed: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" ([51918]Leviticus 19:18). The extent of the obligation, however, would seem to be restricted in the language

immediately preceding it: "Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people." It has been pointed out that the term [[רֵעַ *rea`*] is of wider signification than the English word "neighbor," and expresses the idea of friend, and is applied to any person. The wider rendering is enforced by the fact that in ⟨R⟩Leviticus 19:33,14 the word "stranger" or "foreigner" is substituted for neighbor. The stranger is thus regarded as the special client of God and is commended to look to Him for protection. However this may be, in practice at least the Jews were not faithful to the humanitarianism of their law, and generally, in keeping with other races of antiquity, showed a tendency to restrict Divine favor within the limits of their own land and to maintain an attitude throughout their history of aloofness and repellent isolation toward foreigners. At the same time the obligation of hospitality was regarded as sacred and was practiced in early Hebrew life (⟨0180⟩Genesis 18:1-9). Nor must we forget that whatever may have been the Jewish custom the promise enshrined in their revelation implies the unity of mankind (⟨0190⟩Genesis 19:3), while several of the prophecies and Psalms look forward to a world-wide blessing (Isaiah 61; ⟨1922⟩Psalm 22:27; 48:2,10; 87). In Isaiah 54 we even read, "God of the whole earth shall he be called." "Everything," it has been said, "is definitely stated except the equality of all men in God's love." The morality of bare justice is also in some measure transcended. The universal Fatherhood of God, if not clearly stated, is implied in many passages, and in Second Isaiah and Hosea there are most tender revelations of Divine mercy though it is mercy to Israel only. But we know that the apostle Paul drew the inference from God's treatment of Israel that His mercy and salvation would extend to all.

2. Outline of New Testament Ethics:

We are now prepared to indicate briefly the distinctive features of the ethics of Christianity. As this article is, however, professedly introductory, and as the ethics of Jesus forms the subject of a separate treatment (*see ETHICS OF JESUS*), it will not be necessary to offer an elaborate statement of the subject. It will be sufficient to suggest the formative principles and main characteristics. What we have to say may conveniently be divided under three heads:

   (1) the Christian ideal;

   (2) the dynamic power;

(3) the virtues, duties and spheres of Christian activity.

(1) Ethics of Jesus and Paul.

Before, however, entering upon these details, a few words may fittingly be said upon the relation of the ethics of Jesus to those of Paul. It has been recently alleged that a marked contrast is perceptible between the teaching of Jesus and that of Paul, and that there is a great gulf fixed between the Gospels and the Epistles. Jesus is a moralist, Paul a theologian. The Master is concerned with the conditions of life and conduct; the disciple is occupied with the elaboration of dogma. This view seems to us to be greatly exaggerated. No one can read the Epistles without perceiving the ethical character of a large portion of their teaching and noticing how even the great theological principles which Paul enunciates have a profound moral import. Nor does it seem to us that there is any radical difference in the ethical teaching of Christ and that of the Apostle.

(2) Character.

Both lay emphasis on character, and the great words of Christ are the great words of Paul. The inmost spring of the new life of love is the same for both. The great object of the Pauline dialectic is to place man emptied of self in a condition of receptiveness before God. But this idea, fundamental in Paul, is fundamental also in the teaching of Jesus. It is the very first law of the kingdom. With it the Sermon on the Mount begins: "Blessed are the poor in spirit." If we analyze this great saying it surely yields the whole principle of the Pauline argument and the living heart of the Pauline religion. In perfect agreement with this is the fundamental importance assigned both by Jesus and Paul to faith. With both it is something more than mental assent or even implicit confidence in providence. It is the spiritual vision in man of the ideal, the inspiration of life, the principle of conduct.

(3) Inwardness of Motive.

Again the distinctive note of Christ's ethic is the inwardness of the moral law as distinguished from the externality of the cereMonial law. Almost in identical terms Paul insists upon the need of inward purity, the purity of the inner man of the heart. Once more both lay emphasis upon the fulfillment of our duties to our fellow-men, and both are at one in declaring that man owes to others an even greater debt than duty. Christ's principle is, "Thou

shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; Paul's injunction is "Owe no man anything but to love one another." Christ transforms morality from a routine into a life; and with Paul also goodness ceases to be a thing of outward rule and becomes the spontaneous energy of the soul. For both all virtues are but the various expressions of a single vital principle. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." The dynamic of devotion according to Christ is, "God's love toward us"; according to Paul, "The love of Christ constraineth us."

Ideal of Life:

And if we turn from the motive and spring of service to the purpose of life, again we find substantial agreement: "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect" is the standard of Christ; to attain to the perfect life — "the prize of the high calling of God in Christ" — is the aim of Paul.

(4) **Ultimate End.**

Nor do they differ in their conception of the ultimate good of the world. Christ's ethical ideal, which He worked for as the realization of the object of His mission, was a redeemed humanity, a reestablishment of human society, which He designated "the kingdom of God." Paul with his splendid conception of humanity sees that kingdom typified and realized in the Risen Life of his Lord. It is by growing up in all things unto Him who is the Head that the whole body will be perfected in the perfection of its members. And this is what Paul means when he sums up the goal and ideal of all human faith and endeavor — "till we all attain .... unto a fullgrown man, unto .... the fullness of Christ" (<49043>Ephesians 4:13). Paul everywhere acknowledges himself to be a pupil of the Master and a teacher of His ways (<46047>1 Corinthians 4:17). Without pursuing this subject there can be no doubt that in their hidden depths and in their practical life the precepts of the apostle are in essential agreement with those of the Sermon on the Mount, and have a dommon purpose — the presenting of every man perfect before God (compare Alexander, Ethics of Paul).

3. The Ethical Ideal:

The ethical ideal of the New Testament is thus indicated. The chief business of ethics is to answer the question, What is man's supreme good? For what should a man live? What, in short, is the ideal of life? A careful study of the New Testament discloses three main statements implied in

what Christ designates "the kingdom of God": man's highest good consists generally in doing God's will and more particularly in the attainment of likeness to Christ and in the realization of human brotherhood — a relation to God, to Christ and to man. The first is the pure white light of the ideal; the second is the ideal realized in the one perfect life which is viewed as standard or norm; the third is the progressive realization of the ideal in the life of humanity which is the sphere of the new life.

(1) **Holiness.**

Holiness as the fulfillment of the Divine will is, as we have seen, Christ's own ideal — Be ye perfect as your Father; and it is Paul's — This also we wish, even your perfection (⁴⁷³¹2 Corinthians 13:11). The ideas of righteousness and holiness as the attributes of God are the features of the kingdom of God or of heaven, the realization of which Jesus continually set forth as the highest aim of man; and running through all the epistles of Paul the constant refrain is that ye might walk worthy of God who hath called you unto His kingdom and glory. To walk worthy of God, to fulfill His will in all sincerity and purity, is for the Christian as for the Jew the end of all morality. Life has a supreme worth and sacredness because God is its end. To be a man is to fulfill in his own person God's idea of humanity. Before every man, just because he is man with the touch of the Divine hand upon him and his Maker's end to serve, lies this ultimate goal of existence — the realization of the perfect life-according to the idea of God.

(2) **Christlikeness.**

If Godlikeness or holiness is the end, Christlikeness is the norm or standard in which that end is presented in the Gospel. In Christianity God is revealed to us through Jesus Christ, and the abstract impersonal ideas of holiness and righteousness are transmuted into the features of a living personality whose spirit is to be reproduced in the lives of men. In two different ways Christ is presented in the New Testament as ideal. He is at once the Pattern and the Principle or Power of the new life.

(a) He is the Pattern of goodness which is to be reproduced in human lives. It would lead us to trench on the succeeding article if we were to attempt here a portrayal of the character of Jesus as it is revealed in the Gospels. We only note that it is characteristic of the New Testament writers that they do not content themselves with imaginative

descriptions of goodness, but present a living ideal in the historical person of Jesus Christ.

(b) He is also Principle of the new life — not example only, but power — the inspiration and cause of life to all who believe (⁴⁰¹⁹Ephesians 1:19,20). Paul says not, "Be like Christ," but "Have the mind in you which was also in Christ."

The literal imitation of an example has but a limited reign. To be a Christian is not the mechanical work of a copyist. Kant goes the length of saying that "imitation finds no place in all morality" (Metaphysics of Ethics, section ii). Certainly the imitation of Christ as a test of conduct covers a quite inadequate conception of the intimate and vital relation Christ bears to humanity. "It is not to copy after Him," says Schultz (Grundriss d. evangelischen Ethik, 5), "but to let His life take form in us, to receive His spirit and make it effective, which is the moral task of the Christian." It is as its motive and creative power that Paul presents Him. "Let Christ be born in you." We could not even imitate Christ if He were not already within us. He is our example only because He is something more, the principle of the new life, the higher and diviner self of every man. "He is our life"; "Christ in us the hope of glory."

(3) **Brotherhood and Unity of Man.**

The emphasis hitherto has been laid on the perfection of the individual. But both Christ and His apostles imply that the individual is not to be perfected alone. No man finds himself till he finds his duties. The single soul is completed only in the brotherhood of the race. The social element is implied in Christ's idea of the Kingdom, and many of the apostolic precepts refer not to individuals but to humanity as an organic whole. The church is Christ's body of which individuals are the members, necessary to one another and deriving their life from the head. The gospel is social as well as individual, and the goal is the kingdom of God, the brotherhood of man. Paul proclaims the unity and equality before God of Greek and Roman, bond and free.

4. The Dynamic Power of the New Life:

In the dynamic power of the new life we reach the central and distinguishing feature of Christian ethics. Imposing as was the ethic of Greece, it simply hangs in the air. Plato's ideal state remains a theory only.

Aristotle's "virtuous man" exists only in the mind of his creator. Nor was the Stoic more successful in making his philosophy a thing of actuality. Beautiful as these old-time ideals were, they lacked impelling force, the power to change dreams into realities. The problems which baffled Greek philosophy it is the glory of Christianity to have solved. Christian ethics is not a theory. The good has been manifested in a life. The Word was made flesh. It was a new creative force — a spirit given and received, to be worked out and realized in the actual life of common men.

(1) **The Dynamic on Its Divine Side.**

The problem with Paul was, How can man achieve that good which has been embodied in the life and example of Jesus Christ? Without entering into the details of this question it may be said at once that the originality of the gospel lies in this, that it not only reveals the good but discloses the power which makes the good possible in the hitherto unattempted derivation of the new life from a new birth under the influence of the Spirit of God. Following his Master, when Paul speaks of the new ethical state of believers he represents it as a renewal or rebirth of the Holy Spirit. It is an act of Divine creative power.

Without following out the Pauline argument we may say he connects the working of the Holy Spirit with two facts in the life of Christ, for him the most important in history — the death and resurrection of our Lord. Here we are in the region of dogmatics, and it does not concern us to present a theory of the atonement. All we have to do with is the fact that between man and the new life lies sin, which must be overcome and removed, both in the form of guilt and power, before reconciliation with God can be effected. The deed which alone meets the case is the sacrifice of Christ. In virtue of what Christ has achieved by His death a fundamentally new relationship exists. God and man are now in full moral accord and vital union.

But not less important as a factor in creating the new life is the resurrection. It is the seal and crown of the sacrifice. It was the certainty that He had risen that gave to Christ's death its sacrificial value. "If Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." The new creature is the work of Christ. But His creative power is not an external influence. It is an inner spirit of life. All that makes life life indeed — an exalted, harmonious and

completed existence — is derived from the Holy Spirit through the working of the crucified risen Christ.

(2) **The Dynamic on Its Human Side.**

Possession of power implies obligation to use it. The force is given; it has to be appropriated. The spirit of Christ is not offered to free a man from the duties and endeavors of the moral life. Man is not simply the passive recipient of the Divine energy. He has to make it his own and work it out by an act of free resolution. When we inquire what constitutes the subjective or human element, we find in the New Testament two actions which belong to the soul entering upon the new world in Christ — repentance and faith. These are complementary and constitute what is commonly called conversion. Repentance in the New Testament is a turning away in sorrow and contrition from a life of sin and a breaking with evil under the influence of Christ. If repentance looks back and forsakes, faith looks forward and accepts. In general it is the outgoing of the whole man toward his Lord, the human power or energy by which the individual receives and makes his own the life in Christ. It is not merely intellectual acceptance or moral trust; it is above all appropriating energy. It is the power of a new obedience. As the principle of moral appropriation it has its root in personal trust and its fruit in Christian service. Faith, in short, is the characteristic attitude and action of the whole Christian personality in its relation to the spiritual good offered to it in Christ.

5. *Virtues, Duties and Spheres of the New Life:*

It but remains to indicate how this new power manifests itself in character and in practical conduct. Character is expressed in virtue, and duty is conditioned by station and relationships.

(1) **The Virtues.**

The systematic enumeration of the virtues is one of the most difficult tasks of ethics. Neither in ancient nor in modern times has complete success attended attempts at classification. Plato's list is too meager. Aristotle's lacks system and is marred by omission. Nowhere in Scripture is there offered a complete description of all the virtues that flow from faith. But by bringing Christ's words and the apostolic precepts together we have a rich and suggestive cluster (Matthew 5; 6; Galatians 5:22,23; Colossians 3:12,13; Philippians 4:8; 1 Peter 2:18,19; 4:7,8; 2 Peter 15-8; 1

John 3; Jude). We may make a threefold classification:

(a) The Heroic Virtues:

The heroic virtues, sometimes called the cardinal, handed down from antiquity — wisdom, fortitude, temperance, justice. While these were accepted and dwelt upon, Christianity profoundly modified their character so that they became largely new creations. "The old moral currency was still kept in circulation, but it was gradually minted anew" (Strong).

(b) The Amiable Virtues:

The amiable virtues, which are not merely added on to the pagan, but being incorporated with them, give an entirely new meaning to those already in vogue. While Plato lays stress on the intellectual or heroic features of character, Christianity brings to the foreground the gentler virtues. Two reasons may have induced the Christian writers to dwell more on the self-effacing side of character: partly as a protest against the spirit of militarism and the worship of material power prevalent in the ancient world; and chiefly because the gentler self-sacrificing virtues more truly expressed the spirit of Christ. The one element in character which makes it beautiful and effective and Christlike is love — the element of sacrifice. Love evinces itself in humility which lays low all vaunting ambition and proud selfsufficiency. Closely allied to humility are meekhess and its sister, long-suffering — the attitude of the Christian in the presence of trial and wrong. With these again are connected contentment and patience and forbearance, gentle and kindly consideration for others. Lastly there is the virtue of forgiveness. For it is not enough to be humble and meek; we have a duty toward wrongdoers. We must be ready to forget and forgive (Romans 12:20). "Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you" (Ephesians 4:32).

(c) The Theological Virtues:

The theological virtues or Christian graces-faith, hope, charity. Some have been content to see in these three graces the summary of Christian excellence. They are fundamental in Christ's teaching and the apostolic combination of them may have had its basis in some lost word of the Master (Harnack). These graces cannot be separated. They are all of a piece. He who has faith has also love, and he who has faith and love cannot be devoid of hope. Love is the first and last word of apostolic Christianity.

No term is more expressive of the spirit of Christ. Love was practically unknown in the ancient world. Pre-Christian philosophy exalted the intellect but left the heart cold. Love in the highest sense is the discovery and creation of the gospel, and it was reserved for the followers of Jesus to teach men the meaning of charity and to find in it the law of freedom. It is indispensable to true Christian character. Without it no profession of faith or practice of good deeds has any value (1 Corinthians 13). It is the fruitful source of all else that is beautiful in conduct. Faith itself works through love and finds in its activity its outlet and exercise. If character is formed by faith it lives in love. And the same may be said of hope. It is a particular form of faith which looks forward to a life that is to be perfectly developed and completed in the future. Hope is faith turned to the future — a vision inspired and sustained by love.

(2) **The Duties.**

Of the duties of the Christian life it is enough to say that they find their activity in the threefold relationship of the Christian to self, to his fellow-men and to God. This distinction is not of course quite logical. The one involves the other. Self-love implies love of others, and all duty may be regarded as duty to God. The individual and society are so inextricably bound together in the kingdom of love that neither can reach its goal without the other.

(a) Duties Toward Self:

Duties toward self are, however, plainly recognized in the New Testament. our Lord's commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," makes a rightly conceived self-love the measure of love to one's neighbor. But the duties of self-regard are only lightly touched upon, and while the truth that the soul has an inalienable worth is insisted upon, to be constantly occupied with the thought of oneself is a symptom of morbid egoism and not a sign of healthy personality. But the chief reason why the New Testament does not enlarge upon the duty of self-culture is that according to the spirit of the gospel the true realization of self is identical with self-sacrifice. Only as a man loses his life does he find it. Not by anxiously standing guard over one's soul but by dedicating it freely to the good of others does one realize one's true self.

At the same time several self-respecting duties are recognized, of which mention may be made:

(i) stability of purpose or singleness of aim;

(ii) independence of other's opinion;

(iii) supremacy of conscience and a proper self-estimate.

In this connection may be noticed also the Christian's proper regard for the body which, as the temple of God, is not to be despised but presented as a living sacrifice; his attitude to worldly goods; his obligation to work; his right to recreation; and his contentment with his station — all of which duties are to be interpreted by the apostolic principle, "Use the world as not abusing it." The Christian ideal is not asceticism or denial for its own sake. Each must make the best of himself and the most of life's trust. All the faculties, possessions, pursuits and joys of life are to be used as vehicles of spiritual service, instruments which make a man a fit subject of the kingdom of God to which he belongs.

(b) Duties in Relation to Others:

Duties in relation to others, or brotherly love, are defined as to their extent and limit by the Christian's relation to Christ. Their chief manifestations are:

(i) justice, involving respect for others, negatively refraining from injury and positively yielding deference and honor, truthfulness, in word and deed, "speaking the truth in love," just judgment, avoiding censoriousness and intolerance;

(ii) kindness or goodness, embracing sympathy, service and practical beneficence which provides for physical need, administers comfort and gives, by example and direct instruction, edification;

(iii) patience, comprising forbearance, peaceableness.

(c) Duties in Relation to God:

Here morality runs up into religion and duty passes into love. Love rests on knowledge of God as revealed in Christ, and expresses itself in devotion. Love to God is expressed generally in

(i) thankfulness,

(ii) humility,

(iii) trustfulness; and particularly in worship (sacraments and prayers), and in witness-bearing — adorning the doctrine by beauty of life.

(3) Spheres and Relationships.

Of the various spheres and relationships in which the Christian finds opportunity for the exercise and cultivation of his spiritual life we can only name, without enlarging upon them, the family, the state and the church. Each of these spheres demands its own special duties and involves its own peculiar discipline. While parents owe to their children care and godly nurture, children owe their parents obedience. The attitude of the individual to the state and of the state to the individual are inferences which may be legitimately drawn from New Testament teaching. It is the function of the state not merely to administer iustice but to create and foster those agencies and institutions which work for the amelioration of the lot and the development of the weal of its citizens, securing for each full liberty to make the best of his life. On the other hand it is the duty of the individual to realize his civic obligations as a member of the social organism. The state makes its will dominant through the voice of the people, and as the individuals are so the commonwealth will be.

6. Conclusion:

Absoluteness, Inwardness and Universality.

In closing we may say that the three dominant notes of Christian ethics are, its absoluteness, its inwardness and its universality. The gospel claims to be supreme in life and morals. For the Christian no incident of experience is secular and no duty insignificant, because all things belong to God and all life is dominated by the Spirit of Christ. The uniqueness and originality of the ethics of Christianity are to be sought, however, not so much in the range of its practical application as in the unfolding of an ideal which is at once the power and pattern of the new life. That ideal is Christ in whom the perfect life is disclosed and through whom the power for its realization is communicated. Life is a force, and character is a growth which takes its rise in and expands from a hidden seed. Hence, in Christian ethics all apathy, passivity and inaction, which occupy an important place in the moral systems of Buddhism, Stoicism, and even medieval Catholicism, play no part. On the contrary all is life, energy and unceasing endeavor.

There are many details of modern social life with which the New Testament does not deal: problems of presentday ethics and economics which cannot be decided by a direct reference to chapter and verse, either of the Gospels or Epistles. But Paul's great principles of human solidarity; of equality in Christ; of freedom of service and love; his teachings concerning the church and the kingdom of God, the family and the state; his precepts with regard to personal purity, the use of wealth and the duty of work, contained the germs of the subsequent renewal of Europe and still contain the potency of social and political transformation.

LITERATURE.

General Works on Ethics:

Lotze, Paulsen, Wundt, Green, Sidgwick, Stephen, Dewey and Tufts, Palmer, Bowne, Mezer; Harris, Moral Evolution; Dubois; Randall, Theory of Good and Evil; Calderwood, Handbook of Moral Philosophy; Muirhead, Elementary Ethics; Sutherland, Origin and Growth of Moral Instinct; Simmel, Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft; Givycky, Moralphilosophic; Guyot, Lamentations morale; Janet, Theory Morals (translation); Mackenzie, Manual of Ethics; Eucken, works generally; Hensel, Hauptproblem der Ethik; Lipps, Die ethischen Grundfragen; Natorp, Socialpadagogik; Schuppe, Grundzuge der Ethik u. Rechtsphilosophie; Schwarz, Das sittliche Leben; Wentscher, Ethik.

General History:

See Histories of Philosophy; Zeller, Erdmann, Windelband, Maurice, Turner, Weber, Rogers, Alexander; Jodl, Geschichte der Ethik in der neueren Philosophic.

Works on Theological or Christian Ethics

Old Testament: Dillmann, Baudissin, Bertmann, Geschichte der christlichen Sitte; Konig, Hauptprobleme der Altes Testament Religions-Geschichte; Delitzsch, Riehm, Kuenen; Mozley, Ruling Ideas in Early Ages; Hessey, Moral Difficulties in the Bible; Moore, in Lux mundi; Ladd, Doctrine of Sacred Scripture; Robertson, Early Religion of Israel; Caillard, Progressive Revelation; Schultz, Old Testament Theology (English translation); Bruce, Ethics of the Old Testament; N. Smyth, Christian Ethics; Startton; Strong.

New Testament and Christianity:

Martinsen, Wuttke, Schletermacher, Rothe, Dorner, H. Weiss, Harlen, Hofmann, Frank, Luthardt, Beck, Kiibel, Kahler, Pfieiderer, Schultz, Kostlin; Herrmann, Faith and Morals; Communion of the Christian with God; Thomas, Jacoby, Lemme, Strong, Knight, N. Smyth; Ottley in Lux mundi and Christian Ideas and Ideals; W. L. Davidson, Christian Ethics, Guild Series; W. T. Davidson, Christian Interpretation of Life and Christian Conscience; Mackintosh; Murray, Handbook of Christian Ethics; Maurice, Social Morality; Nash, Ethics and Revelation; Dobschiitz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church; Clark, Christian Method of Ethics; Mathews, The Church and the Changing Order; Freemantle, The World as the Subject of Redemption; The Gospel in Secular Life; Sladden, Applied Christianity; Leckie, Life and Religion; Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Order; Peile, The Reproach of the Gospel; Coe, Education in Religion and Morals; Haering, The Ethics of the Christian Life (English translation); Tymms, Ancient Faith in Modern Light; Harris, God, the Creator; Bovon, Morale chretienne; Wace, Christianity and Morality; Kidd, Morality and Religion; Drummond, Via, Veritas, Vita; Hatch, Greek Ideas and the Christian Church; Matheson, Landmarks of New Testament Morality.

Works on New Testament Theology:

Also contain section on Ethics; Weiss, Holtzmann, Beyschlag; Harnack, Das Wesen, or What Is Christianity?; Stevens; Wernle, The Beginnings of Christianity; Adeney, Gould, Gardner, Bosworth, Briggs; Caird, Evolution of Religion.

Works on the Teaching of Jesus:

Especially Wendt, Bruce, Stevens, Horton, Jackson, Swete, Latham, Pastor Pastorum; Tolstoy; Julicher. See next article for the works on the Ethics of Jesus.

Special Works on Apostolic Ethics:

Ernesti, Ethik des Apostels Paulus; A. Alexander, The Ethics of Paul; Weinel, Paul; Baur, Paulinismus; Joh. Weiss, Paul and Jesus.

History of Christian Ethics:

Wuttke, Sidgwick, Ziegler, Luthardt, Thomas; Martineau, Types of Ethical Theory; Gass; Scharling, Christliche Sittenlehre; Lecky, History of European Morals; Pfleiderer.

Arch. B. D. Alexander

ETHICS OF JESUS

<*eth'-iks*>:

I. IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

If, following the custom prevalent at present, we adopt, as the general name for the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptists, the Kingdom of God, then the divisions of His ethical teaching will be

(1) the Blessings of the Kingdom,

(2) the Character of the Subjects,

(3) the Commandments of the King.

1. The Blessings of the Kingdom:

(1) **Nature of the Kingdom.**

"The Kingdom of God" was not a phrase invented by Jesus. It was used before Him by the Baptist. Its proximate source, for both Jesus and John, was the prophet Daniel, who uses it in very striking passages (2:44,45; 7:13,14). The idea of a kingdom of God goes back to the very commencement of the monarchy in Israel, when the prophet Samuel told those who demanded a king that Yahweh was their king, and that they should desire no other. Through all the subsequent history of the monarchy, which was, on the whole, so disappointing to patriotic and pious minds, the conviction lingered that, if God Himself were king, all would be well; and, when at length the Hebrew state was destroyed and the people were carried into captivity, the prophets still believed that for their country there was a future and a hope, if only Yahweh would take to Himself His great power and reign. In the period between the Old Testament and the New Testament such sentiments so greatly prevailed that Schurer has compiled, from the apocryphal literature, a kind of Messianic creed, embracing no fewer than eleven articles, which he

supposes to have prevailed before the Advent. It may be doubtful how far such beliefs had taken possession of the general mind. Many of the Sadducees were too satisfied with things as they were to concern themselves about such dreams. But the Pharisees undoubtedly gave a large place in their minds to Messianic expectations, and for these the Zealots were ready to fight. It is, however, to the prosdechomenoi, as they are called, because they were "waiting for the consolation of Israel," that we must look for the purest expression of this heritage derived from the piety of the past. In the hymns at the beginning of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, with which the birth of Jesus was greeted, we encounter an intense and lofty conception of the kingdom of God; and, as the earthly home in which Jesus grew up belonged to this select section of the population, there is little doubt that it was here He imbibed both His Messianic ideas and the phraseology in which these were expressed. His use of the term, the kingdom of God, has sometimes been spoken of as an accommodation to the beliefs and language of His fellow-countrymen. But it was native to Himself; and it is not unlikely that the very commonness of it in the circle in which He grew up rendered Him unconscious of the difference between His own conception and that which prevailed outside of this circle. For, as soon as He began to preach and to make known the sentiments which He included within this phrase, it became manifest that He and His contemporaries, under a common name, were thinking of entirely different things. They emphasized the first half of the phrase — "the kingdom"; He the second — "of God." They were thinking of the external attributes of a kingdom — political emancipation, an army, a court, subject provinces; He of the doing of God's will on earth as it is done in heaven. Even He had felt, at one stage, the glamor of their point of view, as is manifest from the account of the Temptation in the Wilderness; but He had decisively rejected it, resolving not to commence with an external framework on a large scale, to be subsequently filled with character, but to begin with the individual, and trust to time and Providence for visible success. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem proves that He never abandoned the claim to be the fulfiller of all the Old Testament predictions about the kingdom of God; but His enemies not unnaturally interpreted the failure of that attempt as a final demonstration that their own view had been the correct one all along. Still, God was not mocked, and Jesus was not mocked. When, at the end of a generation, the Jewish state sank into ruin and the city by which Jesus was martyred had been destroyed, there were springing up, all over the world, communities the members of which were bound more closely to

one another than the members of any other kingdom, obeyed the same laws and enjoyed the same benefits, which they traced up to a King ruling in the heavens, who would appear again on the great white throne, to be the Judge of quick and dead.

(2) **Blessedness of the Kingdom.**

The enemies of Jesus may be said to have carried out to the bitter end their conception of the kingdom of God, when they nailed Him to a tree; but, in the face of opposition, He carried out His own conception of it too, and He never abandoned the practice of employing this phrase as a comprehensive term for all the blessings brought by Him to mankind. He used, however, other nomenclature for the same objects, such as Gospel, Peace, Rest, Life, Eternal Life, Blessedness. His exposition of the last of these, at the commencement of the Sermon on the Mount, is highly instructive. Seldom, indeed, has the structure of the Beatitudes been clearly understood. Each of them is an equation, in which "blessed" stands on the one side and on the other two magnitudes — the one contained in the subject of the sentence, such as "the poor in spirit," "the meek," and so on; and the other contained in a qualifying clause introduced by "for." Sometimes one of these magnitudes may be a minus quantity,

as in "they that mourn"; but the other is so large a positive magnitude that the two together represent a handsome plus, which thoroughly justifies the predicate "blessed." It is remarkable that the first and the eighth of the reasons introduced by "for" are the same: "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," justifying the statement that this is Christ's own name for the blessedness brought by Him to the world; and the sentences between these, introduced in the same way, may be looked upon as epexegetic of this great phrase. They embrace such great conceptions as comfort, mercy, the inheritance of the earth, the vision of God and sonship, which are all certainly blessings of the kingdom; and the list does not finish without mentioning a great reward in heaven — an immortal hope, which is the greatest blessing of all.

(3) **Righteousness — Its Contrasts.**

If the preacher of the Sermon on the Mount was to expound at length any one of these bright conceptions, it might have been expected to be the kingdom of God itself; and this we should have desired. But the one to which this honor fell has still to be mentioned. It is "righteousness." In one

of the Beatitudes the speaker had promised that to be filled with this should be part of the blessedness which He was expounding; and, when He had finished the Beatitudes, He turned back to this conception and devoted the rest of His discourse to its interpretation. Nowhere else, in the reports of His preaching which have come down to us, is there to be found an exposition so sustained and thorough. There is no better way of describing a new thing, with which those who listen are unfamiliar, than to contrast it with something with which they are perfectly acquainted; and this was the method adopted by Jesus. He contrasted the righteousness with which the subjects of the kingdom were to be blessed with the figure of the righteous man familiar to them, first, in the discourses of the scribes, to which they were wont to listen in the synagogue, and secondly, in the example of the Pharisees, to whom they were wont to look up as the patterns of righteousness. It is well known what ample opportunities He found, by means of this felicitous disposition, for probing to the very depths of morality, as well as for covering His opponents with ridicule and exploding the honor in which they stood with the masses. The whole of this scheme is, however, exhausted long before the Sermon comes to a close; and the question is, whether, in the latter half of the Sermon, He still keeps up the exposition of righteousness by contrasting it with the ordinary course of the world. I am inclined to think that this is the case, and that the key to the latter half of the discourse is the contrast between righteousness and worldliness. The doctrine, at all events, which issues from the whole discussion is that the righteousness promised is distinguished by three characteristics — inwardness, as distinguished from the externality of those who believed morality to extend to outward words and deeds alone, and not to the secret thoughts of the heart; secrecy, as distinguished from the ostentation of those who blew a trumpet before them when they were doing their alms; and naturalness, like that of the flower or the fruit, which grows spontaneously from a healthy root, without forcing.

See SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

(4) Apocalyptic Theories.

This substitution of righteousness for the kingdom in the greatest public discourse which has come down to us is a significant indication of the direction in which the mind of Jesus was tending, as He drew away from the notions and hopes of contemporary Judaism. It is evident that He was filling the idea of the kingdom more and more with religious and moral

contents, and emptying it of political and material elements. There are scholars, indeed, at the present day, who maintain that His conception of the kingdom was futuristic, and that He was waiting all the time for an apocalyptic manifestation, which never came. He was, they think, expecting the heavens to open and the kingdom to descend ready made to the earth, like the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse. But this is to assume toward Jesus exactly the attitude taken up toward Him in His own day by Pharisees and high priests, and it degrades Him to the level of an apocalyptic dreamer. It ignores many sayings of His, of which the parable of the Mustard Seed may be taken as an example, which prove that He anticipated for Christianity a long development such as it has actually passed through; and it fails to do justice to many passages in His teaching where He speaks of the kingdom as already come. Of the latter the most remarkable is where He says, "The kingdom of God is within you" — a statement preceded by a distinct rejection of the notion of an apocalyptic manifestation; for the word "observation," which He employs in describing the way in which the kingdom is not to come, is an astronomical term, describing precisely such a phenomenon as He is supposed by such scholars as John Weiss and Schweitzer to have been expecting. The more it became evident that He was not to command the homage of the nation, the more did He devote Himself to the education of the Twelve, that they might form the nucleus of His kingdom upon earth; and it was certainly not with apocalyptic visions that He fed their receptive minds.

2. The Character of the Subjects of the Kingdom:

(1) Conditions of Entrance.

The righteousness described so comprehensively in the Sermon on the Mount is not infrequently spoken of as the condition of entrance to the kingdom of God; but this is altogether to misunderstand the mind of Jesus. The righteousness described by Him is the gift of God to those who are already inside the kingdom; for it is the supreme blessing for the sake of which the kingdom is to be sought; and the condition imposed on those who are outside is not the possession of righteousness, but rather a bottomless sense of the want of it. The more utterly they feel their own lack of righteousness, the more ready are they for entrance into the kingdom. They must "hunger and thirst after righteousness." It has been remarked already that the description, in the Beatitudes, of the character of the candidates for the kingdom is sometimes of a negative character; and

indeed, this is the account in the teaching of Jesus generally of those whom He attracts to Himself. They are drawn by a sense of boundless need in themselves and by the apprehension of an equivalent fullness in Him; He calls those "that labor and are heavy laden," that He may give them rest.

(2) **Christ's Attitude to Sin.**

The first word of the prophetic message in the Old Testament was always the denunciation of sin; and only after this had done its work did the vision of a good time coming rise on the horizon. The same was repeated in the message of John the Baptist; and it did not fail to reappear in the teaching of Jesus, though His mode of treating the subject was entirely His own. He did not, like the prophets, take up much time with convicting gross and open sinners. Perhaps He thought that this had been sufficiently done by His predecessors; or, perhaps He refrained because He understood the art of getting sinners to convict themselves. Yet, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, He showed how profoundly He understood the nature and the course of the commonest sins. If, however, He thus spared transgressors who had no covering for their wickedness, He made up for this leniency by the vigor and even violence with which He attacked those who hid their sins under a cloak of hypocrisy. Never was there a prophetic indignation like that with which He assailed such sinners in Matthew 23; and He shaped the same charges into an unforgettable picture in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. He never named the Sadducees in the same unreserved manner as He thus designated their antagonists; but in more parables than one it is possible that He had them in view. The Unjust Judge was probably a Sadducee; and so was the Rich Man at whose gate the beggar Lazarus was wont to sit. The sin of the Sadducees, at all events, did not escape His prophetic animadversion. In Luke especially He alludes with great frequency to worldliness and the love of money as cankers by which the life of the human soul is eaten out and its destiny destroyed. Thus did Jesus exercise the prophetic office of denouncing all the sins of His time; and He showed what, in this respect, He thought of mankind in general when He began a sentence with, "If ye then, being evil" (Luke 11:13), and when He gave the dreadful description of the heart of man which begins, "Out of the heart come forth evil thoughts" (Matthew 15:19).

(3) **Attainment of Righteousness.**

To all serious students of the Sermon on the Mount it is well known that
the popular notion of it, as containing a simple religion and an easy-going
morality, is utterly mistaken; on the contrary, the righteousness sketched by
the Preacher is far loftier than that ever conceived by any other religious
teacher whatever. Not only, however, does He thus propose to conduct
human beings to a platform of attainment higher than any attempted before,
but He, at the same time, recognizes that He must begin with men lower
than almost any others have allowed. It is here that the ethics of Jesus
differ from those of the philosophers. He takes the task much more
seriously; and, as the ascent from the one extreme to the other is much
longer, so the means of reaching the goal are much more difficult.
Philosophers, assuming that man is equal to his own destiny, lay the
demands of the moral law before him at once, taking it for granted that he
is able to fulfill them; but the path adopted by Jesus is more remote and
humbling. There are in it steps or stages which, in His teaching, it is easy to
discern.

(a) Repentance:

The first of these is repentance. This was a watchword of all the prophets:
after sin had been denounced, penitence was called for; and no hope of
improvement was held out until this had been experienced. In the message
of John the Baptist it held the same place; and, in one of the Gospels, it is
expressly stated that Jesus began His ministry by repeating this watchword
of His predecessor. Not a few of the most touching scenes of His earthly
ministry exhibit penitents at His feet, the most moving of them all being
that of the woman who was "a sinner"; and, in the parable of the Prodigal
Son, we have a full-length picture of the process of repentance.

(b) Faith:

The second step is faith — a word of constant recurrence in the teaching
Of Jesus. In many cases it is connected with His healing ministry; but this
was a parable of a more interior ministry for the soul. In many cases it
formed a school of preparation for the other, as in the case of the man
borne of four, who was brought to Christ for the healing of his body, but
was presented, in addition, with the gift of the forgiveness of his sins. In
healing him Jesus expressly claimed the power of forgiving sins; and, in His

great saying at the institution of the Lord's Supper, He showed the connection which this was to have with His own death.

(c) Imitation of Christ — Service:

Instead of speaking of faith and of believing, Jesus frequently spoke of "coming" to Himself; and then followed the invitation to "follow" Him, which, accordingly, is the third stage. Following Him meant, in many cases, literally leaving home and occupation, in order to accompany Him from place to place, as He journeyed through the land; and, as this involved sacrifice and self-denial, He frequently combined with "following" the invitation to take up "the cross." But by degrees this literal meaning dropped away from the invitation, or at least became secondary to that of imitation, which must be the only meaning when Paul, adopting the language of his Master, calls upon men and women to be "followers" of him, as he was of Christ. It is seldom that Jesus, in so many words, calls upon others to imitate Himself; indeed, He does so less frequently than Paul; but it is implied in following Him, if not literally expressed; and it was a direct consequence of keeping company with Him and coming under the influence of His example. It is highly characteristic that, in the only place where He directly calls upon others to "learn" from Him, the virtue to which He draws attention is meekness — "Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart." The same quality was often emphasized by Him, when He was describing the character which He wished to see exhibited by others, "For every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Luke 14:11). In spite, however, of the importance thus attached by Him to humility, He not only combined with it, as has been pointed out by Bushnell, in his famous chapter on the character of Christ in Nature and the Supernatural, the most stupendous personal claims, but also attributed to His followers a position of personal distinction among men, and called upon them to perform services far beyond the reach of ordinary mortals, saying to them, "Ye are the salt of the earth," "Ye are the light of the world," and ordering them to make disciples of all nations. The principle by which this apparent contradiction is bridged over is another favorite idea of His teaching, namely, Service. He who is able to serve others on a large scale is, in a sense, superior to those he serves, because he is furnished with the resources of which they stand in need; yet he places himself beneath them and forgets his own claims in ministering to their necessities. There are few of the utterances of

Jesus in which the very genius of His ethical system is more fully expressed than that in which He contrasts greatness as it is conceived among men of the world with greatness as He conceives it and His followers must learn to conceive it: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Of this difficult rule, He was able to add, He Himself had given, and was still to give, the most perfect illustration; for "even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (⟨4025⟩Matthew 20:25 ff the King James Version).

This reminds us that, while the character of the subjects of the kingdom is to be learned from the words of Jesus, it may be also derived from His example. That which He demanded from others He fulfilled in His own conduct; and thus the dry precepts of the moral law were invested with the charm of a living personality. Brief as the records of His life are, they are wonderfully rich in instruction of this kind; and it is possible, by going through them with study and care, to form a clear image of how He bore Himself in all the departments of human life — in the home, in the state, in the church, as a friend, in society, as a man of prayer, as a student of Scripture, as a worker, as a sufferer, as a philanthropist, as a winner of souls, as a preacher, as a teacher, as a controversialist, and so on. This is the modern imitation of Christ — that of the details of His earthly existence — the Imitation of a Kempis was an imitation of the cosmical history of the Son of God, as He moves on His Divine mission from heaven to the cross and back to the throne of the universe. See the writer's Imago Christi.

3. Commandments of the King:

The Great Commandments.

In accordance with Scriptural usage, Jesus called by the name of "commandments" those actions which we call "duties"; and He has made this part of our subject easy by reducing the commandments to two: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (⟨4025⟩Matthew 22:37-39). He did not invent either of these commandments; for both occur in the Old Testament (⟨5005⟩Deuteronomy 6:5; ⟨3918⟩Leviticus 19:18). There,

however, they lie far apart and are buried out of sight. The second of them was still more deeply buried under a misinterpretation of the scribes, to which reference is made in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus rescued them from oblivion; He showed the vital and indissoluble connection between the sentiments which they enforce — love of God and love of man — which had been long and violently separated; and He lifted them up into the firmament of ethics, to shine forever as the sun and moon of duty.

(a) Love to God:

It has been denied by some writers on Christian ethics that there can be any such thing as duties to God, and by writers on philosophical ethics love to God is not generally regarded as coming within the scope of their science. But the duty of man is concerned with all the objects, and especially all the beings, he is related to; and to Jesus the outflow of man's heart toward Him who is the author of his being and the source of all his blessings seemed the most natural of actions. "I love Yahweh" was a sentiment to which mankind had risen even in the Old Testament (^{19B01}Psalm 116:1), where it corresponds with not a few expressions of the Divine love equally fervent; and it is not a figure of speech at all when Jesus demands love for His Father from heart and soul, strength and mind.

Love to God involves, however, love to what may be called the Things of God, toward which Jesus always manifested tenderness and honor. Those who are not themselves ecclesiastically minded have, indeed, taken it for granted that Jesus was indifferent, if not hostile, to the objects and actions by which the Almighty is honored; and it is often said that the only service of God which mattered in His eyes was the service of man. But, although, like the prophets before Him, Jesus exposed with withering rebuke the hypocrisy of those who put ritual in the place of righteousness, it requires no more than a glance at His sayings, and the other records of His life, to perceive that His mind was occupied no less with duties to God than with duties to men; indeed, the former bulk more largely in His teaching. The only arrangement of religion with which He seems out of sympathy is the Sabbath; but this was due to a peculiarity of the times; and it is quite conceivable that in other circumstances He might have been a strenuous supporter of Sabbath observance. If there had been in His day a Sadducean attempt to rob the people of the day of rest, He would have opposed it as strenuously as He did the Pharisaic attempt to make it a burden and a weariness to the common man. By declaring the Sabbath to have been made for man (⁴¹⁰²⁷Mark 2:27) He recognized that it was instituted at the

beginning and intended for the entire course of man's existence upon earth. With the other things of God, such as His House, His Word, and His Worship, He manifested sympathy equally by word and deed; He frequented both the Temple and the synagogue; so imbued was His mind with the lit of the Old Testament that He spoke habitually in its spirit and phraseology, having its figures and incidents perfectly at command; and by both precept and example He taught others to pray.

Nothing is commoner than the statement that Jesus had nothing to do with the founding of the church or the arrangement of its polity; but this is a subjective prejudice, blind to the facts of the case. Jesus realized that the worship of the Old Testament was passing away, but He was Himself to replace it by a better order. He did not merely breathe into the air a spirit of sweetness and light; if this had been all He did, Christianity would soon have vanished from the earth; but He provided channels in which, after His departure, His influence should flow to subsequent generations. Not only did He found the church, but He appointed the most important details of its organization, such as preaching and the sacraments; and He left the Twelve behind Him not only as teachers, but as those who were able to instruct other teachers also. There may be ecclesiastical arrangements which are worked in a spirit far removed from the love of God; and such are of course contrary to the mind of Christ; but the love of God, if it is strong, inevitably overflows into the things of God, and cannot, in fact, permanently exist without them.

(b) Duty to Man:

As has been hinted above, the sayings of our Lord about the details of duty to man are less numerous than might have been expected, but what may be lacking in numbers is made up for in originality and comprehensiveness. Many single sayings, like the Golden Rule (⁴⁰⁷²Matthew 7:12) and the lovely word about a cup of cold water given in the name of Christ (⁴¹⁰²Matthew 10:42), are revolutionary in the ethical experience of mankind; and so are such parables as the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son and the Unmerciful Servant. The commandment to love enemies and to forgive injuries (⁴⁰⁵⁸Matthew 5:43-48), if not entirely novel, received a prominence it had never possessed before. The spirit of all such sayings of Jesus is the same: He seeks to redeem men from selfishness and worldliness and to produce in them a godlike passion for the welfare of their fellow-creatures. These they may bless with gifts of money, where such may be

required, still more with sympathy and helpfulness, but most of all with the gospel.

Besides such directions as to the behavior of man to man, there are also among the words of Jesus memorable maxims about the conduct of life in the family, in the state, and in society; and here again He taught even more by example than by precept. As son, brother and friend, He fulfilled all righteousness; but He also, as teacher, determined what righteousness was. Thus He opposed the laxity as to divorce prevalent in His time, pointing back to the pure ideal of Paradise. His conception of womanhood and His tenderness toward childhood have altered entirely the conceptions of men about these two conditions. He was a patriot, glorying in the beauty of His native Galilee and weeping over Jerusalem; and though, from birth to death, He was exposed to constant persecution from the constituted authorities, He not only obeyed these Himself but commanded all others to do the same. Nothing moved Him more than the sight of talents unused, and, therefore, it lay deep in His system of thought to call upon everyone to contribute his part to the service of the body politic; but no less did He recognize the right of those who have done their part of the general task to share in the fruits of industry; "for the laborer is worthy of his hire" (Luke 10:7).

Priceless, however, as are the commandments of Jesus in regard to the things of man, as well as in regard to the things of God, it is not in these that we have to seek His ethical originality, but in the new motive brought into play by Him for doing the Divine will, when once it has been ascertained. As He made it easy to love God by revealing God's love, so did He make it easy to love man by revealing the greatness of man, as an immortal creature, who has come from God and is going to God. Whatever is done to man, good or evil, Jesus esteems as done to Himself; for the great saying to this effect, in the account of the Last Judgment in Matthew 25, though applicable in the first place to Christians, may be extended to men in general. The corollary of the fatherhood of God is the brotherhood of men; and the second great commandment stands under the protection of the first.

II. IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

1. Eternal Life:

In the Fourth Gospel Eternal Life takes the same place as the kingdom of God in the other three. The author is not, indeed, unaware that Jesus employed the latter phrase for the sum of the blessings brought by Him to the world; and it has already been remarked that the Synoptists occasionally employ "life" as an equivalent for the phrase they usually make use of. The reason of John's preference for his own phrase may have lain in some personal idiosyncrasy, or it may have been due to the Gentileenvironment in which he wrote. But the phrase is one suggestive and instructive in itself in the highest degree. It had already entered deeply into the language of religion before the time of Christ; indeed, in every part of Holy Writ the idea is common that separation from God is death, but that union with Him is life.

2. Its Source in God:

In the teaching of Jesus, as this is found in John, the world lies in death, because it has become separated from God, and the children of men are in danger of perishing everlastingly as the punishment of their sin; but "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:16).

3. Through the Son:

This life is, first, in God, who abides in everlasting blessedness; but it is not, even in Him, at rest, but agitated with an impulse to communicate itself. Then, it is in the Son — "For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself" (John 5:26); not, however, for Himself alone, but for the purpose of being communicated to those destitute of it. For this reason He was made flesh and dwelt among us; and He communicated it through His words, which were "words of eternal life." The words of Jesus, as thus bringing life, are the "light" of the world; and they are the "truth" — two favorite expressions of this Gospel — or He of whom they speak is Himself the light and the truth; He said Himself, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." He is in His word in such a way that, when it is received in the right spirit, He enters the soul personally — "ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20). As food is taken into the body, to sustain life, so does He become the life of the soul; He is

the "bread of life" and the "water of life" (⁴⁰⁶⁵John 6:35). As, however, bread has to be broken, before it is eaten, and water to be poured out, when it is drunk, so does the virtue which is in the Son of God only become available through His death — "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world" (⁴⁰⁶¹John 6:51).

4. Need of New Birth:

The world lying dead in sin, a new birth is required for those who are to enter into life; and this is necessary even for so fine a character as Nicodemus (⁴⁰⁰³John 3:3,5,7). Without this change, the children of men are insensible to Divine revelations; and even the children of privilege, who had enjoyed the Old Testament revelation, were indifferent to eternal life, when it came near to them in the person of Christ. Hence, there was required a special drawing on the part of God to awaken the sleeping soul — "No man can come to me, except the Father that sent me draw him" (⁴⁰⁶⁴John 6:44); and, where this influence was not responded to, there might be the most violent and persistent opposition to Christ on the part of those who believed themselves to be the favorites of heaven. The new birth is accompanied with spiritual vision — "seeing the kingdom of God" (⁴⁰⁰³John 3:3) — and, throughout the Fourth Gospel, remarkable stress is laid on the virtue of such seeing or knowing. It leads so directly to faith that to "know" and to "believe" are virtually the same act (⁴³¹⁰⁸John 10:38). Faith is the reception into the soul of the life eternal, or of Him who has been discerned by the spiritual vision and who is Himself the life. It is the eating of the bread of life, the drinking of the water of life, and it makes and keeps alive.

5. Nature of Faith:

Since faith is thus the means whereby the eternal life becomes a personal possession, it is the one thing needful and the sum of all the commandments — "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (⁴⁰⁶⁹John 6:29). It is the unique commandment, comprehending all the commandments, and it "worketh by love" toward the fulfillment of them all. What these are is, however, less brought out in detail in this Gospel than in the others, for it is a peculiarity of the mind of Jesus, as recorded by John, to deal with central principles and to assume that the consequences will follow as a matter of course. Of the

organization, for example, of the community which was to perpetuate His influence, after He had left the world, He says much less in this Gospel than even in the Synoptists; yet He characterizes the very essence of the new body in such words as this, "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me" (John 17:23). In the last half of this saying there is a hint of the influence to be exerted on the outside world by the display of Christian character, with the result of producing belief; but this aim was to be sought more directly through testimony (John 15:27) and the "word" of the disciples (John 17:20). Thus would even the distant, "which are not of this fold," be brought in, so that there might be "one flock" and "one shepherd" (John 10:16). Inside the fold it is the greatest privilege and honor, as well as responsibility, to feed the "sheep" and to feed the "lambs" (John 21:15,16,17).

6. Fruits of Union with Christ:

Character and conduct are, even for the disciples of Christ, "commandments," as, indeed, Jesus does not disdain to speak of the various parts of His own vocation by the same humble name, implying the necessity of moral effort and the temptation to failure (John 15:10). Therefore, they are also proper subjects for prayer. He prayed for the disciples, both that they might be kept from the evil in the world and that they might be sanctified through the truth (John 17:15,17), and doubtless He expected them to ask the same things for themselves, as theirs was to be a life of prayer (John 16:24). But, in the last resort, they are the fruits of union with Himself, and eternal life is not merely a gift of the future, to be given at the death of the body, but is enjoyed even now by those who abide in the vine.

LITERATURE.

Monographs on the ethics of Jesus in German by Grimm and in English by King; compare also Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question, and Jesus Christ and the Christian Character; relevant portions works of larger scope, such as Jacoby, New Testament Ethik, Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, and the handbooks of New Testament theology by Weiss, Holtzmann, Schlatter, Feine, Weinel, Stevens. Very ample references to literature in Stalker, The Ethic of Jesus.

James Stalker

ETHIOPIA

<e-thi-o'-pi-a> ([∨ⱲK, *kush*]; [Αἰθιοπία, *Aithiopia*]):

1. LOCATION, EXTENT AND POPULATION:

Critically speaking Ethiopia may refer only to the Nile valley above the First Cataract, but in ancient as in modern times the term was often used not only to include what is now known as Nubia and the Sudan (Soudan), but all the unknown country farther West and South, and also at times Northern, if not Southern, Abyssinia. While Ethiopia was so indefinitely large, yet the narrow river valley, which from the First to the Fifth Cataract represented the main agricultural resources of the country, was actually a territory smaller than Egypt and, excluding deserts, smaller than Belgium (W. Max Muller). The settled population was also small, since in ancient as in modern times Egypt naturally drew away most of the able-bodied and energetic youth as servants, police and soldiers. The prehistoric population of Northern Nubia was probably Egyptian but this was displaced in early historic time by a black race, and the thick lips and woolly hair of the typical African are as well marked in the oldest Egyptian paintings as in the latest. But by the side of these natives of K'sh, the artist also represents various reddish-brown varieties; for from the beginning of historic time the pure Negro stock has been mixed with the fellaheen of Egypt and with the Sere population of the Arabian coast. The rulers of Ethiopia were generally of foreign blood. The Negroes, though brave and frugal, were slow in thought, and although controlled for centuries by cultivated neighbors, under whom they attained at times high official prominence, yet the body of the people remained uninfluenced by this civilization. The country which we now know as Abyssinia was largely controlled, from the earliest known date, by a Caucasian people who had crossed the Red Sea from Arabia. The true Abyssinians, as Professor Littmann shows, contain no Negro blood and no Negro qualities. In general they are "well formed and handsome, with straight and regular features, lively eyes, hair long and straight or somewhat curled and in color dark olive approaching brown." Modern discoveries prove their close racial and linguistic connection with Southern Arabia and particularly with the kingdom of Sheba (the Sabeans), that most powerful people whose extensive architectural and literary remains have recently come to light. The Sabean inscriptions found in

Abyssinia go back some 2,600 years and give a new value to the Bible references as well as to the constant claim of Josephus that the queen of Sheba was a "queen of Ethiopia." The Falashas are a Jewish community living near Lake Tsana, of the same physical type and probably of the same race as other Abyssinians. Their religion is a "pure Mosaism" based upon the Ethiopic version of the Pentateuch, but modified by the fact that they are ignorant of the Hebrew language (Jewish Encyclopedia). It is uncertain when they became Jews. The older scholars thought of them as dating back to the Solomonic era, or at least to the Babylonian captivity. Since the researches of Joseph Halevy (1868), some date within the Christian era has seemed preferable, notwithstanding their ignorance of Talmudic rules. However, the newly discovered fact that a strong Jewish community was flourishing at Syene in the 6th century BC makes it clear that Jewish influence may have been felt in Ethiopia at least that early. Although Abyssinians are noted for their strict adherence to ancient custom, Jewish characteristics are prominent all over the entire country. The opening formula of the king in every official letter — "The Lion of the Tribe of Judah has Conquered!" — is no more Jewish than scores of ordinary phrases and customs. Although it is barely possible that some rites, like circumcision and observance of the Sabbath, may have been received from the ancient Egyptians or Christian Coptics (The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge Encyclopedia) yet a strong Hebrew influence cannot be denied. All travelers speak of the "industry" of the Falashas and of the "kindliness and grave courtesy" of the Abyssinians. Besides those named above there are many communities of mixed races in Ethiopia, but the ancient basis is invariably Negro, Semitic or Egyptian

2. HISTORY:

The ancient Greek writers are full of fantastic and fabulous stories about Ethiopia. Sometimes they become so puzzled in their geography as to speak of Ethiopia as extending as far as India; their notes concerning the miraculous fauna and flora are equally Munchausian. Homer praises the Ethiopians as the "blameless race," and other writers rank them first among all men for their religious knowledge. This latter notion may have had its origin from a priestly desire to consider the Ethiopian reverence for the priesthood — which had the power of life and death over the kings — as the Divinely ordained primitive custom, or it may have sprung from the fact that the Egyptian "Land of the Gods" was partly situated in Southern

Abyssinia. It is suggestive that the Hebrew prophets never fell into these common errors but invariably "gave a very good idea of geographical and political conditions" (W. Max Muller). The oldest important historic document referring to Ethiopia is from the IVth Dynasty of Egypt. when Sneferu laid waste the land, capturing 7,000 slaves and 100,000 cattle.

In the VIth Dynasty the Egyptians reached as far South as the Second Cataract and brought back some dwarfs, but did not establish any permanent control. In the XIIth Dynasty Egypt's real occupation of Ethiopia began. Usertesen III records his contempt by saying: "The Negro obeys as soon as the lips are opened. They are not valiant, they are miserable, both tails and bodies!" Notwithstanding this satiric reference, these naked Ethiopians clad in skins and tails of wild animals, compelled the Pharaoh to make several campaigns before he could establish a frontier at the Second Cataract beyond which no Negro could come without a permit. That the natives were not cowardly may be seen from the songs of triumph over their subjection and from the fact that every later Pharaoh encouraged them to enlist in his army, until finally the very hieroglyphic for archer became a Nubian. The XVIIIth Dynasty pushed the frontier beyond the Third Cataract into the splendid Dongola district and often boasts of the rich tribute from Ethiopia., in one case 2,667 "manloads" of ivory, ebony, perfumes, gold and ostrich feathers besides cattle, wild beasts and slaves. The chairs of ivory and the jewelry sometimes shown seem barbaric in style but excellent in workmanship. Copper and bronze factories and great iron foundries date also to a very early time in Ethiopia (PSBA, XXXIII, 96). The Ethiopian gold mines where hundreds of criminals toiled, with ears and noses mutilated, made gold in Egypt in the 15th century BC as "common as dust." The choicest son of the Pharaoh, next to him in power, was proud to be called "Prince of Kush." Amenhotep IV (1370 BC), the religious reformer, built his second greatest temple (the only one of his works now existent) in Nubia. The XIXth Dynasty sought to colonize Ethiopia., and some of the most magnificent temples ever built by man can be seen as far South as the Fourth Cataract. For over five centuries Egyptian rule was maintained, until about 1000 BC a war for independence began which was so successful that the victorious Ethiopian kings finally carried their armies against Thebes and Memphis and for a century (763-663) ruled all Egypt from Napata — which in religious architecture became the Southern Thebes — and for another century (and even at times during the Ptolemaic era) controlled upper Egypt. While the

leaders of this revolution were doubtless descendants of exiled priests from
Thebes, yet the mixture of Ethiopian blood is plainly discernible and is
perhaps also shown in their "Puritan morals" (Petrie, III, 276) and spirit of
clemency, so different from the legitimate Pharaohs. Shabaka = So (715-
707) and Taharka = Tirhaqah (693-667), both mentioned in the Bible, were
the last great kings of Ethiopia. When Tanutamen, son of Shabaka and
nephew of Taharka (667-664), was forced by Ashurbanipal to give up his
claim to Egypt and retire to the South, the influence of Ethiopia ceased.
Cambyses (525-521) made Ethiopia tributary clear to the Third Cataract
(compare ²⁵⁰⁴Ezekiel 30:4), while King Ergamenes, near the close of the
3rd century BC, broke forever the power of the Egyptian priesthood.
Though the Romans held a nominal protectorate over Ethiopia, it was of
so little importance as to be scarcely ever mentioned. After being expelled
from Egypt the Ethiopians still continued to honor the gods of Thebes, but,
as foreign influence ceased, the representations of this worship became
more and more African and barbaric. Even after Christianity had triumphed
everywhere else, the Nubians, as late as the 5th century AD, were still
coming to Philae to give honor to the statue of Isis (Erman). In the 6th
century AD a native king, Silko, established a Christian kingdom in the
Northern Sudan with Dongola as its capital. This raised somewhat the
culture of the land. In the next century the Arabs made Nubia tributary,
though it took an immense army to do it. For six centuries thereafter Islam
demanded a tribute of 360 slaves annually, and other treasure, though
innumerable campaigns were necessary to collect it. The Nubian kings
refused all overtures to become Moslems, and Christian churches
multiplied along the banks of the Nile. In the 8th century Egypt was
invaded by 100,000 Nubians to repay an insult given to the Coptic
patriarch and to the sacred pictures in the Egyptian Christian churches. In
the 13th century, David, king of Nubia, not only withheld tribute but
invaded Egypt. He was terribly punished, however, by the Arabs, who
sacked churches and tortured Christians clear to the Fourth Cataract. This
was the beginning of the end. By the close of the 15th century almost every
Christian altar was desolate and every church destroyed.

3. BIBLE REFERENCES:

Winckler long ago proved that the Assyrians designated a district in
Northern Arabia by the same name which they ordinarily applied to
Ethiopia. Skinner (Genesis, 1910, 208) thinks the Hebrews also made this
distinction and were therefore entirely right when they spoke of Nimrod as

"son of Gush," since the earliest Babylonian dynasty had as a matter of fact a Semitic origin. There may be other references to an Arabian district, but undoubtedly the African Kush must be the one generally designated. This is referred to once in the New Testament and over 40 times in the Old Testament. Many secular monuments speak of the high honor paid to women in Ethiopia., and Candace (Acts 8:27) seems certainly to have been an official or dynastic name for a number of Ethiopian queens. One of the pyramids of Meroe was Candace's — her picture can still be seen at Kaga — and to her belonged the wonderful treasure of jewelry found in 1834 by Ferlini and now in the Berlin museum. Petronius (24 BC) raided Ethiopia for Rome and stormed the capital, but Candace sent ambassadors to Rome and obtained peace. The "eunuch" who may have been the treasurer of this very queen was probably "no black proselyte but a Jew who had placed the business ability of his race at the service of the Nubian woman" (W. Max Muller). In the Old Testament Ethiopia is spoken of with great respect, and several Bible characters are named Cushi (2 Samuel 18:21 the King James Version; Jeremiah 36:14; Zephaniah 1:1); even Moses married an Ethiopian wife (Numbers 12:1), and Ebed-melek the Ethiopian is helper to Jeremiah (Jeremiah 38:7). It is a great land situated beyond the frontiers of the civilized world (Ezekiel 29:10), yet with Jews in its farthest district (Zephaniah 3:10). It is very rich (Job 28:19; Isaiah 43:3); is engaged in trade with Arabia (45:14), and its citizens are proud of their nationality (Psalm 87:4). Again and again the relation of Cush with Sheba is mentioned (Genesis 10:7,28; Isaiah 43:3, etc.), which latter statement is strangely corroborated by the recently discovered Sabean inscriptions throughout Abyssinia. Its typical inhabitants have a color as unchangeable as the leopard's spots (Jeremiah 13:23), are careless (Ezekiel 30:9), but very warlike (Ezekiel 38:5; Jeremiah 46:9), giving "infinite" strength to Nineveh (Nahum 3:9), but who can be resisted by Israel because of Yahweh's favor (2 Chronicles 16:8; Isaiah 20:5; 36:6). Yahweh is interested in the history of Ethiopia as well as Egypt (Isaiah 20:3), loves the children of Ethiopia as the children of Israel (Amos 9:7), and the time is coming when Ethiopia shall yet stretch out her hands to Yahweh (Psalm 68:31). Cush and Mizraim are correctly mentioned as political unit (Isaiah 20:4 f) , and several kings of Ethiopia are mentioned by name — Zerah (2 Chronicles 14:9), So (2 Kings 17:4) and Tirhaqah (2 Kings 19:9; Isaiah 37:9). The statements concerning these kings have been pronounced incorrect because it seemed that Zerah could not possibly be

an equivalent for Usarkon or So for Shabaka — the known kings of Egypt at those periods — and also because the reigns of Shabaka and Tirhaqah did not begin until after the dates at which in the Hebrew records they were called "kings of Ethiopia."

Recent, information, however, makes it clear that both Shabaka and Tirhaqah exercised royal authority in the Delta before they were given it farther south, and that the Hebrew transcription of names was very easy and natural. (See W. M. Flinders Petrie, Hist of Egypt, III, 280-309; Egypt and Israel (1911), 76-78.)

4. THE CHURCH IN ABYSSINIA:

Sem influence entered Abyssinia at least as early as the 7th or 8th century BC (see above), and the kings of Axum claimed descent from Menelek, Son of Solomon, but the first certain information concerning the kingdom of Axum comes from the middle of the 1st century AD, at which time Axum was a rich capital, and its ancient sacredness was so great that from that period clear down to the 19th century the kings of Abyssinia would travel there to be crowned. There is no reason to doubt that Frumentius (circa 330 AD) was the first to introduce Christianity. Merope of Tyre, according to the often-told story, when returning from India with his two nephews, was captured and killed off the Ethiopian coast, but the two boys were carried to the Abyssinian king; and although one perished the other, Frumentius, succeeded in converting the king and his people to Christianity, and later was himself consecrated by Athanasius of Alexandria as the first Metropolitan of Ethiopia, taking as his title Abu Salama ("Father of Peace"). From that time until now, with but one single interruption, the Abuna ("Father") has always been appointed by the Patriarch of Alexandria and, since the 13th century, has been by legal necessity not a native Abyssinian, but a Copt.

After the Council of Chalcedon (450 AD) condemned all as heretics who did not accept the "double nature" of Christ, both the Egyptian and Abyssinian churches separated themselves from Rome, believing so thoroughly in the Deity of Christ as to refuse to accept His humanity as essential "nature." In the 5th century a great company of monks entered Abyssinia, since which time the monastic tendency has been strongly marked. About 525, Caleb, king of Axum, attacked the Homeritae across the Red Sea — either for their persecution of Christians or their interference with his trade — and for some half a century controlled a large

district of Arabia. At this time Abyssinian trade was extensive. Greek influence was also felt, and the Christian cathedral at Axum was a magnificent work of architectural article The early churches were protected by heavy surrounding walls and strong towers. The invasion of Africa by Islam in the 7th century required 300 years of battle for the preservation of Abyssinian liberty and Christian faith. It alone of all the African states succeeded in preserving both — but its civilization was destroyed, and for 1,000 years it was completely hidden from the eyes of its fellow- Christians in Europe. Occasionally during those centuries a rumor would reach Europe of a "Prester John" somewhere in the Far East who was king of a Christian people, yet it was a thrilling surprise to Christendom when Pedro de Cavilham in the 15th century discovered this lost Christian kingdom of Abyssinia completely surrounded by infidel pagans and bigoted Mohammedans. When, early in the 16th century, the Negus of Abyssinia sent an envoy to the king of Portugal asking his help against the Moslems, the appeal was met with favor. In 1520 the Portuguese fleet arrived in the Red Sea and its chaplain, Father Francisco Alvarez, 20 years later stirred the Christian world by his curious narratives. Not long afterward, when the Arabs actually invaded the country, another Portuguese fleet was sent with a body of military, commanded by Christopher de Gama. These 450 musketeers and the six little pieces of artillery gave substantial aid to the endangered state. Father Lobe tells the story. The Abyssinian king must have been grateful for such help, yet presently the strenuous efforts of the Portuguese clergy to convert him and his people to the Roman Catholic faith became so offensive that Bermudez, the most zealous missionary, was compelled to leave the country and the Jesuits who remained were mistreated. Other efforts to win the Abyssinian Christians to renounce the Monophysitic heresy and accept the doctrine and control of Rome were somewhat more successful. Early in the 17th century Father Pedro Paez, an ecclesiastic of much tact, won the king fully to his faith, and under his direction many churches were erected and advantageous government works carried on. However, his successor Mendez lacked his conciliatory ability and, although a punishment of seven years' chastisement was proclaimed against recalcitrants, the opposition became so violent and universal that the Negus Sysenius finally abdicated in favor of his son Fasilidas, who in 1633 sent all Jesuits out of the country and resumed official relations with the Egyptian church. Since then, although many efforts have been made, no controlling influence has ever been obtained by Rome. Once more, for over a century, Abyssinia became completely hidden

from the eyes of the outside world until James Bruce, the explorer, visited the country, 1770-72, and made such a report as to arouse again the interest of Christendom. The translation of the Bible, which was made by his Abyssinian guide, was adopted and published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and in 1829 the Church Missionary Society sent out Gobat and Kugler as the first Protestant missionaries to Abyssinia, who were followed shortly after by some Roman Catholics. Owing chiefly to the opposition of native priests the Protestants were expelled in 1838 and the expulsion of the Roman missionaries followed in 1854. In 1858 a Copt who had been influenced as a youth by a Protestant school, became Abuna, and Protestant missionaries were again admitted, but succeeded in doing little permanent work owing to the political disturbances while King Kesa (Theodore) — the Napoleon of Africa — was attempting to consolidate native resources and build up an African empire. At this period the influence of Great Britain began to be felt in Abyssinia. After the suicide of Theodore (1868) and especially after Menelek II had succeeded in making himself emperor (1899), this influence became great. During the 20th century missionaries have been able to work in Abyssinia without much danger, but the Moslem influence is so preponderating that little has been attempted and little done. The religion of the Crescent seems now almost completely victorious over the strange land which for so many centuries, alone and unhelped, held aloft in Africa the religion of the Cross. (See especially The Mohammedan World of Today, by Zwemer, Wherry, and Barton, 1907; Missionary World, 1910-11.)

5. BELIEFS AND PRACTICES:

In creed, ritual, and practice, the Abyssinian church agrees generally with the Coptic. There are seven sacraments and prayers for the dead, high honor is paid to the Virgin Mary and to the saints; fasts and pilgrimages are in much favor; adults are baptized by immersion and infants by affusion. A blue cord is placed about the neck at baptism. An extract from one of the Gospels, a silver ring, an ear pick and a small cross, often very artistic, are also worn about the neck. No charms or beads or crucifixes ("graven images") are worn. The Jewish as well as the Christian Sabbath is kept sacred, and on an average every other day during the year is a religious holiday. The people are ignorant and superstitious, yet impress observers with their grave kindliness and seem at times eager to learn. The clergy can marry before but not after ordination. Priests must be able to read and

recite the Nicene Creed (the "Apostles' Creed" is not known), but do not understand the Ge`ez language in which the liturgies are written. They conduct many and long services and attend to the ceremonial purifications. Deacons must also be able to read; they prepare the bread for the Holy Sacrament and in general help the priests. The monastic clergy have chief care of the education of the young — though this consists mainly in Scripture reading — and their head, the Etshege, ranks next to the Abuna.

The ancient churches were often basilican, but modern native churches are quadrangular or circular. The Holy of Holies always stands in the center, and is supposed to contain an ark. Tradition declares that the ark in the cathedral at Axum is the original ark from Solomon's temple. An outer court surrounds the body of the church, which is freely used by laymen and as a place of entertainment for travelers. Very crude pictures are common. These show both Egyptian and European influence, and are probably not merely decorations but have a relation, as in Egyptian thought, to spiritual advancement in this life or the next (compare Budge, Introduction to the Lives of Maba' Segon and Gabra Krestos, 1898). The services consist of chanting psalms, reading Scriptures and reciting liturgies.

6. ABYSSINIAN LITERATURE:

The Abyssinian canon (Semanya Ahadu) consists of 46 Old Testament and 35 New Testament books. Besides the usually accepted books, they count Shepherd of Hermas, Synodos (Canons), Epistles of Clement, Maccabees, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 4 Ezra, Ascension of Isaiah, Book of Adam, Joseph ben Gorion, Enoch and Jubilees. The Ethiopic texts of the two latter give these books in the most ancient form, and their discovery has led to much valuable discussion. The use of the Ge`ez language in which these are written dates back to a time shortly before the introduction of Christianity. From the 5th to 7th centuries AD, the literature is almost exclusively translated from Greek writers or adaptations of such writings. Quotations abound from Basil, Gregory, Ignatius, Athanasius, Epiphanus, Cyril, Dioscurus, etc. The second literary period begins 1268, when the old "Solomonic" Dynasty regained its place and continues to the present; it consists mainly of translations from the Arabic. In both periods the topics are few: liturgies, hymns, sermons, the heroic deeds of the saints and their orthodoxy. Each saint uses the four Holy Gospels, as David his four stones, to kill every heretical Goliath (compare Goodspeed and Crum, Patrologia Orientalis, IV, 1908). A large place is

given to miracles and magic prayers and secret names (compare Budge, Miracles of the Virgin Mary, 1900, and "Magic Book of Disciples," JAOS, 1904). The legends or histories are occasionally well written, as the famous "Magda Queen of Sheba" (English Translation by Mrs. J. Van Vorst, 1907), but usually are as inferior in style as in thought (compare Littmann, Bibliotheca-Abessinica, 1904). A few specimens of "popular literature" and many Abyssinian "proverbs" are extant (JAOS, XXIII, 51-53; XXV, 1-48; Jour. asiatique, IV, 487-95).

7. NUBIAN LITERATURE:

The modern Nubian does not write, and his ancient predecessors wrote but little. Even in the days of the Pharaohs the hieroglyphics in most Nubian temples were written so poorly as to be almost unintelligible, and in later pre-Christian monuments put up by native rulers the usual tablets accompanying the Divine tableaux are often left blank. Some centuries before our era the necessary monumental inscriptions began to be composed in the Nubian language, though still written in hieroglyphics. Shortly after the beginning of the Christian era a native cursive writing begins to be used on the monuments, closely resembling the Egyptian demotic, from which undoubtedly its alphabet was derived (F. L. Griffith in Areika). Finally, after Nubia became Christian (6th century), another native system appears written in Greek and Coptic letters. Lepsius found two such inscriptions on the Blue Nile and numbers have since been discovered, but until 1906 these were as unreadable as the other two forms of Nubian writing. In that year Dr. Karl Schmidt found in Cairo two precious fragments of parchment which had been owned by some Nubian Christians of probably the 8th or 9th century. One of these contained a selection of passages from the New Testament — as was ascertained by comparing it with the Greek and Coptic Scriptures. By the aid of bilingual cartouches several proper names were soon deciphered. New inscriptions are now being brought to light every few months, and undoubtedly the translation of this important tongue, which contains the "history of an African Negro dialect for some 2,000 years" and also the religious history of the long-lost Christian church of the Sudan, will soon be accomplished. The other fragment found by Schmidt was a curious Hymn of the Cross, well representing the ancient Ethiopian hymnology:

"The cross is the hope of Christians;
The cross is the resurrection of the dead;
The cross is the physician of the sick;
The cross is the liberator of the slave," etc..

 — James H. Breasted in Biblical World, December, 1908; Nation, June 2, 1910.

8. EXPLORATION:

Scientific observation of Nubia began with Burckhardt (1813), Cailliaud, and Waddington (1821), and especially with Lepsius (1844), but excavation in the proper sense was begun by the University of Chicago (1905-7), followed (1907-10) by expeditions sent out by the Royal Academy of Berlin, University of Pennsylvania, University of Liverpool, and Oxford University.

LITERATURE.

Besides the works quoted above, among recent Encyclopedias, see especially Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition) (11th edition) and New Sck-Herz; and among the more recent books: James T. Bent, The Sacred City of the Ethiopians (1893); Glaser, Die Abessinier in Arabien und Afrika (1895); A. B. Wylde, Modern Abyssinia (1901); R. P. Skinner, Abyssinia of Today (1906); Th. Noeldeke, Die athiopische Litteratur (1906); Louis J. Morie, Les civilisations africaines (1904); Littmann, Geschichte der athiopischen Litteratur (1907); W. Max Muller, Aethiopien (1904); Petrie, Hist of Egypt (1895-1901); J. H. Breasted, Temples of Lower Nubia (1906); Monuments of Sudanese Nubia (1908); A. E. Weigall, Report of Antiquities of Lower Nubia (1906); E. A. W. Budge, The Egyptian Sudan (1907); Kromrei, Glaubenslehre und Gebrauche der alteren abessinischen Kirche (1895); M. Fowler, Christian Egypt (1901); Dowling, Abyssinian Church (1909); "Meroe," the City of the Ethiopians, by Liverpool University Expedition (1909-10); University of Pennsylvania Publications, Egyptian Dept., Eckley B. Coxe, Jr., Expedition to Nubia, I-IV (1909-11); Archeological Survey of Nubia; and Egyptian government reports.

Camden M. Cobern

ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH

<e-thi-o'-pi-an u'-nuk> [εὐνοῦχος, *eunouchos*]): A man who occupied a

leading position as treasurer at the court of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, and who was converted and baptized by Philip the deacon (⁴⁴⁸²⁷Acts 8:27-39). Being a eunuch, he was not in the full Jewish communion (compare ⁰⁵²⁰¹Deuteronomy 23:1), but had gone up to Jerusalem to worship, probably as a proselyte at the gate. During his return journey he spent the time in studying Isaiah, the text which he used being that of the Septuagint (compare Professor Margoliouth, article "Ethiopian Eunuch" in HDB). On meeting with Philip the deacon, who was on his way to Gaza, he besought of him to shed light upon the difficulties of the Scripture he was reading, and through this was converted. The place of his baptism, according to Jerome and Eusebius, was Bethsura: by some modern authorities, e.g. G. A. Smith, it has been located at or near Gaza. The verse containing the confession of the eunuch, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," is omitted either in whole or in part by some texts, but Hilgenfeld, Knowling, etc., regard it as quite in keeping with the context. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Revised Version (British and American) text, etc., uphold the omission. The verse occurs in the body of the King James Version, but is given only as a footnote in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version. The diligence with which the eunuch pursued his reading, the earnestness with which he inquired of Philip, and the promptness with which he asked for baptism — all testify to the lofty nature of his character.

C. M. Kerr

ETHIOPIAN WOMAN

See CUSHITE WOMAN.

ETHIOPIC LANGUAGE

<e-thi-op'-ik lan'-gwaj>: The language commonly called Ethiopic is the language in which the inscriptions of the kings of the ancient Aksumitic (Axumite) empire and most of the literature of Christian Abyssinia are written. It is called lesana Ge`ez, "the tongue of Ge`ez," by the Abyssinians themselves, most probably because it was originally the dialect of the Ge`ez tribe, who in antiquity must have dwelt in or near Aksum (Axum).

The names Ethiopia and Ethiopians have been used in many different meanings by various peoples. To the Greeks, Ethiopia was a country South of Egypt, and in this sense the word is generally used in the histories of

Egypt. The Ethiopian kings came from that country which is now called Nubia in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. In Hellenistic times the term received a wider meaning, and Ethiopia was the name of all the land between the Red Sea and the Nile, south of Egypt proper. Sometimes "Indian" and "Ethiopian" were synonymous, or Ethiopia was even considered to stretch as far as to the Atlantic Ocean in the West. But of these countries the Greeks and Romans had very little exact geographical knowledge.

See ETHIOPIA.

The fact that Ethiopia at some time meant the country between the Red Sea and the Nile prompted the pagan kings of Aksum in northern Abyssinia to adopt this name for their own country and to give it a narrower sense than the one which it had at that time. Therefore in the bilingual inscription of King [Αειζανας, *Aeizanas*] (`Ezana), the word [Αἰθιοπία, *Aithiopia*], is a rendering of the Semitic Chabashat ("Abyssinia," but here more specially referring to Northern Abyssinia). Under this same king, about 350 AD, Abyssinia became Christian; and after the Bible had been translated into the Ge`ez language, the Abyssinians found that Ethiopia was mentioned there several times. Their national pride was flattered by the thought that their country should be referred to in the Holy Scriptures, and for this reason they were all the more ready to apply the name in question to their own country. Up to the present day they call it Ethiopia ('Itiopiya), and themselves Ethiopians; their legends speak even of an ancestor Itiopis.

We may then, if we choose to do so, speak of a Nubian and an Abyssinian Ethiopia, but the term "Ethiopic language" has come into general usage as an equivalent of lesana Ge`ez, and should therefore be applied only to the ancient literary language of Abyssinia.

This language is closely allied to the languages of Southern Arabia: it represents the southwestern branch of the southern division of the Semitic languages. The most important branch of this division is, of course, the Arabic language, and with this Ethiopic has a great deal in common. On the other hand there are many words and forms in Ethiopic which are not found in Arabic, but in Hebrew or even in Babylonian and Assyrian. It has been held that the home of the Semites was in Africa; and if that were the case, the people who spoke the Ethiopic language may never have migrated very much. But the majority of scholars who have expressed their opinion upon the subject believe that Asia was the home of the Semites;

this is the opinion of the writer of this article also. Then the Semitic inhabitants of Abyssinia must have come from across the Red Sea. Their migration must have begun many centuries BC. It has hardly ever stopped, since Arabs in smaller, and sometimes in larger, numbers have been drifting into Abyssinia at all periods.

The Semitic conquerors of Abyssinia found peoples of two different races in the country where they settled:

(1) African aborigines and

(2) Kushites, a branch of the Hamitic family. Their languages were different from each other and, of course, different from that of the Semites also; some of them are spoken up to the present day. When the Semites first came and formed their literary language, they did not allow the languages of the country to influence their own speech very much; but gradually this influence grew stronger and stronger, and it is very evident in the modern Semitic languages of Abyssinia. An outline of the history of the Ethiopic language is as follows: Its oldest monument known so far is the Semitic part of the bilingual inscription of King `Ezana, which dates from the first half of the 4th century AD. Before that time Ethiopic must have been spoken, without doubt, but it was not written: Greek and Sabean were written instead. At the time of King `Ezana the knowledge of the Sabean language seems to have been very little; but Sabean script was still used. The Semitic part of the inscription just mentioned is in the Ethiopic language, but carved once in Sabean script and a second time in the native Ethiopic script which had been derived from the Sabean. In the first of these two "editions" two or three Sabean words are used instead of their Ethiopic equivalents. A few other ancient inscriptions found in the Aksumitic empire may also be dated from the same period.

Possibly in the same 4th century the translation of the Bible into Ethiopic was begun; and this fact marks the beginning of a real Ethiopic literature. Perhaps the Psalms and the Gospels were translated first, being most needed in the service of the Christian church. The different books of the Scriptures were translated by different men, some of whom rendered literally, some more according to the sense, some having a good, some only a poor, knowledge of the language from which, and the language into which, they translated. Both Testaments were translated from the Greek by

men whose mother-tongue was probably Aramaic. This is proved by the presence of Greek and Aramaic words and by the forms in which the Hebrew names appear in Ethiopic transliteration. The oldest influences which the Ethiopic language experienced were therefore:

(1) Sabean; a number of technical terms may have been adopted by the ancient Aksumites from the Sabean at the time when this was their literary language;

(2) African, i.e. Kushite and native African; the Semitic conquerors found a great many new animals and trees or plants, which they did not know, in their new country, and in many cases they adopted their African names;

(3) Aramaic, i.e. Jewish and Christian; these are mostly words referring to religious or theological matters;

(4) Greek; some of the Greek words found in Ethiopic refer to religious matters in the same way as the Aramaic, others denote objects or ideas which the ancient Abyssinians received from the civilized world, others again are mere transliterations of Greek words in the Bible and other religious books, which the translators did not understand.

The time of the Aksumitic empire was the time when the Ethiopic language flourished. This empire was overthrown probably in the 7th or 8th century AD; and we know very little indeed of the history of Abyssinia from about 700 until about 1300 AD. In 1270 the so-called Solomonic Dynasty came to the throne again; the seat of the empire, however, was no longer Aksum but Gondar, North of Lake Tsana. Meanwhile the literary language had become a dead language; new dialects had sprung up and taken its place in everyday conversation. But Ge`ez continued to be the sacred language; it was the language of the Bible and of the church, and when in the 14th and 15th centuries a revival of Abyssinian literature came about, the literary language was Ge`ez. But it was influenced by the new dialects, especially by the Amharic, the language of Amhara, where Gondar was situated and where most of the books were written or translated. This influence affected in particular the spelling of Ge`ez in those books which dealt with religious matters and which therefore had to be written in pure Ge`ez. In historical books a great many words were taken from the Amharic; and this

language, called lesana tarik, "the tongue of the chronicles," has often the appearance of mixed language.

In the 16th and 17th centuries European missionaries came to Abyssinia and tried to convert the monophysite Abyssinian Christians to Romanism. In order to come into close contact with the common people they used Amharic as a literary language, so that everybody, not only the learned, might understand their books. Their example was followed by the defenders of the native church; and since that time Amharic has become a recognized literary language in Abyssinia, although Ge`ez is still considered the real language of the church.

Amharic was derived from a sister language of the Ethiopic; the direct descendant of the Ethiopic language is modern Tigrina; a language derived from a dialect very closely related to Ge`ez is modern Tigre.

LITERATURE.

Ludolf, Historia Aethiopica, 1681; id, Commentarius ad suam historiam Aethiopicam, 1691; Dillmann, Grammatik der athiopischen Sprache (translated into English by Crichton) 1907, Intro; Littmann, Geschichte der athiopischen Litteratur, 1907.

Enno Littmann

ETHIOPIC VERSIONS

<e-thi-op'-ik vur'-shuns>: Christianity was introduced into Abyssinia by Tyrian missionaries, who probably spoke Greek, about the time of Constantine the Great. The Bible was translated into Ethiopic, or, to use the native name, Ge`ez, the Old Testament being from the Septuagint, between the 4th and 5th centuries, by various hands, though the work was popularly ascribed to Frumentius, the first bishop. The fact of the Scriptures having been translated into Ethiopic was known to Chrysostom (Hom. II, in Joannem). The versions thus made were revised some time about the 14th century, and corrected by means of the Massoretic Text. The Ethiopic Scriptures contain the books found in the Alexandrine recension with the exception of the Books of Macc; but their importance lies in their pseudepigraphic writings, the Asc Isa, the Book of Enoch and the Book of Jubilees. The 1st edition of the New Testament appeared at Rome in 1545-49 (reprinted in Walton), but a critical edition has yet to be made; one issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1830 contains

many errors. The Old Testament canonical books and Apocrypha have been edited by Dillmann (the Octoteuch and 1-4 Kings and Apocrypha), Bachmann (died 1894) (Isa, Lam, Obidiah and Mal), and Ludolph (Pss). The Psalter has been often printed from 1513 on. The Book of Enoch was first translated by Richard Laurence and published at Oxford in 1821, but the standard editions are those of Dillmann (Leipzig, 1853) and R. H. Charles (Oxford, 1893). The importance of this work lies in the fact that "the influence of Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books taken together" (Charles, 41). Not only the phraseology and ideas, but the doctrines of the New Testament are greatly influenced by it. Of the canonical books and Apocrypha the manuscripts are too poor and too late to be of any value for the criticism of the Greek text.

Thomas Hunter Weir

ETH-KAZIN

<eth-ka'-zin> ([ˆyxˈq;hT{¡ *`ittah qatsin*]; the King James Version Ittah Kazin): A town on the eastern border of Zebulun, mentioned between Gath-hepher and Rimmon (⟨06913⟩Joshua 19:13). The site is not identified. "Ittah" of the King James Version is due to misunderstanding of the Hebrew letter "he" locale.

ETHMA

<eth'-ma> ([Ἐθμά, *Ethma*]), the Revised Version (British and American) *NOOMA* (which see).

ETHNAN

<eth'-nan> ([ˆn″ tˈa, *'ethnan*], "gift" or "hire"; [Ἐθναδί, *Ethnadi*]): A Judahite (⟨13407⟩1 Chronicles 4:7).

ETHNARCH

<eth'-nark> (⟨47112⟩2 Corinthians 11:32 margin).

See GOVERNOR.

ETHNI

<eth'-ni> ([ynit a, 'ethni], "gift"): An ancestor of Asaph, of the Gershom branch of the Levites (<13064>1 Chronicles 6:41).

ETHNOGRAPHY; ETHNOLOGY

<eth-nog'-ra-fi>, <eth-nol'-o-ji>.

See *TABLE OF NATIONS.*

EUBULUS

<u-bu'-lus> ([Εὔβουλος, *Euboulos*], literally, "of good counsel," <5021>2 Timothy 4:21): One of the members of the church in Rome at the time of Paul's second imprisonment in that city.

The apostle mentions how, at his first answer to the charges brought against him at the emperor's tribunal, the Roman Christians as a whole proved disloyal to him "no one took my part, but all forsook me" (<5046>2 Timothy 4:16). In these circumstances when the desertion of Paul by the Christians in Rome was so disheartening, it is pleasing to find that there were some among them who were true, and Eubulus was one of these. Paul therefore in writing the last of all his epistles sends to Timothy a greeting from Eubulus.

Nothing more is known in regard to Eubulus. As his name is Greek, he was probably a Gentile by birth.

John Rutherfurd

EUCHARIST

<u'-ka-rist>.

See *LORD'S SUPPER.*

EUMENES II

<u'-me-nez> ([Εὐμένης, *Eumenes*], "well-disposed"): King of Pergamus, son and successor of Attalus I (197 BC). He is mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Macc 8:8) in connection with the league which Judas Maccabeus made with the Romans. As their ally in the war against

Antiochus the Great and in recognition of his signal service at the decisive battle of Magnesia (190 BC), Eumenes II was rewarded with such extensive tracts of country as raised him at once from comparative insignificance to be the sovereign of a great state. The statement in the Apocrypha describing his extension of territory differs from those of Livy, Polybius and Appian, and cannot be correct. The Romans are said to have taken "India, and Media and Lydia" from Antiochus and to have given them to Eumenes II. Antiochus never had any possessions in India nor had any earlier king of Syria. He was obliged to give up only the countries on the side of Taurus toward Rome. No suggestion for the reading "India" in the narrative has met with acceptance (it may possibly have been a copyist's error for "Ionia"; see Livy xxxvii.44). Eumenes II cultivated the Roman alliance carefully but became suspected in connection with the affairs of Perseus, the last king of Macedonia. He never came to an open rupture with the Romans, and died in 159 BC, after a reign of 39 years.

J. Hutchison

EUNATAN

<u-na'-tan>.

See *ENNATAN.*

EUNICE

<u-ni'-se>, *<u'-nis>* ([Εὐνίκη, *Eunike*], is the correct reading, and not [Εὐνείκη, *Euneike*], which is read by the Textus Receptus of the New Testament of Stephen, three syllables: *Eu-ni-ke*, literally, "conquering well"; 2 Timothy 1:5): The mother of Timothy.

1. EUNICE'S HOME:

Her name is Greek and this might lead to the inference that she was a Gentile by birth, but such a conclusion would be wrong, for we read in Acts 16:1 that she was a Jewess. Her husband however was a heathen Greek She was in all probability a daughter of Lois, the grandmother of Timothy, for both of those Christian women are spoken of, in one breath, by Paul, and this in high terms of commendation.

2. HOW SHE TRAINED HER SON:

Timothy had not been circumcised in childhood, probably because of his

father's being a Gentile; but the mother and the grandmother did all that lay in their power to train Timothy in the fear of God and in the knowledge of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. "From a child" Eunice had taught her boy to "know the holy scriptures" (⁵⁸⁵²2 Timothy 3:15 the King James Version). It is right therefore to connect this home training of Timothy in the fear of God, with his and his mother's conversion to the gospel. His name Timothy — chosen evidently not by the father, but by Eunice — signifies "one who fears God." The "wisdom" of the Hebrews consisted not in worldly prudence or in speculative philosophy, but in the fear of the Lord, as is shown in such passages as ⁶⁹⁸¹¹⁰Psalm 111:10, and in Job 28, and in Proverbs throughout. His name, as well as his careful home training, shows how he was prepared to give a welcome both to Paul and to the gospel proclaimed by him, when the apostle in his first great missionary journey came to Lystra, one of the cities of Lycaonia or Southern (?) Galatia, where Eunice and her family lived. This is implied in the account of Paul's second missionary journey (⁴⁴¹⁶⁰¹Acts 16:1), where we read that he came to Lystra, and found there a certain disciple named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman who was a Jewess, who believed.

3. HER CONVERSION TO CHRIST:

It is therefore certain that Eunice and Timothy were not brought to a knowledge of the gospel at this time, but that they were already Christians; she, "a believer"; he, "a disciple." This evidently means that Eunice, Lois and Timothy had been converted on Paul's former visit to Lystra. This conclusion is confirmed in ⁵⁸³¹¹2 Timothy 3:11, where Paul recalls to Timothy the fact that he had fully known the persecutions and afflictions which came to him at Lystra. The apostle repeats it, that Timothy knew what persecutions he then endured. Now this persecution occurred on Paul's first visit to that city. Eunice was therefore one of those who on that occasion became "disciples." And her faith in Christ, and her son's faith too, were genuine, and stood the test of the "much tribulation" of which Paul warned them (⁴⁴¹⁴²²Acts 14:22 the King James Version); and on Paul's next visit to Lystra, Eunice had the great joy and satisfaction of seeing how the apostle made choice of her son to be his companion in his missionary work. Eunice is not afterward mentioned in the New Testament; though it is a possible thing that there may be reference to her in what is said about widows and the children of widows in ⁵⁴⁵⁰⁴1 Timothy 5:4,5.

John Rutherfurd

EUNUCH

<u'-nuk> ([ܣܪܝܣ; *caric*]; [σπάδων, *spadon*]; [εὐνοῦχος, *eunouchos*]):
Primarily and literally, a eunuch is an emasculated man (⟨06201⟩Deuteronomy
23:1). The Hebrew word *caric* seems, however, to have acquired a
figurative meaning, which is reflected in English Versions of the Bible
where "officer" and "chamberlain" are found as renderings (compare
⟨01736⟩Genesis 37:36; 39:1, where *caric* is applied to married men; Est 4:4).
The barbarous practice of self-mutilation and the mutilation of others in
this way was prevalent throughout the Orient. The religious disabilities
under which men thus deformed labored under the Mosaic law had the
effect of making the practice abominable to the Jews as a people
(⟨06201⟩Deuteronomy 23:1; ⟨03223⟩Leviticus 22:23-25). The law excluded eunuchs
from public worship, partly because self-mutilation was often performed in
honor of a heathen god, and partly because a maimed creature of any sort
was deemed unfit for the service of Yahweh (⟨03116⟩Leviticus 21:16 ff; 22:24).
That ban, however, was later removed (⟨23604⟩Isaiah 56:4,5). On the other
hand, the kings of Israel and Judah followed their royal neighbors in
employing eunuchs
(1) as guardians of the harem (⟨12082⟩2 Kings 9:32; ⟨24116⟩Jeremiah 41:16), and
(2) in military and other official posts (⟨09085⟩1 Samuel 8:15 margin; ⟨11209⟩1
Kings 22:9 margin; ⟨12806⟩2 Kings 8:6 margin; 23:11 the King James Version
margin; ⟨12412⟩2 Kings 24:12,13 margin; 25:19 margin; ⟨13801⟩1 Chronicles 28:1
margin; ⟨14808⟩2 Chronicles 18:8 margin; ⟨24202⟩Jeremiah 29:2; 34:19; 38:7;
compare ⟨01736⟩Genesis 37:36; 40:2,7; ⟨44827⟩Acts 8:27).
Josephus informs us that eunuchs were a normal feature of the courts of
the Herods (Ant., XV, vii, 4; XVI, viii, 1). From the single reference to the
practice in the Gospels (⟨40912⟩Matthew 19:12), we infer that the existence
and purpose of eunuchs as a class were known to the Jews of Jesus' time.
There is no question with Jesus as to the law of Nature: the married life is
the norm of man's condition, and the union thereby effected transcends
every other natural bond, even that of filial affection (⟨40905⟩Matthew 19:5,6).
But He would have His hearers recognize that there are exceptional cases
where the rule does not hold. In speaking of the three classes of eunuchs
(⟨40912⟩Matthew 19:12), He made a distinction which was evidently well
known to those whom He addressed, as was the metaphorical use of the
word in application to the third class well understood by them (compare
Lightfoot, Horae Hebrew et Talmud; Schottgen, Horae Hebrew, in the
place cited.).

How Origen misunderstood and abused the teaching of this passage is well known (Euseb., HE, VI, 8), and his own pathetic comment on the passage shows that later he regretted having taken it thus literally and acted on it. His is not the only example of such a perverted interpretation (see Talmud, Shabbath 152a, and compare Midrash on Ecclesiastes 10:7). The Council of Nicea, therefore, felt called on to deal with the danger as did the 2nd Council of Aries and the Apos Canons (circa 21). (Compare Bingham's Ant, IV, 9.)

It is significant that Jesus expresses no condemnation of this horrible practice. It was in keeping with His far-reaching plan of instilling principles rather than dealing in denunciations (John 3:17; 8:11). It was by His positive teaching concerning purity that we are shown the lines along which we must move to reach the goal. There is a more excellent way of achieving mastery of the sexual passion. It is possible for men to attain as complete control of this strong instinct as if they were physically sexless, and the resultant victory is of infinitely more value than the negative, unmoral condition produced by self-emasculation. These "make themselves eunuchs" with a high and holy purpose, "for the kingdom of heaven's sake"; and the interests created by that purpose are so absorbing that neither time nor opportunity is afforded to the "fleshly lusts, which war against the soul" (1 Peter 2:11). They voluntarily forego marriage even, undertake virtual "eunuchism" because they are completely immersed in and engrossed by "the kingdom of heaven" (compare John 17:4; 1 Corinthians 7:29,33 f; 9:5 and see Bengel, Gnomon Novi Test. in the place cited and Clement of Alexandria., Strom., iii.1 ff).

See MARRIAGE.

LITERATURE.

Driver," Deuteronomy," ICC, Deuteronomy 23:1; Commentary on Mt, in the place cited. by Morison and Broadus; Neander, Ch. Hist, II, 493; Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, 72 ff; The Expositor, IV, vii (1893), 294 ff; Encyclopedia Brit, article "Eunuch."

George B. Eager

EUODIA

<u-o'-di-a> ([Εὐοδία, *Euodia*], literally, "prosperous journey."

1. WOMEN PROMINENT IN CHURCH AT PHILIPPI:

The Textus Receptus of the New Testament of Stephen reads [Εὐωδία, *Euodia*], which means "fragrant," <5002>Philippians 4:2. King James Version has transformed *Euodia* into Euodias, which is a man's name. The mistake is rectified in the Revised Version (British and American)): A Christian woman, one of the members of the church in Philippi. She and Syntyche, who is named in the same verse, were evidently persons of note, prominent in the work of the church there. At Philippi the gospel was first preached to women (<44l613>Acts 16:13), and the church was first formed among women — evidently in the house of Lydia (<44l615>Acts 16:15,40). Paul here makes a request of Euodia and Syntyche. He requests — the word is never used of prayer from us to God — he asks, he beseeches. Euodia, and then he repeats the word, he beseeches Syntyche, to be of the same mind in the Lord. Possibly, as Lightfoot suggests, they may have been deaconesses in the Philippian church, but whatever their position in this respect may have been, differences had arisen between them on some subject, we know not what.

2. THE DIFFERENCE WHICH AROSE:

But whatever the subject in dispute was, it had become so serious that, instead of the breach being healed, matters had become chronic; and news regarding this lack of forbearance between Euodia and Syntyche had been carried to Paul in his captivity in Rome.

3. PAUL ENTREATS THEM:

The state of Christian life in the church at Philippi gave Paul almost unmingled satisfaction. He regarded with joy their faith and steadfastness and liberality. There was no false teaching, no division; among them. The only thing which could cause him any uneasiness was the want of harmony between Euodia and Syntyche. He beseeches them to give up their differences, and to live at peace in the Lord. Such is the motive which he puts before them with a view to bring about their reconciliation; to live in dispute and enmity is not worthy of those who are "in the Lord," who have been redeemed by the Lord, and whose whole life should be an endeavor to please Him.

4. THE TRUE YOKEFELLOW:

Paul proceeds to ask a certain person, unnamed, but whom he terms "true yokefellow" to assist them, that is, to assist Euodia and Syntyche; for each of them, he says, "labored with me in the gospel." It is uncertain what is meant by "true yokefellow." He may refer to Epaphroditus, who carried the epistle from Rome to Philippi. Other names have been suggested — Luke, Silas, Timothy. It has been thought by some that Paul here refers to his own wife, or to Lydia. But such a suggestion is untenable, inasmuch as we know from his own words (⟨4678⟩1 Corinthians 7:8) that he was either unmarried or a widower. And the idea that the "true yokefellow" is Lydia, is equally wrong, because the word "true" is in the Greek masculine Another suggestion is that "yokefellow" is really a proper name — Syzygus. If so, then the apostle addresses Syzygus; or if this is not so, then he speaks to the unnamed "true yokefellow"; and what he says is that he asks him to help Euodia and Syntyche, inasmuch as their work in the gospel was no new thing. Far from this, when Paul brought the gospel to Philippi at the first, these two Christian women had been his loyal and earnest helpers in spreading the knowledge of Christ.

5. THE PLEA FOR RECONCILIATION:

How very sad then that any difference should exist between them; how sad that it should last so long! He asks Clement also, and all the other Christians at Philippi, his fellow-laborers, whose names, though not mentioned by the apostle, are nevertheless in the book of life, to assist Euodia and Syntyche; he asks them all to aid in this work of reconciliation. Doubtless he did not plead in vain.

See SYNTYCHE; YOKEFELLOW.

John Rutherfurd

EUPATOR

<u'-pa-tor> ([Εὐπάτωρ, *Eupator*], "of noble father"): The name given to Antiochus V who had succeeded his father Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), 164 BC, while still a child under the guardianship of Lysias (1 Macc 3:32; 6:17). In the absence of Philip, a friend and foster-brother of the child's father, whom on his deathbed he had appointed guardian for his son, Lysias continued his duty as guardian, set the king upon the throne and named him Eupator. Shortly after his accession he collected a large army and

marched against Jerusalem, accompanied by Lysias, for the relief of a Syrian garrison that was hard pressed by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 6:19 ff). Judas was repulsed at Bethzacharias and after a severe struggle Bethsura was captured (1 Macc 6:31-50). The Jewish force in the temple was hard pressed and indeed reduced to the last extremity (1 Macc 6:53), when Lysias, hearing that his rival Philip had returned from Persia and had made himself master of Antioch (Josephus, Ant, XII, ix, 5 f), made a hasty peace and returned to meet Philip, whom he easily overpowered. In the following year (162 BC) Antiochus and Lysias were put to death by Demetrius Soter, son of Seleucus, in requital of wrongs inflicted upon himself by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 7:2-4; 2 Macc 14:1,2; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 1).

J. Hutchinson

EUPHRATES

<u-fra'-tez> ([trP]*perath*]; [Εὐφράτης, *Euphrates*], "the good and abounding river"): The longest (1,780 miles) and most important stream of Western Asia, generally spoken of in the Old Testament as "the river" (Exodus 23:31; Deuteronomy 11:24). Its description naturally falls into 3 divisions — the upper, middle and lower. The upper division traverses the mountainous plateau of Armenia, and is formed by the junction of 2 branches, the Frat and the Murad. The Frat rises 25 miles Northeast of Erzerum, and only 60 miles from the Black Sea. The Murad, which, though the shorter, is the larger of the two, rises in the vicinity of Mt. Ararat. After running respectively 400 and 270 miles in a westerly direction, they unite near Keban Maaden, whence in a tortuous channel of about 300 miles, bearing still in a southwesterly direction, the current descends in a succession of rapids and cataracts to the Syrian plain, some distance above the ancient city of Carchemish, where it is only about 200 miles from the Northeast corner of the Mediterranean. In its course through the Armenian plateau, the stream has gathered the sediment which gives fertility to the soil in the lower part of the valley. It is the melting snows from this region which produce the annual floods from April to June.

The middle division, extending for about 700 miles to the bitumen wells of Hit, runs Southeast "through a valley of a few miles in width, which it has eroded in the rocky surface, and which, being more or less covered with

alluvial soil, is pretty generally cultivated by artificial irrigation. .... Beyond the rocky banks on both sides is the open desert, covered in spring with a luxuriant verdure, and dotted here and there with the black tent of the Bedouin" (Sir Henry Rawlinson). Throughout this portion the river formed the ancient boundary between the Assyrians and Hittites whose capital was at Carchemish, where there are the remains of an old bridge. The ruins of another ancient bridge occur 200 miles lower down at the ancient Thapsacus, where the Greeks forded it under Cyrus the younger. Throughout the middle section the stream is too rapid to permit of successful navigation except by small boats going downstream, and has few and insignificant tributaries. It here has, however, its greatest width (400 yds.) and depth. Lower down the water is drawn off by irrigating canals and into lagoons.

The fertile plain of Babylonia begins at Hit, about 100 miles above Babylon; 50 miles below Hit the Tigris and Euphrates approach to within 25 miles of each other, and together have in a late geological period deposited the plain of Shinar or of Chaldea, more definitely referred to as Babylonia. This plain is about 250 miles long, and in its broadest place 100 miles wide. From Hit an artificial canal conducts water along the western edge of the alluvial plain to the Persian Gulf, a distance of about 500 miles. But the main irrigating canals put off from the East side of the Euphrates, and can be traced all over the plain past the ruins of Accad, Babylon, Nippur, Bismya, Telloh, Erech, Ur and numerous other ancient cities.

Originally the Euphrates and Tigris entered into the Persian Gulf by separate channels. At that time the Gulf extended up as far as Ur, the home of Abraham, and it was a seaport. The sediment from these rivers has filled up the head of the Persian Gulf for nearly 100 miles since the earliest monumental records. Loftus estimates that since the Christian era the encroachment has proceeded at the rate of 1 mile in 70 years. In early times Babylonia was rendered fertile by immense irrigating schemes which diverted the water from the Euphrates, which at Babylon is running at a higher level than the Tigris. A large canal left the Euphrates just above Babylon and ran due East to the Tigris, irrigating all the intervening region and sending a branch down as far South as Nippur. Lower down a canal crosses the plain in an opposite direction. This ancient system of irrigation can be traced along the lines of the principal canals "by the winding curves of layers of alluvium in the bed," while the lateral channels "are hedged in by high banks of mud, heaped up during centuries of dredging. Not a

hundredth part of the old irrigation system is now in working order. A few of the mouths of the smaller canals are kept open so as to receive a limited supply of water at the rise of the river in May, which then distributes itself over the lower lying lands in the interior, almost without labor on the part of the cultivators, giving birth in such localities to the most abundant crops; but by far the larger portion of the region between the rivers is at present an arid, howling wilderness, strewed in the most part with broken pottery, the evidence of former human habitation, and bearing nothing but the camel thorn, the wild caper, the colocynth-apple, wormwood and the other weeds of the desert" (Rawlinson). According to Sir W. Willcocks, the eminent English engineer, the whole region is capable of being restored to its original productiveness by simply reproducing the ancient system of irrigation. There are, however, in the lower part of the region, vast marshes overgrown with reeds, which have continued since the time of Alexander who came near losing his army in passing through them. These areas are probably too much depressed to be capable of drainage. Below the junction of the Euphrates and the Tigris, the stream is called Shat el Arab, and is deep enough to float war vessels.

LITERATURE.

Fried. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 169 f; Chesney, Narrative of the Euphrates Exped., I; Loftus, Travels, etc., in Chaldoea and Susiana; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, chapters xxi, xxii; Rawlinson, Herodotus, I, essay ix; Ellsworth Huntington, "Valley of the Upper Euphrates River," Bull. Amer. Geog. Soc., XXXIV, 1902.

George Frederick Wright

EUPOLEMUS

<u-pol'-e-mus> ([Εὐπόλεμος, *Eupolemos*]): Son of John, the son of Accos = Hakkoz ([Ἀκκώς, *Akkos*]; Nehemiah 3:4,21, etc.); was one of the two deputies sent by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 8:17; 2 Macc 4:11) to Rome circa 161 BC to ask the help of the Romans against Demetrius. A critical estimate of the narrative (1 Macc 8 and Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 6) of the first meeting of the representatives of the Jewish nation and the Romans will be found in Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, III, 350 ff, where it is admitted that "inaccuracies of detail only confirm the general faithfulness of the impression." Keil (Comm., 14) further remarks on this point: "that the author of 1 Macc wrote from

twenty to twenty-five years after the destruction of Corinth (146 BC) by the Romans; and that the Jews of Palestine were not accurately informed concerning the wars of the Romans with the Greeks." Eupolemus has been identified with the historian of the same name quoted by Eusebius (Praep. Ev., IX, 17 ff); but there is no evidence that the historian was of Jewish origin.

J. Hutchison

EURAQUILO

<u-rak'-wi-lo> (the Revised Version (British and American) [εὐρακύλων, *eurakulon*]; the King James Version [εὐροκλύδων, *eurokludon*]; the King James Version Euroclydon, *<u-rok'-li-don>*): The east or northeast wind which drove Paul's ship to shipwreck at Melita (Acts 27:14). The term seems to have been the sailor's term for that particular wind, and Paul uses the word which was used by them on that occasion. The difference in the text is explained by the fact that the term was not in general use and was therefore subject to being changed. The precise name is doubtful, but "the Euraquilo" is more easily explained as a compound of Greek *euros*, "east wind," and Latin aquilo, "northeast wind," hence, *euraquilo*, "east northeast wind." This agrees with the experience of navigators in those waters. For a summary of the various readings see Sanday, Appendices ad New Testament, 140. Full discussion of the circumstances are given in the Lives of Paul by various writers.

Alfred H. Joy

EUTYCHUS

<u'-ti-kus> ([Εὔτυχος, *Eutuchos*], "fortunate"): The story of Eutychus occurs in the "we" section of Acts, and is therefore related by an eyewitness of the incidents (Acts 20:7-12). On the first day of the week the Christians of Troas had met for an evening service in an upper chamber, and were joined by Paul and his company. As he was to leave in the morning, Paul "prolonged his speech until midnight." A youth named Eutychus, who was sitting at the open window, became borne down with sleep owing to the lateness of the hour, and ultimately fell through the opening from the third story. He "was taken up dead." This direct statement is evaded by Deuteronomy Wette and Olshausen, who translate "for dead." Meyer says this expresses the judgment of those who took him up. However, Luke, the physician, is giving his verdict, and he plainly

believes that a miracle was wrought by Paul in restoring a corpse to life. The intention of Luke in relating this incident is to relate a miracle. Paul went down and embraced the youth while comforting the lamenting crowd, "Make ye no ado; for his life is in him." The interrupted meeting was resumed, the bread was broken, and the conversation continued till break of day. "And they brought the lad alive, and were not a little comforted."

S. F. Hunter

EVANGELIST

<e-van'-jel-ist>: This is a form of the word ordinarily translated "gospel" ([εὐγγέλιον, *euaggelion*]), except that here it designates one who announces that gospel to others ([εὐαγγελιστής, *euaggelistes*], "a bringer of good tidings"), literally, God Himself is an evangelist, for He "preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham" (Galatians 3:8); Jesus Christ was an evangelist, for He also "preached the gospel" (Luke 20:1); Paul was an evangelist as well as an apostle (Romans 1:15); Philip the deacon was an evangelist (Acts 21:8); and Timothy, the pastor (2 Timothy 4:5); and indeed all the early disciples who, on being driven out of Jerusalem, "went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts 8:4 the King James Version).

But Ephesians 4:11 teaches that one particular order of the ministry, distinguished from every other, is singled out by the Head of the church for this work in a distinctive sense. All may possess the gift of an evangelist in a measure, and be obligated to exercise its privilege and duty, but some are specially endued with it. "He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers."

It will be seen that as an order in the ministry, the evangelist precedes that of the pastor and teacher, a fact which harmonizes with the character of the work each is still recognized as doing. The evangelist has no fixed place of residence, but moves about in different localities, preaching the gospel to those ignorant of it before. As these are converted and united to Jesus Christ by faith, the work of the pastor and teacher begins, to instruct them further in the things of Christ and build them up in the faith.

At a later time, the name of "evangelist" was given the writers of the four Gospels because they tell the story of the gospel and because the effect of their promulgation at the beginning was very much like the work of the preaching evangelist. In character, the Gospels bear something of the same relation to the Epistles as evangelists bear to pastors and teachers.

James M. Gray

EVE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

<*ev*>, ([hᵂj ″ , *chawwah*], "life"; [Εὔα, *Eua*]; the name given, as the Scripture writer says, ⁽ᴼᴵᴮᴰ⁾Genesis 3:20 ([Ζωή, *Zoe*]), from her unique function as "the mother of all living"): The first created woman; created secondarily from Adam (or man) as a "help meet for him" (⁽ᴼᴵᴾᴵ⁸⁾Genesis 2:18-22), and later named and designated as the mother of the human race.

For the literary type and object of the story of Eve, see under ADAM, I, 2.

1. THE NAMES GIVEN TO HER:

Two names are given to her, both bestowed by the man, her mate. The first, [hᵂaj *ishshah*], "woman" (literally, "man-ess"), is not strictly a name but a generic designation, referring to her relation to the man; a relation she was created to fulfill in default of any true companionship between man and the beasts, and represented as intimate and sacred beyond that between child and parents (⁽ᴼᴵᴾᴵ⁸⁾Genesis 2:18-24). The second, Eve, or "life," given after the transgression and its prophesied results, refers to her function and destiny in the spiritual history or evolution of which she is the beginning (⁽ᴼᴵᴮᴵ⁶⁾Genesis 3:16,20). While the names are represented as bestowed by the man, the remarks in ⁽ᴼᴵᴼ²⁴⁾Genesis 2:24 and 3:20b may be read as the interpretative addition of the writer, suited to the exposition which it is the object of his story to make.

2. HER RELATION TO MAN:

As mentioned in the article ADAM, the distinction of male and female, which the human species has in common with the animals, is given in the general (or P) account of creation (⁽ᴼᴵᴼ²⁷⁾Genesis 1:27); and then, in the more particularized (or J) account of the creation of man, the human being is described at a point before the distinction of sex existed. This second account may have a different origin, but it has also a different object, which does not conflict with but rather supplements the other. It aims to give the spiritual meanings that inhere in man's being; and in this the relation of sex plays an elemental part. As spiritually related to the man-nature, the woman-nature is described as derivative, the helper rather than the initiator, yet equal, and supplying perfectly the man's social and affectional needs. It is the writer's conception of the essential meaning of mating and

marriage. To bring out its spiritual values more clearly he takes the pair before they are aware of the species meanings of sex or family, while they are "naked" yet "not ashamed" ^{OIO225}Genesis 2:25), and portrays them purely as companions, individual in traits and tendencies, yet answering to each other. She is the helpmeet for him (*ezer keneghdo*, "a help answering to him").

3. HER PART IN THE CHANGE OF CONDITION:

True to her nature as the being relatively acted upon rather than acting, she is quicker than the man to respond to the suggestion initiated by the serpent and to follow it out to its desirable results. There is eagerness of desire in her act of taking the fruit quite different from the quasi matter-of-course attitude of the man. To her the venture presents itself wholly from the alluring side, while to him it is more like taking a desperate risk, as he detaches himself even from the will of God in order to cleave to her. All this is delicately true to the distinctive feminine and masculine natures. A part of her penalty is henceforth to be the subordinated one of the pair (^{OIO316}Genesis 3:16), as if for her the values of life were to be mediated through him. At the same time it is accorded to her seed to perpetuate the mortal antipathy to the serpent, and finally to bruise the serpent's head (^{OIO315}Genesis 3:15).

4. IN SUBSEQUENT HISTORY:

After these opening chapters of Gen, Eve is not once mentioned, nor even specifically alluded to, in the canonical books of the Old Testament. It was not in the natural scope of Old Testament history and doctrine, which were concerned with Abraham's descendants, to go back to so remote origins as are narrated in the story of the first pair. The name Eve occurs once in the Apocrypha, in the prayer of Tobit (Tobit 8:6): "Thou madest Adam, and gavest him Eve his wife for a helper and a stay; of them came the seed of men"; the text then going on to quote ^{OIO218}Genesis 2:18. In 1 Esdras 4:20,21 there is a free quotation, or rather paraphrase, of ^{OIO224}Genesis 2:24. But not even in the somber complaints of 2 Esdras concerning the woe that Adam's transgression brought upon the race (see under *ADAM IN OLD TESTAMENT*, III, 2) is there any hint of Eve's part in the matter.

John Franklin Genung

EVE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

([Εὑα, *Eua*]; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, [Εὑα, *Heua*]): "Eve" occurs twice in the New Testament and both references are in the Pauline writings. In <4212>1 Timothy 2:12-14 woman's place in teaching is the subject of discussion, and the writer declares that she is a learner and not a teacher, that she is to be in quietness and not to have dominion over a man. Paul elsewhere expressed this same idea (see <4643>1 Corinthians 14:34,35). Having stated his position in regard to woman's place, he used the Genesis account of the relation of the first woman to man to substantiate his teaching. Paul used this account to illustrate woman's inferiority to man, and he undoubtedly accepted it at its face value without any question as to its historicity. He argued that woman is inferior in position, for "Adam was first formed, then Eve." She is inferior in character, for "Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression." *See CHILD-BEARING*. In <4710>2 Corinthians 11:3, Paul is urging loyalty to Christ, and he uses the temptation of Eve to illustrate the ease with which one is corrupted. Paul seems to have had no thought but that the account of the serpent's beguiling Eve should be taken literally.

A. W. Fortune

EVE, GOSPEL OF

A Gnostic doctrinal treatise mentioned by Epiphanius (Haer., xxvi.2 ff) in which Jesus is represented as saying in a loud voice, "I am thou, and thou art I, and wherever thou art there am I, and in all things I am sown. And from whencesoever thou gatherest me, in gathering me thou gatherest thyself." *See* LOGIA; and compare Ropes, Die Spruche Jesu, 56.

EVEN; EVENING; EVENTIDE

<e'-v'-n>, *<ev'-ning>*, *<ev-'-n-tid'>* ("even," "evening," [br[, *'erebh*]; [ὀψία, *opsia*], [ὀψέ, *opse*]; see Thayer under the word): The words are used in slightly different meanings:

(1) The time of sunset, the beginning of the Hebrew day, as in Leviticus 15, where directions are given for the removal of uncleanness, which took place at sunset.

(2) Twilight, the time of approaching darkness when lamps are lighted;

⁰²³⁰⁸Exodus 30:8 (literally, "between the two evenings"); ²⁰⁶⁰⁴Jeremiah 6:4 ("the shadows of the evening").

(3) The early part of the night (²⁰⁷⁰⁹Proverbs 7:9; ²⁶¹²⁷Ezekiel 12:7). The Greek *opse* is literally, "late" (⁴¹¹¹⁹Mark 11:19). The Greek [ἐσπέρα, *hespera*], refers evidently to sunset, in ⁴²²⁹Luke 24:29. "Eventide," [br[, t[ẹ`*eth* `*erebh*], "time of evening" (¹⁰¹¹²2 Samuel 11:2; ²³¹⁷¹⁴Isaiah 17:14). "Evening," used in connection with wolves (²⁴⁰⁶Jeremiah 5:6; ³⁶⁰³⁰³Zephaniah 3:3), is from the Hebrew [hbr[} `*arabhah*], which may mean "darkness" or "dark cloud," but more probably "plain" or "desert."

<div align="right">

H. Porter

</div>

EVENINGS, BETWEEN THE

The time of day (the Revised Version (British and American) reads "at even," margin, "between the two evenings") when the Passover lamb was slain (⁰²¹²⁰⁶Exodus 12:6; ⁰⁴⁹⁰³Numbers 9:3), or the offering made of the evening portion of the continual burnt offering (⁰⁴⁸⁰⁴Numbers 28:4). See preceding article.

EVENT

<e-vent'>: In ²¹⁰²¹⁴Ecclesiastes 2:14; 9:2,3, the translation of [hrqⱼm̄i, *miqreh*], "what happens," "lot," "fate." The English word bore this sense at the time of the King James Version. The meaning of "result," "outcome" [ἐκβάσεις, *ekbaseis*]), attaches to it in The Wisdom of Solomon 8:8, "events of seasons," the Revised Version (British and American) "issues."

EVERLASTING

<ev-er-last'-ing> ([μl w[, *olam*], [d[̣" `*adh*]; [ἀΐδιος, *aidios*], [αἰώνιος, *aionios*]): "Everlasting," in strictness, is that which endures forever; either that which has no beginning and will have no end (in which sense it is applicable to God only), or that which, having a beginning, will have no end, but henceforth will exist forever (thus of beings created for immortality; *see IMMORTALITY*). Figuratively also the term is applied to objects of impressive stability and long duration, as mountains, hills (e.g. ⁰¹⁴⁹²⁶Genesis 49:26; ³⁵⁰⁶⁰⁶Habakkuk 3:6).

Of the terms indicated as rendered by this word, `*olam* in the Old Testament and *aionios* in the New Testament, literally, "age-long," generally bear the full sense of "eternal" (always as applied to God, His mercy, His covenant, His kingdom and to the eternal life of believers).

Hence, in the Revised Version (British and American) the rendering "everlasting" in the King James Version is, in the New Testament, uniformly changed to "eternal" (e.g. [G166]Matthew 18:8; 25:41,46; [G166]Luke 16:9; 18:30; [G166]John 3:16,36, etc.; [G166]Acts 13:46; [G166]Romans 6:22; 16:26; [G166]Galatians 6:8; [G166]Hebrews 13:20). In the Old Testament the rendering "everlasting" is usually retained in the Revised Version (British and American), and sometimes takes the place of other words or phrases, as "lasting" ([H5769]Deuteronomy 33:15), "ever," "forever" ([H5769]1 Chronicles 16:36; [H5769]Nehemiah 9:5), "perpetual" ([H5769]Habakkuk 3:6; [H5769]Jeremiah 50:5), "of old" ([H5769]Habakkuk 3:6 margin). In [H5769]Psalm 100:5; 119:144, on the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American) changes the word to "for ever." In much the larger number of places `*olam* is translated "ever" or "for ever."

The word `*adh*, in the two cases in which it is translated "everlasting" in the King James Version (more frequently "for ever"), is in the Revised Version (British and American), in [H5703]Isaiah 9:6, retained, with margin, "Father of Eternity," and in [H5703]Habakkuk 3:6 is changed into "eternal." Another word, *qedhem*, with the meaning "ancient time," is rendered "everlasting" in [H6924]Habakkuk 1:12 ("Art not thou from everlasting?"). With the same meaning it occurs in [H6924]Deuteronomy 33:27, "The eternal God is thy dwelling-place."

The word which strictly answers to "everlasting" in the New Testament is aidios ([G126]Romans 1:20; [G126]Jude 1:6), rendered by the King James Version in the former passages "eternal," but correctly by the Revised Version (British and American) in both passages, "everlasting." The sense of the word "everlasting," in application to future punishment, is considered in the article *PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING*.

The term "everlasting" or "eternal," applied to God, describes Him as filling, or enduring through, all the "ages" of time. It is only thus that we can symbolically represent eternity. In reality, however, the eternity of God is not simply His filling of ever-flowing "ages," but rather that aspect of His being in which He is above time; for which time (the succession-form of existence) does not exist; to which the terms past, present and future do not apply. Yet, while God is not in time (rather holds time in Himself), time-sequence, as the form of existence of the world, is a reality for God.

See ETERNAL; ETERNITY.

James Orr

EVI

<e'-vi> ([ywa‎], *'ewi*], "desire"; [Εὐεί, *Euei*]): One of the five kings, or chiefs of the Midianites, slain by Israel during their sojourn in the plains of Moab (<05108>Numbers 31:8; <06321>Joshua 13:21).

EVIDENCE; EVIDENT; EVIDENTLY

<ev'-i-dens>, <ev'-i-dent-li> [rpse‎,*cepher*]; [ἔλεγχος, *elegchos*], [φανερῶς, *phaneros*]): In <24210>Jeremiah 32:10,11,12,14,16,44, *cepher*, "a writing," is translated (the King James Version) "evidence" (of the purchase of the field in Anathoth), the Revised Version (British and American) "deed"; "evidence" is also the translation of *elegchos*, "conviction," in the King James Version of <58101>Hebrews 11:1, "Now faith is .... the evidence of things not seen," the English Revised Version "proving," margin, "or test," better, as the American Standard Revised Version, "conviction," margin, "or test." The Greek word denotes "putting to the test," examining for the purpose of proof, bringing to conviction (Dr. W. F. Moulton). Thus if "test" or "proving" be adopted, a firm conviction of the reality of things not seen is implied as the result of putting to the proof. Trench remarks (New Testament Synonyms), "in juristic Greek *elegchein* is not merely to reply to, but to refute, an opponent." Hence, the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translation argumentum, followed by Wyclif and Rheims version; Tyndale and Cranmer have "certayntie." (The sense of "conviction" appears in <43846>John 8:46, "Which of you convinceth (*elegchei*, the Revised Version (British and American) "convicteth") me of sin?"; <43020>John 3:20, "reproved," the Revised Version, margin "convicted"; <43608>John 16:8 the King James Version "He will reprove the world of sin," the Revised Version (British and American) "convict." Compare <46124>1 Corinthians 14:24.) "Evident" is the translation of `al panim ("on the face") in <18068>Job 6:28, the King James Version "Look upon me; for it is evident unto you if I lie," margin, "Hebrew before your face," the Revised Version (British and American) "to your face," margin, "And it will be evident unto you if I lie," which is, perhaps, to be preferred to the text; *delos*, "manifest," is translated "evident" (<48011>Galatians 3:11); *katadelos*, "very manifest," is in <58715>Hebrews 7:15, the King James Version "far more evident," the Revised Version (British and American) "more abundantly evident"; *prodelos*, "manifest before-hand" (<58714>Hebrews 7:14), "evident." "Evidently" occurs only in <44003>Acts 10:3, as the translation of *phaneros*, "openly,"

"manifestly," the Revised Version (British and American) "openly."
It is important to note the true nature of faith according to the correct translation of ⁽⁵⁸¹⁰⁰⁾Hebrews 11:1, as being the well-grounded and assured conviction of things not seen.

W. L. Walker

EVIL

<ev'-'-l>, *<e'-vil>* [[ר″, *ra`*]; [πονηρός, *poneros*], *<kakov, kakos>*, *<kakon, kakon>*): In the Bible it is represented as moral and physical. We choose to discuss the subject under these heads. Many of the evils that come upon men have not been intended by those who suffer for them. Disease, individual and national calamity, drought, scarcity of food, may not always be charged to the account of intentional wrong. Many times the innocent suffer with, and even for, the guilty. In such cases, only physical evil is apparent. Even when the suffering has been occasioned by sin or dereliction of duty, whether the wrong is active or passive, many, perhaps the majority of those who are injured, are not accountable in any way for the ills which come upon them. Neither is God the author of moral evil. "God cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself tempteth no man" (⁽⁵⁹⁰¹³⁾James 1:13).

See TEMPTATION.

1. MORAL EVIL:

By this term we refer to wrongs done to our fellowman, where the actor is responsible for the action. The immorality may be present when the action is not possible. "But if that evil servant shall say in his heart" (⁽⁴¹²⁴⁸⁾Matthew 24:48,49), whether he shall smite his fellow-servants or not, the moral evil is present. *See SIN*. "All these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man" (⁽⁴¹⁰⁷²¹⁾Mark 7:21-23). The last six commandments of the Decalogue apply here (⁽⁰²⁰¹²⁾Exodus 20:12-17). To dishonor one's parents, to kill, to commit adultery, to steal, to bear false witness and to covet are moral evils. The spiritual import of these commandments will be found in ⁽⁴¹⁰⁵²¹⁾Matthew 5:21,22,27,28. "But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness" (6:23). Words and deeds are coined in the heart before the world sees or hears them (12:34,35). The word ought or its equal may be found in all languages; hence, it is in the mind of all people as well as in our laws that for the deeds and words we do and speak, we are responsible. "Break off thy sins by righteousness" (⁽²⁷⁰⁴²⁷⁾Daniel 4:27) shows that, in God's

thought, it was man's duty, and therefore within his power, to keep the commandment. "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well" (⁽²⁰⁰¹⁶⁾Isaiah 1:16 f). We cannot think of God commanding men to do what He knew they had no ability to do! God has a standing offer of pardon to all men who turn from their evil ways and do that which is right (⁽²⁶³³¹¹⁾Ezekiel 33:11-14 f). Evil begins in the least objectionable things. In ⁽⁴⁵⁰¹⁸⁾Romans 1:18-23, we have Paul's view of the falling away of the Gentiles. "Knowing God" (verse 21), they were "without excuse" (verse 20), but "glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened" (verse 21). "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (verse 22). This led the way into idolatry, and that was followed by all the corruption and wrongdoing to be instigated by a heart turned away from all purity, and practiced in all the iniquity to be suggested by lust without control. Paul gives fifteen steps in the ladder on which men descend into darkness and ruin (⁽⁴⁸⁰⁵¹⁹⁾Galatians 5:19-21). When men become evil in themselves, they necessarily become evil in thought and deed toward others. This they bring upon themselves, or give way to, till God shall give "them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting" (⁽⁴⁵⁰¹²⁸⁾Romans 1:28). Those thus fallen into habits of error, we should in meekness correct, that "they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, having been taken captive by him unto his will" (⁽⁵⁵⁰²²⁵⁾2 Timothy 2:25,26).

2. PHYSICAL EVIL:

Usually, in the Old Testament the Hebrew word [ra`] is employed to denote that which is bad. Many times the bad is physical; it may have been occasioned by the sins for which the people of the nation were responsible, or it may have come, not as a retribution, but from accident or mismanagement or causes unknown. Very many times the evil is a corrective, to cause men to forsake the wrong and accept the right. The flood was sent upon the earth because "all flesh had corrupted their way" (⁽⁰¹⁰⁶¹²⁾Genesis 6:12). This evil was to serve as a warning to those who were to live after. The ground had already been cursed for the good of Cain (⁽⁰¹⁰⁴¹²⁾Genesis 4:12). Two purposes seemed to direct the treatment:

(1) to leave in the minds of Cain and his descendants the knowledge that sin brings punishment, and

(2) to increase the toil that would make them a better people. God

overthrew Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, cities of the plain, making them "an example unto those that should live ungodly" (⟨6026⟩2 Peter 2:6). In the Book of Isaiah the prophet, we find a number of "burdens": the burden of Babylon (13:1-22); the burden of Moab (15:1-9); the burden of Damascus (17:1-14); the burden of Egypt (19:1-17); the burden of the Wilderness of the Sea (21:1-10); the burden of Dumah (21:11,12); the burden upon Arabia (21:13-17); the burden of the Valley of Vision (22:1-25); the burden of Tyre (23:1-18); the burden of the Beasts of the South (30:6-14); the burden of the Weary Beast (46:1,2). These may serve as an introduction to the story of wrongdoing and physical suffering threatened and executed. Isaiah contains many denunciations against Israel: against the Ten Tribes for following the sin introduced by Jeroboam the son of Nebat; and the threatening against Judah and Benjamin for not heeding the warnings. Jeremiah saw the woes that were sure to come upon Judah; for declaring them, he was shut up in prison, and yet they came, and the people were carried away into Babylon. These were the evils or afflictions brought upon the nations for their persistence in sin. "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am Yahweh, that doeth all these things" (⟨23507⟩Isaiah 45:7). These chastisements seemed grievous, and yet they yielded peaceable fruit unto them that were exercised thereby (⟨58121⟩Hebrews 12:11).

David Roberts Dungan

EVIL-DOERS

<e-v'-l-doo'-erz> [μy[ἰṃ, *mere`im*]; from [[[ʀ; *ra`-a*`]; [κακοποιός, *kakopoios*], always plural): Malefactors or offenders of God's law. Used generally of the ungodly, as, "Fret not thyself because of evil-doers." (⟨19870⟩Psalm 37:1). Sometimes also of personal offenders: "He hath delivered the soul of the needy from the hand of evil-doers." (⟨24013⟩Jeremiah 20:13).

EVIL EYE

([ˆyl[; [ʀ″ , *ra` `ayin*], "evil of eye"; [ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, *ophthalmos poneros*]): The superstition of the influence of the "evil eye," so widely spread over the earth, has had a mighty influence on life and language in Palestine, though direct references to it are not frequent in the Scriptures (⟨05159⟩Deuteronomy 15:9; 28:54,56; ⟨20206⟩Proverbs 23:6; 28:22; ⟨41015⟩Matthew 20:15 (compare ⟨40623⟩Matthew 6:23; ⟨42134⟩Luke 11:34); ⟨41072⟩Mark 7:22). In the Bible the expression is synonymous with envy, jealousy and some forms of

covetousness. In comparing ⌐⁵⁰²⁹⌐Romans 1:29 with ⌐⁴⁰⁷²⌐Mark 7:22 we find that ophthalmos poneros corresponds to [φθόνος, *phthonos*]. See Trench, New Testament Synonyms, under the word The eye of the envious (as also the tongue of the invidious by an apparently appreciative word, which, however, only disguises the strong desire of possessing the object of comment or of destroying it for its rightful owner) was supposed to have a baneful influence upon the wellbeing of others, especially of children. Therefore mothers bestowed constant care against the frustration of such fancied designs by means of innumerable sorts of charms. They often allowed their darlings to appear as unlovely as possible, through uncleanliness or rags, so as to spare them the harmful rising of envy in the hearts of others. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, gives perhaps the most accessible account of this superstition as held at the present day in Egypt, and Thomson, The Land and the Book, does the same for Palestine, while an equal amount of evidence might be collected from every other oriental country. Instances of the same superstition, though possibly slightly disguised, are by no means wanting among ourselves. Compare the expression, "green-eyed jealousy" (Othello, III, iii; Merchant of Venice, III, ii), etc.

For certain Biblical phrases referring to the "evil eye" ***see*** *ENVY; EYE*.

LITERATURE.

F. T. Elworthy, The Evil Eye, London, 1895.

H. L. E. Luering

EVIL-FAVOREDNESS

<e-v'-l-fa'-verd-nes>

The word is the translation of the Hebrew [[r″ rbD; *dabhar ra'*], lit "evil thing," and refers to the ritual unfitness for sacrifice of any animal which, though included in the class of clean beasts, yet possesses a blemish (see the word), or otherwise lacks beauty of symmetry, or is lean-fleshed (⌐⁵¹⁷⁰⌐Deuteronomy 17:1 the King James Version; compare "ill blemish," ⌐⁵¹⁵²⌐Deuteronomy 15:21). We find these conditions combined in ⌐⁰⁴⁰³⌐Genesis 41:3,4,19,20,21,27, where the seven "ill-favored and lean-fleshed" kine of Pharaoh's dream are mentioned.

EVIL-MERODACH

<e-vil-me-ro'-dak>; *<-mer'-o-dak>* [Ëd″ ⌐m]l ywȧ] *'ewil merodhakh*]; Septuagint [Εὐειαληαρωδέκ, *Eueialmarodek*]; so B in K, but B in Jeremiah, and A and Q in both places much corrupted): The name of the son and immediate successor of Nebuchadnezzar II, king of Babylon. The Babylonian form of the name is *Amelu-Marduk*, that is, "man of Marduk." About 30 contract tablets dated in this reign have been found. They show that Evil-merodach reigned for two years and about five months. He is said by Berosus to have conducted his government in an illegal and improper manner, and to have been slain by his sister's brother, Nergalshar-ucur, who then reigned in his stead. Evil-merodach is said in ⁰2 Kings 25:27-30 and in the parallel passage in ⁰Jeremiah 52:31-34 to have taken Jehoiachin, king of Judah, from his prison in Babylon, where he seems to have been confined for 37 years, to have clothed him with new garments, to have given him a seat above all the other kings, and to have allowed him to eat at the king's table all the days of his life. It is an undesigned coincidence, that may be worthy of mention, that the first dated tablet from this reign was written on the 26th of Elul, and ⁰Jeremiah 52:31 says that Jehoiachin was freed from prison on the 25th of the same month.

R. Dick Wilson

EVIL ONE

([ὁ πονηρός, *ho poneros*]): Nearly all peoples who have expressed their religious thought and feeling believe in a spirit that presides over the destinies of men for their good. They believe that there is also a spirit, a person, whose work it is to lead men into temptation: a spirit of light and a spirit of darkness. Feelings and preferences may have much to do with the conclusions. In ⁰Matthew 5:37,39,45; 6:13, the King James Version gives "evil," the Revised Version (British and American) "the evil one," margin, "evil," the personal form referring to the enemy of the race known by various terms: Satan, "the adversary" or "the accuser," occurs 50 times; Beelzebub is found 7 times; devil, 35 times; it means "accuser," "calumniator."

See *SATAN*.

David Roberts Duncan

EVIL-SPEAKING

<*e-v'-l-spek'-ing*>: Occurs twice in English Versions:

(1) ⁶⁰²⁰¹1 Peter 2:1 it is the translation of [καταλαλιά, *katalalia*], "a speaking against," rendered "backbiting" in ⁴⁷¹²⁰2 Corinthians 12:20; compare *katalalos*, "backbiter" (⁴⁵⁰³⁰Romans 1:30); the verb *katalaleo* is rendered to "speak against" (⁶⁰²¹²1 Peter 2:12; ⁵⁹⁰⁴¹James 4:11; ⁶⁰³¹⁶1 Peter 3:16);
(2) of [βλασφημία, *blasphemia*], "what is hurtful to the good name of anyone," "detraction," "slander" (⁴⁹⁰⁶³¹Ephesians 4:31 the Revised Version (British and American), "railing"; compare ⁵⁴⁰⁰⁴1 Timothy 6:4; ⁶⁵⁰⁰⁹Jude 1:9; ⁵¹⁰⁰⁸Colossians 3:8); the verb *blasphemeo* is rendered to "speak evil of" (⁴⁵¹⁴⁶Romans 14:16; ⁴⁶⁰⁸⁰1 Corinthians 10:30; ⁵⁶⁰³²Titus 3:2, etc.); to "speak evil" occurs in ⁴¹⁰⁹⁹Mark 9:39 as the translation of *kakologeo*, "lightly (the Revised Version (British and American) "quickly") speak evil of me"; ⁴⁴¹⁹⁰⁹Acts 19:9 the King James Version "spake evil of that way." In ¹⁹⁰¹¹Psalm 140:11, we have "evil-speaker" as the translation of *'ish lashon*, "a man of tongue"; so the Revised Version (British and American). The wrong thing condemned as evil-speaking seems to be essentially detraction, what is hurtful to the reputation, and it is often too lightly regarded even among Christians.

See BLASPHEMY; RAILING; SLANDER.

W. L. Walker

EVIL SPIRIT

See DEMON; DEMONIAC; COMMUNION WITH DEMONS; SATAN.

EVIL THING

([τὸ κακόν, *to kakon*], plural in ⁴²¹⁶²⁵Luke 16:25): An evil thing or evil things may be the thoughts of evil men, their plans or their deeds; or the things men suffer for their own wrongs; or the evils consequent upon the errors of others. In the dark picture of fallen men in ⁴⁵⁰³⁰Romans 1:30, "inventors of evil things" appear. "The evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil (*poneros*) things" (⁴⁰¹²⁵Matthew 12:35). Men should not lust after evil (*kakos*) things (⁴⁶¹⁰⁶1 Corinthians 10:6. This fixing the mind upon, with desire, leads to increased wrong. "The mouth of the wicked

poureth out evil (*ra'*) things" (⟨20158⟩Proverbs 15:28). The rich man had good things in his life, but did not use them to the glory of God or the good of men. The poor man had evil things: sickness, nakedness, hunger. The scene changes after death (⟨42165⟩Luke 16:25).

David Roberts Dungan

EVOLUTION

<*ev-o-lu'-shun*>:

1. THE IDEA OF EVOLUTION:

Evolution is a scientific and philosophical theory designed to explain the origin and course of all things in the universe. By origin, however, is not understood the production or emergence of the substance and of the cause or causes of things, but that of the forms in which they appear to the observer. Sometimes the term is vaguely used to cover absolute origin in the sense just excluded. A moment's reflection will make it clear that such a view can never secure a place in the realm of pure science. The problem of ultimate origin is not one that science can solve. If it is solved at all, it must be by purely philosophical as distinguished from scientific or scientific-philosophical methods. Evolution, therefore, must be viewed in science purely and strictly as a process of orderly change in the form of things. As such it assumes the existence of substance or substances and of a force or forces working its successive transformations. (NOTE: This position is apparently contradicted in the title of Henri Bergson's L'evolution creatrice. But an examination of Bergson's system shows that the contradiction is only apparent. Bergson's evolution is neither substance nor efficient cause or principle. The latter is given in his vital impetus ([elan vital]); the former in his concept of duration.)

As an orderly change of the form of things, evolution may be viewed as operative in the field of inorganic matter, or in that of life. In the first, it is known and called cosmic evolution; in the second, organic evolution. Of cosmic evolution again there appear two aspects, according as the process, or law. of transformation, is observed to operate in the realm of the lower units of matter (atoms and molecules), or is studied in the region of the great. In the first sphere, it is made to account for the emergence in Nature of the qualities and powers of different kinds of matter called elements. In the second, it explains the grouping together, the movements and transformations of the solar and of stellar systems. Similarly, of organic

evolution there appear to be two varieties. The first occurs in the world of life including the vegetable and animal kingdoms. Evolution here accounts for the various forms of living beings building their bodies and passing from one stage to another in their existence as individuals, and for the course of the history of all life as it differentiates into species and genera. The second variety of evolution operates in the higher realm of intelligence, morality, social activity and religion. The idea of a law of orderly change governing all things is not a new one. Historians of science find it in some form or other embodied in the philosophies of Heraclitus, Democritus, Lucretius and Aristotle. There are those who find it also in the system of Gautama (Buddha).

2. RECENT ORIGIN OF NOTION:

But in none of these was there a sufficiently wide basis of fact inductively brought together, or a thorough enough digestion and assimilation of the material to give the view as presented by them a firm standing. Hegel's idealistic theory of Development is kindred to the evolution theory in its essence; but it too antedates the working out of the system upon the basis of the scientific induction of the phenomena of Nature.

Until the time of Herbert Spencer, the scientific use of the word evolution was limited to the narrow department of embryology. By him, the term was made synonymous with all orderly change in Nature. The notion that such change is the result of chance, however, was not a part of Spencer's teaching. On the contrary, that philosopher held that chance is but the expression of laws undiscerned by the human mind. Yet these laws are just as definite and rigid as those already discovered and formulated.

Since the appearance of the inductive method in scientific research, and the rise of the science of biology in particular, the idea of evolution has been elaborated into a great systematic generalization, and proposed as the philosophy of all perceptible phenomena. Beginning as a working hypothesis in a special narrow department, that of biology, it has been extended into all the sciences until all come under its dominance, and it is viewed no longer as a mere working hypothesis, but as a demonstrated philosophy with the force and certainty of fact.

3. EVOLUTION AND BIBLICAL TRUTH:

It was natural that such an important proposition as the explanation of the present form of the whole universe by theory of evolution should in its course have occasioned much controversy. On one side extravagant claims were bound to be put forth in its behalf, combined with a misconception of its field. On the other a stubborn denial of its sufficiency as an explanation, even in the narrow sphere where it first made its appearance, was destined to confront it. This challenge, too, was the result of the misconception of it as an all-sufficient theory of the universe as distinguished from a law or method of the operation of a cause ulterior and superior to itself. The period of this warfare is now nearly, if not altogether, over. The task which remains to be accomplished is to recognize the bearings of theory on forms of thought arrived at apart from the light thrown on the world by itself.

Since such forms of thought are given in the Bible, certain problems arise which must be solved, if possible, in the light of evolution. These problems concern mainly the following topics:

(1) The belief in a personal God, such as the Christian Scriptures present as an object of revelation;

(2) The origin of the different species of living beings as portrayed in the Book of Gen;

(3) The particular origin of the human species (the descent (ascent) of man);

(4) The origin of morality and religion, and

(5) The essential doctrines of the Christian faith, such as supernatural revelation, the idea of sin, the person of Christ, regeneration and immortality. Beyond the answers to these primary questions, it will be neither possible nor profitable to enter within the brief compass of the present article.

The relation of creation to evolution has been already suggested in the introductory explanation of the nature of evolution. If creation be the act of bringing into existence material or substance which did not previously exist, evolution does not touch the problem. It has nothing to say of a First Cause. The idea of a first cause may be regarded as material for metaphysics or the ground of religious belief.

4. EVOLUTION AND CREATION:

It may be speculated about, or it may be assumed by faith. The theory of evolution begins with matter or substance already in existence. A fairly representative statement of this aspect of it is illustrated by Huxley's dictum, "The whole world living and not living is the result of the mutual attraction according to definite laws of the powers possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed" (Life of Darwin, II, 210). This statement leaves two things unaccounted for, namely, molecules in the form of a "primitive nebulosity" and "powers possessed by these molecules." How did primitive nebulosity come to exist? How did it come to be composed of molecules possessed of certain powers, and how did there come to be definite laws governing these molecules? The agnostic answers, "We do not know, we shall not know" (ignoramus, ignorabimus, DuBois-Reymond). The pantheist says, "They are the substance and attributes of the Ultimate Being." The theist posits "an uncaused Cause who is greater than they, and possesses all the potentialities exhibited in them, together with much more (therefore at least a personal being), has brought them into existence by the power of His will" (compare *EPICUREANS*).

Thus the believer in evolution may be an agnostic, a pantheist or a theist, according to his attitude toward, and answer to, the question of beginnings. He is an evolutionist because he believes in evolution as the method of the transformation of molecules under the control of the powers possessed by them. Conversely theist (and by implication the Christian) may be an evolutionist. As an evolutionist he may be thoroughgoing. He may accept evolution either as a working hypothesis or as a well-established generalization, even in the form in which it is defined by Herbert Spencer: the integration of matter out of an indefinite incoherent homogeneity into definite coherent heterogeneity with concomitant dissipation of energy. (For the exact definition in its full length, see First Principles, 367.) In this definition, as in every other form of it, evolution is the name of a process of transformation, not a theory of absolute causation or creation ex nihilo. The human mind may leave the problem of initial creation uninvestigated; it may assume that there is no problem by regarding matter and energy as uncaused and ultimate realities or phases of one reality; or it may trace these back to a First Cause which has at least the powers and characteristics perceptible in the universe and particularly in itself as mind (i.e. individuality, intelligence and freedom), or in other

words, to a personal God. In any of these contingencies it may hold to theory of evolution.

5. EVOLUTION AND THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES:

Evolution is strongest in the realm of life. It is here that it first achieved its most signal conquests; and it is here that it was first antagonized most forcibly by the champions of religious faith. Here it proved irresistibly fascinating because it broke down the barriers supposed to exist between different species (whether minor or major) of life. It showed the unity and solidarity of the entire living universe with all its infinite variety. It reduced the life-process to one general law and movement. It traced back all present different forms, whether recognized as individuals, varieties, species, genera, families or kingdoms, to a single starting-point. In this realm the adjective "organic" has been prefixed to it, because the characteristic result is secured through organization. One of its most enthusiastic supporters defines it as "progressive change according to certain laws and by means of resident forces" (LeConte).

The proof for organic evolution is manifold. It cannot be given here at any length. Its main lines, however, may be indicated as follows:

(1) The existence of gradations of structure in living forms beginning with the simplest (the amoeba usually furnishes the best illustration) and reaching to some of the most complex organisms (the human body).

(2) The succession of living forms in time. This means that, according to the evidence furnished by geology, the simpler organisms appeared earlier on the face of the earth than the more complex, and that the progress of forms has been in general from the simpler to the more complex.

(3) The parallelism between the order thus discovered in the history of life upon earth and the order observed in the transformations of the embryo of the highest living forms from their first individual appearance to their full development.

(4) The existence of rudimentary members and organs in the higher forms.

The most striking of these proofs of evolution are the two commonly designated the paleontological and the ontogenetic. The first is based on the fact that in the strata of the earth the simpler forms have been deposited in the earlier, and the more complex in the later. This fact points to the growth in the history of the earth of the later, more complex forms of life, from earlier simpler ones. The second consists in the observation that each individual of complexly constructed species of organisms begins its life in the embryonic stage as the simplest of all living forms, a single cell (constituted in some cases out of parts of two preexisting cells). From this beginning it advances to its later stages of growth as an embryo, assuming successively the typical forms of higher organisms until it attains the full form of its own species, and thus begins its individual post-embryonic life. It thus recapitulates in its individual history the history of its species as read in the paleontological records. This consideration shows that whatever the truth may be as to the species as a whole (for instance of man), each individual of the species (each man) has been evolved in his prenatal life, if not exactly from definitely known and identifiable species (anthropoid individuals perfectly formed), at least from foetal organisms apparently of the same type as those of anthropoids.

But assuming organic evolution to be true upon these grounds, and upon others of the same character, equally convincing to the scientific man, it must not be left out of account that it is to be distinguished quite sharply from cosmic evolution. These two phases of the law are identical at their basis, but become very different in their application according to the nature of the field in which they operate. Cosmic evolution works altogether through reactions. These are invariable in their cause and effect. Given material elements and conditions, they always issue in the same results. Their operations are grouped together under the sciences of chemistry and physics. Organic evolution works through processes to which the term "vital" is applied. Whether these are identical with the chemico-physical processes in the ultimate analysis is an open question among scientists. In the field of purely descriptive science, however, which limits itself to the observation of facts, it can scarcely emerge as a question, since the true nature of vitality is beyond the reach of observation. And upon the whole, theory that there is an inner difference between vitality and physico-chemical attractions and affinities is supported by certain obvious considerations. But even if vitality should prove to be nothing more than a series of reactions of a chemical and physical nature, the type of evolution

to which it yields is differentiated by broad characteristics that distinguish it from merely molecular attractions and affinities.

(1) Vital processes cannot be correlated with the chemico-physical ones. Heat, light, electricity, magnetism, gravitation, chemical affinity, are interchangeable and interchanged among themselves. But none of these can be converted into life as far as now known.

(2) All life is from preexisting life (omne vivum e vivo). Biogenesis still holds the field as far as experimental science has anything to say about it, and abiogenesis is at the most an attractive hypothesis.

(3) The vital processes overcome and reverse the chemical and physical ones. When a living organism is constituted, and as long as it subsists in life, it breaks up and reconstitutes forms of matter into new forms. Carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen and oxygen, in combination with other elements, are separated from one another and reunited in new combinations in the tissues of the plant and the animal. On the other hand, the moment the vital process ceases, the chemical and physical resume their course. The organism in which the vital process has been annihilated is immediately put under the operation of chemical affinities, and reduced into its first elements. So long as the vital process is on, there seems to be a ruling or directive principle modifying and counteracting the normal and natural course of the so-called chemical and physical forces.

(4) The vital process is characterized by the manifestation in matter of certain peculiarities that never show themselves apart from it. These are irritability, assimilation of non-living matter in the process of growth, differentiation or the power in each kind of living organism to develop in its growth regularly recurring characteristics, and

(5) reproduction. The result of the vital process is the tendency in the organic product of it to maintain itself as a unity, and become more and more diversified in the course of its life. These features of organic evolution make it necessary to account not only for the origin of the matter and the energy which are assumed in the cosmic form of evolution, but also for the origin and nature of the unknown something (or combination of things) which is called life in the organism, whether this be a unitary and distinct force or a group of forces. (It is interesting to notice the return to the notion of life as primal energy in the

philosophy of Bergson (elan vital); compare Creative Evolution. The same view is advocated by Sir Oliver Lodge, Life and Matter.)

Furthermore, care must be taken not to confuse any special variety of evolutionary theory in the organic realm with the generic theory itself. Evolutionists hold and propound different hypotheses as to the application of the principle. The Lamarckian, the Darwinian, the Weismannian, the Deuteronomy Vriesian views of evolution are quite different from, and at certain points contradictory of, one another. They assume the law to be real and aim to explain subordinate features or specific applications of it as seen in certain given series of facts. They differ from one another in insisting on details which may be real or unreal without affecting the truth of the main law. Lamarckian evolution, for instance (revived recently under the name neo-Lamarckian), makes. much of the alleged transmissibility through heredity of acquired traits. Darwinian evolution is based largely on the principle of accidental variations worked over by natural selection and the slow insensible accumulation of traits fitting individuals to survive in the struggle for life. Weismannian evolution posits an astonishingly complex germinal starting-point. DeVriesian evolution is built on the sudden appearance of mutations ("sports") which are perpetuated, leading to new species. It is unscientific to array any of these against the other in the effort to undermine the generic theory of evolution, or to take their differences as indicating the collapse of theory and a return to the idea of creation by fiat. The differences between them are insignificant as compared with the gulf which separates them all from the conception of a separate creative beginning for each species at the first appearance of life upon earth. (On some differences between the primitive form of Darwinian and later theories of the same general type, see Rudolph Otto, in Naturalism and Religion (ET).)

With these limitations, the law of organic evolution may be taken into the Biblical account of creation as given in Genesis, chapters 1 and 2. The question raised at once is one of the relation of the doctrine to the Biblical account. If the evolutionary conception is true, it naturally follows that the Biblical account cannot be accepted in its literal interpretation. For the one of these accounts pictures the different species and general types as coming into existence gradually out of preexisting ones, whereas the other (literally interpreted) represents them as created by a Divine fiat. This difference it is true may be artificially exaggerated. Nowhere does the Biblical account explicitly ascribe the creation of each species to the fiat of God. The word

"created" (*bara'*), as used in Genesis, does not necessarily exclude pre-existing matter and form. On the other hand, expressions such as "Let the earth bring forth" (1:11 the King James Version) indicate a certain mediation of secondary powers in the elements ("resident forces," LeConte) through which organisms came into being. "After their kind" suggests the principle of heredity. "Abundantly" suggests the law of rapid and ample reproduction leading to the "struggle for life," "natural selection" and "survival of the fittest." But all efforts to harmonize Genesis with science upon this basis lead at the best to the negative conclusion that these two are so far different in their purpose and scope as not to involve radical contradiction. A positive agreement between them cannot be claimed.

The difficulty vanishes in its entirety when it is borne in mind that the two accounts are controlled by different interests, treat primarily of different matters and, where they appear to cover the same ground, do so each in an incidental way. This means that their statements outside of the sphere of their primary interests are popularly conceived and expressed, and cannot be set over against each other as rivals in scientific presentation. Upon this basis the Genesis account is the vehicle of religious instruction (not, however, an allegory); its cosmogonic accounts are not intended to be scientifically correct, but popularly adequate. For all that science is concerned, they may be traditional conceptions, handed down in the form of folklore, and purged of the grotesque, purely mythological element so apt to luxuriate in folklore. Between such accounts and the dicta of pure science, it would be absurd either to assume or to seek for harmony or discord. They are parallel pictures; in the one the foreground is occupied by the actual unfolding of the facts, the religious element is concealed deep by the figures in the foreground. In the other the background of haze and cloud is the domain of fact, the foreground of definite figures consists of the religious ideas and teachings. The evolutionary notion of the origin of living forms on the earth can thus in no way be assumed as in contradiction either to the letter or the spirit of the teaching of Gen.

6. THE DESCENT (ASCENT) OF MAN:

A still more important problem arises when the evolutionary theory touches the origin of man upon earth. Here, too, not simply the Biblical account of the creation of Adam and Eve, and their primitive life in the

Garden of Eden as recorded in Genesis 2 is affected, but all that is said of man as a child of God, clothed with peculiar dignity and eternal worth.

(1) The difference between the Biblical and evolutionary records of the creation of man may easily be resolved if the Biblical account (Genesis 2) is not viewed as a literal statement of actual occurrences, but as the vehicle of certain determinative thoughts designed to affiliate man in his proper relation to God. This means that what is essential in the Biblical account is that man as a distinctive and different being in the world came into existence as the result of a special act of will on the part of God, that he was created as the golden summit of the whole upward movement of life. He is not a mere creature of Nature, but the offspring of the Divine will, with power to know his Maker, to hold fellowship with Him and to carry in him the rational and moral image of the Creator of all. Against this view of the origin of man, evolutionary science has nothing to set over. It is concerned with the process through which the emergence of such a being as man was accomplished, and the time and circumstances in which it took place. These points it finds as it finds similar points affecting other living beings.

It would be easy of course to take materialistic forms of the evolutionary theory, such as that advocated by Haeckel, Guyeau, Ray Lankester, and establish an irreconcilable discord between them and the Biblical account; but such varieties of theory are distinguished, not by the occurrence of the idea of evolution in them, but rather by the materialistic metaphysics underlying them; when, for instance, Haeckel defines the notion of evolution by excluding from it intelligence or purpose, and by obliterating differences between the lower animal creation and man, he does so not as an evolutionist in science, but as a materialist (Monist of the materialistic type) in metaphysics. The moment the evolutionist determines to limit himself to the scientific side of his task, and the interpreter of the Biblical account to the religious side of his task, the assumed discord in Genesis 2 and the evolutionary theory totally vanishes.

(2) The more important point of contact between theory of evolution and the Biblical conception of man, however, is that of the notion of the dignity and worth of man. The very existence of a Bible is based on the idea that man is of some consequence to the Creator. And through the Bible this idea not only appears early ([01026]Genesis 1:26), "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," followed by the statement, "And God created

man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them," but is interwoven with every fundamental teaching.

It is contended that a representation like this is not compatible with the evolutionary conception of the origin of man from simian ancestors. The contention would be well supported if the evolutionary theory actually obliterated the line of distinction between man and the lower creation; and in any form of it in which such line is ignored, and man is regarded as a being of the same order (neither more or less) as those from which he sprang, it is not capable of being harmonized with the Biblical doctrine. But as a matter of fact, the whole drift and tendency of evolutionary thought ought to be and is the very opposite of belittling man. For according to it, man is the culmination and summit of a process whose very length and complexity simply demonstrate his worth and dignity as its final product. Accordingly, some of the most radical evolutionists, such as John Fiske (Through Nature to God) have extended and strengthened the argument for the immortality of man by an appeal to his evolutionary origin.

7. THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF RELIGION:

Kindred to the problem of the origin of man, and, in some aspects of it, a part of that problem, is the further problem of the origin and nature of religion. First of all, according to evolution, religion cannot be an exception to the general law of the emergence of the more complex from simpler antecedents. Accordingly, it must be supposed to have evolved from non-religious or pre-religious elements. But the very statement of the case in this form necessitates the clear conception of the idea of religion. If religion is the sense in the human soul of an infinite and eternal being, or beings, issuing in influences upon life, then it is coeval with man and inseparable from the human soul. There never was a time when man was not religious. The very emergence of this sense in the mind of a prehuman ancestor of man would change the brute into the man.

We may speak of the states of the prehuman brute's mind as "materials for the making of religion," but not as religion. Their transformation into religion is therefore just as unique as the creation of the man himself. Whatever the mental condition of the brute before the emergence of the sense of an eternal reality and the dependence of itself upon that reality, it

was not a religious being. Whatever the form of this sense, and whatever its first content and results, after the emergence of man it became religion. What caused it to appear at that particular moment and stage in the course of the onward movement? This is a question of causes, and its answer eludes the search of science, both pure and philosophical, and if undertaken by pure philosophy, leads to the same diversity of hypotheses as has been found to control the solution of the problem of beginnings in general (Agnosticism, Pantheism, Theism).

For the rest, that the general features hold true in the field of religion is obvious at a glance. Religious thought, religious practices, religious institutions, have undergone the same type of changes as are observed in the material universe and in the realm of life.

8. THE MORAL NATURE:

What is true of religion as an inner sense of a reality or realities transcending the outward world is equally, and even more clearly, true of the moral life which in one aspect of it is the outward counterpart of religion. To speak of the evolution of the conscience from non-ethical instincts is either to extend the meaning and character of the ethical into a region where they can have no possible significance, or to deny that something different has come into being when the sense of obligation, of duty, of virtue, and the idea of the supreme good have appeared.

In other particulars, the development of the moral nature of man, both in the individual and in the community, manifestly follows the process discerned in the material universe at large, and in the realm of organized life in particular. As an observed fact of history, the gradual growth of moral ideas and the mutual play of the inner controlling principle of the sense of oughtness ("the voice of God") and of social conditions and necessities, arising from the nature of man as a social being, are so manifest that they could neither be denied nor better explained in any other way than in accordance with the evolutionary view.

9. CHRISTIANITY AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE:

But the rise of the evolutionary theory calls for a new consideration not only of the questions of the origin and nature of religion and morality, but also of that of the content of the Gospel.

(1) At the basis of Christianity lies the idea of revelation. The God whom Jesus presented to men is supremely concerned in men. He communicates to them His interest in and His wishes concerning them. This fact the followers of Jesus have in general called "revelation." Some have insisted and still do insist that such revelation must be supernatural. Setting aside the consideration that the term "supernatural" does not occur in Biblical phraseology, and that the notion is deduced by a process of interpretation which leaves a large flexibility to it, i.e. a possibility of conceiving it in a variety of ways, revelation itself is not necessarily bound up with any special method of the communication of the Divine will (compare *REVELATION*). Analogies drawn from human life furnish many different ways of making known to the minds of intelligent fellow-beings the thought of one's own mind. These include, first, the pragmatic resort to some act or attitude of a physical nature, as, for instance, the touch of the whip or the point of the spur on the horse; the flown or the smile for the higher class of understanding of the human type. Secondly, the linguistic, wherein by conventional, articulate, highly complex sounds, one tells in words what lies in his own consciousness. All such expression is necessarily partial, indirect and symbolic. Thirdly, the telepathic and mysterious method (whose reality some still doubt) by which communication takes place without the mediation of either language or action. The evolutionary view does not exclude the possibility of any of these methods conceived as ethical and psychological processes. It does exclude any and all of them if understood as magical or preternatural phenomena. There is nothing, however, in a proper interpretation of the facts of Christian revelation to force the magical interpretation of the coming of the Divine message.

On the contrary, there is everything in the gradual and progressive method of the formation of the Christian Scriptures to suggest that the law of evolution was not violated here. One of the latest writers in Scripture plainly represents the whole method of revelation from the Divine point of view as a cumulative delivery of knowledge in different and successive parts and aspects (⁵⁸⁰⁰ᐅHebrews 1:1). Both at its inception and in the course of its history, the gospel shows conformity to this fundamental law. **(2)** Evolution and incarnation: One of the strongest objections to the idea of an all-comprehensive generalization of the law of evolution has been said to be that such a law would destroy the uniqueness of the personality of Jesus Christ. This is, however, due to a confusion of thought. In reality

it is no more a denial of uniqueness to say that the Son of God entered the world in accordance with the laws of the world as ordered by the Father, than to say that He was subject to those laws after He entered the world; for instance, that He hungered and thirsted, was weary and needed rest and sleep, that His hands and feet bled when they were pierced and that He ceased to breathe when His heart failed to beat. It is a denial of uniqueness as to the method of entrance into the world, but not a denial of uniqueness of character, of nature, even of essence in the Nicene sense. It behooved Him, in bringing many sons to perfection, "to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." The question of the Virgin Birth of Jesus is definitely excluded from the discussion because it is one of historical evidence chiefly, and, in whatever way the evidence may solve it, theory of evolution will have no difficulty to set over against the solution.

  See VIRGIN BIRTH.

From the evolutionist's point of view, the incarnation is the climax and culmination of the controlling process of the universe (*see INCARNATION*). Evolution demands such a consummation as the appearance of a new type of person, and particularly the type which appeared in Jesus Christ. This is not saying that other men can be or have been of the same nature and essence as the incarnate Saviour. It is saying simply that through the incarnation God brings into perfection the ideal embodied and unfolded in previous generations partially, and held in view as the goal through the whole process of previous struggle and attainment. In other words, the New Adam, in Jesus Christ, emerges in the course of the upward ascent of man as the Adam of Genesis emerged in the upward ascent from the lower creation. Theology from the point of view of revelation must necessarily explain this as the voluntary entrance of the Son of God into humanity for purposes of redemption. In doing so it does not contradict the evolutionary view, but simply presents another aspect of the subject.

Assuming, as is done throughout, that the evolution theory concerns not causes and principles, but the processes of transformation of life, the idea of the world is not complete with the creation of man in the image of God. That image must be brought into perfection through the incoming of eternal life. But eternal life is the life of God lived in the species of time and space. It could only come in a personal form through fellowship with God.

The bringing of it must therefore be the necessary goal to which all the age-long ascent pointed.

The Incarnation fulfills the conditions of the evolutionary process in that it inserts into the world by a variation the new type governed by the principle of self-sacrifice for others. This is a new principle with Christ, although it is constituted out of preexisting motives and antecedents, such as the "struggle for others" (compare Drummond, The Ascent of Man) and "altruism" (in its noble instances in human history). It is a new principle, first, because in its pre-Christian and extra-Christian antecedents it is not real self-sacrifice, not being consciously consummated as the result of the outplay of the motive given in eternal life, and secondly, because it reverses the main stream of antecedent motive. It enthrones love by revealing God's supreme character and motive to be love. Thus viewed the Incarnation is the real entrance into the stream of cosmic movement of the Superman. Nietzsche's Superman would be exactly the contrary of this, i.e. the reversion of man to the beast, the denial of the supremacy of love, and the assertion of the supremacy of might.

(3) Another difficulty met by the harmonist of the Christian system with the evolutionary theory is that of the problem of sin. The method of the origin of sin in the human race, as well as its nature, are given in the Biblical account in apparently plain words. The first man was sinless. He became sinful by an act of his own.

As compared with this, according to one common conception of the law of evolution, all the bad tendencies and propensities in man are the survival of his animal ancestry. Cruelty, lust, deceitfulness and the like are but the "tiger and the ape" still lingering in his spiritual constitution, just as the vermiform appendix and the coccyx remain in the physical, mere rudiments of former useful organs; and just like the latter, they are apt to interfere with the welfare of the species later developed. Here, as in every previous stage of our survey, the difficulty arises from the failure to distinguish between that which appears in man as man, and the propensities in animals which lead to acts similar in appearance, but different in their place and function in the respective lives of those animals. As a matter of fact, the tendencies to cruelty, greed, lust and cunning in the brute are not sinful. They are the wholesome and natural impulses through which the individual and the race are preserved from extinction. They are sinful in man because of the dawn in the soul of a knowledge that his Maker is showing him a

better way to the preservation of the individual and the race in the human form. Until the sense of the obligation to follow the better way has arisen, there can be no sin. But when it has come, the first act performed in violation of that sense must be regarded as sinful. As the apostle Paul puts it, "I had not known sin, except through the law." "I was alive apart from the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived (was made to live) and I died" (Romans 7:7,9).

Instead of militating against the idea of a primitive fall, the discovery of the law of evolution confirms it by showing that at some time, as the moral sense in man arose, in the very earliest stage of his existence as man, by an act of his own will, he set aside the new and better principle of conduct presented to him in his inner consciousness (disobeyed the voice of God), and fell back to the prehuman non-moral rule of his life. If this is not the doctrine of the Fall expressed in the terms of present-day science, it would be hard to conceive how that doctrine could be formulated in modern words. (F. J. Hall, Evolution and the Fall; compare *FALL, THE*.)

According to this theory, it was possible for man as he first began his career upon the earth to have passed at once into the condition of perfect fellowship with God. Development might have been sinless. But it was not likely. And it was not desirable that it should be (*see ADAM IN OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA*). For moral character apart from struggle and victory is weak and only negatively perfect. The elimination of sin was to be accomplished by a process which according to the evolutionary philosophy everywhere and always produces higher and stronger types. It is only as progress is achieved by regeneration following degeneration that the best results are secured. Thus "where sin abounded," it was `in order that grace might superabound' (Romans 5:20). Yet neither is sin the less sinful nor grace the less supernatural. It would be reading an unwarrantable doctrine into Scripture to say that upon the whole an unfallen race would have been superior to a fallen and redeemed race. The world as it is is not a mistake but the wisest thought of God.

The mystery of evil in the world is thus left neither more nor less difficult to understand under the evolutionary conception than under any other. The difficulty of an unbroken continuity between the lower and the higher forms of life, culminating in the free will of man, with the necessary possibility of conflict with the will of God, is not treated by the evolutionary philosophy, even though it may not be materially relieved. To this extent, however, it is relieved, that the Divine action is here

understood to be analogous and consistent with itself throughout, even though transcending in scope and extent the human intelligence.

(4) In the light of what has already been made clear, it will be easy to dismiss the correlative doctrine of salvation from sin as fully compatible with the idea of evolution. The Christian doctrine of salvation falls into two general parts: the objective mediatorial work of the Redeemer, commonly called the Atonement, and the subjective transforming work of the Holy Spirit, begun in regeneration and continued in sanctification.

The idea of the Atonement lies somewhat remote from the region where the law of evolution is most clearly seen to operate. At first sight it may be supposed to sustain no special relation to evolution either as offering difficulties to it or harmonizing with it and corroborating it. Yet in a system whose parts are vitally interrelated, it would be strange if the acceptance of the evolutionary theory did not in some way and to some extent affect the conception. It does so by fixing attention on the following particulars:

(a) That with the emergence of man as a personality, the relation of the creature to the Creator comes to be personal. If that personal relation is disturbed, it can be restored to its normal state in accordance with the laws observed in the relations of persons to one another. The Atonement is such a restoration of personal relations between God and man.

(b) In achieving the goal of perfect fellowship with Himself on the part of creatures bearing His own image, the Creator must in a sense sacrifice Himself. This Divine self-sacrifice is symbolized and represented in the Cross. Yet the meaning of the Cross is not exhausted in mere external influence upon the sinful creature whose return to the holy Father is thereby aimed at.

(c) Since the alienation of the creature by sin represents an offense to the person of the Creator, there is necessity that this offense should be removed; and this is done through the sacrifice of the Incarnate Son identifying Himself with, and taking the place of, the sinful creature.

The correlative doctrine of Regeneration stands much nearer the center of the thought of evolution. It has always been conceived and expressed in biological phraseology. The condition of sin postulated by this doctrine is one of death. Into this condition a new life is inserted, an act which is

called the New Birth. Whatever life may be in its essence, it overcomes, reverses and directs the lower forces to other results than they are observed to achieve apart from its presence. In analogy to this course of life in the process of regeneration, a new direction is given to the energies of the new-born soul. But the analogy goes farther. Regeneration is from above as life is always from above. It is God's Spirit through the word and work of Christ that begets the new Christian life, nurtures, trains and develops it to its full maturity revealed in the image and stature of Christ Himself (*see* REGENERATION).

10. CONCLUSION:

If the above considerations are valid, the evolutionary and the Christian views of the world cannot logically be placed against each other as mutually exclusive and contradictory. They must be conceived as supplementing one another, and fulfilling each the promise and possibility of the other. Evolution is a scientific generalization which, kept within the limits of science, commends itself as a satisfactory explanation of the great law controlling all the movements of matter, life and mind. Christianity, so far as it enters into the intellectual life, is interested in the idea of God and of man's relation to God. It may confidently leave the facts in the lower world of processes of transformation to be schematized under the scientific generalization of evolution.

LITERATURE.

The literature of the subject is vast. At the basis of the discussion stand the works of Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, Spencer, Weismann, Haeckel, Romanes and others. For a clear statement of theory, see Metcalf, An Outline of the Theory of Organic Evolution, 1905; Saleeby, Evolution the Master-Key, 1907; Osborn, From the Greeks to Darwin (historical), 1908. On its relation to religion and Christianity, B. F. Tefft, Evolution and Christianity, 1885; E. Caird, The Evolution of Religion, 1893; Leviticus Conte, Evolution; Its Nature, Its Evidences and Its Religious Thought, 1888; McCosh, The Religious Aspect of Evolution, 1888; Iverach, Christianity and Evolution, 1894. On its bearing on the ideas of man, sin and redemption, Griffith-Jones, The Ascent through Christ, 1900; H. Drummond, The Ascent of Man, 12th edition, 1901; Tyler, The Whence and Whither of Man; Orr, The Image of God in Man, 1907; Sin as a Problem of Today, 1910; Hall, Evolution and the Fall, 1910; Murray,

Christian Faith and the New Psychology, 1911; T. A. Palm, The Faith of an Evolutionist, 1911.

Andrew C. Zenos

(EDITORIAL NOTE. — It will be understood, that while Professor Zenos has been asked and permitted to state his views on this question unreservedly, neither the publishers nor the editors are to be held as committed to all the opinions expressed.)

EWE

<u> ([l j ɛ; *rachel*], [l ₩[, `ul*], [hc, *seh*], "a female sheep"): *Rachel* (compare pr. note Rachel, and Arabic rachala, "to migrate") is the ordinary Hebrew word for ewe, but is translated "sheep," though with clear indication of sex in context, in ⟨2551⟩Isaiah 53:7 and Song 6:6 (the Revised Version (British and American) "ewes"). `Aloth*, participle of `ul*, "to suckle" (compare Arabic ghal) is found in ⟨19787⟩Psalm 78:71 and ⟨2401⟩Isaiah 40:11 (the King James Version "are with young," the English Revised Version "that give suck," the American Standard Revised Version "have their young"). In ⟨09667⟩1 Samuel 6:7,10 occurs *paroth `aloth*, "milch kine." Seh, in ⟨07228⟩Leviticus 22:28, while translated "ewe," might from the context be "ewe" or "shegoat" and indeed seems to be used here as a term applying equally to either, being used elsewhere for one of a flock of sheep or goats. *See SHEEP*.

Alfred Ely Day

EXACT

<eg-zakt'>:

(1) [cg″ n; *naghas*] (⟨05052⟩Deuteronomy 15:2,3; ⟨12235⟩2 Kings 23:35; ⟨25808⟩Isaiah 58:3), to secure by force or pressure interest or money for tribute, and perhaps, in ⟨25808⟩Isaiah 58:3, labor or toil; but compare the Revised Version, margin "oppress all your laborers"; probably better with a slight change of text, "exact money lent on pledges" (reading for [μkdyB]fbϕ} `abhoT beyedhekhem], [μkyb℁[æatstsebhekhem]).

(2) [avη; *nasha'*], or [hvη; *nashah*] (⟨05057⟩Nehemiah 5:7,10 (the King James Version not the Revised Version (British and American)),11; ⟨18106⟩Job 11:6 (but see below); ⟨19822⟩Psalm 89:22), to demand interest, to be a harsh and importunate creditor, a practice which Nehemiah asks the Jews to forego.

Job 11:6 better with the Revised Version, margin for "exact," "causeth to be forgotten."

(3) [axⴱ⟨, *yotse'*] (2 Kings 15:20 (if text is correct)). Menahem secured the tribute which the king of Assyria demanded by levying a tax on the chief men of his kingdom.

(4) [πράσσειν, *prassein*] (Luke 3:13 the King James Version (compare Daniel 11:20 Septuagint); 1 Macc 10:35 the Revised Version (British and American)), to demand money or tribute or taxes of anyone.

Walter R. Betteridge

EXACTION

<eg-zak'-shun>:

(1) [aVm″, *mashsha'*] (Nehemiah 10:31), a demand for money lent on pledge, which the Jews agreed to forego in the seventh year;
(2) [hvⴱrG, *gerushah*] (Ezekiel 45:9, "your exactions," the Revised Version, margin "expulsions"), eviction from house and home.

EXACTORS

<eg-zak'-ters> ([ËyċΞ″ m″, *noghesayikh*] (Isaiah 60:17, the Revised Version, margin "taskmasters"; compare Exodus 1:11; 3:7)): Righteousness personified is in Zion to take the place of the officials who oppress the people. In Isaiah 14:4 the American Revised Version, margin, Babylon is called an "exactress of gold."

EXALT

<eg-zolt'> ([µⴱr, *rum*], [Hb″ G; *gabhah*] (*mappiq he*), [acŋ; *nasa'*]; [ὑψόω, *hupsoo*]): The Hebrew word most often translated "exalt," "exalted," is rum; "to lift up," "to be or become high." It is used with reference to both God and man, e.g. Exodus 15:2, "My father's God, and I will exalt him"; Psalm 99:5,9, "Exalt ye Yahweh our God"; compare 107:32; 118:28; 1 Samuel 2:10, "Exalt the horn of his anointed"; Job 17:4, "Therefore shalt thou not exalt them"; compare Isaiah 13:2 the King James Version; 14:13; *gabhah*, "to be high," figuratively "to be exalted," occurs in Job 36:7; Proverbs 17:19 the King James Version; Isaiah 5:16, etc.; *nasa'*, "to lift up," occurs in Numbers 24:7; 1 Chronicles 29:11, etc.; other words are *calal*, "to raise up" (Exodus 9:17; Proverbs 4:8), saghabh (Job 5:11; 36:22

the King James Version; ^{⟨3921⟩}Isaiah 2:11,17; 12:4; 33:5), ramam, "to be high" (^{⟨1824⟩}Job 24:24; ^{⟨19816⟩}Psalm 118:16).

In the New Testament "exalt" is the translation of hupsoo, "to elevate" (not used with reference to God) (^{⟨4012⟩}Matthew 11:23; 23:12; ^{⟨4123⟩}Acts 2:33; ^{⟨4710⟩}2 Corinthians 11:7; ^{⟨6056⟩}1 Peter 5:6, etc.); also (twice) of *epairo*, "to lift up, upon or against" (^{⟨4700⟩}2 Corinthians 10:5; 11:20), once of *huperairo*, "to lift up above" (^{⟨5304⟩}2 Thessalonians 2:4); in ^{⟨4710⟩}2 Corinthians 12:7 bis, this word is translated "exalted above measure," the Revised Version (British and American) "exalted overmuch"; *huperupsoo*, "to lift up above" (^{⟨5269⟩}Philippians 2:9), is translated "highly exalted"; *hupsos*, "elevation," is translated "exalted" (^{⟨5009⟩}James 1:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "high estate").

For "it increaseth" (^{⟨1806⟩}Job 10:16), the Revised Version (British and American) gives "and if my head exalt itself"; instead of "God exalteth by His, power" (^{⟨1862⟩}Job 36:22), "God doeth loftily in his power"; for "though thou exalt thyself as the eagle" (Obidiah 1:4), "mount on high"; for "highly esteemed" (^{⟨2165⟩}Luke 16:15) "exalted"; for "exalteth itself" (^{⟨4700⟩}2 Corinthians 10:5), "is exalted"; for "He shall lift you up" (^{⟨5040⟩}James 4:10), "He shall exalt you."

Self-exaltation is strongly condemned, especially by Christ; humbleness is the way to true exaltation (^{⟨4032⟩}Matthew 23:12; ^{⟨2141⟩}Luke 14:11; 18:14; compare ^{⟨5040⟩}James 4:10; ^{⟨6056⟩}1 Peter 5:6); the supreme example is that of Christ Himself (^{⟨5045⟩}Philippians 2:5-11).

W. L. Walker

EXALTATION OF CHRIST, THE

See CHRIST, THE EXALTATION OF.

EXAMINE; EXAMINATION

<eg-zam'-in>, <eg-zam-i-na'-shun>: [ינר; darash], "to follow," "inquire," "make inquisition" (^{⟨15016⟩}Ezra 10:16); and [בחן; bachan], "to test," "investigate," "prove," "tempt" (^{⟨1926⟩}Psalm 26:2). The former was the judicial term. [ἀνακρίνω, anakrino], "scrutinize," "investigate," "interrogate" (in court), "judge," "search" (^{⟨2314⟩}Luke 23:14; ^{⟨4009⟩}Acts 4:9; 12:19; 28:18; ^{⟨4693⟩}1 Corinthians 9:3); and [ἀνετάζω, anetazo], "to investigate" (judicially), "examine" (^{⟨4022⟩}Acts 22:24,29). Also [δοκιμάζω, dokimazo], "to test," "examine," "try" (^{⟨4612⟩}1 Corinthians 11:28 the King James Version); and [πειράζω, peirazo], "scrutinize," "discipline" (^{⟨4730⟩}2

Corinthians 13:5 the King James Version). The noun [ἀνάκρισις, *anakrisis*], "examination," "investigation," occurs in ⁴⁴²⁵⁶Acts 25:26.
  See also *COURTS, JUDICIAL.*

<div align="right">

Frank E. Hirsch

</div>

EXAMPLE

<eg-zam'-p'-l> ([τύπος, *tupos*], "a pattern," [ὑπόδειγμα, *hupodeigma*], "copy" "representation" [ὑπογραμμός, *hupogrammos*], "a writing-copy," example"): A typical, representative, or illustrative case; a pattern or model for imitation (*hupodeigma*, ⁴³¹³⁵John 13:15; ⁵⁸⁰⁶⁵Hebrews 8:5 the King James Version; ⁵⁹⁰⁵¹⁰James 5:10; *hupogrammos*, ⁶⁰²²¹1 Peter 2:21; *tupos*, ⁵⁴⁰⁴¹²1 Timothy 4:12 the King James Version) or warning ([δεῖγμα, *deigma*], "a sample," "exhibition," ⁶⁵⁰⁰⁷Jude 1:7; compare ⁶¹⁰²⁰⁶2 Peter 2:6; *hupodeigma*, ⁵⁸⁰⁴¹¹Hebrews 4:11; *tupos*, ⁴⁶¹⁰⁰⁶1 Corinthians 10:6,11).
"Ensample" (*tupos*, 2 Macc 6:28,31; ⁵⁰⁸¹⁷Philippians 3:17; ⁵²⁰¹⁰⁷1 Thessalonians 1:7; ⁵³⁰⁸⁹2 Thessalonians 3:9; ⁵⁴⁰⁴¹²1 Timothy 4:12; ⁶⁰⁵⁰⁸1 Peter 5:3) and "example" have the same meaning, but the former is always suggestive of goodness.

EXCEED; EXCEEDING; EXCEEDINGLY

<ek-sed'>: The verb is found in other than its present sense in ¹⁸³⁶⁰Job 36:9 the King James Version, "They have exceeded" (the Revised Version (British and American) "behaved themselves proudly"); ⁰⁹²⁰⁴¹1 Samuel 20:41, "They .... wept .... until David exceeded" (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). In both these passages the idea is that of going too far, beyond proper bounds (Hebrew, respectively, *gabhar*, "be strong" (in the Hithpael); *gadhal*, "be great" (in the Hiphil). "Exceeding" (as an adverb with adjectives and rarely as an adjective) and "exceedingly" occur often as representing various expressions for the superlative in Hebrew and Greek

EXCELLENCY

<ek'-se-len-si> ([ˆwⱥⱺ; *ga-on*], [hwⱥⱱ″ , *ga'awah*]; [ὑπερβολή, *huperbole*]): "Excellency" in the Old Testament is chiefly the translation of *ga'on*, "mounting," "swelling" (⁰²¹⁵⁰⁷Exodus 15:7; ¹⁸⁵⁷⁰⁴Job 37:4 the King James Version; ¹⁹⁴⁷⁰⁴Psalm 47:4 the King James Version; ²³¹³¹⁹Isaiah 13:19 the King James Version, etc.); *ga'awah*, rising, is thrice so rendered (⁰⁵³³⁹⁶Deuteronomy 33:26,29; ¹⁹⁶⁸⁴Psalm 68:34); *se'eth*, "rising" (twice)

(⟨8131⟩Job 13:11 the King James Version; ⟨9504⟩Psalm 62:4 the King James Version); *yether*, "superabundance" (twice) (⟨0408⟩Genesis 49:3 the King James Version; ⟨8021⟩Job 4:21 the King James Version), and *chadhar*, "honor," "beauty," "majesty" (twice) (⟨2352⟩Isaiah 35:2); *gobhah*, "uplifted" (⟨8010⟩Job 40:10); *yithron*, "advantage" (⟨2172⟩Ecclesiastes 7:12); *si'*, "elevation" (⟨8106⟩Job 20:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "height"). In the New Testament *huperbole*, "surpassing," "a casting beyond," occurs (⟨7007⟩2 Corinthians 4:7, "that the excellency of the power may be of God," the Revised Version (British and American) "exceeding greatness"); *huperoche*, "a holding over" or "beyond," is translated "excellency" (⟨4601⟩1 Corinthians 2:1), and to *huperechon*, "the pre-eminence" (⟨5008⟩Philippians 3:8), "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ."

Instead of "excellency" the Revised Version (British and American) has "pride" (⟨2319⟩Isaiah 13:19; ⟨2621⟩Ezekiel 24:21), "majesty" (⟨8704⟩Job 37:4 and the American Standard Revised Version 13:11; 31:23), the American Standard Revised Version has "pre-eminence" (⟨0408⟩Genesis 49:3,4), "glory" (⟨9704⟩Psalm 47:4), "dignity" (⟨9504⟩Psalm 62:4); for "the fat of lambs" (⟨9720⟩Psalm 37:20), the English Revised Version has "the excellency of the pastures," with margin, "the fat of lambs"; the American Standard Revised Version retains the King James Version rendering with the English Revised Version in the margin; instead of "Doth not their excellency which is in them go away?" (⟨8021⟩Job 4:21), the Revised Version (British and American) has "Is not their tent-cord plucked up within them?" margin, "Is not their excellency which is in them removed?"

W. L. Walker

EXCELLENT

<*ek'-se-lent*> [רְיֵדִּא״ , *'addir*], [רְיֵתִּי״ , *yattir*] (Aramaic); [διαφορώτερος, *diaphoroteros*], [κράτιστος, *kratistos*]): The translation of various Hebrew words, chiefly of *'addir*, "great," "honorable" (⟨9801⟩Psalm 8:1,9; 16:3; 76:4); *yattir*, "surpassing," is Aramaic, occurring in ⟨2023⟩Daniel 2:31; 4:36; 5:12,14; 6:3. Other words are *bachar*, "to glow," "try," "choose" (Song 5:15); *ga'on*, "mounting," "swelling" (⟨2042⟩Isaiah 4:2; *see EXCELLENCY*); *gadhal*, "to make or become great" (⟨2329⟩Isaiah 28:29), and other words occurring singly.

In the New Testament we have *diaphoroteros*, "greater," "better" (⟨5004⟩Hebrews 1:4; 8:6); *kratistos*, "most excellent," "most noble" (⟨4010⟩Luke

1:3; ⁽⁴²³²⁶⁾Acts 23:26); *ta diapheronta*, "things that differ," "are preeminent" (⁽⁴⁵²¹⁸⁾Romans 2:18; ⁽⁵⁰¹¹⁰⁾Philippians 1:10); megaloprepes, "becoming to the great" (⁽⁶¹⁰¹¹⁷⁾2 Peter 1:17, the King James Version "a voice to him from the excellent glory," the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version, margin "the Majestic Glory"); *kath' huperbolen* "very surpassing" (⁽⁴⁶¹²³¹⁾1 Corinthians 12:31, "Yet I show unto you a more excellent way," the Revised Version (British and American) "most excellent"); *pleion*, "greater," "fuller" (⁽⁵⁸¹¹⁰⁴⁾Hebrews 11:4; *see* ABEL).

W. L. Walker

EXCHANGE; EXCHANGER

<eks-chanj'>, <eks-chan'-jer>.

See BANK, BANKING.

EXCOMMUNICATION

<eks-ko-mu-ni-ka'-shun>: Exclusion from church fellowship as a means of personal discipline, or church purification, or both. Its germs have been found in

(1) the Mosaic "ban" or "curse" ([μⲅj ẹ*cherem*], "devoted"), given over entirely to God's use or to destruction (⁽⁰²⁷²⁹⁾Leviticus 27:29);

(2) the "cutting off," usually by death, stoning of certain offenders, breakers of the Sabbath (⁽⁰³¹¹⁴⁾Exodus 31:14) and others (⁽⁰³¹⁷⁰⁴⁾Leviticus 17:4; ⁽⁰²³⁰²⁾Exodus 30:22-38);

(3) the exclusion of the leprous from the camp (⁽⁰³¹³⁴⁶⁾Leviticus 13:46; ⁽⁰⁴²¹⁴⁾Numbers 12:14). At the restoration (⁽¹⁵¹⁰⁰⁷⁾Ezra 10:7,8), the penalty of disobedience to Ezra's reforming movements was that "all his substance should be forfeited (*cherem*), and himself separated from the assembly of the captivity." Nehemiah's similar dealing with the husbands of heathen women helped to fix the principle. The New Testament finds a well-developed synagogal system of excommunication, in two, possibly three, varieties or stages. [yⲱDnj *nidduy*], for the first offense, forbade the bath, the razor, the convivial table, and restricted social intercourse and the frequenting of the temple. It lasted thirty, sixty, or ninety days. If the offender still remained obstinate, the "curse," *cherem*, was formally pronounced upon him by a council of ten, and he was shut out from the intellectual, religious and social life of the community, completely severed

from the congregation. [atMv" , *shammatha'*], supposed by some to be a third and final stage, is probably a general term applied to both *nidduy* and *cherem*. We meet the system in ⁴⁰⁹²John 9:22: "If any man should confess him to be Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue" ([ἀποσυναγωγός, *aposunagogos*]); ³¹²²John 12:42: "did not confess .... lest they should be put out of the s."; and ³¹⁶²John 16:2: "put you out of the synagogue." In ⁴⁰⁶²Luke 6:22 Christ may refer to the three stages: "separate you from their company ([ἀφορίσωσιν, *aphorisosin*]), and reproach you ([ὀνειδίσωσιν, *oneidisosin*] = *cherem*, "malediction"), and cast out your name as evil ([ἐκβάλωσιν, *ekbalosin*])."

It is doubtful whether an express prescription of excommunication is found in our Lord's words (⁰⁸¹⁵Matthew 18:15-19). The offense and the penalty also seem purely personal: "And if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican," out of the pale of association and converse. Yet the next verse might imply that the church also is to act: "Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," etc. But this latter, like ⁰¹⁶⁹Matthew 16:19, seems to refer to the general enunciations of principles and policies rather than to specific ecclesiastical enactments. On the whole, Jesus seems here to be laying down the principle of dignified personal avoidance of the obstinate offender, rather than prescribing ecclesiastical action. Still, personal avoidance may logically correspond in proper cases to excommunication by the church. ⁵⁰⁸⁴2 Thessalonians 3:14: "Note that man, that ye have no company with him"; ⁵⁶⁸⁰Titus 3:10: "A factious man .... avoid" (American Revised Version margin); ⁶⁰¹⁰2 John 1:10: "Receive him not into your house," etc., all inculcate discreet and faithful avoidance but not necessarily excommunication, though that might come to be the logical result. Paul's "anathemas" are not to be understood as excommunications, since the first is for an offense no ecclesiastical tribunal could well investigate: ⁴⁵⁶²1 Corinthians 16:22, "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema"; the second touches Paul's deep relationship to his Lord: ⁵⁰⁹³Romans 9:3, "I myself .... anathema from Christ"; while the third would subject the apostle or an angel to ecclesiastical censure: ⁴⁰⁰⁸Galatians 1:8,9, "Though we, or an angel .... let him be anathema."

Clear, specific instances of excommunication or directions regarding it, however, are found in the Pauline and Johannine writings. In the case of the incestuous man (⁴⁶⁵⁰1 Corinthians 5:1-12), at the instance of the apostle ("I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit"), the church, in a

formal meeting ("In the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together"), carrying out the apostle's desire and will ("and my spirit"), and using the power and authority conferred by Christ ("and with the power of our Lord Jesus"), formally cut off the offender from its fellowship, consigning (relinquishing?) him to the power of the prince of this world ("to deliver such a one unto Satan"). Further, such action is enjoined in other cases: "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves." [47015]2 Corinthians 2:5-11 probably refers to the same case, terminated by the repentance and restoration of the offender. `Delivering over to Satan' must also include some physical ill, perhaps culminating in death; as with Simon Magus ([44080]Acts 8:20), Elymas ([44131]Acts 13:11), Ananias ([44055]Acts 5:5). [50020]1 Timothy 1:20: "Hymenaeus and Alexander .... that they might be taught not to blaspheme," is a similar case of excommunication accompanied by judicial and disciplinary physical ill. In [64009]3 John 1:9,10 we have a case of excommunication by a faction in control: "Diotrephes .... neither doth he himself receive .... and them that would he .... casteth out of the church."

Excommunication in the New Testament church was not a fully developed system. The New Testament does not clearly define its causes, methods, scope or duration. It seems to have been incurred by heretical teaching ([50020]1 Timothy 1:20) or by factiousness ([56030]Titus 3:10 (?)); but the most of the clear undoubted cases in the New Testament are for immoral or un-Christian conduct ([46050]1 Corinthians 5:1,11,13; perhaps also [50020]1 Timothy 1:20). It separated from church fellowship but not necessarily from the love and care of the church ([53035]2 Thessalonians 3:15 (?)). It excluded from church privileges, and often, perhaps usually, perhaps always, from social intercourse ([46051]1 Corinthians 5:11). When pronounced by the apostle it might be accompanied by miraculous and punitive or disciplinary physical consequences ([46055]1 Corinthians 5:5; [50020]1 Timothy 1:20). It was the act of the local church, either with ([46054]1 Corinthians 5:4) or without ([46053]1 Corinthians 5:13; [64010]3 John 1:10) the concurrence of an apostle. It might possibly be pronounced by an apostle alone ([50020]1 Timothy 1:20), but perhaps not without the concurrence and as the mouthpiece of the church. Its purpose was the amendment of the offender: "That the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" ([46055]1 Corinthians 5:5); and the preservative purification of the church: "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened" ([46057]1 Corinthians 5:7). It might, as appears, be terminated by repentance and restoration ([47015]2 Corinthians 2:5-11). It was not a complex and rigid ecclesiastical engine,

held in terrorem over the soul, but the last resort of faithful love, over which hope and prayer still hovered.

LITERATURE.

Arts. in HDB, DB, Jew Eric, DCG; Martensen, Christian Ethics, III, 330 ff; Nowack, Benzinger, Hebrews Archaeol.; Commentary in the place cited.

Philip Wendell Crannell

EXECUTE; EXECUTIONER

<ek'-se-kut>, *<ek-se-ku'-shun-er>* ([הc[֑ ; `asah], "to do," [ˆyDi֑ *din*],"to judge," "decide"; [ποιέω, *poieo*], "to do"; [σπεκουλάτωρ, *spekoulator*], Latin speculator, "an attendant"): "Execute" in the sense of "executing judgment," "vengeance," etc., is often found in the Old Testament (Exodus 12:12; Deuteronomy 10:18; Psalm 149:7; Jeremiah 22:3; Ezekiel 25:11; Micah 5:15; compare Jeremiah 21:12, "Execute justice in the morning") and a few times in the New Testament (John 5:27; Romans 13:4 the King James Version; Jude 1:15). In the sense of punishing capitally, by legal process, it is not found. "Executioner" is found only in Mark 6:27 the King James Version, where Herod, the king, is said to have "sent an executioner" (*spekoulator*) to behead John the Baptist, but the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have instead, according to the stricter meaning of the text, "The king sent forth a soldier of his guard." The office of executioner, however, was a recognized office in all the great nations of antiquity.

George B. Eager

EXEGESIS

<ek-se-je'-sis>.

See *INTERPRETATION*.

EXERCISE

<ek'-ser-siz> ([הc[֑ ; `asah]; [γυμνάζω, *gumnazo*], [ποιέω, *poieo*]) : "Exercise" (meaning originally, "to drive or thrust out") has different shades of meaning: It means

(1) "to do," "to put into action" ([24024]Jeremiah 9:24, `asah, "to do,"
"Yahweh who exerciseth lovingkindness"; [66312]Revelation 13:12, *poieo*, "to
do," "He exerciseth all the authority of the first"; Tobit 12:9, the Revised
Version (British and American) "do");
(2) with violence implied, gazal, "to take away violently," "have exercised
robbery" ([26229]Ezekiel 22:29); "to act habitually" ([19D101]Psalm 131:1, halakh,
"to walk," "Neither do I exercise myself in great matters" the Revised
Version, margin "walk"; [44246]Acts 24:16, askeo, "to work up"; compare 2
Esdras 15:8; Ecclesiasticus 50:28);
(3) "to train" or "discipline," gumnazo, "to use exercise," "to train up"
([54047]1 Timothy 4:7, "Exercise thyself unto godliness"; [58014]Hebrews 5:14;
12:11; [61214]2 Peter 2:14; compare 1 Macc 6:30; 2 Macc 15:12);
(4) "to afflict ([21013]Ecclesiastes 1:13; 3:10, `anah, "to be afflicted,"
"exercised therewith," "exercised in it"); in [40025]Matthew 20:25; [41042]Mark
10:42, *katakurieuo*, "to lord it over," and katexousiazo, "to exercise
authority," are translated respectively "exercise dominion" and "exercise
authority," the English Revised Version "lord it over" and "exercise
authority"; in [42225]Luke 22:25, the Greek words are *kurieuo*, "to be lord
over" and *exousiazo*, "to have power or authority over," the Revised
Version (British and American) "have lordship," "have authority." In [54048]1
Timothy 4:8 the noun, gumnasia, meaning gymnastic exercise, occurs
(*somatike gumnasia*), translated "bodily exercise," contrasted with
"exercise unto godliness," the Revised Version (British and American)
"For bodily exercise is profitable for a little (m "for little"); but godliness is
profitable for all things," a saying to which the youth of all times would do
well to give heed. In 2 Macc 4:9, Jason is said to have set up "a place of
exercise" (*gumnasion*) in Jerusalem. In [60502]1 Peter 5:2 the Revised Version
(British and American), "exercising the oversight" is substituted for "taking
the oversight."

W. L. Walker

EXHORTATION

<*ek-sor-ta'-shun*> ([παράκλησις, *paraklesis*]): The Greek word
translated "exhortation" ([*paraklesis*]) signifies, originally, "a calling near
or for" (as an advocate or helper who should appeal on one's behalf), and
carries the twofold sense of "exhortation" and "consolation" (which see).
In the Septuagint of the Old Testament it is used in the sense of
"consolation"; but in 2 Macc 7:24, it is translated "exhort," the Revised
Version (British and American) "appeal." The verb parakaleo is also

translated "exhortation" (1 Macc 13:3 the King James Version) and "exhort" (2 Macc 9:26).

In the New Testament *paraklesis* is translated "exhortation" (⁴⁴¹³¹⁵Acts 13:15; ⁴⁵¹²⁰⁸Romans 12:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "exhorting"; ⁴⁶¹⁴¹³1 Corinthians 14:3, the English Revised Version "comfort," the American Revised Version, margin "or comfort"; ⁴⁷⁰⁸¹⁷2 Corinthians 8:17; ⁵⁰²⁰⁰³1 Thessalonians 2:3; ⁵⁴⁰⁴¹³1 Timothy 4:13; ⁵⁸¹²⁰⁵Hebrews 12:5; 13:22). the American Standard Revised Version has also "exhortation," instead of "consolation" in ⁵⁰²⁰⁰¹Philippians 2:1. In ⁴²⁰³⁸¹⁸Luke 3:18, parakaleo, "to call near or for," is translated exhortation," "and many other things in his exhortation," the Revised Version (British and American) "with many other exhortations," and in ⁴⁴²⁰⁰²Acts 20:2, *parakaleo logo pollo* is rendered (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)), "had given them much exhortation."

<div align="right">

W. L. Walker

</div>

EXILE

<ek'-sil>, *<eg'-zil>* ([hl ּ; *galah*], [h[ׇ; *tsa`ah*]): Occurs twice only in the King James Version (⁰¹⁰⁵¹⁹2 Samuel 15:19 (*galah*, "to remove"); ²⁵¹¹⁴Isaiah 51:14 (*tsa`ah*, "to be bowed down")). In the Revised Version (British and American) "exile" is substituted for "captivity" (¹⁵⁰⁸⁵⁵Ezra 8:35 (*shebhi*), and ²⁶¹²⁰⁴Ezekiel 12:4 (*golah*)); "go into exile," for "remove and go" (²⁶¹²¹¹Ezekiel 12:11); "exiles of Ethiopia" for "Ethiopians captives" (²³²⁰⁰⁴Isaiah 20:4); "He shall let my exiles go free" for "He shall let go my captives" (²³⁴⁵¹³Isaiah 45:13); "an exile" for "a captive" (²³⁴⁹²¹Isaiah 49:21). "The exile" is in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "the captivity" (which see).

EXODUS, THE

<ek'-so-dus>:

<div align="center">

I. THE ROUTE.

1. The Starting-Point:

</div>

On the 14th Abib (early in April) the Hebrews were gathered at Rameses (Exodus 111:37; ⁰⁴³⁰⁵Numbers 33:5) where apparently the hostile Pharaoh was also living (⁰²¹²³¹Exodus 12:31). From ⁴⁹⁷⁸¹²Psalm 78:12,43 it appears that the wonders preceding the Exodus occurred in the "field of Zoan," where

the starting-point may be placed (*see RAAMSES; ZOAN*). Dr. Naville has suggested that the court was at Bubastis, not at Zoan, and that the route lay from near Zagazig down Wady Tumeilat — a line well fitted for a people driving flocks and herds. On the other hand, in favor of the starting-point having been at Zoan, we read that the "way of the land of the Philistines" was "near" (Exodus 13:17). This route, which was not taken lest the people should be discouraged by defeat at Gaza where the Egyptians always had troops, reached Egypt at Migdol (*see MIGDOL*, 2), and ran thence to Daphnai — some 15 miles — and to Zoan by a second march of the same length. The route from Bubastis to Daphnai (some 50 miles) is less likely to have been described as "near." Although an Arab will march 30 miles in a day on foot, yet when moving camp with camels, who travel only about 2 miles an hour, with women and children and herds, he only covers about 12 or 15 miles a day. We cannot suppose the Hebrew cattle to have covered more than this distance without water on any single march.

2. Rameses to Succoth:

We are not told how many days were occupied on the way from Rameses to SUCCOTH (which see), though the general impression is that the stages mentioned (Numbers 33) represent a day's journey each. Measuring back from the first camp after crossing the Red Sea, we find that Succoth probably lay in the lower part of Wady Tumeilat, where there was plenty of water and herbage. The direct route from Zoan leads to Phakousa (Tell Faqus) by a march of 15 miles through well-watered lands. A second march, across the desert to Heroopolis and down the valley to Succoth, would be of the same length. The Hebrews departed "in haste," and no doubt made as long marches as they could. If the whole of the people were not in Rameses, but scattered over Goshen, it is possible that some came down the valley from near Bubastis, and that the whole force concentrated at Succoth.

3. Succoth to Etham:

The next march (Exodus 13:20; Numbers 33:6) led Israel to Etham, on the "edge of the wilderness" which lies West of the Bitter Lakes, not far from where the Nile water then entered them, and no doubt made them sweet. The intention of Moses probably was to reach the desert of Shur by rounding the head of this stretch of water; but we are told (Exodus 14:2 f) that he was commanded to "turn" — evidently to the South — and to

encamp before "the mouth of the lakes" (*see PIHAHIROTH*), in order that Pharaoh might conclude that the Hebrews were "entangled in the land," and shut in between the lakes on their left and the desert mountains on their right. This camp would seem to have been West of the lakes, and some 10 miles North of Suez. It was perhaps two days' journey from Etham, since the lakes are 30 miles long; or, if Etham was farther South than the head of the lakes, the distance may have been covered by one forced march of 20 to 25 miles, the beasts being watered from the lakes if they were then filled with fresh water, as they would be when having an outlet to a tideless sea.

4. Passage of the Sea:

The sea which Israel crossed is not named in the actual account of the journey, but in the Song of Moses (Exodus 15:4) it is called the "Red Sea" in the English Versions of the Bible, following the Septuagint, the Hebrew name being Yam Cuph, or "weedy sea," a term which applied not only to the Gulf of Suez (Numbers 33:10), but also to the Gulf of ['Aqabah] (Deuteronomy 28; 1 Kings 9:26). We are also told that the route chosen was "the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea" (Exodus 13:18). It is generally supposed that the head of the Gulf of Suez at the time of the Exodus was farther North than at present; and, as the Bitter Lakes were then probably filled by the Nile waters flowing down Wddy Tumeildt, they would no doubt have carried the Nile mud into this gulf, which mud had gradually filled up this Nile branch before 600 BC. The probable point of passage was the narrow channel (about 2 miles across) by which the lakes discharged into the sea, and was thus about 10 miles North of Suez. We are told that the water was driven back by "a strong east (or "contrary") wind" in the night (Exodus 14:21), and the sea (or "lake," as the word yam often means in the Old Testament; see Gesenius, Lexicon, under the word) was thus "divided," a shoal being formed and the waters being heaped up (Exodus 15:8), so that when the wind ceased they rushed back; whereas, during the passage, they were a "wall" or "defence" (Exodus 14:22) against any flank attacks by the Egyptians (compare 1 Samuel 25:16, where David's men are said to have been a "wall" when defending Nabal's shepherds). The effect of the wind on shallow waters can be seen at the mouth of the Kishon, where a shoal exists which is dry with a west wind, but under water and impassable when the wind blows down the river. In 1882, Sir Alexander Tulloch saw the waters of Lake Menzaleh driven back more than a mile by the east wind.

Thus, however opportune the occurrence, the drying up of the sea, as described in the Bible, was a perfectly natural phenomenon. The Hebrews crossed in the morning, and a march of 15 miles would bring them to the springs from which Suez is supplied, called 'Ain Naba' and 'Ayyun Musa ("the gushing spring" and "the spring of Moses"), from which point their wanderings in the desert of Shur would begin (*see WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL*).

5. Other Views of the Route:

This view of the Exodus route is practically the same as advocated by Dr. Robinson, by Dr. E. Naville, by Sir S. Warren, by Sir W. Dawson, and by others who have visited the region in question. The view advocated by Brugsch, according to which the sea crossed was a lagoon near Pelusium, has found no supporters, because it directly conflicts with the statement that Israel did not follow the shore road to Philistia, but went by the wilderness of the Red Sea. Another theory (*see SINAI*), according to which the "Red Sea" always means the Gulf of ['Aqabah], is equally discarded by most writers of experience, because the distance from Egypt to Elath on this gulf is 200 miles, and the Israelites could not have traversed that distance in four marches, especially as the route has hardly any water along it in springtime. As detailed above, the route offers no difficulties that would discredit the historical character of the narrative.

II. THE DATE.

1. Old Testament Chronology:

The actual statements of the Books of Kings, giving parallel reigns from the time of Solomon's death down to the fixed date of the fall of Samaria in 722 BC, place the foundation of the Temple within a few years of 1000 BC. It is true that this interval is reduced, by about 30 years, by scholars who accept the very doubtful identification of Ahabu of Sir-lai with Ahab of Israel; but this theory conflicts with the fact that Jehu was contemporary with Shalmaneser II of Assyria; and, since we have no historical account of the chronology of Hebrew kings other than that of the Old Testament, for this period, and no monumental notice of Israel in Egypt, or of the Exodus, we must either adopt Old Testament chronology or regard the dates in question as being unknown.

2. Date of Conquest of Palestine:

We have several statements which show that the Hebrew writers believed the conquest of Palestine by Joshua to have occurred early in the 15th century BC, and this date fully agrees with the most recent results of monumental study of the history of the XVIIIth (or Theban) Dynasty in Egypt, as about to be shown, and with the fact that Israel is noticed as being already in Palestine in the 5th year of Minepthah, the successor of Rameses II. In <11061>1 Kings 6:1 we read that the Temple was founded "in the 480th year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt," this referring to the Conquest and not to the Exodus, as appears from other notices. The Septuagint reads "440 years," but the details show that the Hebrew text is preferable. In <07126>Judges 11:26 the first victory of Jephthah is said to have occurred 300 years after Joshua's conquest. The details given for this interval, in other passages of the same book, amount to 326 years; but the periods of "rest" may be given in round numbers, and thus account for this minor discrepancy. Samuel ruled apparently for 20 years (<09702>1 Samuel 7:2), and Saul (the length of whose reign is not stated in our present text of this same book) very probably ruled for 20 years also, as Josephus (Ant., VI, xiv, 9) states. Thus 175 years elapsed between Jephthah's victory and the foundation of the Temple — a total of 475 years, or rather more, from Joshua's conquest.

3. Date of Exodus:

The popular belief that many of the judges were contemporary does not agree with these facts, and is indeed in conflict with ten definite statements in Jgs. In <44319>Acts 13:19,20 we read that after the Conquest there were judges about the space of 450 years, and this rough estimate (including the rule of Samuel) agrees pretty nearly with the 415, or 420, years of the various passages in the Old Testament. According to the Pentateuch and later accounts (<30525>Amos 5:25; <44730>Acts 7:30), Israel abode in the desert 40 years. We therefore find that Joshua's conquest is placed about 1480 BC, and the Exodus about 1520 BC. According to the revised chronology of the XVIIIth Dynasty of Egypt (*see HITTITES*), which rests on the notices of contemporary Kassite kings in Babylon, it thus appears that the Pharaoh of the oppression was Thothmes III — a great enemy of the Asiatics — and the Pharaoh of the Exodus would be Amenophis II or Thothmes IV. If Moses was 80 at the time of the Exodus, he must have been born when Thothmes III was an infant, and when his famous sister Hatasu (according to the more probable rendering of her name by French scholars) was

regent, and bore the title Ma-ka-Ra. She therefore might be the "daughter of Pharaoh" (Exodus 2:5) who adopted Moses — no king being mentioned in this passage, but appearing (Exodus 2:15) only when Moses was "grown"; for her regency lasted more than 20 years, till Thothmes III came of age.

4. Other Views:

As regards this date, it should be remarked that theory of Lepsius, which has been adopted by Brugsch and by many writers who accept his authority, is not accepted by every scholar. E. de Bunsen supposed that the Exodus occurred early in the times of the XVIIIth Dynasty; Sir Peter le Page Renouf said that "no materials have yet been discovered for fixing historical dates in periods of Egyptian history as far back as the Hebrew Exodus" — which was true when he wrote. Professor J. Lieblein supposes the Exodus to have occurred late in the time of Amenophis III — also of the XVIIIth Dynasty (see Proc. Biblical Arch. Soc., 1890, 157-60; 1892, 60-62; 1898, 277; 1899, 53; 1907, 214). Dr. Hommel has also recently declared in favor of the view that the Exodus took place under the XVIIIth Dynasty (Expository Times, February, 1899). Lepsius asserted that the Exodus occurred in 1314 BC, being the 15th year of Minepthah; but this is generally regarded as at least half a century too early for the year in question, and Israel was not in Egypt even ten years earlier in his reign.

5. Astronomical Calculations:

The approximate dates given by Brugsch for the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties are very close to those which can be deduced from notices of contemporary kings of Babylon (History of Egypt, II, 314). The later dates which Mahler based on certain astronomical calculations of the French astronomer Blot (Academie des inscriptions, March 30, 1831, 597, 602-4) are not accepted by other Egyptologists. Brugsch says that on this question, "scientific criticism has not yet spoken its last word" (Hist Egypt, I, 36). Renouf (Proc. Biblical Arch. Soc., December, 1892, 62) more definitely states that "unfortunately there is nothing on Egyptian documents which have as yet come down to us which can, by astronomical calculations, be made to result in a date." This judgment appears to be justified by recent discoveries, since Mahler's dates are about a century too late, as shown by the known history of the Kassites of Babylon. Biot's calculations were based on recorded observations of the rising of Sirius just before the sun, in certain years of certain Egyptian kings. But Sirius is not

in the plane of the earth's orbit, and its rising is not constant in retardation. The "heliacal" rising is now about 2 1/2 min. later each year, but about the date in question the retardation was about 12 min., so that a cycle of 1,461 years cannot be used by simple addition. Blot also assumed that the Egyptian observations were as accurate as those made by a modern astronomer with a telescope, whereas, when using the naked eye, the Egyptian observer may well have been a day wrong, which would make a difference of 120 years in the date, or even more. The Babylonian chronology thus gives a far safer basis than do these doubtful observations. On the basis of Biot's calculations the Exodus has been placed in 1214 BC, or even (by Dr. Flinders Petrie) in 1192 BC (Proc. Biblical Arch. Soc., December, 1896, 248). He thus cuts off more than three centuries in the period of the Judges, many of whom he regards as contemporary. Lepsius in like manner, in order to establish his date, accepted the chronology of the Talmud, which is notoriously 166 years too late for the known date of the fall of Samaria, and he endeavored (while rejecting the Old Testament statement as to the 480 years) to base himself on the number of generations before the Exodus, whereas it is well known that the Hebrew genealogies often give only the better-known names and skip several links.

6. Relation between Date of Exodus and Date of Patriarchs:

As regards the relation between the earlier date for the Exodus (about 1520 BC) and the chronology of the Hebrew patriarchs, the Hebrew text gives an interval of 645 years, and the Greek text of 430 years between the Exodus and the call of Abraham; and the call would thus be dated about 2165 BC or 1950 BC. Abraham is very generally held to have been contemporary with Hammurabi of Babylon (Amraphel), whose accession dates (according to Dr. F. Peiser) in 2139 BC. Dr. Hommel and Mr. King prefer a later date, about 1950 BC, though Nabunahid (the last king of Babylon) places Hammurabi about 2140 BC. The longer reckoning is reconcilable with the Hebrew text, and the shorter with the Greek text, of Gen, without disturbing the approximate date for the Exodus which has been advocated above.

7. Agreement between Monuments and Old Testament Chronology:

There is in fact no discrepancy between the actual results of monumental study and the chronology of the Old Testament. If the Exodus occurred under Thothmes IV, it would have been useless for Israel to attempt the

entrance into Palestine by the "way of the land of the Philistines," because at Gaza, Ashkelon and in other cities, the road was still held by forces of Egyptian chariots, which had been established by Thothmes III. But about 40 years later the rebellion of the Amorites against Egypt began, in the time of the Egyptian general Yankhamu, and general chaos resulted in Southern Palestine The Egyptian garrison at Jerusalem (Amarna Tablets, Berlin, No. 102) was withdrawn in his time — about 1480 BC — and it is then (numbers 102-3-4-6, 199) that a fierce people coming from Seir, and called the 'Abiri or *Chabiri*, are noticed by the Amorite king of Jerusalem as "destroying all the rulers" of the country. They are not named in any of the other Amarna letters (the term gum-gaz, or "man of war," though once applying probably to them, being used of other warriors as well); and the name is geographical for they are called (no. 199) "people of the land of the 'Abiri." The first sign has the guttural sounds 'A and Chronicles, and has not the sound K, which has been wrongly attributed to it, making the word to mean Kabiri, "or great ones." Nor can it be rendered "allies," for it is the name of a people, and quite another word is used for "allies" in this correspondence. The date agrees with that mentioned in the Old Testament for the Hebrew conquest of Palestine,and the only objection to the identification of the 'Abiri (who attacked Ajalon, Lachish, Ashkelon and other cities) with the Hebrews is, that it upsets theory of Lepsius and the popular views as to the date of the Exodus which he maintained.

8. A Text of Minepthah:

Nor is this the only evidence which destroys his theory; for Dr. Flinders Petrie (Contemporary Review, May, 1896) has published an equally important text of the 5th year of Minepthah, from Thebes. A slab of black syenite, bearing this text, was reused from a temple of Amenophis III. In it Minepthah boasts of his conquest of the invaders who — as elsewhere stated — attacked the Delta, and penetrated to Belbeis and Heliopolis. He says that "Sutekh (the Hittite god) has turned his back on their chief"; "the Hittites are quieted, Pa-Kan'ana is ravaged with all violence" — this town being otherwise known to have been near Tyre — "the people of Israel is spoiled, it has no seed"; "Ruten has become as the widows of the land of Egypt." Thus, so far from the Exodus having occurred in the 15th year of Minepthah, Israel is noticed 10 years earlier in connection with a place near Tyre with Hittites yet farther North. Even if the Hebrews had only just arrived, they must have left Egypt 40 years before — in the reign of Rameses II — if we attach any value to Old Testament statements; and all

the dates variously given by followers of Lepsius are quite upset; whereas the notice of the 'Abiri, two centuries before Minepthah's accession, is quite in accord with this allusion to Israel, as well as with Old Testament chronology.

III. THE THEORY OF LEPSIUS.

The reasons which influenced Lepsius require, however, to be stated, and the objections to a date for the Hebrew Conquest about 1480 BC (or a little later) to be considered, since theory that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and Minepthah the Pharaoh of the Exodus is often said to be a secure result of monumental studies, whereas it is really not so, because the only monumental allusions to Israel and the Hebrews are those just mentioned.

1. 1st Argument: City Rameses:

The arguments adduced in favor of the later date are as follows: In the first place, Lepsius (Letters from Egypt, 1842-44) held that no city called Rameses could have been so named, or built by the Hebrews, before the reign of Rameses II, and he placed the site at Heroopolis. This was a very doubtful assumption (*see RAAMSES*), and his identification of the city is now abandoned. The theory always was vitiated by an objection which he seems to have overlooked: for the "land of Rameses" is noticed in the time of Jacob (⁰⁴⁷¹¹ Genesis 47:11), and since it is impossible to suppose that Jacob lived in the time of Rameses II, the followers of Lepsius are obliged to regard this notice as an anachronism, which destroys their case, as it might equally be an anachronism in the account of the Exodus, though it is probably correct.

2. 2nd Argument: Manetho's Statements:

The second argument is based on the account by Manetho of the expulsion of leprous and unclean tribes from Egypt. Manetho was an Egyptian priest who wrote about 268 BC, and who evidently hated the Jews. His account only reaches us secondhand through Josephus (Apion, I, 14, 15, 26-31), this Hebrew author rejecting it as fabulous. Manetho apparently said that, after the Hyksos kings had ruled for 511 years, and had fortified Avaris (*see ZOAN*), they agreed with King Thummosis to leave Egypt, and went through the desert to Jerusalem, being afraid of the Assyrians (who had no power in Palestine at this time). He continued to relate that, after Armesses

Miamon (Rameses II) had ruled 66 years, he was succeeded by an Amenophis whom Josephus calls a "fictitious king" — and rightly so since the name does not occur in the XIXth Dynasty. Apparently Minepthah was meant — though perhaps confused with Amenophis II — and he is said by Manetho to have sent the leprous people to quarries East of the Nile, but to have allowed them later to live in Avaris where the shepherds had been. They were induced by Osarsiph, a priest of Heliopolls, to renounce the Egyptian gods, and this Osarsiph Manetho identified with Moses. They then induced the shepherds who had been expelled by Thummosis to return from Jerusalem to Avaris, and Amenophis fled to Memphis and Ethiopia. His son Rhampses (apparently Rameses III is meant) was sent later to expel the shepherd and polluted people, whom he met at Pelusium and pursued into Syria. This story Josephus discredits, remarking: "I think therefore that I have made it sufficiently evident that Manetho, while he followed his ancient records, did not much mistake the truth of the history, but that, when he had recourse to fabulous stories without any certain author, he either forged them himself without any probability, or else gave credit to some men who spoke so out of their ill will to us" — a criticism sounder than that of Lepsius, who prefers the libelous account of a prejudiced Egyptian priest of the 3rd century BC, identifying Moses with a renegade priest of Heliopolis named Osarsiph, to the ancient Hebrew records in the Bible.

3. Relation of Manetho's Stories to the Exodus:

A thread of truth underlay Manetho's stories, but it has nothing to do with the Exodus, and the details to be found on Egyptian monuments do not agree with Manetho's tale. The Hyksos rulers were not expelled by any Thothmes, but by Aahmes who took Avaris about 1700 BC, and who reopened the quarries of the Arabian chain. Minepthah, about 1265 BC, was attacked in Egypt by Aryan tribes from the North, who had nothing to do with Hyksos chiefs, being Lycians, Sardians and Cilicians. He repelled them, but they again attacked Rameses III (about 1200 BC), and were again driven to the North. No mention of Israel occurs in connection with any of these events.

4. Greek and Latin Writers:

The story of the leprous Jews was, however, repeated by other Greek writers. Cheremon (see Josephus, Apion I, 32) says that Rameses, the son

of Amenophis, defeated and expelled a diseased people led against him, at Pelusium, by Tisithen and Petesiph, whom he identified with Moses and Joseph. Lysimachus said that a scabby people were led by Moses through the desert by Judea and Jerusalem in the time of Bocchoris (735 BC). Diodorus Siculus (Fr. of Bk, 34) repeats the tale, about 8 BC, saying that lepers were driven out of Egypt, and were led by Moses who founded Jerusalem, and "established by law all their wicked customs and practices," and again (Fr. of Bk, 40) that strangers in Egypt caused a plague by their impurity, and being driven out were led by Moses. Tacitus, about 100 AD (Hist, v.ii), believed the Jews to have fled from Crete to Libya and, being expelled from Egypt, to have been led by their "Captains Jerusalem and Judah." Again he says (v. iii) that under Bocchoris (735 BC) there was sickness in Egypt, and that the infected being driven out were led by Moses, and reached the site of their temple on the 7th day.

5. Condition of Egypt under Minepthah:

No true critic of the present time is likely to prefer these distorted accounts of the Exodus, or any of the Greek and Roman calumnies leveled against the hated Jews, to the simple narration of the Exodus in the Bible. The historic conditions in the 5th year of Minepthah were very different from those at the time of Moses. The invaders of Egypt reached Belbeis and Heliopolis (see Brugsch, History of Egypt, II, 117), and Minepthah states, in his text on the wall of the temple of Amon at Thebes, that he had to defend Hellopolls and Memphis against his foes from the East. The region was then "not cultivated but was left as pasture for cattle, on account of the foreigners. It lay waste from the time of our forefathers." The kings of upper Egypt remained in their entrenchments, and the kings of lower Egypt were besieged in their cities by warriors, and had no mercenaries to oppose them. But Israel, as Minepthah himself has told us now, was in Palestine, not in Egypt, in this year of his reign; and, far from desiring to expel Asiatic pastoral peoples, the same Pharaoh encouraged their immigration into the region of Goshen (*see PITHOM*) laid waste by the Aryan raid.

6. Explanations of Minepthah's Statements:

Objections to the view that the Exodus occurred two centuries and a half before the reign of Minepthah began, and attempts to explain away the statements on his monuments require some notice.

(1) **Pithom was Heroopolis.**

The first of these objections is due to the belief that Pithom was Heroopolis, and was a city founded by Rameses II; but this (*see PITHOM*) is too hazardous a conclusion to suffice for the entire neglect of Old Testament chronology which it involves, since the site of this city is still very doubtful.

(2) **Rameses II Not Named in Judges.**

A second objection is made, that the Old Testament shows complete ignorance of Egyptian history if it makes Rameses II contemporary with Judges because he is not named in that book. But Old Testament references to foreign history are always very slight, while on the other hand it is quite probable that there are allusions, in this book, to the events which took place in the reigns of Rameses II, and of Minepthah. The Hebrews were then confined to the mountains (Judges 1:19) and the Egyptians to the plains. No Pharaoh is mentioned by name in the Old Testament till the time of Rehoboam. In his 8th year Rameses II took various towns in Galilee including Salem (North of Taanach), Merom, Beth-Anath, Anem and Dapur (Daberath at the foot of Tabor). The revolt of Barak probably occurred about the 25th year of Rameses II, and began at Tabor. In the Song of Deborah (Judges 5:2), the first words (bi-pheroa` pera`oth), rendered by the Septuagint (Alex MS) "when the rulers ruled," may be more definitely translated "when the Pharaohs were powerful," especially as Sisera — who commanded the Canaanite forces — bears a name probably Egyptian (ses-Ra, or "servant of Ra"), and may have been an Egyptian resident at the court of Jabin. So again when, about 1265 BC, Minepthah says that "Israel is ruined, it has no seed," the date suggests the time of Gideon when wild tribes swarmed over the plains, "and destroyed the increase of the earth, till thou come unto Gaza, and left no sustenance in Israel" (Judges 6:4). The Midianites and Amalekites may have then joined the tribes from Asia Minor who, in the 5th year of Minepthah, ruined the Hittites and invaded the Delta.

(3) **Some Hebrews Were Never in Egypt.**

But another explanation of the presence of Israel in this year on the line of Minepthah's pursuit of these tribes after their defeat has been suggested, namely, that some of the Hebrews never went to Egypt at all. This of course contradicts the account in the Pentateuch (Exodus 1:1-5; 12:41)

where we read that all Jacob's family (70 men) went down to Goshen, and that "all the hosts of the Lord" left Egypt at the Exodus; but it is supposed to be supported by a passage (1 Chronicles 7:21) where we read of one of the sons of Ephraim "whom the men of Gath born in the land slew, because they came down to take away their cattle." Ephraim however was born in Egypt (Genesis 41:52), and his sons and "children of the third generation" (Genesis 50:23) remained there. The meaning no doubt is that men of Gath raided Goshen; and there were probably many such raids by the inhabitants of Philistia during the times of the Hyksos kings, similar to those which occurred in the time of Minepthah and of Rameses III. The objections made to the Old Testament date for the Exodus early in the reign of Amenophis III, or in that of his predecessor Thothmes IV, thus appear to have little force; and the condition of Egypt before the 5th year of Minepthah was unlike that which would have existed at the time of the Exodus. The theory of Lepsius was a purely literary conjecture, and not based on any monumental records. It has been falsified by the evidence of monuments found during the last 20 years, and these are fully in accord with the history and chronology of the Old Testament.

IV. THE NUMBERS.

1. Colenso's Criticism of Large Number:

The historic difficulty with respect to the Exodus does not lie in the account of plagues natural to Egypt even now, nor in the crossing of the Red Sea, but in a single statement as to the numbers of Israel (Exodus 12:37), `about 600,000 footmen — strong men — with many children, and also many wanderers.' The women are not mentioned, and it has been supposed that this represents a host of 2,000,000 emigrants at least. The objection was urged by Voltaire, and the consequences were elaborately calculated by Colenso. Even if 600,000 means the total population, the "heroes," or "strong men on foot" would, it is urged, have been as numerous as the largest Assyrian army (120,000 men) employed in the conquest of Syria. With an army of more than half a million Moses would have held control over Egypt and Palestine alike; and the emigrants, even in close column of companies, would have stretched for 20 miles; the births would occur every ten minutes; and the assembly before Sinai would have been impossible.

2. Increase of Population:

It is also difficult to suppose, on ordinary calculations of the increase of population, that in 430 years (⁰²¹²⁴Exodus 12:40), or in 215 years as given in the Septuagint, a tribe of 70 males (⁰¹⁴⁵⁵Genesis 46:26 f; ⁰⁰¹⁰⁵Exodus 1:5; 6:14) could have increased to 600,000, or even 100,000 men. But on the other hand we are specially told (⁰⁰¹⁰⁷Exodus 1:7-20) that the children of Israel "increased abundantly," and the comments of Dr Orr (Problem of the Old Testament, 1906, 363-65) on this question should be studied. A young and vigorous nation might multiply much faster than is now usual in the East. Dr. Flinders Petrie has suggested that for "thousand" we should read "families"; but, though the word (['eleph]) sometimes has that meaning (⁰⁷⁶¹⁵Judges 6:15; ⁰⁹¹⁰⁹1 Samuel 10:19; 23:23), it is in the singular, and not in the plural, in the passage in question (⁰²¹³⁷Exodus 12:37).

3. Number a Corruption of Original Statement:

It should not be forgotten that variations in numbers are very commonly found in various texts, VSS, and parallel passages of the Old Testament. Thus for instance (⁰⁹¹³⁵1 Samuel 13:5) the Syriac version reads 3,000 for the 30,000 chariots mentioned in the Hebrew and Greek; and the Septuagint (¹¹⁰⁵¹1 Kings 5:11) gives 20,000 for the 20 measures of oil noticed in the Hebrew text. The probable reason for these discrepancies may be found in the fact that the original documents may have used numeral signs — as did the Egyptians, Assyrians, Hittites and Phoenicians — instead of writing the words in full as they appear in the New Testament. These numeral signs — especially in cuneiform — were apt to be misread, and the sign for "unity" could easily be confused with those denoting "sixty" (the Babylonian unit) and "an hundred" — if, in the latter case, a short stroke was added. In the opinion of the present writer the difficulty is due to a corruption of the original statement, which occurred during the course of some fifteen centuries, or more, of continued recopying; but the reader will no doubt form his own conclusions as to this question.

4. Review:

The general questions of the credibility of that history of the Exodus which is given us in the Pentateuch, and of the approximate date of the event, have been treated above in the light of the most recent monumental information. No reference has yet been found in Egyptian records to the presence of Israel in the Delta, though the Hebrews are noticed as present

in Palestine before the 5th year of Minepthah. The Pharaohs as a rule — like other kings — only recorded their victories, and no doubt reckoned Israel only as a tribe of those "hostile Shasu" (or "nomads") whom the Theban kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty drove back into Asia. It would be natural that a disaster at the Red Sea should not be noticed in their proud records still extant on the temple walls in Egypt.

See also *WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.*

C. R. Conder

EXODUS, THE BOOK OF

<ek'-so-dus>:

(NOTE: For the signs J (Jahwist), E (Elohist), P or Priestly Code (Priest Codex), R (Redactor) compare the article on *GENESIS*.)

I. IN GENERAL.

1. Name:

The second book of the Pentateuch bears in the Septuagint the name of [Ἔξοδος, *Exodos*], in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) accordingly Exodus, on the basis of the chief contents of the first half, dealing with the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt. The Jews named the book after the first words: [twmv]hLaw, *we-'elleh shemoth*] ("and these are the names"), or sometimes after the first noun [twmv, *shemoth*] ("names") a designation already known to Origen in the form of [Οὐαλεσμώθ, *Oualesmoth*].

2. Contents in General:

In seven parts, after the Introduction (Exodus 1:1-7), which furnishes the connection of the contents with Genesis, the book treats of
(1) the sufferings of Israel in Egypt, for which mere human help is insufficient (Exodus 1:8 through 7:7), while Divine help through human mediatorship is promised;
(2) the power of Yahweh, which, after a preparatory miracle, is glorified through the ten plagues inflicted on Pharaoh and which thus forces the exodus (Exodus 7:8 through 13:16);

(3) the love of Yahweh for Israel, which exhibits itself in a most brilliant manner, in the guidance of the Israelites to Mt. Sinai, even when the people murmur (Exodus 13:17 through 18:27);

(4) making the Covenant at Mt. Sinai together with the revelation of the Ten Words (Exodus 20:1 ff) and of the legal ordinances (Exodus 21:1 ff) as the condition of making the Covenant (Exodus 19:1 through 24:18);

(5) the directions for the building of the Tabernacle, in which Yahweh is to dwell in the midst of His people (Exodus 24:18 through 31:18);

(6) the renewal of the Covenant on the basis of new demands after Israel's great apostasy in the worship of the Golden Calf, which seemed for the time being to make doubtful the realization of the promises mentioned in (5) above (Exodus 32:1 through 35:3);

(7) the building and erection of the Tabernacle of Revelation (or Tent of Meeting) and its dedication by the entrance of Yahweh (Exodus 35:4 through 40:38). As clearly as these seven parts are separated from one another, so clearly again are they most closely connected and constitute a certain progressive whole.

In the case of the last four, the separation is almost self-evident. The first three as separate parts are justified by the ten plagues standing between them, which naturally belong together and cause a division between that which precedes and that which follows. Thus in the first part we already find predicted the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh, the miracles of Yahweh and the demonstrations of His power down to the slaying of the firstborn, found in the 2nd part (compare Exodus 2:23 through 7:7).

In part 3, the infatuation of Pharaoh and the demonstration of the power of Yahweh are further unfolded in the narrative of the catastrophe in the Red Sea (Exodus 14:4,17). Further the directions given with reference to the Tabernacle (Exodus 25 through 31 taken from P) presuppose the Decalogue (from E); compare e.g. Exodus 25:16,21; 31:18; as again the 6th section (Exodus 32 ff) presupposes the 5th part, which had promised the continuous presence of God (compare Exodus 32:34 J; 33:3,5,7 ff JE; 33:12,14-17 J; 34:9 J, with 25:8; 29:45 f P; compare also the forty days in 34:28 J with those in 24:18 P) as in 34:1,28 J and 34:11-27 J refers back to the 4th part, namely, 20:1 ff E; 21:1 ff E; 24:7 JE (Decalogue; Books of the Covenant; Making the Covenant). In the same

way the last section presupposes the third, since the cloud in [02484]Exodus 40:34 ff P is regarded as something well known (compare 13:21 f JE; 14:19 E and J, 14:24 J) . The entire contents of the Book of Exodus are summarized in an excellent way in the word of God to Israel spoken through Moses concerning the making of the covenant: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" ([21904]Exodus 19:4-6). Here reference is made to the powerful deeds of God done to the Egyptians, to His deeds of lovingkindness done to Israel in the history of how He led them to Sinai, to the selection of Israel, and to the conditions attached to the making of the covenant, to God's love, which condescended to meet the people, and to His holiness, which demands the observance of His commandments; but there is also pointed out here the punishment for their transgression. The whole book is built on one word in the preface to the ten commandments: "I am Yahweh thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" ([02202]Exodus 20:2 E; compare 29:45 f P).

3. Connection with the Other Books of the Pentateuch:

The events which are described in the Book of Exodus show a certain contrast to those in Genesis. In the first eleven chapters of this latter book we have the history of mankind; then beginning with 11:27, a history of families, those of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In Exodus we have following this the beginning of the history of the chosen people. Then there is also a long period of time intervening between the two books. If Israel was 430 years in Egypt (compare 12:40 f P; also [01513]Genesis 15:13 J; see III, 4 below), and if the oppression began during the long reign of the predecessors of the Pharaoh, during whose reign Israel left the country ([01023]Exodus 2:23; 1:8), then, too, several centuries must have elapsed between the real beginning of the book (x 1:8 ff), and the conclusion of Genesis. Notwithstanding these differences, there yet exists the closest connection between the two books. [00101]Exodus 1:1-7 connects the history of the people as found in Exodus with the family history of Genesis, by narrating how the seventy descendants of Jacob that had migrated to Egypt (compare [00105]Exodus 1:5; [04627]Genesis 46:27) had come to be the people of Israel, and that God, who offers Himself as a liberator to Moses and the people, is also the God of those fathers, of whom Genesis spoke (compare

Exodus 3:6 JE; 3:13 E; 3:15 f R; 4:5 J; 6:3 P). Indeed, His covenant with the fathers and His promises to them are the reasons why He at all cares for Israel (Exodus 2:24 P; 6:8 P; 33:1 JE), and when Moses intercedes for the sinful people, his most effective motive over against God is found in the promises made to the patriarchs (Exodus 32:13 JE). As is the case with Genesis, Exodus stands in the closest connection also with the succeeding books of the Pentateuch. Israel is certainly not to remain at Sinai, but is to come into the promised land (3:17 JE; 6:8 P; 23:20 ff JE; 32:34 J; 33:1 ff JE; 33:12 ff J; 34:9 ff J and D; compare also the many ordinances of the Books of the Covenant, 21:1 ff E; 34:11 ff D and J). In this way the narratives of the following books, which begin again in Numbers 10:11 ff P and JE with the story of the departure from Sinai, continue the history in Exodus. But the legislation in Leviticus also is a necessary continuation and supplement of the Book of Exodus, and is prepared for and pointed to in the latter. The erection of the burnt-offering altar (27:1 ff; 38:1 ff), as well as the mention made of the different kinds of sacrifices, such as the burnt sacrifices and the sin offering (29:18,14) and of the heave offering (29:28), point to the promulgation of a law of sacrifices such as we find in Leviticus 1 through 7. The directions given in regard to the consecration of the priests (Exodus 29) are carried out in Leviticus 8 f. The indefinite commands of Exodus 30:10 in reference to the atonement on the horn of the incense altar once every year renders necessary the special ritual of the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16 as its supplement. The more complete enlargement in reference to the shewbread mentioned in Exodus 25:30 is found in Leviticus 24:5-9; and even the repetitions in references to the candlesticks (Exodus 25:31 ff; Leviticus 24:1-4; Numbers 8:1-4), as also the tamidh ("continuous") sacrifices (compare Numbers 28:3-8 with Exodus 29:38-42), point to a certain connection between Exodus and the following books. How close the connection between Deuteronomy and Exodus is, both in regard to the historical narratives and also to their legal portions (compare the Decalogue and the Books of the Covenant), can only be mentioned at this place.

4. Significance of These Events for Israel:

When we remember the importance which the exodus out of Egypt and the making of the covenant had for the people of Israel, and that these events signalized the birth of the chosen people and the establishment of theocracy, then we shall understand why the echo of the events recorded in

Exodus is found throughout later literature, namely, in the historical books, in the preaching of the prophets and in the Psalms, as the greatest events in the history of the people, and at the same time as the promising type of future and greater deliverances. But as in the beginning of the family history the importance of this family for the whole earth is clearly announced (⟨01201⟩Genesis 12:1-3), the same is the case here too at the beginning of the history of the nation, perhaps already in the expression "kingdom of priests" (⟨02906⟩Exodus 19:6), since the idea of a priesthood includes that of the transmission of salvation to others; and certainly in the conception `first-born son of Yahweh' (⟨02042⟩Exodus 4:22), since this presupposes other nations as children born later.

The passages quoted above are already links connecting this book with Christianity, in the ideas of a general priesthood, of election and of sonship of God. We here make mention of a few specially significant features from among the mass of such relationships to Christianity.

5. Connecting Links for Christianity:

How great a significance the Decalogue, in which the law is not so intimately connected with what is specifically Jewish and national, as e.g. in the injunctions of the Priest Codex, according to the interpretation of Christ in Matthew 5, has attained in the history of mankind! But in ⟨40517⟩Matthew 5:17 ff Jesus has vindicated for the law in all its parts an everlasting authority and significance and has emphasized the eternal kernel, which accordingly is to be assigned to each of these legal behests; while Paul, on the other hand, especially in Romans, Galatians and Colossians, emphasizes the transitory character of the law, and discusses in detail the relation of the Mosaic period to that of the patriarchs and of the works of the law to faith, while in 2 Corinthians 3 he lauds the glory of the service in the spirit over that of the letter (compare Exodus 34) — an idea which in reference to the individual legal institutions is also carried out in the Ep. to the Hebrews. Compare on this subject also the articles *LEVITICUS* and *DAY OF ATONEMENT*. Then too the Passover lamb was a type of Jesus Christ (compare e.g. ⟨46057⟩1 Corinthians 5:7; ⟨43936⟩John 19:36; ⟨60119⟩1 Peter 1:19). In Exodus 12 the Passover rite and the establishment of the covenant (24:3-8) arc found most closely connected also with the Lord's Supper and the establishment of the New Covenant. In the permanent dwelling of God in the midst of His people in the pillar of fire and in the Tabernacle there is typified His dwelling among mankind in Christ Jesus (⟨43014⟩John 1:14) and also the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in

the Christian congregation ([60205]1 Peter 2:5; [49042]Ephesians 4:12) and in the individual Christian ([46316]1 Corinthians 3:16; 6:19; [47066]2 Corinthians 6:16; [43423]John 14:23). The Apocalypse particularly is rich in thought suggested by the exodus out of Egypt. Unique thoughts in reference to the Old Testament are found in the conceptions that the law was given through angels ([44753]Acts 7:53; [48319]Galatians 3:19; [58002]Hebrews 2:2); further that the rock mentioned in [02706]Exodus 17:6 followed, and was Christ ([46004]1 Corinthians 10:4); and that in [58004]Hebrews 9:4 the real connection of the altar of incense with the Holy of Holies appears as changed into a local connection ([02406]Exodus 40:26,27), while the idea found in [58004]Hebrews 9:4 that the manna was originally in the Ark of the Covenant, is perhaps not altogether excluded by [02163]Exodus 16:33; and the number 430 years, found in [48317]Galatians 3:17, probably agrees with [02140]Exodus 12:40,41, in so far as the whole of the patriarchal period could be regarded as a unit (compare on the reading of the Septuagint in [02140]Exodus 12:40,41, III, 4 below).

II. STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES AND ACCORDING TO MODERN ANALYSES.

In the following section

(a) serves for the understanding of the Biblical text;

(b) is devoted to the discussion and criticism of the separation into sources.

1. In General:

(a) The conviction must have been awakened already by the general account of the contents given in I, 2 above, that in the Book of Exodus we are dealing with a rounded-off structure, since in seven mutually separated yet intimately connected sections, one uniform fundamental thought is progressively carried through. This conviction will only be confirmed when the details of these sections are studied, the sections being themselves again organically connected by one leading thought. Since, in addition, the Book of Genesis is clearly divided into ten parts by the ten toledhoth ("generations") (compare also the division made by typical numbers in articles *LEVITICUS* and *DAY OF ATONEMENT*), thus too the number seven, as itself dividing the Book of Exodus into seven parts, is probably not accidental; and this all the less, as in the subordinate parts too, a division is to be found according to typical numbers, this in many cases

appearing as a matter of course, and in other cases traced without difficulty, and sometimes lying on the surface (compare 10 plagues, 10 commandments). Yet in all of the following investigations, as is the case in the articles *GENESIS, LEVITICUS* and *DAY OF ATONEMENT*, the demonstration of the fundamental thought must be the main thing for us. The division according to typical numbers is to be regarded merely as an additional confirmation of the literary unity of the book. We refer here first of all to a number of cases, where certain numbers independently of the separate chief parts combine the Biblical text into a unity. In [0442]Numbers 14:22 R, Yahweh states that Israel had now tempted Him and been disobedient to Him ten times: compare [0241]Exodus 14:11 ff JE(?) (Red Sea); 15:23 f JE (Marah); 16:2,3 P; 16:20 JE; 16:27,28 R (Manna); 17:1 ff JE (Massah and Meribah); 32:1 ff JE (Golden Calf); [0410]Numbers 11:1 ff JE (Tuberah); 11:4 ff JE (Graves of Lust); 14:2 ff P and JE (Spies). Most of these cases are accordingly reported in the Book of Exodus, but in such manner that in this particular a clearly marked progress can be noticed, as Yahweh does not begin to punish until Exodus 32; but from here on He does so with constantly increasing severity, while down to Exodus 32 grace alone prevails, and in this particular, previous to Exodus 32, there is found nothing but a warning (16:27). Ten times it is further stated of Pharaoh, in a great variety of forms of expression, that he hardened his own heart (7:13 P; 7:14 JE; 7:22 P; 8:15 P; 8:32 JE; 9:7,34,35 JE; 13:15 D); ten times the hardening is ascribed to God (4:21 JE; 7:3 P; 9:12 P; 10:1 R; 10:20 JE; 10:27 E; 11:10 R; 14:4,8 P; 17 P ?). Here already we must note that within the narrative of the miracles and the plagues at first there is mention made only of the hardening by Pharaoh himself (7:13 P; 7:14 JE; 7:22 P; 8:11 ff; 8:15 P; 8:28 JE; 9:7 JE, i.e. seven times) before a single word is said that God begins the hardening; and this latter kind of hardening thereupon alone concludes the whole tragedy (14:4,8 P; 17 P?). Ten months cover the time from the arrival at Sinai (19:1 P) to the erection of the sacred dwelling-place of God (40:17 P). Since, further, exactly three months of this time are employed in 19:10,16 JE; 24:3 ff JE; 24:16 P (ten days); 24:18 P (40 days); 34:28 J (40 days), there remain for the building of the tabernacle exactly seven months.

(b) What has been said does anything but speak in favor of the customary division of Exodus into different sources. It is generally accepted that the three sources found in Genesis are also to be found in this book; in addition to which a fourth source is found in [0238]Exodus 13:3-16, of a Deuteronomistic character. It is true and is acknowledged that the

advocates of this hypothesis have more difficulties to overcome in Exodus than in Genesis, in which latter book too, however, there are insufficient grounds for accepting this view, as is shown in the article *GENESIS*. Beginning with Exodus 6 the chief marks of such a separation of sources falls away as far as P and J are concerned, namely, the different uses of the names of God, Elohim and Yahweh. For, according to the protagonists of the documentary theory, P also makes use of the name Yahweh from this chapter on; E, too, does the same from ^{⟨0063⟩}Exodus 3:13 ff on, only that, for a reason not understood, occasionally the word Elohim is still used by this source later on, e.g. 13:17 ff; 18:1 ff. But as a number of passages using the name Elohim are unhesitatingly ascribed by the critics to J, this difference in the use of the name of God utterly fails to establish a difference of sources. To this is to be added, that J and E are at this place closely interwoven; that, while the attempt is constantly being made to separate these two sources, no generally accepted results have been reached and many openly acknowledge the impossibility of such a separation, or admit that it can be effected only to a very limited extent. Peculiarities which are regarded as characteristic of the different sources, such as the sin of Aaron in J, the staff of Moses in E, Sinai in J and the Priestly Code (P), Horeb in E, the dwelling of the Israelites in Goshen in J, but according to E their living in the midst of the Egyptians, and others, come to nought in view of the uniform text in the passages considered. This has been proved most clearly, e.g. by Eerdmans in his Alttestamentliche Studien, III ("Das Buck Exodus") in regard to many of these passages. Narratives of a similar character, like the two stories in which Moses is described as striking the rock to produce water (^{⟨0170⟩}Exodus 17:1; ^{⟨0400⟩}Numbers 20:1 ff), are not duplicates, but are different events. Compare the different localities in ^{⟨0170⟩}Exodus 17:7 and ^{⟨0400⟩}Numbers 20:1, as also the improbability that Israel would without cause in the first passage have put into permanent form the story of its shame, and then in the latter there would have been an uncertainty as to the importance of this locality for the career of Moses; and finally, we must notice the distinction expressly made by the additional statement, "waters of Meribah of Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin," in ^{⟨0272⟩}Numbers 27:12-14; ^{⟨0525⟩}Deuteronomy 32:51 (compare ^{⟨2679⟩}Ezekiel 47:19; 48:28). Then, too, these occurrences, if we accept the division into J and E at this place, are not reduced to a single event, since both sources would share in both narratives. The same condition of affairs is found in Exodus 16 in so far as JE comes into consideration, and in Exodus 18 in comparison with

Numbers 11. In the case of Numbers 11 there is express reference made to a former narrative by the word "again" and in the second case all the details in their differences point to different occurrences. Concerning other so-called duplicates in Ex, see later in this article. But the acceptance of P in contradistinction to the text of JE does also not lead to tangible results, notwithstanding that there exists a general agreement with regard to the portions credited to P. Not taking into consideration certain that are peculiar, the following sections are attributed to this source: [0010] Exodus 1:1-7,13-15; 2:23b-25; 6:2 through 7:13 (6:28-30 R); 7:19,20a,21b,22; 8:1-3,11b-15; 9:8-12; 12:1-20,28,37a,40-50; 13:1-2,20; 14:1-4,8-10,15-18?,21aa,22-23,19; 16:1-3,1-14,15b-18,21-26,31-32,34a,35; 17:1a; 19:1,2a; 24:15 through 31:17; 34:29 through 40:38. It is claimed that in the Book of Genesis these sources constitute the backbone of the whole work; but this is not claimed for Ex. The sections ascribed to P constitute in this place, too, anything but an unbroken story. In both language and substance they are, to a certain extent, most closely connected with the parts ascribed to JE, and in part they are indispensable for the connection whence they have been taken (compare for details below). It is absolutely impossible to separate on purely philological grounds in the purely narrative portions in Exodus the portions belonging to P. That genealogies like [0064] Exodus 6:14 ff, or chronological notices like 12:40,41,51; 16:1; 19:1, or directions for the cults like Exodus 12; 25 ff have their own peculiar forms, is justified by self-evident reasons; but this does not justify the acceptance of separate authors. It is the result of the peculiar matter found in each case. We must yet note that the passages attributed to P would in part contain views which could not be harmonized with theological ideas ascribed to this source, which are said to include an extreme transcendental conception of God; thus in 16:10 the majesty of Yahweh suddenly appears to the congregation, and in 40:34 ff this majesty takes possession of the newly erected dwelling. In 8:19 mention is made of the finger of God, and in 7:1 Moses is to be as God to Pharaoh. In [1212] Exodus 12:12 the existence of the Egyptian gods is presupposed and the heathen sorcerers are able to act in competition with Moses and Aaron for a while; 7:11,12,22; 8:3. P also describes the Passover, which on account of the handling of the blood in 12:7 cannot be regarded in any other light than as a sacrifice in the house, and in [0907] Numbers 9:7,13, this act is expressly called a [qorban Yahweh] (`sacrifice of Yahweh'). Compare also the commands in [1210] Exodus 12:10,43,18. But more than anything else, what has been said under (a) above goes to show that all

these sources have been united in a way that characterizes the work of a systematic writer, and declares against any view that would maintain that these sources have been mechanically placed side by side and interwoven into each other. What has here been outlined for the whole book in general must now be applied to the different parts in particular.

2. In the Separate Pericopes:

(1) Exodus 1:8 through 7:7:

(**a**) Everything that is narrated in this section, which in so worthy a manner introduces the whole book, is written from a standpoint of the Egyptian oppression, from which human help could give no deliverance, but from which the mighty power of Yahweh, working through human agency, offered this deliverance. It is a situation which demands faith (4:31). This section naturally falls into ten pericopes, of which in each instance two are still more closely connected. Numbers 1 and 2 (1:8-14,15-22), namely, the oppression through forced labor and the threat to take the life of the newly born males of the Israelites; and in contrast to this, the Divine blessing in the increase of the people in general and of the midwives in particular; numbers 3 and 4 (Exodus 2:1-10,11-22), namely, the birth and youth of Moses stand in contrast. The child seems to be doomed, but God provides for its deliverance. Moses, when grown to manhood, tries to render vigorous assistance to his people through his own strength, but he is compelled to flee into a far-off country. Numbers 5 and 6 (Exodus 2:23 through 4:17; 4:18-31) report the fact that also in the reign of a new Pharaoh the oppression does not cease, and that this causes God to interfere, which in Exodus 2:23-25 is expressed in strong terms and repeatedly, and this again leads to the revelation in the burning bush (3:1 ff). And at the same time the narrative shows how little self-confidence Moses still had (three signs, a heavy tongue, direct refusal). The sixth pericope and also the beginning of the last four, describe, from an external viewpoint, the return of Moses to Midian, and his journey from there to Egypt. Here, too, mention is made of the troubles caused by Pharaoh, which God must remove through His power. This deliverance is not at all deserved by Israel, since not even any son in a family had up to this time been circumcised. On the other hand, everything here is what can be expected. Those who sought the life of Moses had died; the meeting with Aaron at the Mount of the Lord; in Egypt the faith of the people. In an effective way the conclusion (4:31) returns to the point where the two companion narratives (2:24 f) begin. After this point, constituting the

center and the chief point in the introductory section, numbers 7 and 8 (⁰⁰⁵⁰¹Exodus 5:1 through 6:1; 6:2-12), everything seems to have become doubtful. Pharaoh refuses to receive Moses and Aaron; the oppression increases; dissatisfaction in Israel appears; Moses despairs; even the new revelations of God, with fair emphasis on fidelity to the Covenant which is to unfold Yahweh's name in full, are not able to overcome the lack of courage on the part of the people and of Moses. Numbers 9 and 10, introduced by ⁰⁰⁶¹³Exodus 6:13 (6:14-27 and 6:28 through 7:7), show that after Moses and Aaron have already been mentioned together in 4:14,27 ff; 5:1 ff, and after it has become clear how little they are able of themselves to accomplish anything, they are now here, as it were, for the first time, before the curtain is raised, introduced as those who in the following drama are to be the mediators of God's will (compare the concluding verses of both pericopes, 6:27; 7:7), and they receive directions for their common mission, just at that moment when, humanly speaking, everything is as unfavorable as possible.

(b) The unity of thought here demonstrated is in this case too the protecting wall against the flood-tide of the documentary theory. For this theory involves many difficulties. In ⁰⁰¹¹³Exodus 1:13 f there would be an account of the oppression by the Priestly Code (P), but the motive for this can be found only in the preceding verses, which are ascribed to JE; 2:24 speaks of the Covenant of God With Isaac, concerning which P is said to have reported nothing in the Book of Gen, as in the latter book a reference to this matter is found only in ⁰²⁶⁰²Genesis 26:2-5 R; 26:24 J. In ⁰⁰⁶⁰²Exodus 6:2 ff Moses and Aaron are mentioned; but as the text of P reads we know absolutely nothing from this source as to who these men are. According to 7:1 ff Aaron is to be the speaker for Moses before Pharaoh. But according to P neither Moses nor Aaron speaks a single word. The omissions that are found by critics in documents J and E — which, if they are separated, have lines of demarcation claimed for the separation that are very unsettled — we here pass over in silence.

On the critical theory, the narratives of the Priestly Code (P), in the Book of Ex, as also in Gen, would have discarded many of the stereotyped formulas characteristic of this source (compare ⁰⁰²²³Exodus 2:23 ff; 6:2 ff; 7:1 ff), and in both form and contents would be made very similar to the rest of the text ⁰⁰¹⁰⁹Exodus 1:9,10,12 JE; 1:20 E; 7:1 P; and to a great extent expressions similar to these are here found and in part refer to these. The same must be said concerning 3:7 JE in its relation to 2:23 ff P; 6:6 ff (sibhloth) P in its relation to 1:11 JE; 2:11 E; 5:4,5 JE (in contrast 1:13,14;

2:23). JE, in 4:9 for "dry land," makes use of the term ha-yabbashah, which in ⁰⁰¹⁰⁹Genesis 1:9 f and ⁰²¹⁴¹⁶Exodus 14:16 is ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), and a different expression is used for this thought by J in ⁰⁰⁷²²Genesis 7:22. In reference to ⁰²⁰⁷⁰¹Exodus 7:1 P compare 4:14 E (?). In reference to the hardening of Pharaoh, which is found in all the sources (7:3 P), see above under 1a; in reference to the miracles, and their purpose of making Yahweh known to the Egyptians (7:3-5 P) see the following paragraph. The four generations mentioned in 7:14 ff P find their parallel in ⁰¹⁵¹⁶Genesis 15:16 J (compare 46:8 ff); and the sons of Aaron mentioned in ⁰²⁰⁶²³Exodus 6:23 the Priestly Code (P), Nadab and Abihu, are mentioned also in the text of 24:1,9, ascribed to JE although, except in Leviticus 10 the Priestly Code (P), their names are not found elsewhere in the Pentateuch. In reference to the repetitions, it must be said that ⁰²⁰¹¹³Exodus 1:13 P is either the continuation (in so far as the Israelites instead of being compulsory laborers became slaves), or is a concluding summary, such as is found frequently. The new revelation of God in Exodus 6 the Priestly Code (P), according to chapter 3 JE, finds its psychological and historical motive in the account of the failure described in 5:1 ff JE, and in the discouragement of the Israelites and of Moses resulting therefrom. In the same way the renewed mention by Moses of his difficulties of speech (6:12 P; compare with 4:10 ff J and E (?)) is very characteristic of human ways, and this again necessitates the twice repeated consideration of this matter by God (6:30 R; 4:10 ff J and E (?); concerning the names of God, *see GENESIS; GOD, NAMES OF*).

One difficulty, which is also not made clear by the proposed division of sources, is found in the name of the father-in-law of Moses; since according to ⁰²⁰²¹⁸Exodus 2:18 J, this name is Reuel, and according to 3:1; 18:1 JE, it is Jethro (4:18 E in the form "Jether"); in ⁰⁴⁰⁹Numbers 10:29 JE is called Hobab and a son of Reuel (the King James Version "Raguel") for all of these passages are ascribed to J or E. It is probable that the name Jethro is a title ("Excellency"); and as for the rest, in ⁰⁴⁰⁹Numbers 10:29 *chothen* probably does not mean father-in-law but brother-in-law (⁰⁷⁰¹¹⁶Judges 1:16; 4:11); or in ⁰²⁰²¹⁸Exodus 2:18 we find father and in 2:21 daughter in the place of grandfather and granddaughter; otherwise we should be compelled to accept different traditions, by which view, however, the Mosaic authorship of Exodus would be made impossible (compare IV, below).

(2) ⁰²⁰⁷⁰⁸**Exodus 7:8 through 13:16:**

(a) This section is separated as a matter of course from the rest by the typical number of ten plagues. It is introduced by the transformation of the rod into a serpent in the presence of Pharaoh (7:8-13). To explain the fact that there were ten plagues on the ground of the accidental combination of sources, is from the very outset a precarious undertaking. To this must be added the following reasons that indicate a literary editing of the material. All of the plagues are introduced by the same formula (7:12 JE; 8:1 J; 8:12 P; 8:16 JE; 8:20 JE; 9:1 JE; 9:8 P; 9:13 JE; 10:1,12 JE; 10:21 E; 11:1 E), and in connection with each plague the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh is mentioned (compare (1a) above); compare 7:22 P; 8:11 J; 8:15 P; 8:28 JE; 9:7 JE; 9:12 P; 9:34 JE; 9:35 JE; 10:1 R; 10:20 JE; 10:27 E; 11:10 R; 13:15 D. As is the case in the first section, we find here too in each instance two plagues more closely connected, namely, numbers 1 and 2 already externally united by the double address of Yahweh (compare 7:14 JE; 7:19 P and 7:26 J; 8:1 P), but also by the methods of punishment that are related to each other (water changed to blood and frogs); and, finally, by the extension of the plague (the Nile and beyond the river). In 3 and 4 we have to deal with insects (stinging flies and dung flies); in 5 and 6 with a kind of pest (pest among cattle, and boils); 7 and 8 are again formally joined by the repeated command of Yahweh to Moses in 9:13,12 JE and 10:1,12 JE, as also by the fullness of the account the two show and their similarity, in both also use being made of the staff (9:23 f JE; 10:13 f JE), in the repetition of the emphasis put on the remarkable character of the plague (9:18,24; 10:6,14 JE). By both plagues vegetation is destroyed; and in the plague of locusts special reference is made also to the hail (compare 10:5,12,15). In the case of 9 and 10, the darkness constitutes a connecting link (compare 10:21 E; 11:4 J; 12:12 P; 12:30,31 JE). By the side of the occasional rhythm formed of two members there is also one formed of three members (after the manner of a triole in a measure of two beats). In the case of each group of three plagues, two are announced beforehand (thus 1 JEP and 2 JP; 4 JE and 5 JE; 7 JE and 8 JE; 10 EJ over against 3 the Priestly Code (P), 6 P and 9 E); the first of each group of three plagues, as 1, 4 and 7, is to be announced by Moses on the following morning to Pharaoh (7:15; 8:20; 9:13 JE). Also in regard to the impression caused by the plagues a distinct progress can be noticed, in this too, that the Egyptian sorcerers are active only down to the third plague. Naturally, too, over against these facts, further peculiarities can be pointed out in the separate plagues, e.g. the fact that Goshen, or rather that Israel, is spared in the 4th, 5th, 7th through 10th plagues (8:22; 9:6,26 JE; 10:23 E; 11:7 J);

and in the mention made of the intercession in the 2nd, 4th, 7th, 8th (8:8 J; 8:12; 9:28,33; 10:17 f JE) without thereby destroying the artistic construction of the whole that has been described above, or that in each such case of individuality of presenting the matter there is to be found a reason for claiming a separate source.

(b) In the same way, too, it is not a permissible conclusion, that in the first miracle and in the first three plagues mention is made of the fact that Aaron performed this miracle with his staff (Exodus 7:8 ff,19; 8:5-20 ff P). At any rate, in the parts ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), no absolute uniformity is to be found, since plagues 1 to 3 are commanded to Moses, while the 6th is commanded to Moses and Aaron (Exodus 7:19; 8:1,20 over against 9:8); and since, further, in the 6th plague (Exodus 9:8) it is Moses, and in the 10th (Exodus 12:12) it is God Himself who really carries out the command, and not Aaron, as was the case in the introductory miracles and in the first three plagues. Further, according to JE (Exodus 4:30), it appears that the presupposition is that we are to consider all of the addresses and actions in general as taking place through Aaron, even in those cases where this is not especially mentioned. Only the 1st plague (Exodus 7:14 ff) furnishes an apparent reason for the acceptance of two sources. In this case mention is made at times of the waters of the Nile only, and then of all other waters being changed into blood; and a separation from this point of view at least could be carried through. But this possibility disappears at once in the case of the 2nd plague (frogs), where the passage Exodus 8:1-3, ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), which verses contain the consummation of the plague announced in 7:26-29 J (Hebrew), is altogether necessary for this connection; as otherwise the impression made upon Pharaoh by this plague, which is not mentioned in P at all, would be a torso. The similarity in the construction of the 2nd and the 1st plague, however (compare under (a) above), and the same difference in the mention made of the Nile and of the other waters in the 2nd plague, make it possible and even advisable in the case of the first plague, too, to discard the hypothesis of a difference in sources, because in the 2nd plague this difference cannot be carried out. Then, too, there would be other omissions found in P. According to the customary separation of sources, P would not contain the fulfillment of the threatened tenth plague announced in 12:12 at all. In the same way the statement in 12:28 refers to the carrying out of a command, the announcement of which to Israel in 12:21 ff would be found in another source. Further in 12:37a

we would have the Priestly Code (P), as when the parts belonging to P have been eliminated, the other sources too would contain omissions in 12:21 ff, mostly JE; 12:37b E; 13:3 ff D. In the same way the announcement of a large number of miracles (7:3 P; 11:9 R) is too comprehensive, if these verses refer only to the narratives found in P. In addition, there is a remarkable similarity found in all of the narratives of P with those parts which are ascribed to JE; compare the first miracle in 7:8 ff with 4:2 ff J; 4:17 E. In the Priestly Code (P), too, as is the case with JE, it is stated that the purpose of the miracle is, that Pharaoh, or the Egyptians, or Israel, are to recognize that Yahweh is God and the Lord of the earth, or something to this effect (7:5 P; 7:17 JE; 8:10 R; 8:22; 9:14,29,30 JE; 10:2 R; 11:7 J; compare from the next section, 14:4 P; 14:18 the Priestly Code (P), which at the same time is also the fundamental thought that forms the connecting link of the whole section). The position of ^{‹0210›}Exodus 11:1-3 E between 10:28,29 E and 11:8 J constitutes a difficulty, because in the last-mentioned passages Moses is represented as standing continuously before Pharaoh. The announcement made by Yahweh to Moses, that one more plague is to come, and that the Israelites should borrow articles of value from the Egyptians, must in reality have been made before, but for good reasons it is mentioned for the first time at this place, in order to explain the confident utterance of Moses, that he would not again appear before Pharaoh (10:29). But the fact that according to 12:31 JE Pharaoh does in reality once more cause Moses and Aaron to be called, can readily be explained on the ground of the events that happened in the meantime.

The structure of Exodus 12 f contains nothing that could not have been written by one and the same author. Only Moses naturally did not at once communicate (12:21 ff) to the leading men of Israel the command given in 12:15 ff concerning the unleavened bread, which command had been given for later generations; and not until 13:3 ff is this command mentioned in connection with the order given to the people in the meantime concerning the firstborn (13:1 f) . The further fact, that the story of the exodus reaches a preliminary conclusion in 12:42 before the details of the Passover (verses 3 ff) have been given, is in itself justifiable. As far as contents are concerned, everything in chapters 12 f, namely, the exodus, the festival of unleavened bread, the firstborn, and orders pertaining thereto, that the month of the exodus is to be regarded as the first month, etc., are closely connected with the Passover and the 10th plague. Because the latter had to be described more fully than the other plagues, we find already in 11:9,10,

after the announcement of this plague and its results, a comprehensive notice concerning all the miracles through which Yahweh demonstrated how He, amid great manifestations of power (7:4 P) and with a mighty hand (6:1 JE), has led His people forth.

(3) ¹³¹⁷**Exodus 13:17 through 18:27:**

(a) This section finds its connecting thought in the emphasis placed on the love of Yahweh, on His readiness to help, and His long-suffering in the leading of His at times murmuring people on the road to and as far as Sinai. This section covers two months. What is narrated, beginning with ¹⁶⁰¹Exodus 16:1, transpires even within a single two weeks (compare ¹⁹⁰¹Exodus 19:1). Number 1 (¹³¹⁷Exodus 13:17-22), describes the journey to Etham (out of love God does not lead the people the direct way, since He fears that they will become unfaithful in the event of a battle; Joseph's bones are taken along, since God now really is taking care of His people (compare ⁰⁵²⁴Genesis 50:24,26); Yahweh's friendly presence is shown in the pillar of fire). Number 2 (¹⁴⁰¹Exodus 14:1-31) contains the passage through the Red Sea (Yahweh the helper; compare ¹⁴¹⁰Exodus 14:10,15,13,14,30,21,24,26 f,31, notwithstanding the murmuring of Israel, 14:11 f). Number 3 (¹⁵⁰¹Exodus 15:1 ff) contains the thanksgiving hymn of Moses for Yahweh's help, with which fact each one of the four strophes begins (¹⁵⁰¹Exodus 15:1 ff,6 ff,11,16b ff). Number 4 (¹⁵²⁰Exodus 15:20 f) contains Miriam's responsorium. Number 5 (¹⁵²²Exodus 15:22-27) treats of Marah and Elim (Yahweh proves Himself to be Israel's helper and physician (¹⁵²⁵Exodus 15:25 f) notwithstanding the murmuring of Israel (¹⁵²⁴Exodus 15:24)). Number 6 introduces the last five pericopes, with a designation of the time (¹⁶⁰¹Exodus 16:1-36), and describes the miraculous feeding with manna and quails. (The murmuring is particularly emphasized in ¹⁶⁰²Exodus 16:2,7-9,12. Israel also gathers more than they have been directed to do (¹⁶¹⁶Exodus 16:16 f); reserves some for the following day (¹⁶¹⁹Exodus 16:19 f); collects some on the Sabbath (¹⁶²⁷Exodus 16:27); Yahweh, who in ¹⁶⁰⁶Exodus 16:6-12 alone is mentioned in rapid succession no fewer than ten times, at first does not even utter a word of reproach, and when the Sabbath has been violated He does nothing more than reprove.) Number 7 (¹⁷⁰¹Exodus 17:1-7) reports the help of Yahweh (¹⁷⁰⁴Exodus 17:4) at the Waters of Contention (Strife). He even appears on the rock (¹⁷⁰⁶Exodus 17:6), notwithstanding the murmuring (¹⁷⁰²Exodus 17:2-4,7). Number 8 (¹⁷⁰⁸Exodus 17:8-16) describes the victory over the Amalekites, which furnished the occasion for the erection of the memorial

altar, called `Yahweh-my- Banner.' Possibly in this connection Joshua ("Yahweh helps") was changed from Hosea ([04136]Numbers 13:16). Compare Hengstenberg, Authenthic. des Pentateuches, II, 395 f. Number 9 ([02801]Exodus 18:1-12) shows in a constantly changing variety of expressions that emphasis is laid on the impression which the deeds of God in connection with Israel make on Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, while he was visiting the latter ([02801]Exodus 18:1,8-12). Effective in this connection is also the mention made of the symbolical names of the sons of Moses (Gershom, "I have been a sojourner in a foreign land"; and Eliezer, "The God of my father was my help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" ([02803]Exodus 18:3 f)). Further, the name Mount of God ([02805]Exodus 18:5; compare 18:12) probably is a reminder of the fulfillment of [00312]Exodus 3:12. Number 10 ([02813]Exodus 18:13-17) shows how God helps Moses (compare [02819]Exodus 18:19) through the advice of Jethro to appoint judges. In this part, too, [02137]Exodus 13:17 through 18:27, we have ten sections, which can easily be arranged in groups of two and two. Thus numbers 1 and 2 are connected by their analogous beginnings (13:17,18 RE; 14:1,2 P) and by the cloud of fire (13:21 f JE; 14:19,24 J); numbers 3 and 4 by the responsive hymn; numbers 5 and 6, which already by the feeling of hunger and thirst are connected in thought, by their reference to the ordinances of Yahweh (15:25 D; 16:4 JE ?; 16:28 R); numbers 7 and 8 by the use made of Moses' staff (17:5,9 JE); numbers 9 and 10 by Jethro's person, and the close connection of their contents in point of time (18:13). Further, the Biblical text of this place is clearly presupposed in the list of stations, expressly stated to have been prepared at the command of Moses (Numbers 33). This list, as is acknowledged on all sides, has the characteristics of P; and it takes into consideration not only the portions ascribed to this source, but also the text of JE. Compare [04309]Numbers 33:9 (Marah and Elim) with [02152]Exodus 15:22-27, and [04314]Numbers 33:14 (lack of water in Rephidim) with [02170]Exodus 17:1 ff.

(b) Over against the analysis into different sources the following data in detail can also be advanced. In P the last demonstration of the power of Yahweh over Pharaoh would be indeed endangered in [02140]Exodus 14:4,15 ff,21a, but afterward would not be related. In [02160]Exodus 16:1 we cannot find in the Priestly Code (P), unless we bring in also 15:27 from JE, how Israel came to be in Elim. On the other hand, in 16:4 ff (JE?) the promise of bread from heaven is groundless without the preceding verses, which are attributed to P; and without 17:1 the Priestly Code (P), we do not know to what the word "there" in 17:3 belonging to JE refers, and how in 17:8 JE

the Israelites had come to Rephidim. How entirely data taken from the language utterly fail here in establishing the separation of sources we see from the fact that in Exodus the distribution of the different portions and verses between P and E becomes a matter of doubt, and also in Exodus 16 a harmony of view has not been gained as to whether only the Priestly Code (P), or in addition also J, E or JE have contributed to the text. The hymn found in ^{◁[2150]▷}Exodus 15:1 ff, which certainly is an old composition, presupposes passages which are assigned to different sources, and in this way speaks for the unity of the text. Compare 15:2 with 14:30 J; 14:13 JE (?); 15:3 with 14:14 JE (?); 14:25 J; 14:4a with 14:9 P; 14:4b with 14:7 JE; 14:8 with 14:22 EP; 14:29 P; with 14:9.

On the other hand, ^{◁[2149]▷}Exodus 14:19a and b cannot be utilized in favor of a division of sources E and J; but rather the analogous structure of this passage presupposes the same author, and there is only indicated what elsewhere is always a presupposition, namely, that God Himself has taken His abode somewhere in the cloud of fire (13:21,22 JE; 14:24 J; compare 40:34 ff P) Just as little are the two commands found in 14:16 to be divided between P and E and J, one stating what Moses does, and the other what Yahweh does, since both rather belong together (compare 9:22 f with 9:33; 10:13). At first glance 16:6 ff does not appear to be in its proper place, as Moses and Aaron in 16:6,7 have already told Israel what only in 16:9 ff is revealed through the appearance of Yahweh and His injunction to Moses. But these very verses are in harmony with the character of the whole section (compare under a above), since it is here stated that under all circumstances Israel is to be convinced of this, that Yahweh has proven Himself to be Yahweh, and has heard their murmuring. In addition, the appearance of Yahweh in 16:10 is clearly announced by 16:7. Accordingly, 16:9 ff serve only to confirm and strengthen what is found in 16:6 ff. The fact that not until in 18:2 JE Jethro brings the wife and the sons of Moses, while the latter himself according to 4:20 J had taken them along when he joined Israel, finds a satisfactory explanation in 18:2b. He sent them back doubtless because of the conduct of Zipporah on the occasion of the circumcision of her son (4:25 J). The fact that Jethro comes to Moses at the Mount of God (18:5 JE), while the latter does not arrive at Mt. Sinai until 19:1 ff according to P and J, is no contradiction; for by the Mount of God is meant the whole chain of Horeb, which Moses has already reached according to 17:6 JE; but Mt. Sinai is a single mountain. The special legal ordinances and decisions mentioned in 18:20 JE before the giving of the

law (19 ff E and JE) are in perfect harmony with 15:25 D; 16:4 JE (?); 16:28 R.

(4) **Exodus 19:1 through 24:18a:**
(a) This fourth section contains the conclusion of the covenant at Mt. Sinai (compare 19:5 R at beginning; 24:7,8 JE toward the end). The contents cover a period of ten days (compare 19:10,11,16; 24:3,1 JE; 24:16 P). The text of this section can again be divided into ten pericopes. After the introduction (19:1-8), which contains a cardinal feature of Exodus (compare under I, 2 above), numbers 1 and 2 (19:9-19,20-25) report the preparation for the conclusion of the Covenant. Number 2 in Exodus 19:23 refers expressly to number 1, but is distinguished from number 1 through the new addition in 19:20 after 19:18, as also through the express amplified application of the ordinances referring to purifications and the restriction of the prohibition to the priests (compare 19:22,21,24 with 19:10,12). Numbers 3 and 4 (Exodus 20:1-17,18-26) contain the Decalogue and the directions for the cults, together with a description of the impression made by the revelation of the law. Numbers 5 and 6 (Exodus 21:1 through 23:13 expressly circumscribed by a subscription, 23:14-19) contain legal ordinances and further directions for the cults. Numbers 3-6 accordingly contain the laws or the conditions of the Covenant. Now follow in numbers 7 and 8 the promises of the Covenant (Exodus 23:20-26,27-33), which in verses 20 and 27, 23 and 28 and 24 and 32 f correspond to each other. Numbers 9 and 10 (Exodus 24:3-8,9-18a, combined more closely by 24:1,2) describe the conclusion of the Covenant and the Covenant congregation in different stages. Further, typical numbers at this place also appear in the laws, numbers 3-6. Number 4 (Exodus 20:18 ff) contains five directions (Exodus 20:23a,23b,24,25,26); number 6 (Exodus 23:14-19) is divided into 2 X 5 ordinances (compare the anaphoristic addition in Exodus 23:14 and 17), namely, verses Exodus 23:14,15a,15b,16a,16b-17,18a,18b,19a,19b. Number 3 (Exodus 20:1 ff, the Decalogue) contains, according to Exodus 34:28; Deuteronomy 4:13; 10:4, "ten words" margin, according to the two tables doubtless divided into two groups of five each, no matter how in detail we may divide and number them. In the same way number 5 (21:1 through 23:13) falls into ten sections, separate in form and contents, yet belonging together; and these again are divided into 2 X 5 groups, as will appear presently. Taken altogether then we have in numbers 3-6 (Exodus 20:1 through 23:19)

17 X 5 legal ordinances or groups of laws. While in the historical sections the divisions into 5 X 2 pericopes was made, we here find three times the division into 2 X 5, although here too the beginning of the last five pericopes in the second and third sections is particularly noticeable (compare [0908]Exodus 9:8 and [1601]Exodus 16:1), and in the same way a new division can be made at [0418]Exodus 4:18. Number 5 ([2101]Exodus 21:1 through 23:13) is, however, divided as follows: I and II ([2102]Exodus 21:2-6,7-11) ordinances for the protection of slaves; III and IV ([2112]Exodus 21:12-17,18-27) protection of life, or liberty, of the dignity of parents, and hygienic laws; V ([2128]Exodus 21:28 through 22:3) harm to animals; VI ([2204]Exodus 22:4-16) to property; VII ([2217]Exodus 22:17-26) against witchcraft, against imitating the Canaanites, and lack of mercy; VIII ([2227]Exodus 22:27-30) the relation to God; IX and X ([2301]Exodus 23:1-5,6-12) ethical and humane law practice. I through IV accordingly contain laws pertaining to persons; V and VI those referring to things; VII through X, those referring to religion, morality, and administration of justice. But the chief line of demarcation is to be made after V; for I through V contain each four ordinances, VI through X each seven, which in the original text in almost each case are in their language separated from each other by particular conjunctions or by the construction. Only in VI ([2204]Exodus 22:4-16) one command seems to be lacking; for only [2204]Exodus 22:4,5,6 f,9-12,13 f,15 f are distinguished by the "ki" in the beginning; but the seventh ordinance is found in 22:8. Here too, in each case, II and I, two and two as a rule are more closely connected, after the manner of the division in the first three sections, 1:8 through 7:7; 7:8 through 13:16; 13:17 through 18:27; at least this is the case in I and II, III and IV through VII and VIII, IX and X.

(b) In this section, too, [1901]Exodus 19:1 through 24:18a, there is no real occasion for a division into sources. It is claimed that P is found only in 19:1,2a; 24:15-18; but 19:1,2a is indispensable for 19:2b on account of the word "there"; and before 24:15 ff there is an omission, if the preceding verses are to be ascribed to a different source. The duplicates 19:8,9; 19:18,20 are best explained by the assumption of a new beginning in 19:9 at 19:20 (compare above); 24:1,2, which at the same time introduces 24:9 ff, is placed before 24:3, because in point of time it belongs here. According to the original text, the translation at this place must read: "To Moses he spoke," in contrast to the ordinances which, in 21:1 ff, are addressed to the congregation of Israel. Certainly 24:3-8 is purposely formulated to show in almost the same words that 24:3 reports the

Violation and 24:4 ff the writing of the decision to obey on the part of Israel (24:3b and 24:7b). It is not perfectly clear to the reader where Moses was during the promulgation of the Decalogue, whether upon the mountain or at the foot of the mountain (compare 19:24 f; 20:18 ff; but also Deuteronomy 5:5). In view of the importance of the matter itself and the vividness of the narrative and the continual change in the place where Moses abode, it is psychologically easily understood that the clearness of the account has suffered somewhat.

(5) **Exodus 24:18b through 31:18:**

(a) During the forty days which Moses tarries with God on the mountain, and at the conclusion of which he receives the two tables of the law (31:18), God converses with him seven times (25:1; 30:11,17,22,34; 31:1,12). Number 1 (25:1 through 30:10) contains directions in reference to the building of the Tabernacle, and laws for the priests serving in it. Numbers 2-6 bring a number of directions supplementing number 1, namely, number 2 (Exodus 30:11-16), individual tax; number 3 (Exodus 30:17-21), copper washing vessels; number 4 (Exodus 30:22-33), oil for anointing; number 5 (Exodus 30:34-38), incense; number 6 (Exodus 31:1-11), the calling of Bezalel and Aholiab to be the master builders; additionally and in conclusion, number 7 (Exodus 31:12-17), the Sabbath command. It is probably not accidental that the Sabbath idea is touched upon 7 times, namely, in addition to the present passage, also in

(a) Exodus 16:5 JE (?); 16:23-29 P and R;

(b) 20:8-11 E;

(c) 23:10-12 E;

(d) 24:16 P;

(e) 34:21 J;

(f) 35:1-3 the Priestly Code (P), and that as is the case in this present passage, other passages too, such as 24:16 P; 35:1-3 P conclude a main section, and 22:10-22 a subordinate section, with this reference.

The first more complete pericope itself in Exodus (25:1 through 30:10) is, however, divided into 12 pieces (we cannot at this place enter into details in reference to the typical numbers found so often in the measurements of

the Tabernacle, but can refer only to the cubical form of the Holy of Holies on the basis of 10 cubits), namely,

(1) contributions for the sanctuary (25:1-9);

(2) the holy ark (25:10-22);

(3) table of shewbread (25:23-30);

(4) golden candlesticks (25:31-40);

(5) tabernacle (26:1-37) in which at the same time the articles mentioned from 2 to 4 are placed (compare 26:33 ff);

(6) altar for burnt sacrifices (27:1-8);

(7) court (27:9-19) in which this altar stood (compare 40:29,33);

(8) oil for the lights (27:20,21);

(9) sacred garments for the priests (28:1-43);

(10) consecration of priests (29:1-37);

(11) the burnt sacrifices (29:38-46);

(12) incense altar (30:1-10).

The five articles included in 8 to 12 are combined into a contrast to the five in 1 to 7 by their express reference to the priests (compare in addition to 9 and 10 also 27:21; 29:44; 30:7 f,10). With the incense altar, which was of great importance, and of equal importance with the great altar on the Day of Atonement (30:10), this section closes (compare (b)).

Thus it will under all circumstances be better to search for an explanation for putting oil in the place of the candlesticks and of the incense altar, which at first seems surprising, than in the case of every difficulty to appeal to a redactor's working without system or order. However, the entire portion [02418]Exodus 24:18b through 31:18 finds its explanation in the promise of 25:8 that Yahweh will dwell in the midst of Israel (compare 29:45 f). He is enthroned on the ark, in which the accusing law as the expression of the Divine will is deposited (for this reason called ha-`edhuth; 25:16,21; 26:33,14), but above the atonement lid, the kapporeth, at which on the Day of Atonement, the atonement ceremony is carried out (compare 25:17-22; Leviticus 16; *see DAY OF ATONEMENT*.

(b) This whole section, with the exception of Exodus 31:18 E (?) is ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), although at this place, though without good reasons, different strata are distinguished. In regard to the contradiction claimed to exist in the different persons to be anointed (high priest, or all the priests; compare 29:7 over against 28:41; 29:21), *see LEVITICUS*. Also the duplicates of the tamidh sacrifice and of the candlesticks (compare I, 3, above) are not at all the decisive factor in proof of a difference of sources within the parts treating of the priests, providing it can be shown that each passage stands where it belongs. With regard to the candlesticks, *see LEVITICUS*. In addition compare passages like Matthew 10:39 and 16:25; 10:22 and 24,13; 6:14 ff and 18:35; 5:29 f and 18:8 ff; 19:30 and 20:16. But as far as attributing certain passages to P in general is concerned, it is self-evident that ordinances referring to the cults make use of technical terms pertaining to the cults, without this fact justifying any conclusion as to a particular author or group of authors. On the other hand, it could not at all be understood how P could so often call the Decalogue ha-`edhuth, without having contained this all-important law itself (compare Exodus 25:16,21 f; 26:33 f; 34:29; 38:21, etc.). On the other hand, as is well known, the fourth commandment (Exodus 20:8-11 E) expressly refers back to Genesis 2:2,3, that is, to P; also Exodus 23:15 to 12:20.

(6) **Exodus 32:1 through 35:3:**

(a) God's promise to dwell in the midst of Israel, the turning-point in the fifth section, seems to have become a matter of doubt, through the apostasy of Israel, but is nevertheless realized in consequence of the intercession of Moses and of the grace of God, which, next to His primitive holiness, is emphasized very strongly. This entire sixth section is to be understood from this standpoint. As was the case in the preceding section, the forty days are prominent in this too (compare 34:28 J with 24:18 P). We can divide the contents here also into ten pericopes. Number 1 (32:1-14) reports that Yahweh tells Moses of the idolatry with the golden calf, that He is determined to destroy Israel, but is influenced to change this determination by the intercession of Moses. Number 2 (32:15-29) describes the wrath of Moses and the punishment through him. He breaks the tablets into pieces, grinds the golden calf into powder, reproves Aaron, dissolves through the Levites the curse which had for this reason impended over them since Genesis 49:5-7 and causes this to be changed into a blessing: three thousand killed. Number 3 (32:30-35) reports that Yahweh at the petition of Moses will send some of His angels, but later on will

punish the people for their sins. Number 4 (33:1-6) reports that Yahweh Himself no longer accompanies His people, which, on the one hand, is an act of grace, since the presence of God would even harm the people, but on the other hand is a punishment, and is felt as such by Israel. Number 5 (33:7-11) declares that God meets Moses only outside of the camp in a tent, but communes with him face to face. Number 6 introduces the last six pericopes in a natural way, since God's grace is appearing in constantly increasing glory (33:12-33). Here we have the petition of Moses to Yahweh that He in person should accompany him and show him His glory (Yahweh's grace is made especially prominent in 33:12,13,16,17,19). Number 7 (34:1-10) describes the preparation for the new conclusion of the covenant; Yahweh appears to Moses as the gracious, merciful, long-suffering kind, and faithful God, so that Moses again appeals to His grace. Number 8 (34:11-28) describes the new establishment of the covenant on the basis of the renewal of the Divine and grandiose promises of ordinances pertaining to religion and cults, and the ten words. Number 9 (34:29-35) describes how, in consequence of his close communion with God, Moses' face shines. Number 10 (35:1-3) contains the Sabbath command (see (5a)). Numbers 9 and 10 give expression to the renewed covenant relationship. If we again in the larger group 1 to 8 take two and two together we find that each of these four groups contains a petition of Moses: [0321]Exodus 32:11 ff; 33:30-32; 33:12 ff; 38:8,9. The entire section brings out equally prominently the love and the holiness of God, and does this in such a way that both characteristics find their expression in each group of two of these ten numbers. The progress beyond the third section (leading Israel to Sinai) is noticeable, since the murmuring is in each case followed only by an expression of the love of God; but equally this present section stands in contrast to Numbers 11 ff, where, on the occasion of the continuous murmuring of Israel the love of God is not indeed ignored, but it must take a place in the background as compared with His punitive holiness, which is particularly apparent in the story of the return of the spies in [04411]Numbers 14:11 ff. Here is at once seen the great similarity with the present section of [04412]Numbers 14:12,15,16,17 ff and with [03210]Exodus 32:10,12; 34:6 f, but at the same time the great difference caused by a divergency of the events (compare [04421]Numbers 14:21 ff). In contrast to this, [03234]Exodus 32:34 refers back to Numbers 14, and [03235]Exodus 32:35 is a proleptic judgment based on this experience.

(b) It is incomprehensible how critics have found in the renewal of the covenant caused by the apostasy of Israel and in the conditions of this

renewal, namely, in the Books of the Covenant and in the Decalogue, duplicates, which are distributed between E and J (Exodus 20:1 ff; 21 ff; 24:8 through 34:1 ff,28; 34:11-26; 34:27). But in Exodus 34:11-26 there is no sign of the number ten being used in connection with the ordinances referring to the religion and the cults. Goethe's attempt to find at this place the original Decalogue, which effort is constantly being repeated, is accordingly without any foundation, even in the use of the number ten. In 34:28 b, according to 34:1 and tradition (compare Deuteronomy 10:2,4; also Exodus 24:12; 31:18), Yahweh is to be regarded as the subject. Again Exodus 33:4 and 5 ff are not duplicates. In 33:4 the people are described as having laid aside their ornaments a single time as a sign of repentance; according to 33:5,6 the people permanently dispense with these, a state of mind which makes it possible for God again to show His mercy. It is an arbitrary assumption that these ornaments were used in the construction of the Tabernacle, the building of which had been announced beforehand in Exodus 25 ff, so that in front of 33:7 a parallel account to 35 ff P taken from JE would have been omitted. In 33:7 ff according to the text the author has in mind a tent already in existence, which up to this time had been standing within the camp and now had to be taken without, because Yahweh for the present can no longer dwell in the midst of the people (32:34; 33:3,1), until Moses, through his intercession, again makes this possible (33:15-17; 34:9,10). And the promised tabernacle takes the place of the provisional tent (Exodus 35 ff), which, as is done by the Septuagint, is probably to be preferred to Moses' own tent. In the Priestly Code (P), to whom 34:29 ff is attributed, such a provisional arrangement is presupposed in 34:35, since already at this place, and before the building of the tabernacle in Exodus 35 ff, mention is made of the fact that Moses entered for the purpose of receiving the revelation of God. This accordingly presupposes what is reported in 33:7 ff. Even without the facts mentioned and for other reasons, too, an omission must be accepted before 34:29 ff; for 34:29 speaks of the tables of the Law, concerning the origin of which P has reported nothing; and in 34:32 concerning the commandments which Moses received on Mr. Sinai and had imparted to the people, which, however, do not refer to the directions that were given in Exodus 25 ff, since these, according to 35:4 ff, are yet to be expressly communicated to the people.

(7) **Exodus 35:4 through 40:38:**
(a) The construction of the Tabernacle. This section is divided into four

pericopes, each with four subdivisions (compare Structure of Leviticus 16 in *DAY OF ATONEMENT*). The same principle of division is found also in the history of Abraham and in Deuteronomy 12 through 26. Number I (⁰²⁵⁰⁴Exodus 35:4 through 36:7) describes the preparation for the construction:

(1) ⁰²⁵⁰⁴Exodus 35:4-19 appeals for contributions for this purpose;

    (2) 35:20-29, contributions;

    (3) 35:30 through 36:1, characterization of the builders;

    (4) 36:2-7, delivering the contributions to the builders.

Numbers II and III (⁰²⁶⁰⁸Exodus 36:8 through 38:31; 39:1-31) report the construction of the Tabernacle and the preparation of the priests garments (compare ⁰²⁹³²Exodus 39:32,1); number II:

(1) ⁰²⁶⁰⁸Exodus 36:8-38, dwelling-place;

    (2) 37:1 through 38:9, utensils;

    (3) 38:10-20, court;

    (4) 38:24-31, cost of 38:1-3;

Number III

    (1) 39:2-7, shoulder garment;

    (2) 39:8-21, pocket;

    (3) 39:22-26, outer garment;

    (4) 39:27-31, summary account concerning coats, miter, bonnets, breeches, girdle, diadem.

Number IV (39:32 through 40:38) reports the completion:

    (1) 39:32-43, consecration of these objects;

    (2) 40:1-15, command to erect;

    (3) 40:16-33, carrying out this command;

    (4) 40:34-38, entrance of the glory of Yahweh. In this way the dwelling of Yahweh, which had been promised in 25:8 the Priestly Code (P), and in Exodus 32 through 34 JE had been uncertain, has become a reality. The whole section is closely connected with Exodus 25 through

31, yet is independent in character. The full details found in both groups are completely justified by the importance of the object. It is self-evident that at this place, too, the language of the cults is demanded by the object itself.

(b) The attempts to distribute this section among different authors are a total failure in view of the unity of the structure, which is independent also over against Exodus 25 through 31. Since the numbers given in 38:26 agree entirely with the numbers gathered later in ^{‹0122›}Numbers 2:32, it is evident that for the latter the lists for the contributions were used, which in itself is very probable because it was practical. In case this section is ascribed to P it is inexplicable how the writer can in ^{‹0484›}Exodus 40:34 ff speak of the pillar of fire as of something well known, since this has not yet been mentioned in the parts ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), but has been in 13:21 f JE; 14:19,24 J.

III. HISTORICAL CHARACTER.

1. General Consideration:

The fact that extra-Israelitish and especially Egyptian sources that can lay claim to historical value have reported nothing authentic concerning the exodus of Israel need not surprise us when we remember how meager these documents are and how one-sided Egyptian history writing is. Whether the expulsion of the lepers and the unclean, who before this had desolated the country and acquired supremacy over it as reported by Manetho and other historians, is an Egyptian version of the exodus of Israel, cannot be investigated at this place, but is to the highest degree improbable. If Israel was oppressed by the Egyptians for a long period, then surely the latter would not have invented the fable of a supremacy on the part of Israel; and, on the other hand, it would be incomprehensible that the Israelites should have changed an era of prosperity in their history into a period of servitude. Over against this the remembrance of the exodus out of Egypt not only is re-echoed through the entire literature of Israel (compare I, 4, above), but the very existence of the people of God forces us imperatively to accept some satisfactory ground for its origin, such as is found in the story of the exodus and only here. In addition, the Book compare Exodus shows a good acquaintance with the localities and the conditions of Egypt, as also of the desert. It is indeed true that we are still in doubt on a number of local details. But other statements in the book

have in such a surprising manner been confirmed by discoveries and geographical researches, that we can have the greatest confidence in regard to the other difficulties: compare e.g. Naville's The Store-city of Pithom (⁕Exodus 1:11). In general, the opening chapters of Ex, especially the narratives of the different plagues, contain so much Egyptian coloring, that this could scarcely have resulted from a mere theoretical study of Egypt, especially since in the narrative everything makes the impression of resulting from recent experience. The fact that Israel from its very origin received ordinances in regard to religion, morality, law and cults, is explained from the very conditions surrounding this origin and is indispensable for the explanation of the later development of the nation. None of the later books or times claim to offer anything essentially new in this respect; even the prophets appear only as reformers; they know of the election of Israel, and, on the other hand, everywhere presuppose as something self-evident the knowledge of a righteous, well-pleasing relation with God and chide the violation of this relation as apostasy. Ethical monotheism as the normal religion of Israel is reflected in the same way in all the sources of Israel's history, as has been proven in my work ("Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit," in the May, 1903, issue of Beitrage zur Forderung christlicher Theologie). And the idea that an oriental people, especially if they came out of Egypt, should have had no religious cult, is in itself unthinkable. If all of these norms, also the direction for the cults in the Books of Covenant, of the Priestly Code, or D, at least in the kernel, do not go back to the Mosaic times, then we have to deal with an insoluble problem (compare my work, Are the Critics Right?).

2. The Miraculous Character:

The Book of Exodus is as a matter of fact from its first to its last page filled with miraculous stories; but in this characteristic these contents agree perfectly with the whole history of redemption. In this immediate and harmonious activity of God, for the purpose of establishing a chosen people, all these miracles find their purpose and explanation, and this again is only in harmony with other periods of sacred history. The reason is self-explanatory when these miracles are found grouped at the turning-points in this history, as is the case also in the critical age of Elijah and Elisha, and in the experiences and achievements of "Jonah," so significant for the universality of the Biblical religion. Above all is this true in the ministry of Jesus Christ; and also again in His return to judgment. And in the same

way, too, we find this at the beginning of Israel as a nation (see my article in Murray's Dictionary). Compare in this respect the rapid numerical growth of the nation, the miracles, the plagues, in the presence of Pharaoh, the passage through the Red Sea, the miraculous preservation of the people in the desert, the many appearances of God to Moses, to the people, to the elders, the protection afforded by the cloud, the providential direction of the people of Israel and of the Egyptians, and of individual persons (Moses and Pharaoh). The fact that the author himself knows that Israel without the special care and protection of God could not have survived in the desert is in complete harmony with his knowledge of the geographical situation already mentioned.

3. The Legislative Portions:

If any part of the laws in Exodus is to be accepted as Mosaic, it is the Decalogue. It is true that the ten commandments are found in two recensions (Exodus 20; Deuteronomy 5). The original form is naturally found in Exodus 20. Only Moses could regard himself as inwardly so independent of the Decalogue as it had been written by God, that he did not consider himself bound in Deuteronomy 5 by its exact wording. The legal ordinances in Exodus 21:1 ff have found an analogy already in Code of Hammurabi, more than 500 years older although moving in a lower sphere. As Israel had lived in Goshen, and according to Genesis 26:12 Isaac had even been engaged in agriculture, and Israel could not remain in the desert but was to settle down in permanent abodes again, the fact of the existence of this law of Israel, which in a religious and ethical sense rises infinitely above the Code of Hammurabi, is in itself easily understood. And again since the sacred ark of the covenant plays an important role also in the other sources of the Pentateuch (Numbers 10:33 ff; 14:44 JE; Deuteronomy 10:1-8; 31:9,25) and in the history of Israel (compare Joshua 3; 6:6-8; 8:33; Judges 20:27; 1 Samuel 6:2 ff; 2 Samuel 15:24 f; 1 Kings 3:15; 6:19; 8:1-9), then a suitable tent, such as is announced in Exodus 25 ff, and was erected according to Exodus 35 ff, was an actual necessity.

As the Paschal sacrifice, according to Exodus 12:3 ff; 12:43 ff P; 12:21 ff JE (?) was to be killed in the houses, and this on the 14th of Nisan in the evening (12:6), and as P directs that a festival assembly shall be held on the next day at the sanctuary (compare Leviticus 23:6 ff; Numbers 28:17 ff), these are conditions which can be understood only in case Israel is regarded as being in the wilderness. For this reason Deuteronomy

16:5 ff changes this direction, so that from now on the Passover is no longer to be celebrated in the houses but at the central sanctuary. In the same way the direction <02229>Exodus 22:29, which ordered that the firstborn of animals should be given to Yahweh already on the 8th day, could be carried out only during the wanderings in the desert, and is for this reason changed by <05423>Deuteronomy 14:23 ff; 15:19 ff to meet the conditions of the people definitely settled after this wandering. Compare my work, Are the Critics Right? 188-89, 194-95.

4. Chronology:

As is well known, the average critic handles the Biblical chronology in a very arbitrary manner and is not afraid of changing the chronology of events by hundreds of years. If we leave out of consideration some details that often cause great difficulties, we still have a reliable starting-point in the statements found in <11060>1 Kings 6:1 and <02240>Exodus 12:40 f. According to the first passage, the time that elapsed between the exodus of the Israelites and the building of the temple in the 4th year of Solomon was 480 years; and according to the second passage, the time of the stay in Egypt was 430 years. A material change in the first-mentioned figures is not permitted by the facts in the Book of Judges, even if some particular data there mentioned are contemporaneous; and to reduce the 430 years of the stay in Egypt, as might be done after the Septuagint, which includes also the stay of the patriarchs in Canaan in this period, or to reduce the whole period from the entrance into Egypt to the building of the temple, is contrary to the synchronism of Hammurabi and Abraham (Genesis 14). The first-mentioned could not have lived later than 2100 BC. The 430 years in <02240>Exodus 12:40,41 P are also, independently of this passage, expressly supported by the earlier prediction of an oppression of Israel for 400 years from the time of Abraham (<01513>Genesis 15:13 J); and the 480 years of <11060>1 Kings 6:1 are confirmed by <07126>Judges 11:26, according to which, at the time of the suppression by the Amorites and of Jephthah as judge, already 30 years must have elapsed since the east Jordan country had been occupied by the Israelites. According to this the exodus must have taken place not long after 1500 BC. And in perfect agreement with this supposition would be the condition of affairs in Palestine as we know them from the Tell el-Amarna Letters dating about 1450-1400 BC, according to which the different Canaanitish cities had been attacked by the Chabiri in the most threatening manner, as this is reported too in the Book of Joshua. As is well known linguistically, too, the identification of the

Chabiri with the Hebrews is unobjectionable. Finally, on the well-known Menepthah stele of the 13th century BC, Israel is mentioned in connection with Canaan, Ashkelon, Gezer, Y-nu`m (= Janoah, [0606]Joshua 16:6,7?), and accordingly is already regarded as settled in Canaan. A date supported in such different ways makes it impossible for me to find in Rameses II the Pharaoh of the oppression, and in Menepthah the Pharaoh of the exodus (both between 1300 and 1200 BC). A conclusive proof that the name and the original building of the city Rameses ([0111]Exodus 1:11 JE; 12:37 P; [3303]Numbers 33:3,5 P) necessarily leads back to Rameses II can, at least at the present time, not yet be given (compare on this point also, Kohler, Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte des Alten Testamentes, I, 238 ff).

5. Unjustifiable Attacks:

All these attacks on the historical character of this book which originate only in the denial of the possibility of miracles, the Christian theologian can and must ignore. Such attacks do not stand on the ground of history but of dogma. Let us accordingly examine other objections. Thus, it is claimed that the number of men in Israel, which in [1237]Exodus 12:37 is said to have been 600,000, is too high, because not only the desert but Goshen also would not have been able to support two million people, and Israel had been too short a time in Egypt to grow into so populous a nation. Yet Israel, beginning with the time of the oppression, which, according to 2:23; 18 continued many years and hence began before the highest number in population had been reached, had claims for support from the Egyptian corn (grain) granaries; and the 430 years in 12:40 certainly cannot be reduced, as has been shown under (4) above. To this must be added that in [0107]Exodus 1:7,9 f, 12,20 f the rapid numerical growth of Israel is represented as the result of a Divine blessing. Then, too, in the company of Jacob and his descendants, doubtless servants, male and female, came down to Egypt (compare the 318 servants of Abraham alone in Genesis 14). The figures in [1237]Exodus 12:37 P are further confirmed by [1121]Numbers 11:21 (according to critics from JE) and by the results of the two enumerations, Numbers 1 f (2:31; compare [3826]Exodus 38:26 (603, 550)) and [2651]Numbers 26:51 (601, 730). The attacks made also on the existence of the Tabernacle must be rejected as groundless. According to the Wellhauscn school the Tabernacle is only a copy of the temple of Solomon dated back into the Mosaic times; and the fact that there is only one central seat of the cults is regarded as a demand first made by the Deuteronomistic legislation in the 7th century. Against this latter claim

militates not only the impossibility of placing Deuteronomy at this time (compare my work Are the Critics Right? 1-55), but also the legislation of the Book of the Covenant, which, in ⁰²³¹⁷Exodus 23:17,19; 34:23,14,26 presupposes a sanctuary, and which even in the passages incorrectly analyzed by Wellhausen, ⁰²⁰²⁴Exodus 20:24 (compare again, Are the Critics Right ? 19, 48, 161 ff, 189 ff) speaks only of a single altar (compare also ⁰²¹¹⁴Exodus 21:14) and not of several existing at the same time. (The matter mentioned here is the building of an altar, according to a theophany, for temporary use.) Against the critical view we can quote the prophetic utterances of Amos, who condemns the cult in the Northern Kingdom (5:4 f), but teaches that God speaks out of Zion (1:2; compare probably also, 9:1); those of Isaiah (1:12; 2:2 ff; 4:5 f; 6; 8:18; 18:7; 30:29; 33:20; 14:32; 28:16); also the facts of history (compare especially the central sanctuary in Shiloh, 1 Samuel 1 through 4; ⁰⁷²¹⁹Judges 21:19, which is placed on the same level with Zion in ²⁴⁷¹²Jeremiah 7:12 ff; 26:6; ¹⁹⁷⁶⁰Psalm 78:60-72). To this must be added such statements as ¹⁰⁷⁰⁶2 Samuel 7:6; ⁰⁶⁸⁰¹Joshua 18:1; ¹¹⁰⁰⁴1 Kings 3:4; 8:4; ¹³¹⁶⁹1 Chronicles 16:39,40; ¹⁴⁰¹⁰2 Chronicles 1:3. All these facts are not overthrown by certain exceptions to the rule (compare *LEVITICUS*). But the whole view leads to conclusions that in themselves cannot possibly be accepted. What a foolish fancy that would have been, which would have pictured the Tabernacle in the most insignificant details as to materials, amounts, numbers, colors, objects, which in Numbers 4 has determined with exact precision who was to carry the separate parts of the tent, while e.g. for the service of the Tabernacle, so important for later times, only very general directions are given in ⁰⁴⁸⁰²Numbers 18:2,4,6; 8:22 ff. This complete picture would be entirely without a purpose and meaningless, since it would have no connection whatever with the tendency ascribed to it by the critics, but rather, in part, would contradict it. Compare my book, Are the Critics Right? 72 ff, 87 ff.

That particularly in the post-exilic period it would have been impossible to center the Day of Atonement on the covering of the ark of the covenant, since the restoration of this ark was not expected according to ²⁴³¹⁶Jeremiah 3:16, has already been emphasized in *DAY OF COVENANT*. If God had really determined to give to His people a pledge of the constant presence of His grace, then there can be absolutely no reason for doubting the erection of the Tabernacle, since the necessary artistic ability and the possession of the materials needed for the structure are sufficiently given in the text (compare also ⁰²⁵⁰⁹Exodus 25:9,40; 26:30; 27:8 through 31:2 ff; 35:30 ff through 12:35; 3:21,22; 11:2 f; ⁰¹⁵¹⁴Genesis 15:14; ⁰²³⁰⁴Exodus 33:4

ff). The examination of the separate passages in Ex, such as the relation of 20:24 (see above) to Deuteronomy, or the ordinances concerning the Passover and the firstborn (Exodus 12 f), and other laws in the different codices, goes beyond the purpose of this article (compare however under 3 above, at the close).

IV. AUTHORSHIP.

1. Connection with Moses:

As the Book of Exodus is only a part of a large work (compare I, 3 above), the question as to authorship cannot be definitely decided at this place, but we must in substance restrict ourselves to those data which we find in the book itself. In several parts it is expressly claimed that Moses wrote them. He sang the hymn found in Exodus 15, after the passage of the Red Sea, and it breathes the enthusiasm of what the author has himself experienced. Exodus 15:13 ff do not speak against the unity of the hymn, but rather for it, since the perfects here found as prophetic perfects only give expression to the certainty that the Israelites will take possession of the land of promise. In the course of history the nations often acted quite differently from what is here stated and often antagonized Israel (compare Numbers 14:39-45; 20:18 ff; 21:4,21-35; 22:6; Joshua 6 through 12; also Exodus 13:17). In Exodus 15:13,17 not only Zion is meant, but all Canaan; compare Leviticus 25:23; Numbers 35:34; Jeremiah 2:7; for har, "mountain," compare Deuteronomy 1:7,20 ("hill-country"); 3:25; Psalm 78:54,55. According to Exodus 17:14 Moses writes in a book the promise of Yahweh to destroy Amalek from the face of the earth. It is absolutely impossible that only this statement should have been written without any connecting thought and without at least a full description of the situation as given in Exodus 17:8 ff. And as 17:14 linguistically at least can mean merely `to write a sheet,' as Numbers 5:23, it yet appears in the light of the connection of a comparison with related passages, such as Joshua 24:26; 1 Samuel 10:25, much more natural to think of a book in this connection, in which already similar events had been recorded or could at any time be recorded.

The Ten Words (Exodus 20:1 ff) were written down by God Himself and then handed over to Moses; compare Exodus 24:12; 31:18; 34:1 ff,28 (Deuteronomy 10:2,4). The laws and judicial ordinances beginning with Exodus 21, according to 24:4, were also written down by Moses himself, and the same is true of the ordinances in 34:11 ff, according to

34:27.

The proof that formerly had to be furnished, to the effect that the knowledge of the art of writing in the days of Moses was not an anachronism, need not trouble us now, since both in Egypt and Babylon much older written documents have been discovered. But already from the passages quoted we could conclude nothing else than that Moses understood how to make use of different forms of literature — the poetical, the historical and the legal — unless the different statements to this effect by decisive reasons could be shown to be incorrect. In Numbers 33, in the catalogue of stations, there is a portion ascribed to Moses that bears the express characteristics of the Priestly Code; and, finally Deuteronomy, with its hortatory, pastoral style, claims him as its author. Already in ⁰²¹⁷¹⁴Exodus 17:14 there were reasons to believe that Moses had written not only this statement which is there expressly attributed to him. Thus it becomes a possibility, that in general only in the case of particularly important passages the fact that Moses penned these also was to be made prominent, if it can be shown as probable that he in reality wrote more, as we find in parallel cases in the writings of the prophets (compare ²³⁰⁰⁰¹Isaiah 8:1; 30:8; ²⁴⁵⁰²Jeremiah 30:2; ²⁶⁶³¹¹Ezekiel 43:11; ³⁵⁰⁰²Habakkuk 2:2). In addition, we notice in this connection that in the catalogue of stations mentioned above and ascribed to Moses (Numbers 33), the close relation of which to the portions attributed to P is certain, not only this part, but also the other words from JE in the present Bible text from Exodus 12 through 19 (see above) are regarded as self-evident as Mosaic (as is the case also later with the corresponding historical part), and this is an important witness in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the historical parts. But Exodus 25 through 31; 35 through 40 also claim, at least so far as contents are concerned, to be the product of the Mosaic period. The entire portable sanctuary is built with a view to he wanderings in the desert. Aaron and his sons are as yet the only representatives of the priesthood (27:21; 28:4,12,41-43; 29:4 ff, etc.). In view of the relationship which Numbers 33 shows with the Priestly Code (P), it is clear, if we accept the genuineness of this part, a matter that is in the highest degree probable, that this style was current in Moses' time, and that he had the mastery of it, even if other hands, too, have contributed to the final literary forms of these laws. In favor of the Mosaic authorship of the whole Book of Exodus we find a weighty reason in the unity and the literary construction of the work as shown above. This indeed does not preclude the use and adaptation of other sources of historical or legal statements, either from the

author's own hands or from others, if such a view should perhaps be suggested or made imperative by the presence of many hard constructions, unconnected transitions, unexpected repetitions, etc. But even on the presupposition of the Mosaic authorship, a difference in style in the different kinds of matters discussed is not impossible, just as little as this is the case with peculiarities of language, since these could arise particularly in the course of vivid narration of the story (compare the anacolouths in Paul's writings). But still more a reason for accepting the Mosaic authorship of Exodus is found in the grand and deep conception and reproduction of all the events recorded, which presupposes a congenial prophetic personality; and finally, too, the natural and strong probability that Moses did not leave his people without such a Magna Charta for the future. This Mosaic authorship becomes almost a certainty, in case the Book of Deuteronomy is genuine, even if only in its essential parts. For Deuteronomy at every step presupposes not only P (compare Are the Critics Right? 171 ff), but also the history and the Books of the Covenant (Exodus 21 ff; 34:11 ff) as recorded in Exodus.

2. *Examination of Objections:*

Against the Mosaic authorship of Exodus the use of the third person should no longer be urged, since Caesar and Xenophon also wrote their works in the third person, and the use of this provision is eminently adapted to the purpose and significance of Exodus for all future times. In ⁀²³⁰¹Isaiah 20:1 ff ⁀²⁶²⁴Ezekiel 24:24, we have analogies of this in prophetic literature. The statement (⁀⁰²¹⁰³Exodus 11:3) that Moses was so highly regarded by the Egyptians is entirely unobjectionable in the connection in which it is found. That the book was not written for the self-glorification of Moses appears clearly in 4:10-16; 6:12. In itself it is possible that some individual passages point to a later date, without thereby overthrowing the Mosaic authorship of the whole (compare also under **(1)**). In this case we are probably dealing with supplementary material. ⁀⁰²¹⁶³⁵Exodus 16:35 declares that Israel received manna down to the time when the people came to the borders of Canaan. Whether it was given to them after this time, too, cannot be decided on the basis of this passage (compare however ⁀⁰⁶⁵¹²Joshua 5:12). If the entire Book of Exodus was composed by Moses, then ⁀⁰²¹⁶³⁵Exodus 16:35 would be a proof that at least the final editing of the book had been undertaken only a short time before his death. This is suggested also by 16:34b, since at the time when the manna was first given the ark of the covenant did not yet exist; and the statement in

32:35 takes into consideration the later development as found in Numbers 13 f. In the same way [12166]Exodus 16:36 could be a later explanation, but is not necessarily so, if the `*omer* was not a fixed measure, of which nothing further is known, and which probably was not to be found in every Israelite household, but a customary measure, the average content of which is given in 16:36. If we take Exodus alone there is nothing that compels us to go later than the Mosaic period (concerning the father-in-law of Moses, see under II, 2, 1 (1:8 through 7:7) at the close). The question as to whether there are contradictions or differences between the different legal ordinances in Exodus and in later books cannot be investigated at this place, nor the question whether the connection of Exodus with other books in any way modifies the conclusion reached under **(1)**.

LITERATURE.

Books that in some way cover the ground discussed in the article: Against the separation into different sources: Eerdmans, Alttestamentliche Studien, III ("Das Buch Exodus"); Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Moller, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung. In favor of the construction of Exodus 21 ff: Merx, Die Bucher Moses und Josua ("Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbucher," II, Series, number 3). For Exodus 21 ff in its relation to the Code of Hammurabi: A. Jeremias, Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients; J. Jeremias, Moses und Hammurabi (with fuller literature); Histories of Israel by Kittel, Konig, Oettli, Kohler, Klostermann, Hengstenberg; Commentaries of Ryssel, Lange, Keil, Strack; Introductions to the Old Testament by Strack, Baudissin, Driver, Sellin. Against the Wellhausen hypothesis: Moller, Are the Critics Right? (with fuller literature); Orr (see above). Against the evolutionary theory: Orr (see above); Moller, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit (with fuller literature). Representatives of other schools: The Introductions of Kuenen and Cornill; the Commentaries of Holzinger and Baentsch; the Histories of Israel by Wellhausen and Stade.

Wilhelm Moller

EXORCISM; EXORCIST

<ek'-sor-siz'-m>, *<ek'-sor-sist>* ([Ἐξορκιστής, *Exorkistes*], from [ἐξορκίζω, *exorkizo*], "to adjure" ([41266]Matthew 26:63)):

1. DEFINITION:

One who expels demons by the use of magical formulas. In the strict etymological sense there is no exorcism in the Bible. The term "exorcists" is used once ([44913]Acts 19:13) in a way to discredit the professional exorcists familiarly known both among Jews and Gentiles.

2. METHOD OF EXPELLING DEMONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The method of Jesus in dealing with demoniacs was not that of the exorcists. While it is said ([40816]Matthew 8:16) that He "cast out the spirits with a word," it is abundantly clear that the word in question was not ritualistic but authoritative.

In [40435]Luke 4:35 we have a typical sentence uttered by our Lord in the performance of His cures: "Hold thy peace, and come out of him." In [41029]Mark 9:29 we have Christ's own emphasis upon the ethical element in dealing with these mysterious maladies: "This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer." In [40228]Matthew 12:28 Jesus gives His own explanation of the method and power used in His cures: "But if I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."

In [40901]Luke 9:1 the terms "authority" and "power" are used in such a way as to show the belief of the evangelists that to cure demon-possession an actual power from God, together with the right to use it, was necessary. This group of passages gives the New Testament philosophy of this dread mystery and its cure. The demons are personal evil powers afflicting human life in their opposition to God. It is beyond man unaided to obtain deliverance from them. It is the function of Christ as the redeemer of mankind to deliver men from this as well as other ills due to sin. Miraculous cures of the same kind as those performed by Christ Himself were accomplished by His disciples in His name ([41617]Mark 16:17). The power attributed to "His name" supplies us with the opportunity for a most enlightening comparison and contrast.

3. EXORCISM IN ETHNIC AND JEWISH WRITINGS:

Exorcism among ancient and primitive peoples rests largely upon faith in the power of magical formulas, ordinarily compounded of the names of deities and pronounced in connection with exorcistic rites, upon the bodies

of the afflicted. The words themselves are supposed to have power over the demons, and the mere recital of the correct list of names is supposed to be efficacious.

Attention should be called again to the incantation texts of the Babylonians and Assyrians (see, for translations and full exposition of texts, Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 146 ff). In this direction the absurdities and cruelties of superstition have carried men to extreme lengths. In the case of Josephus we are amazed to see how even in the case of an educated man the most abject superstition controls his views of such subjects. In Ant, VIII, v, in speaking of the wisdom of Solomon, he says that "God enabled him to learn that skill which expels demons, which is a science useful and sanitative to him." He also describes, in the same connection, a cure which he alleges to have seen, "in the presence of Vespasian and his sons," performed in accordance with methods of incantation ascribed to Solomon. A ring to which was attached a kind of root mentioned by Solomon was placed at the nostrils of the demoniac and the demon was drawn out through the nostrils. The proof that exorcism had actually taken place was given in the overturning of a basin placed nearby.

The absurdities of this narrative are more than equaled by the story of exorcism told in the Book of Tobit (see Lunge, Apocrypha, 151-53) where the liver and heart of a fish, miraculously caught, are burned upon the ashes of incense, and the resulting smoke drives away a demon. This whole story is well worthy of careful reading for the light it throws upon the unrestrained working of the imagination upon such matters.

In the rabbinical writers the very limit of diseased morbidness is reached in the long and repulsive details, which they give of methods used in exorcism (see Whitehouse, HDB, article "Demon," I, 592b; compare 593b; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 775-76).

4. CONTRASTS OF NEW TESTAMENT AND POPULAR METHODS WITH DEMONS:

In most striking contrast with this stand the Biblical narratives. The very point of connection which we have noted is also the point of contrast. The mighty and efficacious word with which Jesus rebuked and controlled demons was no exorcistic formula spoken by rote, but His own living word of holy power. "In the name of Jesus" did not mean that the sacred name

formally uttered possessed magical power to effectuate a cure. The ancient Semitic formula, "in the name of," given a deep ethical meaning in the Old Testament, had a still deeper meaning in the New Testament. The proper and helpful use of it meant a reliance upon the presence and living power of Christ from whom alone power to do any mighty work comes (᠁John 15:5).

This fundamental difference between the ideas and methods of Jesus and His disciples and current conceptions and usages becomes the more striking when we remember that the lower range of ideas and practices actually prevailed among the people with whom the Lord and His followers were associated. The famous passage (᠁Matthew 12:24 and parallel) in which the Pharisees attribute to demoniacal influence the cures wrought by Jesus upon the demonized, usually studied with reference to our Lord's word about the unforgivable sin, is also remarkable for the idea concerning demons which it expresses. The idea which evidently underlies the accusation against Jesus was that the natural way to obtain control over demons is by obtaining, through magic, power over the ruler of demons. In reply to this Jesus maintains that since the demons are evil they can be controlled only by opposition to them in the power of God.

It is most suggestive that we have in ᠁Acts 19:13 ff a clear exposition, in connection with exorcism, of just the point here insisted upon. According to this narrative a group of wandering professional Jewish exorcists, witnessing the cures accomplished by Paul, attempted to do the same by the ritualistic use of the name of Jesus. They failed ignominiously because, according to the narrative, they lacked faith in the living Christ by whose power such miracles of healing were wrought, although they were letter-perfect in the use of the formula. This narrative shows clearly what the New Testament understanding of the expression "in my name" implied in the way of faith and obedience.

Here as elsewhere, the chastened mental restraint under which the New Testament was composed, the high spiritual and ethical results of the intimacy of the disciples with Jesus, are clearly manifest.

Our Lord and His disciples dealt with the demoniacs as they dealt with all other sufferers from the malign, enslaving and wasting power of sin, with the tenderness of an illimitable sympathy, and the firmness and effectiveness of those to whom were granted in abundant measure the presence and power of God.

Louis Matthews Sweet

EXPECT; EXPECTATION

<eks-pekt'>, <eks-pek-ta'-shun>: Of the three Greek words, translated in the New Testament by "expect," *prosdokao*, meaning to look forward toward what will probably occur, whether in hope or dread (⁴⁰⁵Acts 3:5; ⁴²⁵Luke 3:15), is not as intense as *ekdechomai* (⁵⁸¹³Hebrews 10:13), meaning to wait for that of the realization of which one is assured ("as the husbandman waits for the processes of Nature (⁵⁹⁵⁷James 5:7), and the patriarchs for the Divine promise," Westcott), or as vivid as the noun *apokaradokia* (⁵⁸⁹Romans 8:19; ⁵⁰⁰Philippians 1:20, "earnest expectation"), which describes the stretching forth of the head toward an object that is anticipated (see Ellicott on ⁵⁰⁰Philippians 1:20). In the Old Testament "expectation" always means that which is expected, as ⁰⁰⁸Proverbs 10:28, "The expectation of the wicked shall perish."

H. E. Jacobs

EXPECTATION, MESSIANIC

<mes-i-an'-ik>.

> *See CHRISTS, FALSE; ESCHATOLOGY OF OLD TESTAMENT; JESUS CHRIST; MESSIAH.*

EXPEDIENT

<eks-pe'-di-ent> ([συμφέρω, *sumphero*]): The Greek word translated "expedient" (*sumphero*) means literally, "to bear or bring together"; with a personal reference, "to be well or profitable." In the New Testament it never means "profitable" or "convenient" as opposed to what is strictly right. It is translated "expedient" (⁴³¹⁵⁰John 11:50, "it is expedient for us," the Revised Version (British and American) "for you"; ⁴³⁶⁰⁷John 16:7, "It is expedient for you that I go away," i.e. "profitable," "for your good," 18:14; ⁴⁰⁶²1 Corinthians 6:12; 10:23; ⁴⁷⁸¹⁰2 Corinthians 8:10; 12:1). In ⁴⁰¹⁹⁰Matthew 19:10, instead of "not good to marry," the Revised Version (British and American) has "not expedient." The modern sense of "expediency" as "hastening" or "acceleration," is not found in the New Testament, any more than its bad sense of "mere convenience." "Nothing but the right can ever be expedient" (Whately).

W. L. Walker

EXPERIENCE

<eks-pe'-ri-ens>: This word is employed 3 times. In [01327]Genesis 30:27 the King James Version, Laban says, to Jacob, "I have learned by experience (the Revised Version (British and American) "divined") that Yahweh hath blessed me for thy sake." Here it translates the Hebrew [vj " n; *nachash*], "to observe diligently," as when one examines the entrails of a bird or animal for the purpose of divination.

In [21016]Ecclesiastes 1:16, the writer says, "I have gotten me great wisdom ....; my heart hath had great experience of wisdom and knowledge." Here the Hebrew (*ra'ah*) means "hath seen abundantly," and the idea seems to be that of a wide outlook combined with actual trial of the things discovered or known.
In [45604]Romans 5:4 the King James Version, the Greek word [δοκιμή, *dokime*] (the American Standard Revised Version more correctly "approvedness"), means the proof or testing of a thing. We rejoice in tribulation because it works out or produces patience, while the latter develops an experience of God, i.e. it brings out as a proved fact His power and love toward us in our preservation in and deliverance from trial. Thus it is seen the Bible use of the word is not different from the ordinary, which means "the sum of practical wisdom taught by the events and observations of life," or, to go a little farther, the personal and practical acquaintance with what is so taught. [58613]Hebrews 5:13 gives a good practical example. the King James Version says, "Every one that useth milk is unskillful (apeiros) in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe," while the Revised Version (British and American) renders "unskilful" by "without experience of." The thought is that he who fails to search out the deep things of the word of God is so lacking in the exercise of his spiritual senses as to be unable really to know truth from error.

James M. Gray

EXPERIMENT

<eks-per'-i-ment> ([δοκιμή, *dokime*], "approvedness," "tried character"): "The experiment of this ministration" ([47913]2 Corinthians 9:13 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the proving of you by his ministration"), i.e. the sincerity of their Christian profession was evidenced by their liberal contribution.

EXPIATION

<eks-pi-a'-shun>: This word represents no Hebrew or Greek word not rendered also by "atonement." In ⁰⁴⁸⁰⁷Numbers 8:7 it is employed in the Revised Version (British and American) to translate *chaTath* and in ⁰⁵²⁴³Deuteronomy 32:43, *kipper*. This version also employs "expiate" in the margin of several passages, e.g. ¹⁹⁵⁶³Psalm 65:3; 79:9. Always its use in English Versions of the Bible is somewhat more narrow and specific than "atonement" and has especial reference to specific uncleanness or sin. It will be sufficient to refer to *ATONEMENT; SACRIFICE; PROPITIATION*.

EXPOSURE, TO WILD BEASTS

<eks-po'-zhur>.

See *PUNISHMENTS.*

EXPRESS

<eks-pres'>: In the King James Version of ⁵⁸⁰¹³Hebrews 1:3 "express" has the meaning "exactly resembling the original," as the impress of a seal resembles the figure engraved upon the seal. Thus "express image" in the verse referred to is a good translation (Greek [χαρακτήρ, *charakter*], literally, "engraving" and hence, "impression"); the Revised Version (British and American) "the very image."

EXQUISITE

<eks'-kwi-sit> ([ἀκριβής, *akribes*]): The Greek word means "accurate" "searched out," equivalent to *exquisitus* from which "exquisite" is derived. It also means in argument "close," "subtle." In Ecclesiasticus 18:29, we have, "They poured forth exquisite parables," the Revised Version (British and American) "apt proverbs," and 19:25, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "There is an exquisite subtleity, and the same is unjust."

EXTINCT

<eks-tinkt'>: In ⁴⁸⁷⁰¹Job 17:1, "My days are extinct" ([Ë[ʮ; *za`akh*] (in Niphal)) and in ²³⁶¹⁷Isaiah 43:17, "They are extinct" ([Ë[Đ; *da`akh*]), the word "extinct" should be recognized as a form of the participle, equivalent

to "extinguished," so that in both passages an action, not merely a state, is indicated.

EXTORTION

<eks-tor'-shun>: This particular word occurs twice in King James Version: ⁽²⁶²¹²⁾Ezekiel 22:12 ([qv֜[ρ`*osheq*]), and ⁽⁴¹³²⁵⁾Matthew 23:25 ([ἁρπαγή, *harpage*]), and indicates that one who is an extortioner is guilty of snatching away from another by strife, greed and oppression that which does not lawfully belong to him. The element of covetousness and usury is involved in the meaning of this word; for it is greedily gotten gain. The publicans were considered as being specially guilty of this sin; this is clear from the Pharisee's deprecatory remark: "I am not .... an extortioner ..... as this publican" (⁽²¹⁸¹¹⁾Luke 18:11). Paul classes extortion (*pleonexia*, literally, "over-reaching") among a category of the grossest crimes known to humanity (⁽⁴⁶⁵¹⁰⁾1 Corinthians 5:10,11); indeed, so grievous is it that it closes the door of heaven in the face of the one guilty of it (⁽⁴⁶⁶¹⁰⁾1 Corinthians 6:10).

William Evans

EXTREME; EXTREMITY

<eks-trem'>, *<eks-trem'-i-ti>* We have the adjective "extreme" in 2 Esdras 5:14, "extreme fear," the Revised Version (British and American) "trembling"; in The Wisdom of Solomon 12:27, "extreme (terma) damnation," the Revised Version (British and American) "the last end of condemnation"; in 2 Macc 7:42, "extreme (*huperballousas*) tortures," the Revised Version (British and American) "exceeding barbarities"; in Ecclesiasticus 42:8 it is used as an adverb, "the extreme aged" (*eschatogeros*), the Revised Version (British and American) "of extreme old age."

Extremity: [∨P″ , *pash*]; Septuagint [παράπτωμα, *paraptoma*], occurs only in ⁽¹⁸⁵¹⁵⁾Job 35:15 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "arrogance," and [ἀκμή, *akme*] in 2 Macc 1:7.

EYE

<i> ([ˆyi[,″ `*ayin*]; [ὀφθαλμός, *ophthalmos*]):

(1) The physical organ of sight, "the lamp of the body" (⁽⁴⁰⁶²²⁾Matthew 6:22), one of the chief channels of information for man. A cruel custom therefore

sanctioned among heathen nations the putting out of the eyes of an enemy or a rival, because thus his power was most effectually shattered (Judges 16:21; 2 Kings 25:7; Jeremiah 39:7). Such blinding or putting out of the "right eye" was also considered a deep humiliation, as it robbed the victim of his beauty, and made him unfit to take his part in war (1 Samuel 11:2; Zechariah 11:17).

The eye, to be useful, was to be "single," i.e. not giving a double or uncertain vision (Matthew 6:22 = Luke 11:34). Eyes may grow dim with sorrow and tears (Job 17:7), they may "waste away with griefs" (Psalm 6:7; 31:9; 88:9). They may "pour down" (Lamentations 3:49), "run down with water" (Lamentations 1:16; 3:48). Eyes may "wink" in derision (Psalm 35:19; Proverbs 6:13; 10:10; compare also Proverbs 16:30; 30:17), and the harlot takes the lustling "with her eyelids" (Proverbs 6:25). To `lift up the eyes' (Genesis 13:10 et passim) means to look up or around for information and often for help; to `turn away the eye' or `hide the eyes' indicates carelessness and lack of sympathy (Proverbs 28:27); to `cast about the eyes,' so that they "are in the ends of the earth" (Proverbs 17:24) is synonymous with the silly curiosity of a fool, and with the lack of attention of him who is everywhere but at his work. In the execution of justice the "eye shall not pity," i.e. not be deflected from the dictates of the law by favorable or unfavorable impressions (Deuteronomy 19:13 et passim), nor spare (Ezekiel 5:11 et passim), and the lexicon talionis demanded "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" (Exodus 21:24; Deuteronomy 19:21).

(2) Figurative: The eye of the heart or mind, the organ of spiritual perception, which may be enlightened or opened (Psalm 119:18). This is done by the law of God (19:8) or by the spirit of God (Ephesians 1:18), or it may be "darkened" and "holden" (Luke 24:16; compare Matthew 13:13; 2 Corinthians 4:4).

(3) The eye as an index of the mind and disposition of man. The Bible speaks of the "good" margin, or "bountiful" eye, i.e. the kindly, disposition (Proverbs 22:9); of "proud," haughty," "lofty eyes" (Psalm 18:27; 131:1; Proverbs 6:17); of the `lowly eyes' of the humble (Job 22:29 margin; compare also Luke 18:13); of `adulterous eyes,' "eyes which play the harlot" (Ezekiel 6:9, in the sense of idolatrous inclinations; 2 Peter 2:14). Rage or anger is shown by the "sharpening" of the eyes (Job 16:9).

(4) The eyes of God, as well as the "seven eyes" of the Lamb

(⁶⁰⁵⁰⁶Revelation 5:6) and the `many eyes' of the four living creatures of the Apocalypse (⁶⁰⁴⁰⁶Revelation 4:6; also ²⁶⁰¹⁸Ezekiel 1:18; 10:12) are figurative expressions for the omniscience of God (compare ⁵⁸⁰⁴³Hebrews 4:13; ¹⁹⁰⁹¹⁶Psalm 139:16) and of His watchfulness and loving care (²⁴²¹⁹Jeremiah 32:19). As the human eye may, with the slightest glance or motion, give an indication, a command, so God is able to "guide" or "counsel" His obedient child "with his eye" (¹⁹³²⁰⁸Psalm 32:8).
(5) Three Hebrew expressions are translated by "apple of the eye":

(a) [ˆwŒya, *'ishon*], literally, "the little man," which probably means the "pupil of the eye," it being the part of the eye in which the close onlooker may see his image reflected *en miniature*. Several oriental languages have very similar expressions (⁰⁵²¹⁰Deuteronomy 32:10; ¹⁹¹⁷⁰⁸Psalm 17:8; ²⁰⁰⁷⁰²Proverbs 7:2).

(b) [hbB; *babhah*], literally, "the gate of the eye" (³⁸⁰²⁰⁸Zechariah 2:8).

(c) [ˆyˆ[AtB″ , *bath-`ayin*], literally, "the daughter of the eye" (¹⁹¹⁷⁰⁸Psalm 17:8; ²⁵¹²¹⁸Lamentations 2:18). All these three phrases seem to indicate the pupil rather than the "apple of the eye," and designate the most sensitive part of the eye, which we protect with the greatest care. Thus the Scriptures declare, for our great comfort, that God will protect and care for those that are His own.
To eye ([ˆw″ [; *`awan*], "to watch closely," "to look maliciously at"): "Saul eyed David from that day and forward" (⁰⁹¹⁸⁹1 Samuel 18:9).
     See ENVY; EVIL EYE.

                                        H. L. E. Luering

EYELID

<i'-lid>: Eyes and eyelids in Hebrew are sometimes used synonymously, as in the parallelism of ²⁰⁰²⁵Proverbs 4:25 (compare 6:4; 30:13):
"Let thine eyes look right on,

And let thine eyelids look straight before thee."

(Compare ¹⁸⁴¹¹⁸Job 41:18; ¹⁹¹¹⁰⁴Psalm 11:4; ²⁴⁰⁹¹⁸Jeremiah 9:18.) The alluring power of the wanton woman is conceived of as centered in her eyes (²⁰⁰⁶²⁵Proverbs 6:25; ²³⁰³¹⁶Isaiah 3:16): "Neither let her take thee with her eyelids." Painting the eyelids was resorted to to intensify the beauty, antimony (which see) being used for darkening the lashes (¹²⁰⁹⁸⁰2 Kings 9:30;

[2085]Jeremiah 4:30; [2530]Ezekiel 23:40).

George B. Eager

EYEPAINT

<i'-pant>.

  See *ANTIMONY; EYELID; KEREN-HAPPUCH.*

EYESALVE

<i'-sav> ([κολλούριον, *kollourion*]; *collyrium*; [6083]Revelation 3:18): A Phrygian powder mentioned by Galen, for which the medical school of Laodicea seems to have been famous (see Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*), but the figurative reference is to the restoring of spiritual vision.

EYES, BLINDING, OF THE

<blind'-ing>.

  See *EYE; PUNISHMENTS.*

EYES, COVERING, OF THE

<kuv'-er-ing>: In [0206]Genesis 20:16, means forgetfulness of the past, a willingness to overlook the wrong to which Sarah had been exposed.

EYES, DISEASES, OF THE

<di-zez'-is>: Blindness, defects of sight and diseases of the eye are frequently mentioned in the Scriptures, but usually in general terms. It is probable that in the period covered by the Bible, ophthalmia was as common in Palestine and Egypt as it is now. *See BLINDNESS*. The commonest of the diseases at present is the purulent conjunctivitis which is a highly infectious malady affecting people of all ages, but especially children, and whose germs are carried from eye to eye by the flies, which are allowed to walk freely over the diseased eyes. This is one of the most disgusting sights in a Palestine village, but I have been told by mothers that it is esteemed unlucky to drive off the flies. In this manner the disease is propagated. The number of persons in any Palestine village whose eyes are more or less blemished by disease is on this account phenomenally large.

Blindness incapacitated a man from serving in the priesthood (Leviticus 21:16,18); even a blemish of the eye was regarded as a disqualification (Leviticus 21:20).

The cases in the New Testament of persons blind from their birth (as John 9:1) were probably the results of this ophthalmia, but may have been due to congenital malformation. The interesting psychological record of the difficulty of interpreting the new visual sensations by the blind man healed by our Lord (Mark 8:22) indicates that it was probably not a case of congenital blindness, as the evangelist uses the word apokatestathe ("restored"), but he had been so long blind that he had lost the power of appreciating the sense-impressions. This condition has been often discussed as a psycho-physical problem since the days of Molyneux and Locke (Essay on the Human Understanding, II, 9, 8).

The blindness of Paul was probably a temporary paralysis of the retina from the shock of a dazzling light accentuated by the intense emotion which accompanied his vision on the road to Damascus. The "scales" mentioned in Acts 9:18 were not material, but his sight was restored as if (*hosei*) scales had fallen from his eyes. How far this left his eyes weak we do not know, but from his inability to recognize the high priest (Acts 23:5) and from his employing an amanuensis for transcribing his epistles (Romans 16:22), as well as from his writing in characters of large size (*pelikos*; Galatians 6:11), it is probable that his vision was defective, and this it has been conjectured was the "thorn in the flesh" of 2 Corinthians 12:7.

Senile blindness, the result either of cataract or retinal degeneration, is mentioned in the cases of Isaac (Genesis 27:1), Jacob (Genesis 48:10) and Eli (1 Samuel 4:15). The frequency of such senile dimness of sight made the case of Moses the more remarkable that at the age of 120 his eye was not dim (Deuteronomy 34:7).

Tobit's blindness, caused by the irritation of the sparrow's dung (Tobit 2:10), was a traumatic conjunctivitis which left an opacity. It is not said that the whiteness was itself sufficiently large to destroy vision. There was with it probably a considerable amount of conjunctival thickening, and it is possible that the remedy might have removed this. It certainly could not remove a cicatricial white spot of the nature of an albugo. The conjecture of a recent commentator that the gall, by coloring the spot, made the eye look as if sight was restored when it really was not, seems ludicrously

inept. In any case the historical accuracy of the narrative is so problematical that explanation is unnecessary.

See BLINDNESS.

Alexander Macalister

EYESERVICE

<i'-sur-vis> ([ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, *ophthalmodouleia*]): A term coined by Paul to express the conduct of slaves, who work only when they are watched, and whose motive, therefore, is not fidelity to duty, but either to avoid punishment or to gain reward from their masters (⁴⁰⁶⁶Ephesians 6:6; ⁵¹⁰⁸²Colossians 3:22). "A vice which slavery everywhere creates and exhibits. Hence, the need for drivers and overseers" (Eadie).

EYES, TENDER

See BLINDNESS.

EZAR

<e'-zar>.

See EZER.

EZBAI

<ez'-ba-i>, <ez'-bi> ([yBzꜣ, *'ezbay*], "shining," "blooming"; [ʾΑζωβαί, *Azobai*]): One of David's "mighty men" (⁽¹³¹¹³⁷⁾1 Chronicles 11:37; compare ⁽¹⁰²³⁵⁾2 Samuel 23:35 margin).

EZBON

<ez'-bon>:

(1) ([ˆBꜛꜣ, *'etsbon*]; Peshitta, ˆw[bxa; Septuagint [Θασοβάν, *Thasoban*]): A son of Gad (⁰⁴⁶¹⁶Genesis 46:16) = Ozni of ⁰²⁵¹⁶Numbers 26:16 (*see OZNI*).

(2) ([ˆwBꜛꜣ, *'etsbon*]; Septuagint [ʾΑσεβών, *Asebon*]): In ¹³⁰⁷⁷1 Chronicles 7:7 is said to be a grandson of Benjamin. Curtis (Ch., 148) holds that the genealogical table there is that of Zebulun and not Benjamin, and says that Ezbon suggests Ibzan (⁰⁷²⁰⁸Judges 12:8-10), a minor judge of

Bethlehem of Zebulun (Moore, Judges, 310).

EZECHIAS; EZECIAS

<ez-e-ki'-as>, *<ez-e-si'-as>*.

See *EZEKIAS (3).*

EZEKIAS

<ez-e-ki'-as> ([Ἐζεκίας, *Ezekias*]):

(1) the King James Version Greek form of Hezekiah (thus, the Revised Version (British and American); Matthew 1:9,10). A king of Judah.
(2) the King James Version Ezechiad (1 Esdras 9:14), called Jahzeiah in Ezra 10:15.
(3) the King James Version Ezecias (1 Esdras 9:43), called Hilkiah in Nehemiah 8:4.

EZEKIEL

<e-ze'-ki-el>:

I. THE PROPHET AND HIS BOOK.

1. The Person of Ezekiel:

The name [יְחֶזְקֵאל, *yehezqe'l*], signifies "God strengthens." The Septuagint employed the form [Ἰεζεκιήλ, *Iezekiel*], from which the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) took its "Ezechiel" and Luther "Hesekiel." In Ezekiel 1:3 the prophet is said to be the son of a certain Buzi, and that he was a priest. This combination of the priestly and prophetic offices is not accidental at a time when the priests began to come more and more into the foreground. Thus, too, Jeremiah (1:1) and Zechariah (1:1; compare Ezra 5:1; 6:14; Nehemiah 12:4,16, and my article "Zechariah" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary) were priests and prophets; and in Zechariah 7:3 a question in reference to fasting is put to both priests and prophets at the same time. And still more than in the case of Zechariah and Jeremiah, the priestly descent makes itself felt in the case of Ezekiel. We here already draw attention to his Levitical tendencies, which appear particularly prominent in Ezekiel 40 through 46 (see under II, 2 below), and to the high-priestly character of his picture of the Messiah (21:25 f; 45:22; see II, 3 below).

We find Ezekiel in Tel-abib (3:15) at the river Chebar (1:1,3; 3:15) on a Euphrates canal near Nippur, where the American expedition found the archives of a great business house, "Murashu and Sons." The prophet had been taken into exile in 597 BC. This event so deeply affected the fate of the people and his personal relations that Ezekiel dates his prophecies from this event. They begin with the 5th year of this date, in which year through the appearance of the Divine glory (compare II, 1 below) he had been consecrated to the prophetic office (1:2) and continued to the 27th year (29:17), i.e. from 593 to 571 BC. The book gives us an idea of the external conditions of the exiles. The expressions "prison," "bound," which are applied to the exiles, easily create a false impression, or at any rate a one-sided idea. These terms surely to a great extent are used figuratively. Because the Jews had lost their country, their capital city, their temple, their service and their independence as a nation, their condition was under all circumstances lamentable, and could be compared with the fate of prisoners and those in fetters.

The external conditions in themselves, however, seem rather to have been generally tolerable. The people live in their own houses (Jeremiah 29:5). Ezekiel himself is probably the owner of a house (Ezekiel 3:24; 8:1). They have also retained their organization, for their elders visit the prophet repeatedly (Ezekiel 8:1; 14:1; 20:1). This makes it clear why later comparatively few made use of the permission to return to their country. The inscriptions found in the business house at Nippur contain also a goodly number of Jewish names, which shows how the Jews are becoming settled and taking part in the business life of the country.
Ezekiel was living in most happy wedlock. Now God reveals to him on a certain night that his wife, "the desire of his eye," is to die through a sudden sickness. On the evening of the following day she is already dead. But he is not permitted to weep or lament over her, for he is to serve as a sign that Jerusalem is to be destroyed without wailing or lamentation (24:15 ff). Thus in his case too, as it was with Hosea, the personal fate of the prophet is most impressively interwoven with his official activity.

The question at what age Ezekiel had left Jerusalem has been answered in different ways. From his intimate acquaintance with the priestly institutions and with the temple service, as this appears particularly in chapters 40 to 48, the conclusion is drawn that he himself must have officiated in the temple. Yet, the knowledge on his part can be amply explained if he only in a general way had been personally acquainted with the temple, with the law

and the study of the Torah. We accept that he was already taken into exile at the age of 25 years, and in his 30th year was called to his prophetic office; and in doing this we come close to the statement of Josephus, according to which Ezekiel had come to Babylon in his youth. At any rate the remarkable statement in the beginning of his book, "in the 30th year," by the side of which we find the customary dating, "in the 5th year" (1:1,2), can still find its best explanation when referred to the age of the prophet. We must also remember that the 30th year had a special significance for the tribe of Levi (Numbers 4:3,13,10,39), and that later on, and surely not accidentally, both Jesus and John the Baptist began their public activity at this age (Luke 3:23).

It is indeed true that the attempt has been made to interpret this statement of Ezekiel on the basis of an era of Nabopolassar, but there is practically nothing further known of this era; and in addition there would be a disagreement here, since Nabopolassar ruled from 625 on, and his 30th year would not harmonize with the year 593 as determined by Ezekiel 1:2. Just as little can be said for explaining these 30 years as so many years after the discovery of the book of the law in 623, in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings 22 f). For this case too there is not the slightest hint that this event had been made the beginning of a new era, and, in addition, the statement in Ezekiel 1:1, without further reference to this event, would be unthinkable.

As in the case of the majority of the prophets, legends have also grown around the person of Ezekiel. He is reported to have been the teacher of Pythagoras, or a servant of Jeremiah, or a martyr, and is said to have been buried in the tomb of Shem and Arphaxad. He indeed did stand in close relationship to Jeremiah (see 2, 3 below). Since the publication of Klostermann's essay in the Studien und Kritiken, 1877, it has been customary, on the basis of Ezekiel 3:14 f,26 f; 4:4 ff; 24:27, to regard Ezekiel as subject to catalepsy (compare the belief often entertained that Paul was an epileptic). Even if his condition, in which he lay speechless or motionless, has some similarity with certain forms of catalepsy or kindred diseases, i.e. a temporary suspension of the power of locomotion or of speech; yet in the case of Ezekiel we never find that he is describing a disease, but his unique condition occurs only at the express command of God (3:24 ff; 24:25 ff); and this on account of the stubbornness of the house of Israel (3:26). This latter expression which occurs with such frequency (compare 2:5 ff; 3:9,27, etc.) induces to the consideration of the reception which the prophet met at the hand of his contemporaries.

He lives in the midst of briars and thorns and dwells among scorpions (2:6). Israel has a mind harder than a rock, firmer than adamant (3:8 f). "Is he not a speaker of parables?" is cast up to him by his contemporaries, and he complains to God on this account (20:49); and God in turn sums up the impression which Ezekiel has made on them in the words (33:32): "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument; for they hear thy words, but they do them not." They consequently estimate him according to his aesthetic side (compare II, 1, below), but that is all.

2. The Book:

(1) **Its Genuineness.**

When compared with almost every other prophetic book, we are particularly favorably situated in dealing with the genuineness of the Book of Ezekiel (compare my work, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, zugleich ein Protest gegen moderne Textzersplitterung), as this is practically not at all called into question, and efforts to prove a complicated composition of the book are scarcely made.

Both the efforts of Zunz, made long ago (compare Zeitschrift der deutsch-morgenlandishchen Gesellschaft, 1873, and Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden), and of Seinecke (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, II, 1 ff) to prove a Persian or even a Greek period as the time of the composition of the book; as also the later attempt of Kroetzmann, in his Commentary on Ezekiel, to show that there are two recensions of the book, have found no favor. The claim that Ezekiel 40 through 48 were written by a pupil of Ezekiel was made as a timid suggestion by Volz, but, judging from the tendency of criticism, the origin of these chapters will probably yet become the subject of serious debate. But in general the conviction obtains that the book is characterized by such unity that we can only accept or reject it as a whole, but that for its rejection there is not the least substantial ground. This leads us to the contents.

(2) **Its Structure.**

The parts of the book are in general very transparent. First of all the book is divided into halves by the announcement of the fall of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 33; of which parts the first predominantly deals with punishments and threats; the other with comfort and encouragement. Possibly it is these

two parts of the book that Josephus has in mind when he says (Ant., X) that Ezekiel had written two books. That the introduction of prophecies of redemption after those of threats in other prophetical books also is often a matter of importance, and that the right appreciation of this fact is a significant factor in the struggle against the attacks made on the genuineness of these books has been demonstrated by me in my book, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Prophelen (compare 39-40 for the case of Amos; 62 ff, 136 f, for the case of Hosea; 197 ff for Isaiah 7 through 12; 238 ff for Micah; see also my article in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary).

Down to the time when Jerusalem fell, Ezekiel was compelled to antagonize the hopes, which were supported by false prophets, that God would not suffer this calamity. Over against this, Ezekiel persistently and emphatically points to this fact, that the apostasy had been too great for God not to bring about this catastrophe. There is scarcely a violation of a single command — religious, moral or cultural — which the prophet is not compelled to charge against the people in the three sections, 3:16 ff; 8:1 ff; 20:1 ff, until in 24:1 ff, on the 10th day of the 10th month of the 9th year (589 BC) the destruction of Jerusalem was symbolized by the vision of the boiling pot with the piece of meat in it, and the unlamented destruction of the city was prefigured by the unmourned and sudden death of his wife (see 1 above). After the five sections of this subdivision I, referring to Israel — each one of which subdivisions is introduced by a new dating, and thereby separated from the others and chronologically arranged (1:1 ff, with the consecration of the prophet immediately following it; 3:16 ff; 8:1 ff; 20:1 ff; 24:1 ff) — there follow as a second subdivision the seven oracles against the Ammonites (25:1 ff); the Moabites (25:8 ff); the Edomites (25:12 ff); the Philistines (25:15 ff); Tyre (26:1 ff); Sidon (28:20 ff); Egypt (29:1 ff), evidently arranged from a geographical point of view.

The most extensive are those against Tyre and the group of oracles against Egypt, both provided with separate dates (compare 26:1 through 29:1; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1,17). The supplement in reference to Tyre (29:17 ff) is the latest dated oracle of Ezekiel (from the year 571 BC), and is found here, at a suitable place, because it is connected with a threat against Egypt (Ezekiel 40 through 48 date from the year 573 according to ◁2640▷Ezekiel 40:1). The number seven evidently does not occur accidentally, since in other threats of this kind a typical number appears to have been purposely chosen, thus: Isaiah 13 through Isaiah 22, i.e. ten; Jeremiah 46 through

Jeremiah 51, also ten; which fact again under the circumstances is an important argument in repelling attacks on the genuineness of the book. Probably the five parts of the first subdivision, and the seven of the second, supplement each other, making a total of twelve (compare the analogous structure of ⁅0250⁆Exodus 25:1 through 30:10 under *EXODUS*, and probably the chiastic structure of Ezekiel 34 through 48, with 7 and 5 pieces; see below). The oracles against the foreign countries are not only in point of time to be placed between Ezekiel 24 and 33:21, but also, as concerns contents, help splendidly to solve the difficulty suggested by chapter 24, and in this way satisfactorily fill the gap thus made. The arrival of the news of the fall of Jerusalem, in 586 BC (compare 33:21 ff), which had already been foretold in chapter 24, introduced by the mighty watchman's cry to repentance (33:1 ff), and followed by a reproof of the superficial reception of the prophetic word (see 1 above), concludes the first chief part of the book.

The second part also naturally fails into two subdivisions, of which the first contains the development of the nearer and more remote future, as to its inner character and its historical course (Ezekiel 34 through 39):

(1) the true shepherd of Israel (Ezekiel 34);

(2) the future fate of Edom (Ezekiel 35);

(3) Israel's deliverance from the disgrace of the shameful treatment by the heathen, which falls back upon the latter again (⁅2600⁆Ezekiel 36:1-15);
(4) the desecration of the name of Yahweh by Israel and the sanctification by Yahweh (⁅2615⁆Ezekiel 36:15-38);
(5) the revival of the Israelite nation (⁅2670⁆Ezekiel 37:1-14);
(6) the reunion of the separated kingdoms, Judah and Israel (⁅2675⁆Ezekiel 37:15-28);
(7) the overthrow of the terrible Gentilepower of the north (Ezekiel 38 f).

The second subdivision (Ezekiel 40 through 48) contains the reconstruction of the external affairs of the people in a vision, on the birthday of 573, "in the beginning of the year" (beginning of a jubilee year? (⁅0510⁆Leviticus 25:10); compare also *DAY OF ATONEMENT*). After the explanatory introduction (⁅2600⁆Ezekiel 40:1-4), there follow five pericopes:
(1) directions with reference to the temple (compare the subscription ⁅2632⁆Ezekiel 43:12) (⁅2605⁆Ezekiel 40:5 through 43:12);

(2) the altar (⁽²⁶⁶¹³⁾Ezekiel 43:13 through 46:24);

(3) the wonderful fountain of the temple, on the banks of which the trees bear fruit every month (⁽²⁶⁶⁷⁰ᵇ⁾Ezekiel 47:1-12);

(4) the boundaries of the land and its division among the twelve tribes of Israel (⁽²⁶⁶⁷¹³⁾Ezekiel 47:13 through 48:29);

(5) the size of the holy city and the names of its twelve gates (⁽²⁶⁶⁸⁰⁾Ezekiel 48:30-35).

In (3) to (5) the prominence of the number twelve is clear. Perhaps we can also divide (1) and (2) each into twelve pieces: (1) would be ⁽²⁶⁴⁰⁵⁾Ezekiel 40:5 ff,17 ff,28 ff,39 ff,48 ff; 41:1 ff,5 ff,12 ff,15 ff; 42:1 ff,15 ff; 43:1 ff; for (2) it would be 43:13 ff,18 ff; 44:1 ff,4 ff,15 ff; 45:1 ff,9 ff,13 ff,18 ff; 46:1 ff,16 ff,19 ff.

At any rate the entire second chief part, Ezekiel 34 through 48, contains predictions of deliverance. The people down to 586 were confident, so that Ezekiel was compelled to rebuke them. After the taking of Jerusalem a change took place in both respects. Now the people are despairing, and this is just the right time for the prophet to preach deliverance. The most important separate prophecies will be mentioned and examined in another connection (II below).

The transparent structure of the whole book suggests the idea that the author did not extend the composition over a long period, but wrote it, so to say, at one stretch, which of course does not make it impossible that the separate prophecies were put into written form immediately after their reception, but rather presupposes this. When the prophet wrote they were only woven together into a single uniform book (compare also EXODUS, IV, 1, 2).

(3) **Relation to Jeremiah.**

As Elijah and Elisha, or Amos and Hosea, or Isaiah and Micah, or Haggai and Zechariah, so too Jeremiah and Ezekiel constitute a prophetic couple (compare 1 above); compare e.g. in later time the sending out of the disciples of Jesus, two by two (⁽⁴²¹⁰⁰ᵇ⁾Luke 10:1), the relation of Peter and John in Acts 3 ff; of Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13 ff; of Luther and Melanchthon, Calvin and Zwingli. Both prophets prophesy about the same time; both are of priestly descent (compare 1 above), both witness the overthrow of the Jewish nation, and with their prophecies accompany the fate of the Jewish state down to the catastrophe and beyond that, rebuking, threatening, warning, admonishing, and also comforting and encouraging.

In matters of detail, too, these two prophets often show the greatest similarity, as in the threat against the unfaithful shepherds ([2642]Ezekiel 34:2 ff; [2230]Jeremiah 23:1 ff); in putting into one class the Northern and the Southern Kingdom and condemning both, although the prediction is also made that they shall eventually be united and pardoned (Ezekiel 23; 16; [2470]Jeremiah 3:6 ff; [2675]Ezekiel 37:15 ff; [2484]Jeremiah 3:14-18; 23:5 f; 30 f); in the individualizing of religion (compare the fact that both reject the common saying: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," [2680]Ezekiel 18:2; [2432]Jeremiah 31:29); in their inwardness ([2662]Ezekiel 36:25 ff; [2247]Jeremiah 24:7; 31:27-34; 32:39; 33:8); in their comparisons of the coming judgment with a boiling pot ([2640]Ezekiel 24:1 ff; [2013]Jeremiah 1:13 ff); and finally, in their representation of the Messiah as the priest-king (see 1 above; namely, in [2625]Ezekiel 21:25 f; 45:22; compare [2502]Jeremiah 30:21; 33:17 ff; see II, 3, and my work Messianische Erwartung, 320 ff, 354 ff). Neither is to be considered independently of the other, since the prophetical writings, apparently, received canonical authority soon after and perhaps immediately after they were written (compare the expression "the former prophets" in [3010]Zechariah 1:4; 7:7,12, also the constantly increasing number of citations from earlier prophets in the later prophets, and the understanding of the "exact succession of the prophets" down to Artaxerxes in Josephus, CAp, I, 8), it is possible that Ezekiel, with his waw consecutivum, with which the book begins, is to be understood as desiring to connect with the somewhat older Jeremiah (compare a similar relation of Jonah to Obadiah; see my articles "Canon of the OT" and "Jonah" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary).

(4) **Fate of the Book and Its Place in the Canon.**

With Jeremiah and Ezekiel, many Hebrew manuscripts, especially those of the German and French Jews, begin the series of "later prophets," and thus these books are found before Isaiah; while the Massorah and the manuscripts of the Spanish Jews, according to the age and the size of the books, have the order, Isa, Jer, Ezk. The text of the book is, in part, quite corrupt, and in this way the interpretation of the book, not easy in itself, is made considerably more difficult. Jerome, Ad Paul., writes that the beginning and the end of the book contained many dark passages; that these parts, like the beginning of Gen, were not permitted to be read by the Jews before these had reached their 30th year. During the time when the schools of Hillel and Shammai flourished, Ezekiel belonged to those books

which some wanted "to hide," the others being Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Esther and Canticles. In these discussions the question at issue was not the reception of the book into the Canon, which was rather presupposed, nor again any effort to exclude them from the Canon again, which thought could not be reconciled with the high estimate in which it is known that Est was held, but it was the exclusion of these books from public reading in the Divine service, which project failed. The reasons for this proposal are not to be sought in any doubt as to their authenticity, but in reference to their contents (compare my article "Canon of the Old Testament," in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary). Possibly, too, one reason was to be found in the desire to avoid the profanation of the most sacred vision in the beginning of the book, as Zunz suggests. There is no doubt, however, that the difference of this book from the Torah was a reason that made it inadvisable to read it in public. It was hoped that these contradictions would be solved by Elijah when he should return. But finally, rabbinical research, after having used up three hundred cans of oil, succeeded in finding the solution. These contradictions, as a matter of fact, have not yet been removed, and have in modern times contributed to the production of a very radical theory in criticism, as will be shown immediately under II, 2.

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF EZEKIEL IN ISRAEL'S RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

Under the first head we will consider the formal characteristics and significance of the book; and the examination of its contents will form the subject under the next four divisions.

1. Formal Characteristics of Ezekiel:

It is not correct to regard Ezekiel merely as a writer, as it is becoming more and more customary to do. Passages like 3:10 f; 14:4 ff; 20:1 ff,27; 24:18 ff; 43:10 f show that just as the other prophets did, he too proclaimed by word of mouth the revelations of God he had received. However, he had access only to a portion of the people. It was indeed for him even more important than it had been for the earlier prophets to provide for the wider circulation and permanent influence of his message by putting it into written form. We will, at this point, examine his book first of all from its formal and its aesthetic side. To do this it is very difficult, in a short sketch, to give even a general impression of the practically

inexhaustible riches of the means at his command for the expression of his thoughts.

(1) **Visions.**

Thus, a number of visions at once attract our attention. In the beginning of his work there appears to him the Divine throne-chariot, which comes from the north as a storm, as a great cloud and a fire rolled together. This chariot is borne by the four living creatures in the form of men, with the countenances of a man, of a lion, of an ox and of an eagle, representing the whole living creation. It will be remembered that these figures have passed over into the Revelation of John (Revelation 4:7), and later were regarded as the symbols of the four evangelists. In Ezekiel 10 f this throne-chariot in the vision leaves the portal of the temple going toward the east, returning again in the prediction of deliverance in Ezekiel 43. Moreover, the entire last nine chapters are to be interpreted as a vision (compare 40:2). We must not forget, finally, the revivification of the Israelite nation in Ezekiel 37, represented in the picture of a field full of dead bones, which are again united, covered with skin, and receive new life through the [ruach] (word of two meanings, "wind" and "spirit").

As a rule the visions of Ezekiel, like those of Zechariah (compare my article "Zechariah" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary), are not regarded as actual experiences, but only as literary forms. When it is given as a reason for this that the number of visions are too great and too complicated, and therefore too difficult of presentation, to be real experiences, we must declare this to be an altogether too unsafe, subjective and irrelevant rule to apply in the matter. However, correct the facts mentioned are in themselves they do not compel us to draw this conclusion. Not only is it uncertain how many visions may be experiences (compare e.g. the five visions in Amos 7 ff, which are generally regarded as actual experiences), but it is also absolutely impossible to prove such an a priori claim with reference to the impossibility and the unreality of processes which are not accessible to us by our own experience. As these visions, one and all, are, from the religious and ethical sides, up to the standards of Old Testament prophecy, and as, further, they are entirely unique in character, and as, finally, there is nothing to show that they are only literary forms, we must hold to the conviction that the visions are actual experiences.

(2) **Symbolical Acts.**

Then we find in Ezekiel, also, a large number of symbolical acts. According to Divine command Ezekiel sketches the city of Jerusalem and its siege on a tile (4:1 ff); or he lies bound on his left side, as an atonement, 390 days, and 40 days on his right side, according to the number of years of the guilt of Israel and Judah (4:4 ff). During the 390 days the condition of the people in exile is symbolized by a small quantity of food daily of the weight of only 20 shekels, and unclean, being baked on human or cattle dung, and a small quantity of water, which serves as food and drink of the prophet (4:9 ff).

By means of his beard and the hair of his head, which he shaves off and in part burns, in part strikes with the sword, and in part scatters to the wind, and only the very smallest portion of which he ties together in the hem of his garment, he pictures how the people shall be decimated so that only a small remnant shall remain (Ezekiel 5:1 ff). In Ezekiel 12, he prepares articles necessary for marching and departs in the darkness. Just so Israel will go into captivity and its king will not see the country into which he goes (compare the blinding of Zedekiah, 2 Kings 25:7). In Ezekiel 37:15 ff, he unites two different sticks into one, with inscriptions referring to the two kingdoms, and these picture the future union of Israel and Judah. It is perhaps an open question whether or not some of these symbolical actions, which would be difficult to carry out in actuality, are not perhaps to be interpreted as visions; thus, e.g. the distributing the wine of wrath to all the nations, in Jeremiah 25:15, can in all probability not be understood in any other way. But, at any rate, it appears to us that here, too, the acceptance of a mere literary form is both unnecessary and unsatisfactory, and considering the religio-ethical character of Ezekiel, not permissible.

(3) **Allegories.**

In regard to the numerous allegories, attention need be drawn only to the picture of the two unfaithful sisters, Oholah and Oholibah (i.e. Samaria and Jerusalem), whose relation to Yahweh as well as their infidelity is portrayed in a manner that is actually offensive to over-sensitive minds (Ezekiel 23; compare Ezekiel 16). In Ezekiel 17, Zedekiah is represented under the image of a grapevine, which the great eagle (i.e. the king of Babylon) has appointed, which, however, turns to another great eagle

(king of Egypt), and because of this infidelity shall be rooted out, until God, eventually, causes a new tree to grow out of a tender branch.

(4) **Lamentations.**

Of the lamentations, we mention the following: according to Ezekiel 19, a lioness rears young lions, one after the other, but one after the other is caught in a trap and led away by nose-rings. The ones meant are Jehoahaz and certainly Jehoiachin. The lion mother, who before was like a grapevine, is banished (Zedekiah). Another lamentation is spoken over Tyre, which is compared to a proud ship (compare ²⁶⁷⁰Ezekiel 27:1 ff); also over the king of Tyre, who is hurled down from the mountain of the gods (²⁶⁸¹Ezekiel 28:11-19); and over Pharaoh of Egypt, who is pictured as a crocodile in the sea (²⁶⁹⁰Ezekiel 32:1 ff).

That his contemporaries knew how to appreciate the prophet at least from the aesthetic side, we saw above (I, 1). What impression does Ezekiel make upon us today, from this point of view? He is declared to be "too intellectual for a poet"; "fantastic"; "vividness in him finds a substitute in strengthening and repetition"; "he has no poetical talent"; "he is the most monotonous prose writer among the prophets." These and similar opinions are heard. In matters of taste there is no disputing; but there is food for reflection in the story handed down that Frederick yon Schiller was accustomed to read Ezekiel, chiefly on account of his magnificent descriptions, and that he himself wanted to learn Hebrew in order to be able to enjoy the book in the original. And Herder, with his undeniable and undenied fine appreciation of the poetry of many nations, calls Ezekiel "the Aeschylus and the Shakespeare of the Hebrews" (compare Lange's Commentary on Ezk, 519).

2. Ezekiel and the Levitical System:

(1) ²⁶⁴⁰**Ezekiel 44:4 ff: Theory That the Distinction of Priests and Levites Was Introduced by Ezekiel.**
(a) The Biblical Facts:

In the vision of the reconstruction of the external relations of the people in the future (Ezekiel 40 through 48), in the second pericope, which treats of the cult (43:13 through 46:24; compare I, 2, 2), it is claimed that Ezekiel, at the command of Yahweh, reproaches the Israelites that they engage in their room strangers, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to take charge of the service of Yahweh in the sanctuary, instead of doing this

service themselves, and thus desecrate the temple (44:4-8). From now on the Levites, who hitherto have been participating in the service of the idols on the high places and had become for Israel an occasion for guilt, are to attend to this work. They are degraded from the priesthood as a punishment of their guilt, and are to render the above-mentioned service in the temple (⟨26409⟩Ezekiel 44:9 ff), while only those Levitical priests, the sons of Zadok, who had been rendering their services in the sanctuary in the proper way, while Israel was going astray, are to be permitted to perform priestly functions (⟨26415⟩Ezekiel 44:15 ff).

(b) Modern Interpretation of This Passage:

The modern interpretation of this passage (⟨26404⟩Ezekiel 44:4 ff) is regarded as one of the most important proofs for the Wellhausen hypothesis. Down to the 7th century BC it is claimed that there are no signs that a distinction was made between the persons who had charge of the cults in Israel, and this is held to be proved by the history of the preceding period and by the Book of Deuteronomy, placed by the critics in this time. It is said that Ezekiel is the first to change this, and in this passage introduces the distinction between priests and the lower order of Levites, which difference is then presupposed by the Priestly Code. According to this view, the high priest of the Priestly Code, too, would not yet be known to Ezekiel, and would not yet exist in his time. More fully expressed, the development would have to be thought as follows: the Book of Deuteronomy, which abolished the service on the high places, and had introduced the concentration of the cults, had in a humane way provided for the deposed priests who had been serving on the high places, and, in 18:6 ff, had expressly permitted them to perform their work in Jerusalem, as did all of their brethren of their tribe, and to enjoy the same income as these. While all the other Deuteronomic commands had in principle been recognized, this ordinance alone had met with opposition: for in ⟨12239⟩2 Kings 23:9 we are expressly told that the priests of the high places were not permitted to go up to Jerusalem. Ezekiel now, according to Wellhausen's statement, "hangs over the logic of the facts a moral mantle," by representing the deposition of the priests of the high places as a punishment for the fact that they were priests of the high places, although they had held this position in the past by virtue of legal right.

It is indeed true, it is said, that these priests did not submit to such a representation of the case and such treatment. The violent contentions which are said to have arisen in consequence are thought to have their

outcome expressed in Numbers 16 f (the rebellion of Korah, the budding staff of Aaron). The Priestly Code, however, continued to adhere to the distinction once it had been introduced, and had become a fact already at the return in 538 BC (compare [15236]Ezra 2:36 ff), even if it was found impossible to limit the priesthood to the Zadokites, and if it was decided to make an honorable office out of the degraded position of the Levites as given by Ezekiel. The fact that, according to [15236]Ezra 2:36-39, in the year 538 BC, already 4,289 priests, but according to verse 40, only 74 Levites, returned, is also regarded as proving how dissatisfied the degraded priests of the high places had been with the new position, created by Ezekiel, to which they had been assigned. With the introduction of the P Codex in 444 BC, which made a distinction between high priest, priests and Levites within the tribe of Levi, this development reached an end for the time being. While Deuteronomy speaks of the "Levitical priests," which expression is regarded as confirming the original identity of the priests and the Levites, it is claimed that since the days of Ezekiel, priests and Levites constitute two sharply distinguished classes.

(c) Examination of Theory:

Both the exegesis of [26404]Ezekiel 44:4 ff and the whole superstructure are in every direction indefensible and cannot be maintained (compare also my work, Are the Critics Right? 30 ff, 124 ff, 196 ff).

   (i) Not Tenable for Preexilic Period:

Proof that the hypothesis cannot be maintained for the preexilic period. The claim that down to the 7th century BC there did not exist in Israel any distinction among the persons engaged in the public cults is in itself an absurdity, but has in addition against it the express testimony of history. In preexilic times the high priest is expressly mentioned in [12209]2 Kings 12:9 ff; 22:4,8; 23:4. Accordingly he cannot have been a product of the post-exilic period. The rank of an Eli (1 Samuel 1 ff), Ahimelech (1 Samuel 21 f), Abiathar ([11026]1 Kings 2:26 f), Zadok ([11025]1 Kings 2:35), is vastly above that of an ordinary priest. The fact that the expression "high priest" does not happen to occur here is all the less to be pressed, as the term is found even in the Priestly Code only in [03210]Leviticus 21:10; [04525]Numbers 35:25-28. From [05106]Deuteronomy 10:6; [06243]Joshua 24:33; [07028]Judges 20:28, we learn that the office of high priest was transmitted from Aaron to his son, Eleazar, and then to his son, Phinehas (compare also [04251]Numbers 25:11). Before the time of Eli, according to [13243]1 Chronicles 24:3, it had passed

over to the line of the other surviving son of Aaron, that of Ithamar, but, according to [1026]1 Kings 2:26 f,35, at the deposition of Abiathar and the appointment of Zadok, it returned again to the line of Eleazar (compare [0927]1 Samuel 2:27,28,35 f with [1348]1 Chronicles 24:3). Distinctions within the tribe are also expressly presupposed by [2400]Jeremiah 20:1; 29:25 f,29; 52:24; [1258]2 Kings 25:18. In the same way Levites are expressly mentioned in history (compare Judges 17 f; 19 through 21; [0965]1 Samuel 6:15; [1052]2 Samuel 15:24; [1008]1 Kings 8:3 ff). This very division of the priestly tribe into three parts possibly suggested the three parts of the temple of Solomon (the holy of holies, the holy place, the forecourt). According to all this, it is not possible that this distinction is not found in Deuteronomy, especially if this book was not written until the 7th century BC and throughout took into consideration the actual condition of affairs at that time, as is generally claimed. But this difference is found in Deuteronomy, the false dating of which we can here ignore, and is probably suggested by it; for, if this were not the case, then the addition of the words "the whole tribe of Levi" to the words "Levitical priests" in [5180]Deuteronomy 18:1 would be tautology. But as it is, both expressions already refer to what follows: namely, 18:3-5 to the priests and 18:6 ff to the rest of the Levites. In the same way, the Levites are in 12:12,18 f; 14:27,29; 16:11,14 the objects of charity, while 18:3 ff prescribes a fixed and not insignificant income for the priests. Then, finally, such general statements as are found in 10:8; 18:2 ff; 33:8 ff, not only demand such specific directions as are found only in the Priestly Code (P), but in 10:9; 18:2 there is a direct reference to [0482]Numbers 18:20,24 (from P). On the other hand, Deuteronomy, in harmony with its general tendency of impressing upon Israel in the spirit of pastoral exhortation the chief demands of the law, does not find it necessary, in every instance, to mention the distinctions that existed in the tribe of Levi.

In [0487]Numbers 18:7 we have in P even an analogon to [5108]Deuteronomy 10:8; 33:8 ff; since here, too, no distinction is made between priests and high priests separately, but the whole priestly service is mentioned in a summary manner (compare further [0862]Leviticus 6:22 in comparison with 6:25; Numbers 35 in comparison with Joshua 21). That Deuteronomy cannot say "Aaron and his sons," as P does, is certainly self-evident, because Aaron was no longer living at the time when the addresses of Deuteronomy were delivered. And how the expression "Levitical priests," which Deuteronomy uses for the expression found in the Priestly Code (P), and which was entirely suitable, because under all circumstances the priests

were of the tribe of Levi, is to be understood as excluding the subordinate members of the cults-officers belonging to the same tribe, is altogether incomprehensible (compare the emphasis put on the Levitical priesthood in P itself, as found in Numbers 17; Joshua 21:4,10 ff). So are other passages which originated at a time after the introduction by Ezekiel, or, according to the critics, are claimed to have been introduced then (compare Malachi 2:1 ff,4,8; 3:3; Jeremiah 33:18; Isaiah 66:21; 2 Chronicles 5:5; 23:18; 29:4 ff; 30:27), and even in Ezekiel (44:15). The claims that Deuteronomy is more humane in its treatment of the priests who had engaged in the worship in high places (compare e.g. 2 Kings 22 f) cannot at all be reconciled with Deuteronomy 13, which directs that death is to be the punishment for such idolatry. If, notwithstanding this, it is still claimed that Deuteronomy 18:6 ff allows the priests of the high places to serve in Jerusalem, then it is incomprehensible how in 2 Kings 23:9 these men did not appeal directly to Deuteronomy in vindication of their rights over against all hindrances, since Deuteronomy was regarded as the absolute norm in carrying out the cult tradition.

(ii) Not Sustained by Ezekiel:

Examination of the hypothesis on the basis of Ezekiel: No less unfavorable to the view of the critics must the judgment be when we examine it in the light of the contents of Ezekiel itself. The prophet presupposes a double service in the sanctuary, a lower service which, in the future, the degraded priests of the high places are to perform and which, in the past, had been performed in an unlawful manner by strangers (44:6-9), and a higher service, which had been performed by the Zadokites, the priests at the central sanctuary, in the proper way at the time when the other priests had gone astray, which service was for this reason to be entrusted to them alone in the future (compare, also, 40:45,46; 43:19). Since in 44:6 ff the sharpest rebukes are cast up to Israel (according to the reading of the Septuagint, which here uses the second person, even the charge of having broken the covenant), because they had permitted the lower service to be performed by uncircumcised aliens, it is absolutely impossible that Ezekiel should have been the first to introduce the distinction between higher and lower service, but he presupposes this distinction as something well known, and, also, that the lower service has been regulated by Divine ordinances. As we have such ordinances clearly given only in Numbers 18:2 ff (from P) it is in itself natural and almost necessary that Ezekiel has reference to these very ordinances, but these very ordinances direct that the

Levites are to have charge of this lower service. This is confirmed by [2682]Ezekiel 48:12 f, where the designation "Levites" in contradistinction from the priests is a fixed and recognized term for the lower cult officials. For Ezekiel has not at all said that he would from now on call these temple-servants simply by the name "Levites," but, rather, he simply presupposes the terminology of P as known and makes use of it. He would, too, scarcely have selected this expression to designate a condition of punishment, since the term "Levites" is recognized on all hands to be an honorable title in the sacred Scriptures. And when he, in addition, designates the Zadokites as "Levitical priests" ([26415]Ezekiel 44:15), this only shows anew that Ezekiel in his designation of the lower temple-servants only made use of the terminology introduced by P.

But, on the representation of the critics, the whole attitude ascribed to Ezekiel cannot be upheld. It is maintained that a prophet filled with the highest religious and ethical thoughts has been guilty of an action that, from an ethical point of view, is to be most sharply condemned. The prophet is made to write reproaches against the people of Israel for something they could not help ([26406]Ezekiel 44:6 ff), and he is made to degrade and punish the priests of the high places, who also had acted in good faith and were doing what they had a right to do ([26409]Ezekiel 44:9 ff; compare "the moral mantle" which, according to Wellhausen, "he threw over the logic of facts"). Ezekiel is accordingly regarded here as a bad man; but at the same time he would also be a stupid man. How could he expect to succeed in such an uncouth and transparent trick? If success had attended the effort to exclude from the service in Jerusalem the priests of the high places according to [12709]2 Kings 23:9, and notwithstanding [05806]Deuteronomy 18:6 ff, which according to what has been said under (a) is most improbable, then this would through the action of Ezekiel again have been made a matter of uncertainty. Or, was it expected that they would suffer themselves to be upraided and punished without protesting if they had done no wrong? Finally, too, the prophet would have belonged to that class whose good fortune is greater than their common sense. This leads us to the following:

(iii) Not Supported by Development after Ezekiel:

Examination of the development after the time of Ezekiel: Ezekiel's success is altogether incomprehensible, if now the distinction between priests and Levites has, at once, been introduced and at the return from captivity, in the year 538 ([15126]Ezra 2:36 ff), certainly was a fact. It is true

that we at once meet with a host of difficulties. Why do only 74 Levites return according to [15240]Ezra 2:40 if their degradation from the ranks of the priesthood through Ezekiel had not preceded? asks the Wellhausen school. Why did any Levites, at all, return, if they had been so disgraced? is our question. But, how is it at all possible that so many priests could return (4,289 among 42,360 exiles, or more than one-tenth of the whole number; compare [15236]Ezra 2:36-38 with verse 64; but many more than one-tenth if women are included in the 42,360), if, since the times of Ezekiel, there were none other than Zadokite priests? In examining the writers claimed as the authors of the Priestly Code (P), all those difficulties recur again which are found in the case of Ezekiel himself. That Numbers 16 f indicates and reflects the opposition of the degraded is nothing but an unproved assertion; but if they had revolted, which was probable enough, then there would have been no worse and more foolish means than to change the degraded position of the Levites according to Ezekiel into the honorable position assigned them in the Priestly Code (P). This would only have made the matter worse. The Levites would again have been able to claim their old rights and they would have acquired the strongest weapons for their opposition. The fact that Ezekiel's restoration of the priesthood to the Zadokites would have been ignored by the Priestly Code (P), as also the descent of Aaron through Eleazar and Ithamar, according to the account of the Priestly Code (P), that is, that in reality also others were admitted to the priesthood, would only have the effect of making those who still were excluded all the more rebellious, who could appeal to each case of such an admission as a precedent and accordingly as a violation of the principle. What possible purpose the authors of P could have had in the creation of those products of imagination, Nadab and Abihu, and the portrayal of the terrible fate of these sons of Aaron (Leviticus 10) remains incomprehensible (compare the purposeless and constructive imagination in the description of the details of the Ark of the Covenant, which stands in no connection with the tendency of P; *see EXODUS*, III, 5). Nor can it be understood why the creators of the Priestly Code would have had assigned other duties to the Levites than Ezekiel had done; the slaying of the burnt offerings and the sacrifices (44:11) and the cooking of the latter (46:24) is lacking in the Priestly Code (P), in which document the transportation of the imaginary tabernacle would have exhausted the duties of the priests (Numbers 4), while in other respects, their services would be described only in such general notices as in [04823]Numbers 8:23 ff; 18:2 ff (compare for this reason the very credible account in Chronicles, which through

[26441]Ezekiel 44:11; 46:24 only becomes all the more trustworthy, where we are told of the enlargement of the duties of the Levites already by David in [13235]1 Chronicles 23:25 ff). In short, the critical views offer one monstrosity after another, and each greater than its predecessor. We will only mention further that, if the critics are right in this matter, then of the directions found in Ezekiel 40 through 48 nothing else has ever been carried out in reality, even when these chapters are correctly understood (see 2 (d) below), and at first nothing was intended to be carried out, so that it would be all the more surprising if this one feature of the program of Ezekiel had alone been picked out and had been carried out with an inexplicable haste, and that too at a time when the whole cult was not at all observed (573, according to 40:1).

(d) The True Solution:

The text as it reads in [26409]Ezekiel 44:9 ff actually does speak of a degradation. If the matter involved only a mere putting back into the status quo ante, of the Levites, who on the high places, contrary to the law, had usurped the prerogatives of the higher priestly offices, as this could easily be understood, then the expression in [26410]Ezekiel 44:10,12, "They shall bear their iniquity," would lose much of its significance. On the other hand, the whole matter finds its explanation if, in the first place, the lower order of Levites did not put a high estimate on their office, so that they transferred their service to aliens (44:6 ff), and if, in the second place, by those Levites who departed from Yahweh, when Israel was going astray, not all the Levites are to be understood, but only a certain group of priests, who by these words were for themselves and their contemporaries clearly enough designated: namely, the descendants of Aaron through Ithamar and Eleazar in so far as they were not Zadokites, that is, had not officiated at the central sanctuary. The non-Zadokite priests had permitted themselves to be misled to officiate in the idolatry in the services of the high places, and for this reason were for the future to be degraded to the already existing lower order of the Levites.

The fact that in the ranks of lower participants in the cults, already in the days of David, according to Chronicles, a still further division had taken place (1 Chronicles 23 through 26), so that by the side of the Levites in the most narrow sense of the word, also the singers and the gate watchmen were Levites of a lower rank ([16244]Nehemiah 12:44-47; 13:10), is again in itself entirely credible, and, in addition, is made very probable by [15240]Ezra 2:40 ff. This too at once increases the small number of Levites who

returned from the exile from 74 to 341. In comparison to the number of priests (4,289) the number yet remains a small one, but from [26406]Ezekiel 44:6 ff we learn further that the Levites also before the days of Ezekiel had not appreciated their office, for then they would not have given it over to aliens. In this way not only does everything become clear and intelligible, but the weapon which was to serve for the defense of the Wellhausen school has in every respect been turned against these critics. The historical order can only be: first, the Priestly Code, and after that Ezekiel; never vice versa.

(2) Ezekiel 40 through 48: Priority claimed for Ezekiel as against the Priest Codex

(a) Sketch of the modern view:

The entire vision of what the external condition of affairs would be in the future in Ezekiel 40 through 48, and not only what is particularly stated in 44:4 ff, is made a part of Israel's religious development in accordance with the scheme of the Wellhausen school. For this hypothesis, this section is one of the chief arguments, besides the opposition which it claims exists on the part of the prophets against the sacrifices, in addition to the proof taken from the history of the people and from the comparison of the different collections of laws with each other. In Ezekiel 40 through 48 many things are different from what they are in the Priestly Code, and in Ezekiel much is lacking that is found in P. How now would a prophet dare to change the legislation in P? Hence, P is regarded as later than Ezk. This is, briefly, the logic of the Wellhausen school.

(b) One-Sidedness of This View:

If we first state the facts in the case and complete the observations of the modern school, the picture will at once assume quite a different form and the conclusions drawn will in their consequences prove very embarrassing. It is a fact that in Ezekiel the high priest so prominent in P is lacking. No mention is made of the equipment of the holy of holies, and in the holy place the table of the shewbread and the candlesticks, old utensils that are mentioned in the tabernacle of the Priestly Code (P), and in part play an important role there. But the differences in Ezekiel are not found only in comparison with the Priestly Code (P), but just as much, too, in features which belong to the legislation of Deuteronomy, as also of the Book of the Covenant, accepted at all hands as preexilic (Exodus 21 through 23; 34).

Thus there is lacking in Ezekiel 40 through 48 not only the tithes of P (Leviticus 27:30-33), also the laws with reference to the firstborn from P (Leviticus 27:26 f; Numbers 18:15 f), the ordinances with reference to the portions of the redemption sacrifice to be given to the priests from P (Leviticus 7:31 ff), but equally the ordinance with reference to the tithes, firstborn and sacrificial gifts from Deuteronomy (compare 14:22 ff; 26:12 ff; 14:23-26; 15:19-23; 18:3). The feast of weeks is wanting, which is demanded not only by P in Leviticus 23:15 ff; Numbers 28:26 ff, but also by the older legislation (Exodus 23:16; 34:22; Deuteronomy 16:9 ff); and in the place of the three parallel feasts demanded everywhere, only the Passover and the Feast of the Tabernacles are prescribed (Ezekiel 45:21). Thus too the direction with regard, e.g. to the Day of Atonement in Ezekiel 45:18 ff is different in regard to number, time and ritual from P in Leviticus 16, etc. (compare *DAY OF ATONEMENT*, I, 1), but also the command found in Exodus 20:26 (from E) that it was not permitted to ascend on steps to the altar of Yahweh is overthrown by Ezekiel 43:17. And, according to what has been described under **(1)**, criticism itself accepts (although without reason) that Ezekiel had changed the commandment of Deuteronomy 18:6 ff, according to which all the Levites in Jerusalem could perform priestly service, so that he not only forbade this, as did 2 Kings 23:9, but that he also degraded these priests of the high places as a punishment and reduced them to a lower service.

As is the case in reference to the law, Ezekiel also disagrees with the facts of history. He changes the dimensions of the Solomonic temple entirely (40:5 through 42:20); he gives an entirely different distribution of the Holy Land (47:13 through 48:29) from that which was carried out in actual history. What sheer arbitrariness and short-sightedness it would be, to pick out of this condition of affairs only those features in which he differs from the Priestly Code (P), in order, for this reason, to force the composition of the Priestly Code into the postexilic period, and at the same time to close one's eyes to the necessary conclusion that if this principle of interpretation is correct, then the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy, the temple and the migration into Canaan must also be post-exilic. "The prophet is not allowed to change the Priestly Code (P)," we are told; but as a matter of fact he has changed P no more than he changed the older laws and history. Hence, the claim is false. And then, too, P is not to be regarded as unchangeable. Even the writer of Chronicles, who writes from the standpoint of the Priestly Code (P), has changed P; for he narrates in 1

Chronicles 23:24,27 that the age of the Levites since the time of David had been reduced from 30 or 25 years (ᐸ⁰⁰⁴⁰³ᐳNumbers 4:3,13,10,35; 8:23 ff) to 20 years (compare also the participation of the Levites in the burnt sacrifices and the Passover under Hezekiah (ᐸ¹⁴²⁸⁴ᐳ2 Chronicles 29:34; 30:17,19)), and in P itself, according to ᐸ⁰⁴⁰⁰⁶ᐳNumbers 9:6-12, the observation of the Passover after the regular time was permitted, and in general if such changes and adaptations of the law on the part of Ezekiel could not be demonstrated elsewhere, the difficulties for the advocates of the Wellhausen hypothesis would be exactly as great as they are for the adherents of the Biblical views, only that the problem would be inverted to explain how the author of P could have ventured to deviate so far from the will of God as this had been revealed to Ezekiel.

(c) Impossibility That Ezekiel Preceded P:

While the description of the temple in 40:5 ff and of the future dwelling-places of the people (47:13 ff) is comparatively complete, it is the very legislation of the ritual in 43:13 through 46:24, in which it is maintained that the authors of P followed the precedent of the prophet, that is in itself so full of omissions in Ezek, that it could not possibly have been a first sketch, but must presuppose the Priestly Code (P), if it is not to be regarded as suspended in the air. Ezekiel presupposes not only burnt offerings, peace offerings and food offerings, but also sin offerings (40:39; 42:13; 43:19,21,22,25; 44:27,29; 46:20). Ezekiel is indeed the first and the only prophet who mentioned sin offerings, just as the guilt offerings are found outside of Ezekiel only in ᐸ²⁵⁵³¹⁰ᐳIsaiah 53:10. But this reference is of such a kind that he presupposes on the part of his readers an acquaintance also with these two kinds of sacrifices; hence, it is, in itself, a natural conclusion, that the sacrificial legislation of the Priestly Code (P), that is, chiefly Leviticus 1 to 7, is older, and as the guilt offerings and the sin offerings are prescribed only by the Priestly Code (P), and in Leviticus 4 f appear to be emphasized anew, this conclusion becomes a necessity.
If this is not the case then Ezekiel is without any foundation. In the same way the injunctions with reference to what is clean and unclean are presupposed as known in 44:23,15 f (compare 22:26). How long the uncleanness described in 22:26 continued can be seen only from ᐸ⁰⁴⁹¹¹ᐳNumbers 19:11 ff. Since in ᐸ²⁶²²⁶ᐳEzekiel 22:26 there is presupposed a definitely fixed [Torah] or Law, which it is possible to violate, then it is only natural to conclude that such commands existed before the days of Ezekiel, especially such as are found in Leviticus 11 through 15. In the

same way the general character of the ordinances (⟨2648⟩Ezekiel 44:30a), concerning the tithes due to the cult officials, demand such further developments as are found especially in Numbers 18 in P. The high priests, too, although Ezekiel makes no mention of them, belong to the period earlier than Ezekiel, as was proved under **(1)**. If there had been no high priest before the days of Ezekiel, it would have been a perfect mystery, in addition, how he would be found after 520 BC (⟨3700⟩Haggai 1:1; ⟨3008⟩Zechariah 3:8; 6:10 ff), without a word having been mentioned of the establishment of such an important institution. In addition, if the office had been created just at this time, this would make it very uncomfortable for the contentions of the Wellhausen school, since the other ordinances of P were introduced only in 444 BC, and should here be regarded as innovating.

That Ezekiel presupposed the ordinances of P in reference to the cult officials has been demonstrated under (1). Accordingly, there yet remains to be discussed the universally recognized relationship that exists between Ezekiel and the so-called Law of Holiness (H) in Leviticus 17 through 26 (compare *LEVITICUS*), which is so great, that for a time Ezekiel was regarded as the author or the editor of this law, a view which, however, has been dropped, because a number of the peculiarities of Ezekiel do not admit of its acceptance. The more advanced critics then went farther, and claimed that the Law of Holiness (H, Leviticus 17 through 26) is later than Ezekiel, which is the only possible and defensible position. For practical reasons we here examine, in addition to Ezekiel 40 through 48, also the older parts of the book. Especially do we take into consideration, in addition to chapter 44, also chapters 18, 20 and 22; but in the end the contents of H are suggested by the entire Book of Ezekiel. Especially Leviticus 26 has been very fully used by Ezekiel; compare for the details, Driver's Introduction to the Old Testament; or, Hoffmann, Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese. That Ezekiel could not be the earlier of the two can be concluded as far as P in general is concerned, and for H in particular, especially from this, that Ezekekiel is just as closely connected with Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, as with P; while, on the other hand, in the passage in question, P is connected only with Ezekiel, while the expressions which Ezekiel has in common with Deuteronomy and those Ezekiel has in common with Jeremiah are not found in P (compare the exceedingly interesting and instructive proof in Hoffmann, op. cit.). Equally striking is the proof of Kohler, Biblische Geschichte, III, 154 ff, who shows that the contents of the Torah (Law)

presupposed and recognized by Jeremiah and Ezekiel as dating from the Mosaic period, take into consideration not only the Books of the Covenant (Exodus 21 ff; 34) and Deuteronomy, but especially P in general and H in particular. Further, if we place P in a later period, it would be incomprehensible that this body of laws, in which the systematic feature is so important, can differ from the still more systematic ordinances of Ezekiel, and thus become more unsystematic. Thus the sacrifices on the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles are in number of the same kind in Ezekiel 45:21 ff; but not so in P in Numbers 28:16 ff; 29:12 ff. In the same way in the food offerings on the feasts as far as oxen, rams, lambs, and the amount of oil to be given are concerned, there is everywhere the proper proportion in Ezekiel 45:18 through 46:15, while in Numbers 28 this is regulated according to a different principle. Then in Ezekiel are found in the description of the sanctuary (42:15 through 20; 45:2), of the inner and outer courts (40:23,17,47; compare also 40:19; 48:16 f), square figures in places where they are not found in the tabernacle according to P. To this must be added that no other ordinances of Ezekiel would be carried out in actual practice. Even the ordinances in 44:4 ff, according to the views of the critics, would be changed in the Priestly Code (P), in so far as the establishment and work of the lower cult officials and the enlargement of the powers of the higher cult officials are concerned (compare **(1)**). The Day of Atonement, whose roots are said to be found in Ezekiel 45:18 ff, would be materially changed in number, length and ritual (compare *DAY OF ANTONEMENT* I, 1 and III, 1). When the Israelites returned from captivity, they did not think at all of building the temple or the tabernacle in accordance with Ezekiel's scheme, or dividing the land according to the directions of his book (both of these subjects have great prominence in Ezekiel 40 through 48; compare 40:5 through 43:12; 47:13 through 48:29), or of harmonizing Ezekiel with the Priestly Code (P), or of carrying out the latter practically. The Wellhausen hypothesis is then in conflict with all ritual legislation, whether real or constructed by Wellhausen himself.

(d) Correct Interpretation of Passage

Ezekiel 40 through 48: These chapters dare not be made a part of the development of the law in the Old Testament. Ezekiel's was not a program that was under all circumstances to be carried out or even could be carried out, for it presupposes conditions that were beyond the control of Israel. For in 40:2 ff, a new geographical or geological situation is presupposed,

which the country up to this time did not possess (compare the "very high mountain," 40:2), and the same is true in 47:1 ff in reference to the miraculous temple fountain with its equally miraculous powers, and in 47:13 ff in the division of the land. Only after these changes had been effected in the character of the localities by Yahweh, and Yahweh should again have entered the holy city according to 43:1 if, would it be possible to carry out also the other injunctions. It is impossible, either, to interpret these chapters as an allegory. This interpretation is out of the question on account of a large number of directions and measurements. It is, however, true that the whole is an ideal scheme, which portrays to the eye the continuation of the kingdom of God, and represents symbolically the presence of Yahweh, which sanctifies all around about it and creates for itself a suitable outward form. This is particularly apparent in the new name which is assigned to Jerusalem, namely, "Yahweh at that place," or the conclusion of this section and at the same time of the entire book. This, finally, leads us to a brief account of the views presented.

(3) **Ezekiel's Leviticism.**

In (1) and (2) above, it has been shown that Ezekiel was not the starting-point of Leviticism in Israel: it rather represents the extreme development of this tendency. It was in harmony with the elementary stage of the Old Testament to give the thoughts and demands of God, not in a purely abstract form, but to clothem in objective and external materials, in order to prepare and educate Israel to understand Christianity. (The negative side of Leviticism, which is not to be overlooked by the side of the positive, is discussed in the article *LEVITICUS*) It is a matter of utmost importance for the correct understanding of the Old Testament, that we recognize that the prophets too throughout think Levitically; in their discourses, too, sacred trees, sacrifices, times, persons, tithes, play a most important role, notwithstanding all the spiritualization of religion on their part; and where it is thought possible to show an absolute opposition on the part of the prophets to the Levitical system, namely, in the matter of sacrifices, a close consideration, but especially, too, the analogy of the other external institutions, shows that we have in these cases only a relative antithesis (compare Are the Critics Right? 99 ff; Messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, 333 ff). Thus e.g. Jeremiah who, in 6:20; 7:21 ff, engages as sharply as possible in polemics against the sacrificial system, and in 31:31 ff, in the passage treating of the new covenant, spiritualizes religion as much as possible, has assigned to sacrifices a place in his

predictions of the future (compare 17:19 ff,26; 31:14; 33:18), just as the abiding-place and the revelation of God for this prophet too, are always found connected with the Holy Land, Jerusalem or Zion (compare 3:17; 12:15; 30:18; 31:6,11,12; 32:36 ff; 33:9). That in this the ultimate development of the kingdom of God has not yet been reached, but that the entire Old Testament contains only a preliminary stage, cannot be too sharply emphasized. In so far Ezekiel, in whose book Leviticism appears in its most developed state, more than others, shares in the limitations of the Old Testament. But just as little can it be denied that the Levitical system was really one stage, and that, too, an important and indispensable stage in the development of the kingdom of God; and that in this system, the question at issue is not only that of a change of a religion into a stereotyped formalism or externalism, which is the case if this system loses its contents, but the fact that it contained a valuable kernel which ripened in this shell, but would not have ripened if this shell had been prematurely discarded. The external conditions, their harmonious arrangement, the ceremonial ordinances, keeping clean from external pollution, are indeed only forms; but in them valuable contents succeed in finding their expression; through these Israel learned to understand these contents. The kernel could not be given without the shell nor the contents without the form, until in Christianity the time came when the form was to be broken and the shell discarded. This significance of the Levitical system becomes more evident in Ezekiel than is the case, e.g. in the Priestly Code (P), where indeed a few passages like [0258]Exodus 25:8; 29:45 ff; 40:34 ff; Leviticus 16; 19:18; 26:31,41 clearly show in what sense the entire legislation is to be understood; but the mere fact that there are so few of these passages makes it easy to overlook them; while in Ezekiel, in addition to the purely Levitical utterances, and in part more closely connected with these, the entire work is saturated with the emphasis put on the highest religious and ethical thoughts, so that both must be in the closest harmony with each other (compare on this subject also Ezekiel's conception of God under 5 below). That Ezekiel and the Law of Holiness stand in such close relations to each other is not to be explained from this, that Ezekiel is in any way to be connected with the composition of the law in Leviticus 17 through 26, but on the ground of the tendency common to both. The fact that Ezekiel shows a special liking for these chapters in P does not, accordingly, justify the conclusion that Leviticus 17 ff ever existed as a separate legal codex. We must in this connection not forget the close connection of the prophets with the rest of P mentioned under (2) above

(compare *LEVITICUS*). We close this part of the discussion with the statement that Ezekiel constructed his system on the basis of the Levitical ordinance, but as priest-prophet (compare under I, 1) utilized this material independently and freely.

3. Ezekiel and the Messianic Idea:

Chs 40 through 48 treat of the future, and furnish us the transition to another matter, in which Ezekiel by modern theology has been forced into a wrong light, namely, in regard to the Messianic idea. After the critics had, as a matter of fact, eliminated from the entire preexilic prophetical writings nearly all of the passages speaking of the Messiah on the ground that they were not genuine (e.g. [30908]Amos 9:8 ff; [26010]Hosea 1:10,11; 3:5; [31212]Micah 2:12 f; 4 f; [29042]Isaiah 4:2-6; 7:14; 9:1-7; 11:1-10, etc.), Marti and Volz have now completed this task. While the former declared as not genuine all the Messianic predictions down to Deutero-Isaiah, the latter has, in his work, Die vorexilische Jahwe-Prophetic und der Messias, halted at Ezekiel, but for this works up the entire material into a uniform fundamental conception with pronounced characteristics. He declares that prophecy and the Messianic idea are two mutually exclusive phenomena, by regarding the Messiah as a purely political and national fact, but the prophetic expectation of the future as something purely religious. Ezekiel he regards as the first prophet with whose views on other matters the Messianic idea indeed did not harmonize, but who, nevertheless, yielded to the tendencies of his times and to the general national feelings, and submitted to the influence of the false prophets, who had created the carnal national expectation of a Messiah and constantly fed this, and accordingly received into his book the Messiah passages in 17:22-24; 21:25 f; 34:23 f; 37:22,24,25. But this too is, all in all, simply a monstrous assumption. It is exegetically incorrect to regard the Messiah merely as a political, national and particularistic person, whenever the religious and ethical and universalistic characteristics of the Messiah are portrayed by prophecy; and it is also incorrect to regard prophecy as abstractly religious, when the national and external side of the kingdom of God is ignored. It is impossible to eliminate the different Messianic passages preceding the time of Ezekiel, as these are proved to be genuine by their contents and form, their close connection with the context, the structure of the prophetic writings, and by the mutual relation of these passages to each other. But we must here refer to our book, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten. We draw attention to this only because since the

publication of Gressmann's book, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-judischen Eschatologie, the critics have begun to be a little less skeptical in reference to the genuine character of the Messianic passages in the older prophetical writings. We here point to the fact, that the positive contentions of Volz, which ascribe to Ezekiel the introduction of the Messianic idea out of the popular faith, are exceedingly inconsiderate. The different passages mentioned above, which in Ezekiel speak of the Messiah, can scarcely be said to add any new features to the picture of the Messiah as it is found in earlier literature (of one exception to this we will speak later). If the Messiah was not yet portrayed in the earlier prophetic literature, then Ezekiel had the less occasion to introduce this new feature, if this feature did not harmonize with his other views, as Volz claims. And, if this is only a mistake, it is yet a fact that in Ezekiel the Messianic idea is not relatively a prominent feature; he, as it were, only recalls the pictures known from the predictions of the earlier prophets; he accepts these pictures as revealed truth, because they, in his conviction, evidently originated in the development of prophecy. Compare for the idea that the Messiah is to come forth from small origins and from a lowly station [26722]Ezekiel 17:22-24; [231063]Isaiah 10:33,14; 11:1; [30501]Micah 5:1 ff. [35212]Ezekiel 21:32 only hints at the general expectation of a Messiah; [26423]Ezekiel 34:23 f; 37:22,24,25 connect especially with the promises given to David in 2 Samuel 7. Then the reunion of the two kingdoms into one scepter is found also in [30911]Amos 9:11; [28102]Hosea 2:2; 3:5; [23082]Isaiah 8:23 through 9:1 ff; 11:13 f; [30502]Micah 5:2; [24618]Jeremiah 3:18; 23:5 f; [11139]1 Kings 11:39; the blessing of Nature, [23106]Isaiah 11:6-8; [30913]Amos 9:13 ff; [28020]Hosea 2:20 ff; 14:6 ff. At all events the Messianic expectations of Ezekiel exhibit too few peculiar features and are too little prominent in the body of his prophecies to justify the belief that he was the first prophet to have introduced this so important Messianic figure. On the other hand, let us remember too that Ezekiel opposes the national feelings as sharply as possible by representing the entire past history of Israel as an unbroken chain of heathenish abominations (Ezekiel 1 through 24; 33, especially 16 and 23), and remember it was just he who like Jeremiah saw his most bitter opponents in the false prophets ([26501]Ezekiel 13:1 ff; 14:9; 22:28), and that in the most pronounced antithesis to these he proclaimed before the fall of Jerusalem that this fall would and must come. And now it is claimed that he borrowed his Messianic idea from these very people, although this Messianic conception is everywhere represented as being a Divine revelation and not a natural product of the popular consciousness. A greater blunder in

theological thought could scarcely be imagined.

In one point, however, we do find in Ezekiel a further development of the Messianic idea, namely, that in His work, in addition to His characteristics as a king, the Messiah has also those of a high priest, as this is shown at the same period by Jeremiah (see under I, 1, and 2, 3; compare later Zechariah 3 f, and possibly 6:9 ff). The *mitsnepheth*, which the Messiah bears according to ³⁵²⁶Ezekiel 21:26, is in other connections always the mitre of the high priest (compare Exodus 4,39; 29:6; 39:28,31; see above II, 2, 1a and 2c). At the Passover feast, at least, the prince conducts a purification through a bullock for a sin offering, which, through the fact that this is done for himself and for the entire people of the land, reminds us of the ceremony of the high priest on the day of atonement (²⁶⁵²²Ezekiel 45:22; ⁰³¹⁶⁷Leviticus 16:17,24,33; compare *DAY OF ATONEMENT*, I, 1, and Messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, 356 ff). Over against the current view, we finally emphasize the fact that Ezekiel's expectations of a Messianic feature are not confined to Israel, but like those of Isaiah (2:2 ff; 11:10: ³⁰⁵⁸Micah 5:3,1) and of other prophets are universal in their scope (compare ²⁶⁷²³Ezekiel 17:23; 16:53,11; 34:26).

4. Ezekiel and Apocalyptic Literature:

Ezekiel is also, finally, regarded as the creator of apocalyptic literature, which in prophetic garment sought to satisfy the curiosity of the people and picture the details of the last times. In this connection the critics have in mind especially Ezekiel 38; 39, that magnificent picture of the final onslaught of the nations under Gog and Magog, which will end with the certain victory of the Divine cause and the terrible overthrow of the enemies of Yahweh. On the mountains of Israel the hosts will fall (39:4); seven years it will be possible to kindle fires with the weapons of the enemies (39:9); it takes seven months to bury the dead (39:12); a great feast is prepared for the birds (39:17 ff).

In reply to this there are two things to be said. First of all Ezekiel is not the creator of these thoughts. There is a whole list of passages in the Prophets that already before his time picture how matters will be after and beyond the Messianic age (compare ³¹²²Micah 2:12b f; 4:11 f; 5:4 f,7,20; ²⁹⁸⁰²Joel 3:2,12 f; ²³¹⁰⁴Isaiah 11:4; 28:6; ²⁸⁰¹²Hosea 2:2). These are, however, all regarded by the critics as not genuine, or as the product of a later period, but they forget in this to observe that Ezekiel in these passages refers to older prophets (38:17; 39:8), and thus they saw off the branch upon which he sits. In regard, however, to painting the fullest details of the picture,

Ezekiel is equaled by none of his predecessors. In this matter, too, he represents the highest point of development, in which he is followed by Zechariah 12; 13:7 ff; 14:1 ff, and Daniel, and with direct dependence on Ezekiel 38 f by the Apocalypse of John (⁶⁶⁹¹⁷Revelation 19:17 ff). On the other hand, Ezekiel is entirely different from the later Jewish apocalyptic literature. The latter borrowed the prophetic form but possesses neither the Divine contents nor the Divine inspiration of the prophet. For this reason the apocalyptic literature appears anonymously or under a pseudonym. Ezekiel, however, openly places his name over his prophecies. In Ezekiel the eschatology is a part of his prophetic mission, and as he in his thoughts throughout remains within the bounds of the religious and ethical ideals of prophecy, this feature, too, of his work is to be regarded as a Divine revelation in a form in harmony with the Old Testament stage of the development of the kingdom of God. We are here indeed considering a matter in connection with which it is especially difficult to determine how much in reality belongs to the eternally valid contents, and how much to the temporary forms. Here too, as is the case in the exegesis of Ezekiel 40 through 48, Christian theology will vacillate between the extremes of spiritualism and realism, one extreme constantly correcting the other, and in this way constantly approaching the correct middle course, until at some time in the future we will reach the full truth in the matter.

5. Ezekiel's Conception of God:

A prophet who, from the aesthetic side, enjoyed the highest appreciation of a Schiller and a Herder (see 1 above), who has brought the Leviticism of the Old Testament to the highest stage of development (compare 2 above), who in his portrait of the Messiah has introduced the high-priestly characteristics (compare 3 above), who in eschatology developed new features and laid the foundation for the development that followed in later times (compare 4 above), can scarcely with any right or reason be termed a "secondary character among the prophets." This fact becomes all the more sure when we now finally examine the conception of God as taught in Ezk. In grandeur and variety of thought, in this respect only, Isaiah and Moses can be compared with Ezekiel. Already in the visions, we are struck by the sublimity of God as there pictured, especially in the opening vision, where He appears as the absolute ruler of all creation, over which He sits enthroned (compare II, 1, above). He is constantly called "the Lord Yahweh," over against whom the prophet is at all times only "the son of man." More than fifty times it is said that the purpose of the prophecy was

that the heathen nations, as well as the Israelites, shall by His judgments and His promises recognize that He is Yahweh.

On this side Ezekiel stands in an especially close relation to the description of the exodus from Egypt (compare Exodus 7:5,17; 8:10,22; 9:14,29,30; 10:2; 11:7; 14:4,18, and *see* EXODUS, II, 2, on 7:8 through 13:16). Above everything Yahweh's honor must be defended (Ezekiel 36:23,12). Here again there is a place where the evolutionist hypothesis of the development of the idea of God is thoroughly put to shame. For in the preprophetic times it is claimed that God is, in the Old Testament, merely placed by the side of other gods and was regarded only as the God of Israel, with which He was indissolubly connected, because His existence had depended on the existence of the nation. As a proof, reference is made to the defense of His honor; and now we find the same thought in Ezekiel, in whose case it is impossible that any doubt as to his absolute monotheism can any longer arise (compare my Entwicklung der Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit, 138 ff 152 ff). The sublimity of this conception of God also appears in its universality. He is declared to be punishing the nations (compare Ezekiel 25 ff; 35 f); He uses them for His purposes (compare Ezekiel 38 f; 17; 19; 24; 33); He intends to give them salvation (Ezekiel 17; 23; 16:53,11; 34:26; compare 3 above).

Most of all, Ezekiel's conception of God, according to the preceding sketch, reminds us of that of Calvin. By the exalted character of God we find also a second feature. On the one side we find the holy God; on the other, sinful man. The entire development of the people is from the beginning a wrong one. Ezekiel's thoughts are to be regarded as those for days of penance when he, on the one hand, emphasizes the great guilt of the people as such (compare Ezekiel 16 and 23), and by the side of this maintains the principle that each one must be punished on account of his own sins (Ezekiel 18:2), so that the individual cannot excuse himself, and the individual cannot be freed through the guilt of the people as a totality.

But now comes the highest conception. The exalted and holy God comes to be a God of love. What is it but love, that He does not reject His people forever, but promises them a future (compare Ezekiel 34 through 48, in which also the divided kingdoms are to be reunited, 37:15 ff)? As Exodus finds its culmination point in the indwelling of God among His people, which He promised in Exodus 25 ff (25:8; 29:45 f), but seems to have become a matter of doubt again in Exodus 32 ff through the apostasy of

the people, and nevertheless is finally realized in Exodus 35 ff (40:34 ff), thus too in Ezekiel 10 f, Yahweh leaves the city, but in 43:1 ff He again returns, and now the name of the city is "Yahweh is there" (48:35). But as every single member participates in the sin and the punishment of the people, so too he takes part in the deliverance.

Ezekiel is indeed, as little as is Jeremiah, the creator of individualism, which he has often been declared to be. Against this claim, e.g. the character of the patriarchs can be appealed to. But a deeper conception of individualism has actually been brought about by Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The national organization as such was for the present dissolved. Accordingly, these prophets have now to deal more with the individual (compare 1, 2, 3, above). Ezekiel is actually the pastor of those in exile. He has been appointed the watchman of the house of Israel (3:16 ff and 33:1 ff). He can bear the responsibility for the individual souls (compare also Ezekiel 18). The wicked man who dies without having been warned is demanded from his hand by God. Yahweh does not wish the death of the sinner, but that he should repent and live.

Here such a clear mirror is given, that before it conscientious Christian preachers must all feel ashamed. Yahweh is the gracious God, who does not treat men simply according to the principle of retaliation, else what would become of man? God rather desires to bestow all things out of free grace; he that repents shall live. This is the highest ideal of the prophet, and with it we close.

The Feast of Weeks, the Pentecost of the Israelites, Ezekiel does not mention (compare II, 2, 2b, above). This festival has come to be one of higher importance since on Pentecost the Holy Spirit was poured out, and this Spirit Ezekiel knows. Besides, such passages as [24215]Jeremiah 32:15; 44:1-6; [49512]Psalm 51:12 ff; [29028]Joel 2:28 ff; [28131]Jeremiah 31:31 ff, it is Ezekiel which contains the clearest predictions of Pentecost. It is the Spirit who in Ezekiel 37 awakens to new life the dead bones of Israel. And in [26802]Ezekiel 38:25-28 we read: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep mine ordinances, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye

shall be my people, and I will be your God."

LITERATURE.

Comm. of Keil, Havernick, Hengstenberg, von Orelli, Smend, Bertholet, Kraetzschmar.

For the Messianic Prophecies, the works of von Orelli, Riehm, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg. Compare also Volz, Die vorexilische Jahwe-Prophetie und der Messias; Moller, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, zugleich ein Protest gegen moderne Textzersplitterung; Cornill, The Prophet Ezekiel; Klostermann, Studien und Kritken, 1877.

Introductions of Kuenen, Strack, Baudissin, Konig, Cornill, Driver.

Histories of Israel, by Kohler, Konig, Kittel, Klostermann, Oettli, Stade, Wellhausen.

Bible Lexicons, see under "Ezekiel."

Against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis, Moller, Are the Critics Right? In this Encyclopedia, for further literature compare also the article *LEVITICUS*: Orr, Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament; Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, and The Origin of the Pentateuch; Hoffmann, Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese; Kegel, Wilhelm Vatke u. die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese; Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden; Seinecke, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, II.

Wilhelm Moller

EZEL

<e'-zel> ([l zah; *ha-'azel*]); Septuagint [παρὰ τὸ ἐργὰβ ἐκεῖνο, *para to ergab ekeino*]): As it stands, the narrative in 1 Samuel 20:19 records the tryst of Jonathan with David at the stone Ezel. The name occurs only here. There is general agreement that the text is corrupt, but there is no agreement as to how it should be restored. The Septuagint reads "this mound" (the Revised Version (British and American), margin), or "yonder cairn"; and in 1 Samuel 20:41 instead of "out of a place toward the South" it reads "from beside the mound" or "cairn." Dr. Cheyne suggests "yonder juniper tree" (Encyclopaedia Biblica, under the word).

EZEM

<e'-zem> ([μχ[, `*etsem*], "bone"; [Βοοσάλ, *Boosal*], [Βοασόμ, *Boasom*]): A city in the extreme South of Judah, assigned to Simeon. Some identify it with Azmon (Joshua 15:29; 19:3; 1 Chronicles 4:29).

EZER

<e'-zer> ([rz[e`*ezer*], "help"):

(1) A Horite chief (Genesis 36:21; 1 Chronicles 1:38).

(2) A Judahite (1 Chronicles 4:4).
(3) An Ephraimite, slain by men of Gath (1 Chronicles 7:21).

(4) A Gadite who followed David while in exile on account of the wrath of Saul (1 Chronicles 12:9).
(5) One of those who under direction of Nehemiah repaired the wall of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 3:19).
(6) A musician in one of the great companies appointed by Nehemiah to give thanks at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 12:42).

EZERIAS

<ez-e-ri'-as> ([Ἐζερίας, *Ezerias*]): 1 Esdras 8:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Zechrias," the Azariah of Ezra 7:1.

EZIAS

<e-zi'-as>: the Revised Version (British and American) OZIAS (which see).

EZION-GEBER

<e-zi-on-ge'-ber> ([rbℊ,ˆwℓχ[, *'etsyon gebher*]; [Γασιών Γάβερ, *Gasion Gaber*]): Always mentioned along with Elath ("Eziongaber," Numbers 33:35 f the King James Version). When the children of Israel left "the way of the Arabah," having come from the Northwest, they seem to have turned to the Northeast from the neighborhood of `Aqaba, passing

up by *Wady el-Ithm* toward the eastern desert (⁵⁰⁸Deuteronomy 2:8). Elath and Ezion-geber were evidently not far apart. They are named together again in connection with the maritime enterprises of Solomon and Jehoshaphat (¹⁰²⁶1 Kings 9:26, etc.). They therefore both lay on the shore of the sea. No trace of Ezion-geber is to be found on the present coast line. It is probable, however, that in ancient times the sea covered a considerable stretch of the mud flats at the South end of *Wady el-`Arabah*, and the site of Ezion-geber may be sought near the spring `*Ain el-Ghudyan*, about 15 miles North of the present head of the Gulf of `Aqaba.

W. Ewing

EZNITE

<ez-'nit> ([ynἰx⟨, `*etsni*] or [wῆx⟨, `*etsno*]).

See *ADINO.*

EZORA

<e-zo'-ra> ([ʾΕζωρά, *Ezora*], the King James Version Ozora): He and his six sons "gave their hands to put away their strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:20,34 = "Machnadebai" of ⁵¹⁰⁰Ezra 10:40).

EZRA

<ez'-ra> (Aramaic or Chaldee, [arz⟨, `*ezra'*], "help"; a hypocoristicon, or shortened form of Azariah, "Yahweh has helped." The Hebrew spells the name [hrz⟨, `*ezrah*], as in ¹³⁰⁴⁷1 Chronicles 4:17, or uses the Aramaic spelling of the name, as in ⁴⁵⁷⁰¹Ezra 7:1. The Greek form is Esdras):
(1) A priest who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (¹⁶²²⁰Nehemiah 12:1). In ¹⁶⁰²Nehemiah 10:2, Azariah, the full form of the name, is found.
(2) A descendant of Judah and father of Jethro and other sons (¹³⁰⁴⁷1 Chronicles 4:17).

(3) The distinguished priest who is the hero of the Book of Ezra and co-worker with Nehemiah.

1. FAMILY:

The genealogy of Ezra is given in ⁴⁵⁷⁰¹Ezra 7:1-6, where it appears that he was the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah, the son of Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, the son of Ahitub, the son of Amariah, the son of Azariah, the son

of Meraioth, the son of Zerahiah, the son of Uzzi, the son of Bukki, the son of Abishua, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, the high priest. Since Seraiah, according to the Book of Kings, was killed by Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah (2 Kings 25:18-21), and since he was the father of Jehozadak, the high priest who was carried into captivity by Nebuchadrezzar (1 Chronicles 6:14,15 (Hebrew 5:40), etc.) in 588 BC, and since the return under Ezra took place in 458 BC, the word "son" must be used in Ezra 7:2 in the sense of descendant. Since, moreover, Joshua, or Jeshua, the high priest, who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, was the son of Jehozadak and the grandson of Seraiah, Ezra was probably the great-grandson or great-great-grandson of Seraiah. Inasmuch as Jehozadak is never mentioned as one of his forefathers, Ezra was probably not descended from Jehozadak, but from a younger brother. He would thus not be a high priest, though he was of high-priestly descent as far as Seraiah. For the sake of shortening the list of names, six names are omitted in Ezra 7:2-7 between Azariah and Meraioth, and one between Shallum and Ahitub from the corresponding list found in 1 Chronicles 6:4-14 (Hebrew 5:30-40).

Being a priest by birth, it is to be supposed that Ezra would have performed the ordinary functions of a member of his order, if he had been born and had lived in Palestine.

2. OCCUPATION:

Jos, indeed, says that he was high priest of his brethren in Babylon, a statement that in view of the revelation of the Elephantine papyri may not be without a foundation in fact. According to the Scriptures and Jewish tradition, however, Ezra was pre-eminently a scribe, and especially a scribe of the law of Moses. He is called "a ready scribe in the law of Moses," a "scribe of the words of the commandments of Yahweh, and of his statutes to Israel," "the scribe of the law of the God of heaven." As early as the time of Jeremiah (compare Jeremiah 8:8), "scribe" had already attained the meaning of one learned in the Scriptures, one who had made the written law a subject of investigation. Ezra is the first who is called by the title of "the scribe," the title by which Artaxerxes designates him in his letter of instructions in Ezra 7:6,11.

3. HIS COMMISSION:

In the 7th year of Artaxerxes I (459-458 BC) Ezra requested permission of the king to go up to Jerusalem; for "Ezra had set his heart to seek the law of Yahweh, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and ordinances." Artaxerxes granted his request, and gave him a letter permitting as many of the people of Israel and of the priests and Levites as so desired to accompany him to Jerusalem, and commissioning him to inquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem, and to carry a gift of money from the king and his counselors, and all the money to be found in the province of Babylon, and the freewill offerings of the people and priests, with which to buy offerings to offer upon the altar of the house of God which was in Jerusalem. He was commissioned also to carry vessels for the service of the house of God, and to do at the expense of the royal treasury whatever was needful for the house of God. The king decreed, moreover, that the treasurers of the king should assist Ezra with a tribute of wheat, wine, oil and salt, and that they should impose no tribute, custom or toll upon any of those employed in the service of the house of God. Moreover, Ezra was authorized to appoint judges to judge the people according to the law of God and the law of the king, and to inflict punishments upon all who would not obey these laws.

Ascribing this marvelous letter of the king to the lovingkindness of his God, and strengthened by this evidence of God's power, Ezra proceeded to gather together out of Israel the chief men and teachers and ministers of the house to go up with him to Jerusalem. He gathered these men in camp at Casiphia, on the river Ahava. Here he proclaimed a time of fasting and prayer, that God might prosper their journey (¹⁵⁸¹⁵Ezra 8:15-23). Then, having delivered the treasures into the hands of the priests, the assembled company departed for Jerusalem, where by the help of God they arrived in safety, delivered over the money and gifts by number and weight, offered burnt offerings and sin offerings, delivered the king's commissions and furthered the people and the house of God.
Shortly after Ezra's arrival at Jerusalem, the princes accused the people, the priests, and the Levites of having intermarried with the peoples of the land, even asserting that the princes and rulers had been leaders in the trespass. Upon hearing this, Ezra was confounded, rent his garments, plucked off his hair, fell upon his knees and prayed a prayer of confession, weeping and casting himself down before the house of God. While he prayed the people assembled and wept, acknowledged their sin and

promised to do according to the law. The whole people were then assembled in counsel, and in spite of some opposition the strange wives were put away.

In Nehemiah 8, Ezra appears again upon the scene at the Feast of Tabernacles as the chief scribe of the law of Moses, the leader of the priests and Levites who read and explained the law to the people. On his advice the people ceased from their mourning and celebrated the festival according to the law of Moses with joy and thanksgiving and giving of gifts, dwelling also in booths in commemoration of the manner of their fathers' sojourning while in the wilderness.

4. TRADITIONS:

The traditions with regard to Ezra found in Josephus and in the Talmud are so discrepant that it is impossible to place reliance upon any of their statements which are not found also in the. canonical Scriptures.

R. Dick Wilson

1. NAME:

The books of Ezra and Nehemiah, by whomsoever written, are properly so named according to analogy from the principal persons mentioned in them. In the Hebrew Bibles, the former is headed simply, Ezra, and the latter, Nehemiah. The two books are counted in the Talmud, in Josephus, and in the Canon of Melito, 171 AD, as one, and are so treated also in the subscription of the Massoretic Text, which reads: "The totality of the verses of Ezra and Nehemiah is 688, and its sign is `Remember, Yahweh, the reproach of thy servants,' and its two parts (are at the sentence) `unto the ascent of the corner' (Nehemiah 3:31) and its chapters (*sedharayw*) are ten, and its sign is `Upon a high mountain get thee up, O thou that announcest good tidings to Zion.' " In the Septuagint, Ezra-Nehemiah is called Esdras B, while an apocryphal Book of Ezra is called Esdras A (see below). In the catalogues of the Old Testament writings handed down to us by the Fathers (Origen, Cyril, Melito, Jerome and the Council of Laodicea) our Ezra is called

   1 Ezra; Nehemiah,

   2 Ezra; the apocryphal Greek Ezra,

3 Ezra; and an apocalyptic book, falsely called a book of Ezra, is denominated

4 Ezra.

2. OBJECT:

The object of the books is to show that God fulfilled His promise, or prophecy, to restore His exiled people to their inheritance, through the instrumentality on the one hand of the great heathen monarchs, Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes, and on the other hand by stirring up the spirit of such great men among the chosen people as Joshua and Zerubbabel, Haggai and Zechariah, and Ezra and Nehemiah, through whom the altar, the temple, the houses and walls of Jerusalem, and finally the worship and ceremony of the Jewish people were reestablished, the people being separated from foreign admixtures, customs and idolatry, and their religious observances purified and fixed for all time.

3. PLAN:

The object of the work justifies the selection and arrangement of the material and the plan pursued by the composer, or composers; all matter being stringently excluded which does not bear directly upon the purpose in view. However much we may wish that other historical records had been included, it is not proper to criticize the work because of these omissions, nor is it fair to argue that the writer was ignorant of what he has not seen fit to record.

4. UNITY:

The unity of the combined work is shown by the fact that they have the same common object, the same plan, and a similarity of language and style; that they treat, for the most part, of the same period of time; and that Ezra is one of the most prominent persons in both. It is not fair to deny the essential unity on the ground that the list of priests and others found in Ezra 2 is repeated in Nehemiah 7; for there is no doubt that Ezra was the compiler of parts at least of the book called after him, and that Nehemiah also was the original writer of parts of the book that bears his name. Whoever was the final editor of the whole work, he has simply retained the two almost identical lists in their appropriate places in the documents which lay before him.

5. SOURCES:

The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are a compilation of genealogical lists, letters and edicts, memoirs and chronicles. We cannot be certain as to who was the composer of either or both books. Many think that Ezra compiled both the books out of preexisting materials, adding parts of his own composition. Others, suppose that Ezra wrote the book named after him, while Nehemiah composed the Book of Nehemiah. Others, again, are of the opinion that neither Ezra nor Nehemiah, but some other unknown editor, most probably the compiler of the Books of Chronicles, put together the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, using largely the memoirs of the two great men who are the principal persons in the records. While there is still much difference of opinion as to who was the final redactor, there is a general agreement as to the composite character of the whole, and that the person who wrote the parts that bind together the original sources was the same as he who wrote the canonical books of Chronicles.

6. LITERARY CHARACTER:

The diversified character of the style, languages and other literary peculiarities of the books is accounted for by the large number and the variety of sources. From the style and contents of the first chapter it has been argued with great plausibility that it was written by Daniel; for similar reasons it has been argued that the portion of Ezra from 3:2 to 4:22 inclusive was written by Haggai the prophet. All admit that the parts of Ezra and Nehemiah in which the 1st person is employed were written by Ezra and Nehemiah respectively. As to who it was who added the other connecting portions there is and must always be great doubt arising from the fact that the author is not mentioned. The style points to the same hand as that which composed the Book of Chronicles. Those who believe that Ezra compiled the Book of Chronicles will believe that he most probably composed also the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The principal objection to his authorship arises from the inexplicable change from the 1st to the 3rd person occurring in both Ezra and Neh. Inasmuch as the 3rd person is the proper form to use in the best style of Biblical historical composition; inasmuch as Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon often employ it in their histories; inasmuch as some of the Bah monuments mingle the 1st and 3rd persons in the same document; and finally, inasmuch as the prophets and psalmists of Israel likewise interchange the persons in what is for us often an unaccountable manner: this characteristic of the style of Ezra-Nehemiah

seems an insufficient reason upon which to base the denial of the claim that Ezra may have been the author.

The facts that there is unevenness in the treatment of the history, and that there are long periods on which the narrator is silent, do not militate against the authorship of Ezra nor do they imply a date long after his age; for the author is perfectly consistent in his purpose to stick to the object and plan which he had in view for himself, that is, to give an account of the reestablishment of the Israelite people and of their Divinely given institutions. That he has omitted other matters-does not imply that he was ignorant of them.

7. LANGUAGES:

The language of the books is Hebrew, except <1547>Ezra 4:7 through 6:18 and 7:12-26, which is written in Aramaic. The Hebrew closely resembles that of Daniel, Haggai and Chronicles, much more so than it does that of Ecclesiasticus, which was written probably about 180 BC. The Aramaic (formerly called Chaldee) is very much like that of the Egyptian papyri which are dated in the 5th century BC. It closely resembles also the Aramaic in Daniel.

8. HISTORICITY:

Neither language nor style can be assigned as a ground for asserting a date later than the 5th century BC as the time of the composition of the book. A much stronger reason against placing the final redaction of the books at so early a time is the mention of a Jaddua among the high priests in <161211>Nehemiah 12:11,22, it being assumed that this is the same Jaddua whom Josephus mentions (Ant., XI, viii, 4) as having filled the high-priestly office in the time of Alexander the Great. In view of the fact that Josephus is the only source of information as to the period between 400 and 300 BC, it seems unfair to accept what he says as to the existence of this Jaddua, while rejecting substantially all the rest of the same chapter in Josephus which tells about Sanballat, Manasseh and Alexander's meeting with Jaddua. Inasmuch as the Sachau papyri, written in the 17th year of Darius Nothus, that is, in 410-408 BC, mention the sons of Sanballat the governor of Samaria, the Sanballat who was their father must have lived about 450 BC. The same papyrus mentions Jehohanan (Johnnan of <161222>Nehemiah 12:22) as the high priest of the temple at Jerusalem, and Bagohi (Bagoas) was the Persian governor of Jerusalem in 410-408 BC.

Since, according to ^{⊲16136⊳}Nehemiah 13:6, Nehemiah was governor in 434-433 BC, the 32nd year of Artaxerxes, Bagoas would be perhaps his immediate successor. If we are to put any confidence in the story of Josephus, then there must have been at least two Sanballats, and probably two Jadduas, and at two different times a son of a high priest must have married a daughter of a Sanballat. While this is not impossible, it seems better to suppose that Josephus has confused matters beyond any possibility of disentanglement, and we might be justified in throwing over entirely his account of a Sanballat, a Manasseh, and a Jaddua as living in the year 330 BC, when Alexander conquered Syria. As far, of course, as the Jaddua of ^{⊲1621⊳}Nehemiah 12:11,22 is concerned, he may well have been high priest as early as 406 BC, and have continued to serve till 330 BC. On the other hand, another of the same name, probably a grandson, may, for all we know to the contrary, have been high priest in 330 BC. In view of the numerous Oniases, Simons, and Johns who served in that position between 600 and 150 BC, and in view, further, of our almost absolute lack of information as to the history of this period, it will be a bold man who will dare to deny, on the ground of the Jaddua of Josephus, that Ezra-Nehemiah might have been written as early as 4OO BC.

The objection against the books having been composed in the Persian period, based upon the use of the titles of the kings of Persia, is fully answered by the fact that the same titles as those used in these books are found to have been used by the Persian kings themselves. (See the articles of the present writer in the Presbyterian Reformed Review for 1905-6.) The "Darius the Persian" of ^{⊲16222⊳}Nehemiah 12:22 is shown by the Sachau papyri to have been Darius Notbus, as Keil long ago suggested. The author may have called him "the Persian" to distinguish him from Darius the Mede. At any rate, it is best for us to remember that our inability to explain why the author called him by this title does not prove that he did not do so. Of all the Dariuses known to history, any one might have been called "the Persian," except Darius the Mede, because all but he were Persians. The assertion that a king of Persia could only have been called a Persian "after the Persian period was past" involves, on the one hand, the assumption of such thorough knowledge of the possibilities of the usus loquendi of that time, and, on the other hand, such real ignorance of the usage of all times in such matters, as well as of the usage of the Persian and Babylonian monuments of the Persian era, as almost to cause one to believe that it can scarcely have been seriously made. (See the writer's articles cited above.) Josephus, it is true, apparently confuses in his account Darius II and Darius

III.

The phrase "the days of Nehemiah" (⟨16:26⟩Nehemiah 12:26) certainly implied that the final redactor "looked back upon them as past." But there is no intimation as to how long they were past. According to ⟨16:5:14⟩Nehemiah 5:14, Nehemiah returned to Babylon in the 32nd year of Artaxerxes, that is, in 434 BC. As Bagoas was already governor of Jerusalem, and Johnnan high priest in 408 BC, a writer living about 400 BC can very well have referred to what happened "in the days of Joiakim .... and in the days of Nehemiah the governor, and of Ezra the priest and the scribe" as having occurred "in the days of Zerubbabel, and in the days of Nehemiah" (⟨16:2:47⟩Nehemiah 12:47). From all we know it appears that these were the only Jews who were ever governors of Jerusalem under the Persian domination. Certainly Bagoas is not a Hebrew name any more than Sanballat, and it looks as if on the death of Nehemiah his place as governor of Jerusalem had been filled by a native Persian just as the governorship of Samaria was held by Sanballat, a Cuthean. If we can trust Josephus, Bagoas treated the Jews with harshness and even desecrated the temple itself (Ant., XI, vii, 1). Already, then, in 405 BC, any patriotic and pious Israelite may have justly looked back upon the days of their native governors with longing and pride, and have written with appropriate eulogy of the days of Zerubbabel, Nehemiah and Ezra — the time of his people's semi-independence and of the glorious and unforgetable restoration of the temple and city, just as we today refer to the time of Bismarck, Victoria, or Lincoln (compare ⟨13:13:3⟩1 Chronicles 13:3). Waiving the discussion of the probability of Ezra's having called himself "a ready scribe in the law of Moses," and one who had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, etc., it certainly cannot be denied that someone writing in 405 BC may have employed the language here used. There is not the slightest proof that any of Ezra-Nehemiah is unhistorical, nor the least indication that all of it may not have been written as early as 405 BC.

The section ⟨15:4:1⟩Ezra 4:1-6 presents difficulties of date and composition. The section may have been misplaced. It may be episodical. It may be explained, as suggested by Klostermann, as having been inserted here as a sort of resume which is later expanded. But however explained, it is a literary rather than a historical or linguistic problem which it presents, and may safely be left for solution to those who think that everything in literature whose purpose or meaning they cannot perceive is therefore inexplicable.

In conclusion, we Would say in the words of Professor Cornill, that since Ed. Meyer's demonstration of the authenticity of the documents in Ezra 4 through 7, the hypercritical reconstruction of the books "has lost all claim to serious consideration, and we may rest assured that in Ezra-Nehemiah we have every reason to recognize an essentially trustworthy recital of the events narrated therein."

9. TEXT:

The most thorough investigation of the text of Ezra-Nehemiah has been made by Professor A. Klostermann, his results being published in the 3rd German edition of RE. After an examination of the Arabic, Syriac, Greek and Latin versions and a comparison of them with the Hebrew Massoretic Text, he comes to the conclusion that our Hebrew text as a whole is of more value than that represented by the versions. The writer of this article has noted a wonderful accuracy in the transmission of the Aramaic part of Ezra, the spelling or writing of the words resembling in many of the smallest particulars that of the Aramaic papyri of Elephantine, which date from the 5th century BC.

LITERATURE.

Commentaries and Introductions: A, Introductions: Sayce, Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther; Angus-Suen, The Cyclopedic Hand-Book to the Bible; Rarnu, Introduction to the Old Testament; Keil, Old Testament Intro. B, Commentaries: Keil, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther; Rawlinson, in the Speaker's Comm., and in the Pulpit Commentary; and in Ezra and Nehemiah ("Men of the Bible" series); Lange's Comm.; Meyer, Entstehung des Judenthums; OTJC2; RE2.

R. Dick Wilson

EZRAHITE

<ez'-ra-hit> ([yj rzḁ, *'ezrachi*]; [᾽Ασεβών, *Asebon*]): Found in [1061]1 Kings 4:31; Psalms 88; 89, titles; from which it appears that the word is a patronymic for Ethan and Heman. It may be derived from Zerah, instead of Ezrah, seeing that there were an Ethan and a Heman who were descendants of Zerah, head of a Judahite family ([3306]1 Chronicles 2:6). There were also an Ethan and a Heman who were Levites ([3517]1 Chronicles 15:17).

EZRI

<ez'-ri> ([yrɜᴵ, `ezri], "my help"; [᾿Εζραί, *Ezrai*], or [᾿Εζδρί, *Ezdri*]): "Ezri, the son of Chelub," appointed by David to be superintendent of agriculture (<13726>1 Chronicles 27:26).

EZRIL

<ez'-ril> ([᾿Εζρίλ, *Ezril*], the King James Version Esril): One who had married a foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:34); called Azarel in <15104>Ezra 10:41.

PUBLISHERS NOTES

CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at…

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to "make the words of the wise available to all —inexpensively." We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at SAGE Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered

errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation