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FABLE

<fa’-b’-l> ([μῦθος, muthos]):

(1) Primitive man conceives of the objects around him as possessing his own characteristics. Consequently in his stories, beasts, trees, rocks, etc., think, talk and act exactly as if they were human beings. Of course, but little advance in knowledge was needed to put an end to this mode of thought, but the form of story-telling developed by it persisted and is found in the folk-tales of all nations. More particularly, the archaic form of story was used for the purpose of moral instruction, and when so used is termed the fable. Modern definitions distinguish it from the parable

(a) by its use of characters of lower intelligence than man (although reasoning and speaking like men), and

(b) by its lesson for this life only. But, while these distinctions serve some practical purpose in distinguishing (say) the fables of Aesop from the parables of Christ, they are of little value to the student of folk-lore. For fable, parable, allegory, etc., are all evolutions from a common stock, and they tend to blend with each other.

See ALLEGORY; PARABLE.

(2) The Semitic mind is peculiarly prone to allegorical expression, and a modern Arabian storyteller will invent a fable or a parable as readily as he will talk. And we may be entirely certain that the very scanty appearance of fables in the Old Testament is due only to the character of its material and not at all to an absence of fables from the mouths of the Jews of old. Only two examples have reached us. In Judges 9:7 through 15 Jotham mocks the choice of Abimelech as king with the fable of the trees that could find no tree that would accept the trouble of the kingship except the worthless bramble. And in 2 Kings 14:9 Jehoash ridicules the pretensions of Amaziah with the story of the thistle that wished to make a royal alliance with the cedar. Yet that the distinction between fable and allegory, etc., is
artificial is seen in Isaiah 5:1,2, where the vineyard is assumed to possess a deliberate will to be perverse.

(3) In the New Testament, “fable” is found in 1 Timothy 1:4; 4:7; 2 Timothy 4:4; Titus 1:14; 2 Peter 1:16, as the translation of muthos (“myth”). The sense here differs entirely from that discussed above, and “fable” means a (religious) story that has no connection with reality — contrasted with the knowledge of an eyewitness in 2 Peter 1:16. The exact nature of these “fables” is of course something out of our knowledge, but the mention in connection with them of “endless genealogies” in 1 Timothy 1:4 points with high probability to some form of Gnostic speculation that interposed a chain of eons between God and the world. In some of the Gnostic systems that we know, these chains are described with a prolixity so interminable (the Pistis Sophia is the best example) as to justify well the phrase “old wives’ fables” in 1 Timothy 4:7. But that these passages have Gnostic reference need not tell against the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, as a fairly well developed “Gnosticism” is recognizable in a passage as early as Colossians 2, and as the description of the fables as Jewish in Titus 1:14 (compare 3:9) is against 2nd-century references. But for details the commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles must be consulted. It is worth noting that in 2 Timothy 4:4 the adoption of these fables is said to be the result of dabbling in the dubious. This manner of losing one’s hold on reality is, unfortunately, something not confined to the apostolic age.

Burton Scott Easton

FACE

<fas>: In Hebrew the translation of three expressions:

(1) [µynP ; panim]

(2) [˙y[ “, `ayin], literally, “eye” and

(3) [t a ” , `aph], literally, “nose,” “nostril,” already noted under the word COUNTENANCE, which see. The first and second of these words are used synonymously, even in metaphorical expressions, as, e.g. in the phrase “the face of the earth,” where panim is used (Deuteronomy 6:15 et passim) and `ayin (Numbers 22:5 et passim). The third expression preserves more clearly its original
meaning. It is generally used in the phrases “to bow one’s self to the earth,” “to fall on one’s face,” where the nose actually touched the ground. Often “my face,” “thy face” is mere oriental circumlocution for the personal pronoun “I,” “me,” “thou,” “thee.” “In thy face” means “in thy presence;” and is often so translated. A very large number of idiomatic Hebrew expressions have been introduced into our language through the medium of the Bible translation. We notice the most important of these phrases.

“To seek the face” is to seek an audience with a prince or with God, to seek favor (Psalm 24:6; 27:8 bis; 105:4; Proverbs 7:15; Hosea 5:15; compare Proverbs 29:26, where the Revised Version (British and American) translates “Many seek the ruler’s favor,” literally, many seek the face (Hebrew pene) of a ruler).

If God “hides his face” He withdraws His presence, His favor (Deuteronomy 32:20; Job 34:29; Psalm 13:1; 30:7; 143:7; Isaiah 54:8; Jeremiah 33:5; Ezekiel 39:23,14; Micah 3:4). Such withdrawal of the presence of God is to be understood as a consequence of man’s personal disobedience, not as a wrathful denial of God’s favor (Isaiah 59:2). God is asked to “hide his face,” i.e. to disregard or overlook (Psalm 51:9; compare 10:11). This is also the idea of the prayer: “Cast me not away from thy presence” (literally, “face,” Psalm 51:11), and of the promise: “The upright shall dwell in thy presence” (literally, “face,” Psalm 140:13). If used of men, “to hide the face” expresses humility and reverence before an exalted presence (Exodus 3:6; Isaiah 6:2); similarly Elijah “wrapped his face in his mantle” when God passed by (1 Kings 19:13). The “covering of the face” is a sign of mourning (2 Samuel 19:4 = Ezekiel 12:6,12); a “face covered with fatness” is synonymous with prosperity and arrogance (Job 15:27); to have one’s face covered by another person is a sign of hopeless doom, as if one were already dead. This was done to Human, when judgment had been pronounced over him (Nehemiah 7:8).

“To turn away one’s face” is a sign of insulting indifference or contempt (2 Chronicles 29:6; Ezekiel 14:6; Sirach 4:4; compare Jeremiah 2:27; 18:17; 32:33); on the part of God an averted face is synonymous with rejection (Psalm 13:1; 27:9; 88:14).
“To harden the face” means to harden one’s self against any sort of appeal (Proverbs 21:29; Isaiah 50:7; Jeremiah 5:3; compare Ezekiel 3:9).

See also SPIT.

In this connection we also mention the phrase “to respect persons,” literally, to “recognize the face” (Leviticus 19:15, or, slightly different in expression, Deuteronomy 1:17; 16:19; Proverbs 24; 23; 28:21), in the sense of unjustly favoring a person, or requiting him with undue evil. Compare also the Hebrew hadhar (Exodus 23:3 the King James Version), “to countenance” (see under the word).

The “showbread” meant literally, “bread of the face,” “of the presence,” Hebrew lechem panim; Greek artoī enopioi, artoī tes protheseos.

H. L. E. Luering

FACT

Lit. “a deed.” The word occurs only in the heading of the chapter, 2 Kings 10 the King James Version, “Jehu excuseth the fact by the prophecy of Elijah,” and in 2 Macc 4:36, with reference to the murder of Onias, “certain of the Greeks that abhorred the fact (the deed) also” (summisoponerounton, literally, “hating wickedness together with (others),” the Revised Version (British and American) “the Greeks also joining with them in hatred of the wickedness.”

FADE

<fad> ([l b ἄ b, nabhel]; [μαραίνω, maraino]): “To fade” is in the Old Testament the translation of nabhel, “to droop or wither,” figuratively, “to fade,” or “pass way” (Psalm 18:45; Isaiah 1:30; 24:4; 28:1, 4; 40:7, 8); once it is the translation of balal “to well up,” “to overflow”; perhaps from nabhal (Isaiah 64:6, “We all do fade as a leaf”); in the New Testament of maraino, “to come to wither or to fade away” (Jas 1:11, “So also shall the rich man fade away in his ways,” the Revised Version (British and American) “in his goings”); compare The Wisdom of Solomon 28, “Let us crown ourselves with rosebuds, before they be withered” (maraino); amarantinos (amaranth), “unfading,” occurs in 1 Peter 5:4, “the crown of glory that fadeth not away,” and amarantos (1 Peter 1:4), “an inheritance .... that fadeth not away”; compare The Wisdom
of Solomon 6:12, “Wisdom is glorious (the Revised Version (British and American) “radiant”), and fadeth not away.”

For “fade” (Ezekiel 47:12), the Revised Version (British and American) has “wither”; for “fall” “falleth” “falling” (Isaiah 34:4), “fade,” “fadeth,” “fading.”

W. L. Walker

FAIL

<fal> ([h | K; kalah], [t r " K; karath]; [ēkλεὶπω, ekleipo]): “Fail” is both intransitive, “to fall short,” “be wanting,” and trans, “to be wanting to.”

Of the many words translated “fail” in the Old Testament, kalah is the most frequent, meaning “to be consumed,” “ended” (Job 11:20; 17:5; Psalm 69:3; 71:9, etc.; Proverbs 22:8; Isaiah 15:6, etc.; Jeremiah 14:6; Lamentations 2:11; 3:22; 4:17); it is the translation of karath, “to be cut off” (2 Samuel 3:29, of failure in succession; so 1 Kings 2:4, etc.); `adhar, “to marshal,” “to be missed” or “lacking” (Isaiah 34:16 the King James Version; Isaiah 40:26 the King James Version; Isaiah 59:15 the King James Version; Zephaniah 3:5); of raphah, “to become faint” or “to make feeble” (Deuteronomy 31:6,8; “I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee,” Joshua 1:5; I Chronicles 28:20); of `-abhadh, “to perish,” “be lost” (Psalm 142:4, “Refuge hath failed me”; Ezekiel 12:22, “Every vision faileth”). Many other Hebrew words are translated “fail,” “faileth,” for the most part in single instances.

In the New Testament, ekleipo, “to leave out” or “off,” is thrice rendered “fail” (Luke 16:9 “when it shall fail”; 22:32, “that thy faith fail not”; Hebrews 1:12, “Thy years shall not fail”); ekpipto, “to fall off or away” (I Corinthians 13:8, “Charity (the Revised Version (British and American) “love”) never faileth”); katargeo, “to make useless” (I Corinthians 13:8 the King James Version, “Whether prophecies, they shall fail”); hustereo, “to be behind,” “to lack” (Hebrews 12:15 the King James Version); apopsucho, “to swoon away,” “failing” (Luke 21:26 the King James Version).

The Revised Version (British and American) has “fail,” in a new translation of Jeremiah 18:14, for “fall” (Lamentations 1:14, margin “stumble”); “his hand fail” for “fallen in decay” (Leviticus 25:35); “I will in no wise fail thee” for “I will never leave thee” (Hebrews 13:5; compare
Deuteronomy 31:6; Joshua 1:5; “failed to enter” for “entered not” (Hebrews 4:6); “faileth” (American Standard Revised Version) for “ceaseth” (Psalm 49:8), the English Revised Version “must be let alone for ever”; “failing” for “was darkened” (Luke 23:45); for “fail” (Ezr 4:22), “be slack,” “be missing” (Isaiah 34:16); “falleth short of” (Hebrews 12:15, maqrgin, “falleth bacf from’); for “failed,” “was all spent” (Genesis 47:15); “wholly” (Joshua 3:16); “fail (in looking)” (Lamentations 4:17); for “faileth,” “is lacking” (Isaiah 40:26; 59:15); for “men’s hearts failing them” (Luke 21:26), “men fainting,” margin “expiring.”

W. L. Walker

FAIN

<fain> (advb.): Occurs twice in English Versions of the Bible, in the sense of “gladly”:

(1) in Job 27:22 as the rendering of [ןַר ב] ב, barach], “to flee with haste” (from anything), “He would fain flee out of his hand,” literally, as in in of the King James Version, “in fleeing he would flee”;

(2) in Luke 15:16, as the translation of [ἐπιθυμεῖω, epithumeo], “to fix the mind or desire on,” “He would fain have filled his belly with the husks which the swine did eat.” the Revised Version (British and American) adds two instances:


See ALMOST.

FAINT

<fant> ([יָֽפֶה; `ayeph], [ט וו; `uph], [ט [ י; ya`aph], [ט ] [ ; `alaph], [ט ] [ ; aTaphi], [יָֽפֶה; , dawway], [יָֽפֶה; yaghea`], [ס ] [ ; macac], [ך ק ] [ ; rakakh], [ג ] [ ; paghar], [כ נ; kahah]; [κλω; ekluo], [κκκεκέω; ekkakeo], [κάμνω; kamma]): The Hebrew vocabulary for the depressing physical conditions and mental emotions which are rendered in the King James Version by the English words “faint,” “fainthess,” and other compounds of that stem, is, as will be seen above, wide and varied in
derivation. The 11 Hebrew and 3 Greek words and their derivatives are used in 62 passages in the King James Version to express these conditions.

`Ayeph is used to express the exhaustion from fatigue and hunger in the case of Esau (Genesis 25:29,30). This and its variants come from a root which primarily means “to cover or conceal,” therefore “to be dark or obscure,” and so, figuratively, “to be faint or depressed.” Israel’s helpless state when harassed by Amalek (Deuteronomy 25:18) and the plight of Gideon’s weary force when they sought in vain for help at Succoth (Judges 8:4) are described by the same word. Isaiah also uses it to picture the disappointed and unsatisfied appetite of the thirsty man awakening from his dream of refreshment (Isaiah 29:8). In 2 Samuel 16:14, `ayephim is probably a proper name of a place (Revised Version, margin).

`Uph in 1 Samuel 14:28-31 describes the exhaustion of Saul’s host in pursuit of the Philistines after the battle of Michmash. The same word expresses the failure of David’s strength when in conflict with the same foes, which led to his imminent peril and to the consequent refusal of the commander of his army to allow him to take part personally in the combat (2 Samuel 21:15).

Ya`-aph is used by Ziba when he brought refreshments to David’s men on the flight from Absalom (2 Samuel 16:2); see also its use in Isaiah 40:28. Cognate verbal forms occur in Isaiah 40:30,31; Jeremiah 2:24; 51:58,64; Habakkuk 2:13, as also in Judges 8:15, meaning in all cases the faintness or exhaustion of fatigue or weariness.

`Alpah expresses the faintness from thirst in Amos 8:13, or from the heat of the sun (Jonah 4:8), and figuratively, the despondency which was the result of the captivity (Isaiah 51:20). Ezekiel uses it allegorically as describing the withering of the trees for grief at the death of the Assyrian kings (Ezekiel 31:15).

`Ataph is the weariness of the wanderers in the desert (Psalm 107:5), the faintness from hunger (Lamentations 2:19), or the despondency of Jonah dispelled by his remembrance of God’s mercies (Jonah 2:7).

Dawway, from a root which signifies the sickness produced by exhaustion from loss of blood, is used in Isaiah 1:5 for the faintness of heart, the
result of remorse for sin, and in Jeremiah 8:18 for the prophet’s sorrow for the sins of Israel. A cognate form expresses his sorrow on account of the judgments of God which were incurred as punishments for the national backsliding (Lamentations 1:13, 12; 5:17).

*Macac*, literally, “dissolving or melting,” is applied to the contagious fear which the example of a cowardly soldier produces among his comrades (Deuteronomy 20:8, the Revised Version (British and American) “melt”). In the remarkable passage in Isaiah 10:18, in which God pronounces the doom of Assyria when his purposes of chastisement on Israel have been fulfilled, the collapse of Assyria is said to be “as when a standard-bearer fainteth.” For this the Revised Version, margin substitutes “as when a sick man pineth away,” which is probably the correct rendering. The word *macac* may mean either a sick man, or else something glittering and seen from afar, such as a standard, but the former sense is more intelligible and suggestive in the context. The rarely used verbal form cognate to macac is used on account of its assonance.

*Yaghea* (yagha’), which is usually translated “grieved” or “tormented” or “fatigued,” is rendered as “fainted” in Jeremiah 45:3. This passage, “I fainted in my sighing” the King James Version, is in Hebrew the same as that which reads, “I am weary with my groaning” in Psalm 6:6, and is similarly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American).

*Rakhakh*, like *macac*, primarily signifies “to melt” or “to become soft,” and is used in prophetic exhortations in which the people are encouraged not to be panic-stricken in the presence of enemies (Deuteronomy 20:3, and also Jeremiah 51:46; Isaiah 7:4). Another related word, *morekh*, in the sense of despair and utter loss of courage, is used in expressing the consequences of God’s wrath against Israel (Leviticus 26:36). In its literal sense it signifies “blandness,” as of the words of a hypocritical enemy (Psalm 55:21).

*Paghar* is the prostration of utter fatigue whereby one is unable to raise himself or to proceed on a journey, as were some of David’s little band (1 Samuel 30:10-21). A cognate word describes the prostration of amazement and incredulity with which Jacob heard of Joseph’s condition in Egypt (Genesis 45:26).

*Kahah*, the pining of earnest, longing desire, is translated “fainteth” in Psalm 84:2; 119:81; elsewhere it is rendered by words expressing
wasting or languishing. The panic in Canaan due to famine is expressed (Gen. 47:13) by the word *lahah*, which implies a state of frenzy.

The only records of actual fainting are

(1) Daniel, in Daniel 8:27, where the word used is the Niphal of the verb *hayah*, literally, “became,” meaning that he became weak;

(2) swooning is mentioned in Additions to Esther 15:7-15.

In the New Testament “faint” is used in the sense of physical exhaustion (Matthew 9:36 the King James Version; Matthew 15:32, Mark 8:3), where it is part of the verb *ekluo*, “to relax.” Otherwise it is used figuratively of discouragement of spirit. The same verb is used in Galatians 6:9; Hebrews 12:3,5; but in Luke 18:1; 2 Corinthians 4:1-16; Ephesians 3:13 it is part of the verb *ekkakeo* (according to some authorities *egkakeo*, pronounced *enkakeo*, meaning “to be faint-hearted” or “to be culpably negligent”). In Revelation 2:3 it is [*kopiao*], literally, “to be tired.”

Alexander Macalister

**FAIR**

<far>: The word translated in the King James Version from 9 Hebrew and 4 Greek expressions has nowhere in the Bible the modern sense of “blond,” “fair-skinned.” The translation of Isaiah 54:11, “fair colors,” refers to the cosmetic use of [*pukh*], stibium, antimony powder, with which black margins were painted around the eyelids, so as to make the eyes appear large and dark. The stones of rebuilt Jerusalem, beautifully laid in their black mortar, are compared with such eyes. We can distinguish the following varieties of meaning:

(1) Beautiful, attractive, [*bwOf*, *Tobh*], [*hp;y; yaphah*], [*hp;y; yapheh*]; Aramaic [*shappir*]; Septuagint [*kalos*]; in the New Testament [*asteios*]. This latter word is in both places where it is found used of Moses (Acts 7:20; Hebrews 11:23, the Revised Version (British and American) “goodly”), and means literally, town bred (as opposed to boorish), polite, polished in manners, urbane, then nice, pretty.

(2) Pure, free of defilement, the Revised Version (British and American) “clean,” [*Tahor*] (Zec 3:5).
(3) “Fair speech,” plausible, persuasive ([יְקָד האֲלֹהִים, legah], Proverbs 7:21; [εὐλαλος, eulalos], Sirach 6:5; compare [εὐλογία, eulogia], Romans 16:18).

(4) Making a fine display ([εὐπροσωπεῖν, eupsopein], Galatians 6:12, “to make a fair show”).

(5) Good (of weather) ([בָּהֲז; zahabh], “golden,” “clear,” Job 37:2,2, the Revised Version (British and American) “golden splendor”); [εὐδία, eudia] (Matthew 16:2).

H. L. E. Luering

FAIR HAVENS

<far ha’-v’-nz> ([Κάλοι Λιμένες, Kaloi Limenes]): A roadstead on the South coast of Crete, about 5 miles East of Cape Matala, the most southerly point of the island. The harbor is formed by a bay, open to the East, and sheltered on the Southwest by two small islands. Here Paul waited for a considerable time (Acts 27:9); but while it afforded good anchorage and a shelter from North and Northwest winds, “the haven was not commodious to winter in” (Acts 27:8,12).

See CRETE.

FAIRS

<farz>: Found only 5 times in the King James Version (Ezekiel 27:12,14,16,19,27), apparently incorrect translation of [יוֹצָה רוּחַ, izzabhon], according to modern Hebraists (though Gesenius gives “fair” as one of its meanings). The Septuagint translates the Hebrew of the above five passages by two different words, [ἀγορά, agora], “market-place” (Ezekiel 27:12,14,16,19), and [μισθός, misthos], “hire,” “pay” (Ezekiel 27:27,33). The King James Version follows the Wyclif version in Ezekiel 27:12 and the Geneva version throughout, although it properly translates “wares” in 27:33. The Revised Version (British and American) gives “wares” (which see) throughout.

FAITH
In the Old Testament (the King James Version) the word occurs only twice: Deuteronomy 32:20 (כְּפָנָה אֶ מֵעַ, ‘emun); Habakkuk 2:4 ([הָנָּהַ] ‘emunah). In the latter the Revised Version (British and American) places in the margin the alternative rendering, “faithfulness.” In the New Testament it is of very frequent occurrence, always representing [πίστις, pístis], with one exception in the King James Version (not the Revised Version (British and American)), Hebrews 10:23, where it represents [ἐλπίς, elpis], “hope.”

1. ETYMOLOGY:

The history of the English word is rather interesting than important; use and contexts, alike for it and its Hebrew and Greek parallels, are the surest guides to meaning. But we may note that it occurs in the form “feyth,” in Havelok the Dane (13th century); that it is akin to fides and this again to the Sanskrit root bhidh, “to unite,” “to bind.” It is worth while to recall this primeval suggestion of the spiritual work of faith, as that which, on man’s side, unites him to God for salvation.

2. MEANING: A DIVERGENCY:

Studying the word “faith” in the light of use and contexts, we find a bifurcation of significance in the Bible. We may distinguish the two senses as the passive and the active; on the one side, “fidelity,” “trustworthiness”; and “faith,” “trust,” on the other. In Galatians 5:22, e.g. context makes it clear that “fidelity” is in view, as a quality congruous with the associated graces. (the Revised Version (British and American) accordingly renders pístis there by “faithfulness.”) Again, Romans 3:3 the King James Version, “the faith of God,” by the nature of the case, means His fidelity to promise. But in the overwhelming majority of cases, “faith,” as rendering pístis, means “reliance,” “trust.” To illustrate would be to quote many scores of passages. It may be enough here to call attention to the recorded use of the word by our Lord. Of about twenty passages in the Gospels where pístis occurs as coming from His lips, only one (Matthew 23:23) presents it in the apparent sense of “fidelity.” All the others conspicuously demand the sense of “reliance,” “trust.” The same is true of the apostolic writings. In them, with rarest exceptions, the words “reliance,” “trust,” precisely fit the context as alternatives to “faith.”
3. FAITH IN THE SENSE OF CREED:

Another line of meaning is traceable in a very few passages, where pistis, “faith,” appears in the sense of “creed,” the truth, or body of truth, which is trusted, or which justifies trust. The most important of such places is the paragraph Jas 2:14-26, where an apparent contradiction to some great Pauline dicta perplexes many readers. The riddle is solved by observing that the writer uses “faith” in the sense of creed, orthodox “belief.” This is clear from Jas 2:19, where the “faith,” in question is illustrated: “Thou believest that God is one.” This is the credal confession of the orthodox Jew (the [shema`]; see Deuteronomy 6:4), taken as a passport to salvation. Briefly, James presses the futility of creed without life, Paul the necessity of reliance in order to receive “life and peace.”

4. A LEADING PASSAGE EXPLAINED:

It is important to notice that Hebrews 11:1 is no exception to the rule that “faith” normally means “reliance,” “trust.” There “Faith is the substance (or possibly, in the light of recent inquiries into the type of Greek used by New Testament writers, “the guaranty”) of things hoped for, the evidence (or “convincing proof”) of things not seen.” This is sometimes interpreted as if faith, in the writer’s view, were, so to speak, a faculty of second sight, a mysterious intuition into the spiritual world. But the chapter amply shows that the faith illustrated, e.g. by Abraham, Moses, Rahab, was simply reliance upon a God known to be trustworthy. Such reliance enabled the believer to treat the future as present and the invisible as seen. In short, the phrase here, “faith is the evidence,” etc., is parallel in form to our familiar saying, “Knowledge is power.”

5. REMARKS:

A few detached remarks may be added:

(a) The history of the use of the Greek pistis is instructive. In the Septuagint it normally, if not always, bears the “passive” sense “fidelity,” “good faith,” while in classical Greek it not rarely bears the active sense, “trust.” In the koine, the type of Greek universally common at the Christian era, it seems to have adopted the active meaning as the ruling one only just in time, so to speak, to provide it for the utterance of Him whose supreme message was “reliance,” and who passed that message on to His apostles. Through their lips and
pens “faith,” in that sense, became the supreme watchword of Christianity.

See JUSTIFICATION; UNION WITH CHRIST.

6. CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, without trespassing on the ground of other articles, we call the reader’s attention, for his Scriptural studies, to the central place of faith in Christianity, and its significance. As being, in its true idea, a reliance as simple as possible upon the word, power, love, of Another, it is precisely that which, on man’s side, adjusts him to the living and merciful presence and action of a trusted God. In its nature, not by any mere arbitrary arrangement, it is his one possible receptive attitude, that in which he brings nothing, so that he may receive all. Thus “faith” is our side of union with Christ. And thus it is our means of possessing all His benefits, pardon, justification, purification, life, peace, glory.

As a comment on our exposition of the ruling meaning of “faith” in Scripture, we may note that this precisely corresponds to its meaning in common life, where, for once that the word means anything else, it means “reliance” a hundred times. Such correspondence between religious terms (in Scripture) and the meaning of the same words in common life, will be found to be invariable.

Handley Dunelm

FAITHFUL; FAITHFULNESS

<\textit{fath’-fool}>, <\textit{fath’-fool-nes}>:

Faithfulness is a quality or attribute applied in the Scripture to both God and man. This article is limited to the consideration of the Scripture teaching concerning the meaning of faithfulness in its application to God.

Faithfulness is one of the characteristics of God’s ethical nature. It denotes the firmness or constancy of God in His relations with men, especially with His people. It is, accordingly, one aspect of God’s truth and of His unchangeableness. God is true not only because He is really God in contrast to all that is not God, and because He realizes the idea of Godhead, but also because He is constant or faithful in keeping His promises, and therefore is worthy of trust (see \textit{TRUTH}). God, likewise, is
unchangeable in His ethical nature. This unchangeableness the Scripture often connects with God’s goodness and mercy, and also with His constancy in reference to His covenant promises, and this is what the Old Testament means by the Faithfulness of God (see UNCHANGEABleness).

1. FAITHFulNESS OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In the Old Testament this attribute is ascribed to God in passages where the Hebrew words denoting faithfulness do not occur. It is implied in the covenant name Yahweh as unfolded in Exodus 3:13-15, which not only expresses God’s self-existence and unchangeableness, but, as the context indicates, puts God’s immutability in special relation to His gracious promises, thus denoting God’s unchangeable faithfulness which is emphasized in the Old Testament to awaken trust in God (Deuteronomy 7:9; Psalm 36:5 (Hebrew 6); Isaiah 11:5; Hosea 12:6,9). (For fuller remarks on the name Yahweh in Exodus 3:13-15, see article UNCHANGEABLENESS.) It is, moreover, God’s faithfulness as well as His immutability which is implied in those passages where God is called a rock, as being the secure object of religious trust (Deuteronomy 32:4,15; Psalm 18:2 (Hebrew 3); 42:9 (Hebrew 10); Isaiah 17:10, etc.). This same attribute is also implied where God reveals Himself to Moses and to Israel as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and their fathers’ God (Exodus 3:6,15,16). The truth concerning God here taught is not simply that He stood in a gracious relation to the Patriarchs, but that He is faithful to His gracious promise to their fathers, and that what He was to them He will continue to be to Moses and to Israel. This is the fundamental idea in the Old Testament concerning the faithfulness of God.

This can be seen also from the Hebrew words which are used to express this quality of God’s nature and activity. These words are ne’eman, the Niphal participle of the verb ‘aman used as an adjective — ”faithful” — and the nouns ‘emeth and ‘emunah — ”faithfulness.” The verbal stem ‘aman means “to be secure or firm.” In the Qal it denotes the firmness of that which supports something, being used in the participle of a nurse who carries a child (Numbers 11:12; 2 Samuel 4:4; Isaiah 49:23). In the Niphal it denotes the firmness of that which is supported, for example, a child which is carried (Isaiah 60:4); a well-founded house (1 Samuel 2:35; 25:28); a wall which firmly holds a nail (Isaiah 22:23,15);
a kingdom firmly established (2 Samuel 7:16); persons secure in political station (Isaiah 7:9); a heart which is faithful (Nehemiah 9:8). Hence, in the Niphal the verb comes to have the meaning of being true in the sense of the agreement of words and assertions with reality; for example, of words and revelations (Genesis 42:20; Hosea 5:9); and of persons (Isaiah 8:2; Jeremiah 42:5). It has also the meaning of being faithful, being applied to men in Numbers 12:7; Psalm 101:6; Nehemiah 13:13, etc. In this sense the term is applied to the covenant-keeping Yahweh to express the truth that He is firm or constant, that is, faithful in regard to His covenant promises, and will surely fulfill them (Deuteronomy 7:9; Isaiah 49:7; and possibly Hosea 11:12 (Hebrew 12:1)).

A similar use is made of the nouns ‘emeth and ‘emunah. Apart from the instances where ‘emeth denotes the idea of truth or the correspondence of words and ideas with reality, and the instances where it denotes the agreement of acts and words with the inner disposition, that is, sincerity, it is also used to denote the idea of faithfulness as above defined. As regards the noun ‘emunah, apart from a few passages where it is doubtful whether it means truth or faithfulness, it usually denotes the latter idea. Both these nouns, then, are used to signify the idea of faithfulness, that is, constancy or firmness, especially in the fulfillment of all obligations. In this sense these words are not only applied to men, but also to God to express the idea that He is always faithful to His covenant promises. It is this attribute of God which the Psalmist declares (Psalm 40:10 (Hebrew 11)), and the greatness of which he affirms by saying that God’s faithfulness reacheth to the clouds (Psalm 36:5 (Hebrew 6)). It is this which he makes the object of praise (Psalm 89:1,2 (Hebrew 2,3); Psalm 92:2 (Hebrew 3)); and which he says should be praised and reverenced by all men (Psalm 89:5,8 (Hebrew 6,9)). And even this faithfulness is itself characterized by constancy, if we may so speak, for the Psalmist says that it endures to all generations (Psalm 100:5). Being thus a characteristic of God, it also characterizes His salvation, and becomes the basis of confidence that God will hear prayer (Psalm 143:1). It thus becomes the security of the religious man (Psalm 91:4); and the source of God’s help to His people (Psalm 31:5 (Hebrew 6)). Accordingly in the teaching of prophecy, the salvation of the covenant people rests upon no claim or merit of their own, but solely upon Yahweh’s mercy, grace and faithfulness.
as if His promise was to fail, but, so far from this being true, as Yahweh, He is faithful to His word of promise which stands forever (Isaiah 40:8). Even from eternity His counsels are characterized by faithfulness and truth (Isaiah 25:1); and this is not because of Israel’s faithfulness, but it is for His own sake that Yahweh blotteth out their transgressions (Isaiah 43:22-25; Micah 7:18-20). It is, moreover, this same characteristic of Yahweh which is asserted in many cases where the Hebrew words ‘emeth and ‘emunah are translated by the word “truth” in the King James Version. In Exodus 34:6 it is God’s faithfulness (‘emeth) which is referred to, since it evidently signifies His constancy from generation to generation; and in Deuteronomy 32:4 it is also God’s faithfulness (‘emunah) which is mentioned, since it is contrasted with the faithlessness of Israel. The same is true of ‘emeth in Micah 7:20; Psalm 31:5 (Hebrew 6)); 91:4; 146:6. This is also true of the numerous instances where God’s mercy and truth (‘emeth) are combined, His mercy being the source of His gracious promises, and His truth the faithfulness with which He certainly fulfills them (Psalm 25:10; 57:3 (Hebrew 4); 61:7 (Hebrew 8); 85:10 (Hebrew 11); 86:15). And since the covenant-keeping Yahweh is faithful, faithfulness comes also to be a characteristic of the New Covenant which is everlasting (Psalm 89:28 (Hebrew 29)); compare also for a similar thought, Isaiah 54:8 ff; Jeremiah 31:35 ff; Hosea 2:19 ff; Ezekiel 16:60 ff.

It is in this connection, moreover, that God’s faithfulness is closely related to His righteousness in the Old Testament. In the second half of the prophecy of Isaiah and in many of the psalms, righteousness is ascribed to God because He comes to help and save His people. Thus righteousness as a quality parallel with grace, mercy and faithfulness is ascribed to God (Isaiah 41:10; 42:6; 45:13,19,21; 63:1). It appears in these places to widen out from its exclusively judicial or forensic association and to become a quality of God as Savior of His people. Accordingly this attribute of God is appealed to in the Psalms as the basis of hope for salvation and deliverance (Psalm 31:1 (Hebrew 2); 35:24; 71:2; 143:11). Hence, this attribute is associated with God’s mercy and grace (Psalm 36:5 (Hebrew 6); 36:9 (Hebrew 10); 89:14 (Hebrew 15)); also with His faithfulness (Zec 8:8; Psalm 36:6 (Hebrew 7)); Psalm 40:10 (Hebrew 11); 88:11,12 (Hebrew 12,13); 89:14 (Hebrew 15); 96:13; 119:137,142; 143:1). Accordingly the Old Testament conception of the righteousness of God has been practically identified with His covenant
faithfulness, by such writers as Kautzsch, Riehm and Smend, Ritschl’s definition of it being very much the same. Moreover, Ritschl, following Diestel, denied that the idea of distributive and retributive justice is ascribed to God in the Old Testament. In regard to this latter point, it should be remarked in passing that this denial that the judicial or forensic idea of righteousness is ascribed to God in the Old Testament breaks down, not only in view of the fact that the Old Testament does ascribe this attribute to God in many ways, but also in view of the fact that in a number of passages the idea of retribution is specifically referred to the righteousness of God (see RIGHTEOUSNESS; compare against Diestel and Ritschl, Dalman, Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testament).

That which concerns us, however, in regard to this close relation between righteousness and faithfulness is to observe that this should not be pressed to the extent of the identification of righteousness with covenant faithfulness in these passages in the Psalms and the second half of Isaiah. The idea seems to be that Israel has sinned and has no claim upon Yahweh, finding her only hope of deliverance in His mercy and faithfulness. But this very fact that Yahweh is merciful and faithful becomes, as it were, Israel’s claim, or rather the ground of Israel’s hope of deliverance from her enemies. Hence, in the recognition of this claim of His people, God is said to be righteous in manifesting His mercy and faithfulness, so that His righteousness, no less than His mercy and faithfulness, becomes the ground of His people’s hope. Righteousness is thus closely related in these cases to faithfulness, but it is not identified with it, nor has it in all cases lost entirely its forensic tone. This seems to be, in general, the meaning of righteousness in the Psalms and the second half of Isaiah, with which may also be compared Micah 6:9; Zec 8:8.

The emphasis which this attribute of God has in the Old Testament is determined by the fact that throughout the whole of the Old Testament the covenant relation of Yahweh to His people is founded solely in God’s grace, and not on any merit of theirs. If this covenant relation had been based on any claim of Israel, faithfulness on God’s part might have been taken for granted. But since Yahweh’s covenant relation with Israel and His promises of salvation spring solely from, and depend wholly upon, the grace of God, that which gave firm assurance that the past experience of God’s grace would continue in the future was this immutable faithfulness of Yahweh. By it the experience of the fathers was given a religious value for Israel from generation to generation. And even as the faithfulness of
God bridged over the past and the present, so also it constituted the connecting link between the present and the future, becoming thus the firm basis of Israel’s hope; compare Psalm 89 which sets forth the faithfulness of God in its greatness, its firmness as the basis of the covenant and the ground it affords of hope for future help from Yahweh, and for hope that His covenant shall endure forever. When God’s people departed from Him all the more emphasis was put upon His faithfulness, so that the only hope of His wayward people lay not only in His grace and mercy but also in His faithfulness, which stands in marked contrast with the faithlessness and inconstancy of His people. This is probably the meaning of the difficult verse Hosea 11:12 (Hebrew 12:1).

2. FAITHFULNESS OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

In the New Testament teaching concerning the faithfulness of God the same idea of faithfulness to His gracious promises is emphasized and held up as the object of a confident trust in God. This idea is usually expressed by the adjective pistos, and once by the noun pistis, which more frequently has the active sense of faith or trust.

An attempt has been made by Wendt (SK, 1883, 511 f; Teaching of Jesus, English translation, I, 259 f) to interpret the words aletheia and alethes in many instances, especially in the Johannine writings, as denoting faithfulness and rectitude, after the analogy of the Septuagint rendering eleos kai aletheia for the Hebrew phrase “mercy and truth,” in which truth is equivalent to faithfulness. But the most that could be inferred from the fact that the Septuagint uses the word aletheia to translate the Hebrew word ‘emeth, and in about one-half the cases where ‘emunah occurs, would be that those Greek words might have been prepared for such a use in the New Testament. But while it is true that there is one usage of these words in John’s writings in an ethical sense apparently based on the Old Testament use of ‘emeth and ‘emunah, the Greek words do not have this meaning when employed to denote a characteristic of God. Neither is the adjective alethinos so used.

See TRUTH.

In the Epistles of Paul the word aletheia occurs quite frequently to denote the truth revealed by God to man through reason and conscience, and to denote the doctrinal content of the gospel. In two passages, however, the words alethes and aletheia seem to signify the faithfulness of God
(Romans 3:4,7; 15:8). In the former passage Paul is contrasting the faithfulness of God with the faithlessness of men, the word *alethes*, 3:4, and *aletheia*, 3:7, apparently denoting the same Divine characteristic as the word *pistis*, 3:3. In the latter passage (Romans 15:8), the vindication of God’s covenant faithfulness, through the realization of His promises to the fathers, is declared to have been the purpose of the ministry of Jesus Christ to the Jews.

This faithfulness of God to His covenant promises is frequently emphasized by Paul, the words he employs being the noun *pistis* (once) and the adjective: pistos. The noun *pistis* is used once by Paul in this sense (Romans 3:3 ff). In this place Paul is arguing that the unbelief of the Jews cannot make void God’s faithfulness. Both Jew and Gentile, the apostle had said, are on the same footing as regards justification. Nevertheless the Jews had one great advantage in that they were the people to whom the revelation of God’s gracious promises had been committed. These promises will certainly be fulfilled, notwithstanding the fact that some of the Jews were unfaithful, because the fulfillment of these promises depends not on human conduct but on the faithfulness of God, which cannot be made void by human faithlessness and unbelief. And to the supposition that man’s faithlessness could make of none effect God’s faithfulness, Paul replies ‘let God be faithful (alethes) and every man a liar’ (Romans 3:4), by which Paul means to say that in the fulfillment of God’s promises, in spite of the fact that men are faithless, the faithfulness of God will be abundantly vindicated, even though thereby every man should be proven untrue and faithless. And not only so, but human faithlessness will give an opportunity for a manifestation of the faithfulness (aletheia) of God, abounding to His glory (Romans 3:7). God’s faithfulness here is His unchangeable constancy and fidelity to His covenant promises; and it is this fidelity to His promises, or the fact that God’s gracious gifts and election are without any change of mind on His part, which gave to Paul the assurance that all Israel should finally be saved (Romans 11:25-29). Moreover this covenant faithfulness of God is grounded in His very nature, so that Paul’s hope of eternal life rests on the fact that God who cannot lie promised it before the world began (Titus 1:2); and the certainty that God will abide faithful notwithstanding human faithlessness rests on the fact that God cannot deny Himself (2 Timothy 2:13). It is because God is faithful that His promises in Christ are yea and amen (2 Corinthians 1:18,20). This attribute of God, moreover, is the
basis of Paul’s confident assurance that God will preserve the Christian in temptation (1 Corinthians 10:13); and establish him and preserve him from evil (2 Thessalonians 3:3). And since God is faithful and His gracious promises trustworthy, this characteristic attaches to the “faithful sayings” in the Pastoral Epistles which sum up the gospel, making them worthy of trust and acceptance (1 Timothy 1:15; 4:9; Titus 3:8).

This faithfulness of God in the sense of fidelity to His promises is set forth as the object of sure trust and hope by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It was the basis of Sarah’s faith that she would bear a child when she was past age (Hebrews 11:11); and it is because God is faithful to His promise in Christ that we can draw nigh to Him with full assurance of faith, holding fast without wavering the profession of hope (Hebrews 10:23).

John also ascribes this attribute to God. Since one of the most precious of God’s promises through Christ is the pardon of sin through the “blood of Jesus Christ,” John says that God’s faithfulness, as well as His righteousness, is manifested in the forgiveness of sin (1 John 1:9).

The faithfulness of God is viewed from a slightly different point by Peter when he tells his readers that those who suffer as Christians and in accordance with God’s will should “commit their soul’s in well-doing unto a faithful Creator” (1 Peter 4:19). The quality of faithfulness, which in the Scripture is more frequently ascribed to God in His relation to man as gracious Savior, and as the ground of hope in His gracious promises, is here applied by Peter to God in His relation to man as his Creator, and is made the ground of comfort under persecution and suffering. The omission of the article before the words “faithful Creator” makes emphatic that this is a characteristic of God as Creator, and the position of the words in the sentence throws great emphasis on this attribute of God as the basis of comfort under suffering. It is as if Peter would say to suffering Christians, “You suffer not by chance but in accordance with God’s will; He, the almighty Creator, made you, and since your suffering is in accordance with His will, you ought to trust yourselves to Him who as your Creator is faithful.” It is, of course, Christians who are to derive this comfort, but the faithfulness of God is extended here to cover all His relations to His people, and to pledge all His attributes in their behalf.
This attribute is also ascribed to Christ in the New Testament. Where Jesus is called a faithful high priest, the idea expressed is His fidelity to His obligations to God and to His saving work (Hebrews 2:17; 3:2,6). But when in the Book of Revelation Jesus Christ is called the “faithful witness” or absolutely the “Faithful and True,” it is clear that the quality of faithfulness, in the most absolute sense in which it is characteristic of God in contrast with human changeableness, is ascribed to Christ (Revelation 1:5; 3:14; 19:11). This is especially clear in the last-named passage. The heavens themselves open to disclose the glorified Christ, and He appears not only as a victorious warrior whose name is faithful and true, but also as the one in whom these attributes have their highest realization, and of whom they are so characteristic as to become the name of the exalted Lord. This clearly implies the Deity of Jesus.

In summing up the Scripture teaching concerning God’s faithfulness, three things are noteworthy. In the first place, this characteristic of God is usually connected with His gracious promises of salvation, and is one of those attributes which make God the firm and secure object of religious trust. As is the case with all the Scripture teaching concerning God, it is the religious value of His faithfulness which is made prominent. In the second place, the so-called moral attributes, of which this is one, are essential in order to constitute God the object of religion, along with the so-called incommunicable attributes such as Omnipotence, Omnipresence and Unchangeableness. Take away either class of attributes from God, and He ceases to be God, the object of religious veneration and trust. And in the third place, while these moral attributes, to which faithfulness belongs, have been called “communicable,” to distinguish them from the “incommunicable” attributes which distinguish God from all that is finite, it should never be forgotten that, according to the Scripture, God is faithful in such an absolute sense as to contrast Him with men who are faithful only in a relative sense, and who appear as changeable and faithless in comparison with the faithfulness of God.

See RIGHTEOUSNESS; TRUTH; UNCHANGEABLENESS.
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Gaspar Wistar Hodge

FAITHFUL SAYINGS

<sa’-inz> ([πιστός ὁ λόγος, pistos he logos]): “This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation” (the King James Version). These words form a striking formula which is found — with slight variations — only in the Pastoral Epistles, in 1 Timothy 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Timothy 2:11; Titus 3:8. A similar expression occurs in Revelation (21:5 and 22:6 the King James Version), “These sayings are faithful and true.”

THE FIVE “SAYINGS.”

Paul’s faithful sayings are thus five in number, and “were no doubt rehearsed constantly in the assemblies, till they became well-known watchwords in the various churches scattered over the Mediterranean-washed provinces of the Roman empire” (Ellicott, New Testament Commentary on 1 Timothy 1:15).

1. THE FIRST “SAYING”:

The first of the faithful sayings speaks of the pre-existence of Christ, of His coming into the world, and the purpose why He came is distinctly stated — to save the lost, irrespective of race or nationality, sinners who, apart from Christ, are without God and without hope.
2. THE SECOND “SAYING”:
The second of the faithful sayings refers to the work of being a minister of the gospel, a work then so full of danger and always full of difficulty. The office in question is honorable and Christlike, and, in those early days, it meant stern and ceaseless work, grave and constant danger. This faithful saying would act as a call to young men to offer themselves for the work of proclaiming the gospel to the world, and of witnessing for Christ.

3. THE THIRD “SAYING”:
The third saying is that godliness has an influence that is world-wide; it consists, not merely in holiness and in that fellowship and communion with God which is the very life of the soul; it is also an active force which springs from “the love of Christ constraining us,” and manifests itself in love toward all our fellow-men, for they are God’s creatures. Godliness transfigures every rank and condition of life. It has the promise of the life that now is: to those who seek the kingdom of God first, all other things will be added. And it has the promise of the life that is to come, the rich prospect of eternal blessedness with Christ. Compare with this saying the remarkable words in Titus 1:2, “in hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before times eternal.” Godliness gives all gladness here, and future glory too. This is a faithful saying.

4. THE FOURTH “SAYING”:
The fourth of the faithful sayings speaks of the Christian believer’s union with Christ, and of the blessedness of that union. The Christian is “dead with Christ,” he “suffers with Christ.” But the union with Christ is eternal, “We shall also live with him; .... we shall also reign with him” in life that is fadeless, endless and full of glory. Surely then, no one will draw back, for “if we deny him,” “if we believe not,” “he also will deny us,” for “he abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself.”

5. THE FIFTH “SAYING”:
The fifth and last of the faithful sayings speaks of our former unconverted state, “for we also once were foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures. But .... the kindness and love of God .... toward man appeared, not by works which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us.” Blessedness is now the Christian’s lot, and this is the result
not of our works: we owe it all to the tender love of God, to His Divine pity, to His redeeming grace. Yes, this is a faithful saying.

John Rutherfurd

FAITHLESS

<fath’-les>: The translation of [ἀπιστος, apistos], “without faith,” having the sense of “unbelieving,” “disbelieving.” Jesus upbraids the people, “O faithless and perverse generation!” (<Matthew 17:17; Mark 9:19; Luke 9:41); He says to Thomas, “Be not faithless, but believing” (<John 20:27); the Revised Version (British and American) adds, “If we are faithless,” instead of “believe not” (<2 Timothy 2:13); compare I Corinthians 7:12-15; 10:27; 14:22,24, etc.; Titus 1:15. In Luke 12:46 apistos has the sense of “unfaithful,” so the Revised Version (British and American); perhaps also Revelation 21:8, “unbelieving.”

FALCON

<fo’-k’-n>, <fol’-k’-n>, <fal’-kun>: The Hebrews did not know the word. Their bird corresponding to our falcon, in all probability, was one of the smaller kestrels covered by the word nets, which seemed to cover all lesser birds of prey that we include in the hawk family. That some of our many divisions of species were known to them is indicated by the phrase “after its kind.” The word occurs in the Revised Version (British and American) in Job 28:7, to translation ‘ayyah, Greek [γυψ, gups] (compare Leviticus 11:14; Deuteronomy 14:13):

“That path no bird of prey knoweth, Neither hath the falcon’s eye seen it.”

This substitutes “falcon” for “vulture” in the King James Version. The change weakens the force of the lines. All ornithologists know that eagles, vultures and the large hawks have such range of vision that they at once descend from heights at which we cannot see them to take prey on earth or food placed to tempt them. The falcons and sparrow hawks are small members of the family, some of which feed on little birds, some on insects. They are not celebrated for greater range of vision than other birds of the same location and feeding habits. The strength of these lines lay in the fact that if the path to the mine were so well concealed that the piercing eye of the vulture failed to find it, then it was perfectly hidden indeed.
FALL<fol> (vb.): The idea of falling is most frequently expressed in Hebrew by [l p n; naphal], but also by many other words; in Greek by [πίπτω, pipto], and its compounds. The uses of the word in Scripture are very varied. There is the literal falling by descent; the falling of the countenance in sorrow, shame, anger, etc. (Genesis 4:5,6); the falling in battle (Genesis 14:10; Numbers 14:3, etc.); the falling into trouble, etc. (Proverbs 24:16,17); prostration in supplication and reverence (Genesis 17:3; Numbers 14:5, etc.); falling of the Spirit of Yahweh (Ezekiel 11:5; compare 3:24; 8:1); of apostasy (2 Thessalonians 2:3; Hebrews 6:6; Jude 1:24), etc. the Revised Version (British and American) frequently changes “fall” of the King James Version into other words or phrases, as “stumble” (Leviticus 26:37; Psalm 64:8; 2 Peter 1:10, etc.), “fade” (Isaiah 33:4), etc.; in Acts 27, the Revised Version (British and American) reads “be cast ashore on rocky ground” for “have fallen upon rocks” (Acts 27:29), “perish” for “fall” (Acts 27:34), “lighting upon” for “falling into” (Acts 27:41).

W. L. Walker

FALL, THE<br

The question concerning the origin, the age and the written record of the history of the Fall in Genesis 3 need not be discussed here. For in the first place, science can never reach to the oldest origins and the ultimate destinies of humanity, and historical and critical inquiry will never be able to prove either the veracity or the unveracity of this history. And in the second place, exactly as it now lies before us, this history has already formed for centuries a portion of holy Scripture, an indispensable element in the organism of the revelation of salvation, and as such has been accepted in faith by the Hebrew congregation (Jewish people), by Christ, by the apostles, and by the whole Christian church.

1. Meaning of Genesis 3:

That Genesis 3 gives us an account of the fall of man, of the loss of his primitive innocence and of the misery, particularly death, to which he has since been subjected, cannot reasonably be denied. The opinion of the
Ophites, Kant, Schiller, Hegel, etc., that Genesis 3 relates the awakening of man to self-consciousness and personality (see *Adam in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha*), and therefore does not tell us of a fall, but a marked progression, is disputed by the name which the forbidden tree bears, as indicating to man not merely a tree of knowledge in the ordinary way, but quite specially a tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Genesis 3 is not in the least meant to relate to us how man obtained the idea of his nakedness and sexual passions, and from a state of childlike innocence changed in this respect to manlike maturity (Eerdman’s *De Beteekenis van het Paradijsverhaal, Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1905, 485-511). For according to Genesis, man was created full-grown, received a wife immediately as helpmeet, and at the same time saw himself allotted the task of multiplying and replenishing the earth. Moreover, the idea that sexual desire is something sinful and deserves punishment was entirely foreign to ancient Israel.

Finally, the interpretation of Wellhausen (*Geschichte Israels*, 1878, 344) cannot be accepted, that man in Genesis 3 should obtain “die intellektuelle Welterkenntniss, die metaphysische Erkenntniss der Dinge in ihrem Zusammenhange, ihrem Werth oder Unwerth, ihrem Nutzen oder Schaden” (“the intellectual knowledge of the world, the metaphysical knowledge of things in their connection, their worth or unworth, their utility or hurtfulness”). For in the first place, according to Genesis, this was man’s peculiar province from the beginning; he received indeed the vocation to subdue the earth, to keep and till the ground, to give the animals their names. And in the second place, the acquiring of this knowledge among the Israelites, who esteemed practical wisdom so highly, is difficult to represent as a fall, or as a punishment deserved for disobedience.

There is no other explanation possible of Genesis 3 than that it is the narration of a fall, which consists in the transgression of an explicit command of God, thus bearing a moral significance, and therefore followed by repentance, shame, fear and punishment. The context of the chapter places this interpretation beyond all doubt, for before his fall man is represented as a creature made after God’s image and receiving paradise as a dwelling-place, and after the fall he is sent into a rough world,
condemned to a life of labor and sorrow, and increases more and more in sin until the judgment of the Flood.

2. *Genesis 3 in the Old and the New Testaments:*

It is indeed remarkable how very seldom the Old Testament refers to this history of the Fall. This is not a sufficient reason for pronouncing it of later origin, for the same peculiarity presents itself at the time when, according to all criticism, it was recorded in literature. Prophets, Psalms, Proverbs never quote it; at the most, allusions may be found to it in Hosea 6:7 and Ecclesiastes 7:29; and even Jesus and His apostles in the New Testament very seldom appeal to Genesis 3 (John 8:44; Romans 5:12; 1 Corinthians 15:22; 2 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Timothy 2:14). But it may be considered that the Prophets, Psalms and Proverbs only mention special facts of the past by way of exception, that the apostles even hardly ever quote the words and deeds of Jesus, and that all lived at a time when revelation itself was still proceeding and did not lie before them as a complete whole. With us it is quite a different matter; we are in a certain sense outside revelation, make it a subject of our study and meditation, try to discover the unity which holds all its parts together, and devote our special interest to Adam as a figure and counterpart of Christ. The creation and fall of man occupy therefore a much broader place in the province of our thoughts than they did among the writers of the books of the Old and New Testaments.

Nevertheless, the Fall is the silent hypothesis of the whole Biblical doctrine of sin and redemption; it does not rest only on a few vague passages, but forms an indispensable element in the revelation of salvation. The whole contemplation of man and humanity, of Nature and history, of ethical and physical evil, of redemption and the way in which to obtain it, is connected in Scripture with a Fall, such as Genesis 3 relates to us. Sin, for example, is common to all men (1 Kings 8:46; Psalm 14:3; 130:3; 143:2), and to every man from his conception (Genesis 6:5; 8:21; Job 14:4; Psalm 51:7). It arouses God’s anger and deserves all kinds of punishment, not only of an ethical but of a physical nature (Genesis 3:14-19; 4:14; 6:7,13; 11:8; Leviticus26:14 f; Deuteronomy 28:15; Psalm 90:7, etc.); the whole of Scripture proceeds from the thought that sin and death are connected in the closest degree, as are also obedience and life. In the new heaven and new earth all suffering ceases with sin (Revelation 21:4). Therefore redemption is possible only in the
way of forgiveness (Psalm 32:1; Isaiah 43:25, etc.), and circumcision of the heart (Deuteronomy 10:16; 30:16; Jeremiah 4:4), and this includes, further, life, joy, peace, salvation. When Paul in Romans 5:12; 1 Corinthians 15:22 indicates Adam as the origin of sin and death, and Christ as the source of righteousness and life, he develops no ideas which are contrary to the organism of revelation or which might be neglected without loss; he merely combines and formulates the data which are explicitly or silently contained in it.

3. The Fall and the Theory of Evolution:

Tradition does little toward the confirmation and elucidation of the Biblical narrative of the Fall. The study of mythology is still too little advanced to determine the ideal or historical value which may be contained in the legend of a Golden Age, in many people’s obsequious honoring of the serpent, in the equally widespread belief in a tree of life. The Babylonian representation also (a seal on which a man and woman, seated, are figured as plucking fruit from a tree, while a serpent curls up behind the woman as if whispering in her ear), which G. Smith, Lenormant and Friedrich Delitzsch compare with the Paradise narrative, shows no similarity on nearer view (A. Jeremias, Das Altes Testament im Lichte des alten Orients2, Leipzig, 1906, 203). Indirectly, however, a very powerful witness for the fall of man is furnished by the whole empirical condition of the world and humanity. For a world, such as we know it, full of unrighteousness and sorrow, cannot be explained without the acceptance of such a fact. He who holds fast to the witness of Scripture and conscience to sin as sin (as ἁνομία, anomia) cannot deduce it from creation, but must accept the conclusion that it began with a transgression of God’s command and thus with a deed of the will. Pythagoras, Plato, Kant, Schelling, Baader have all understood and acknowledged this with more or less clearness. He who denies the Fall must explain sin as a necessity which has its origin in the Creation, in the nature of things, and therefore in God Himself; he justifies man but accuses God, misrepresents the character of sin and makes it everlasting and indefeasible. For if there has not been a fall into sin, there is no redemption of sin possible; sin then loses its merely ethical significance, becomes a trait of the nature of man, and is inexterminable.

This comes out, in later years, in the many endeavors to unite the Fall with the doctrine of evolution (compare Tennant, The Origin and Propagation
of Sin2, 1905; A. S. Peake, Christianity: Its Nature and Its Truth, 1908; W. E. Orchard, Modern Theories of Sin, 1909; Francis J. Hall, Evolution and the Fall, 1910). All these endeavors lead to setting on one side the objective standard of sin, which is the law of God, and determining the nature and importance of sin subjectively by the feeling of guilt, which in its turn again depends on the knowledge of and the love for the moral ideal, and itself forms an important factor in moral progress. It is true that the strength of all these endeavors is drawn from theory of the descent of man from the animal. But as to this theory, it is worthy of notice:

(1) that it is up to the present day a hypothesis, and is proved by no single observation, whether direct or indirect;

(2) that the fossils of prehistoric men, found in Germany, Belgium, France and elsewhere have demonstrated the low degree of culture in which these men have lived, but in no sense their dissimilarity with mankind of today (W. Branca, Der Stand unserer Kenntnisse vom fossilen Menschen, Leipzig, 1910);

(3) that the uncivilized and prehistoric man may be as little identified with the first man as the unjustly so-called nature-people and children under age;

(4) that the oldest history of the human race, which has become known through the discoveries at Babylon in the last century, was not that of a state of barbarism, but of high and rich culture (D. Gath Whitley, “What was the Primitive Condition of Man?” Princeton Theol. Review, October, 1906; J. Orr, God’s Image in Man, 1906);

(5) that the acceptance of theory of descent as a universal and unlimited rule leads to the denial of the unity of the human race, in a physical and also in an intellectual, moral and religious sense. For it may be possible, even in the school of Darwin, to maintain the unity of the human race so long a time as tradition exercises its influence on the habit of mind; but theory itself undermines its foundation and marks it as an arbitrary opinion.

From the standpoint of evolution, there is not only no reason to hold to the “of one blood” of Acts 17:26 the King James Version, but there has never even been a first man; the transition from animal to man was so slow and successive, that the essential distinction fails to be seen. And with the
Effacing of this boundary, the unity of the moral ideal, of religion, of the laws of thought and of truth, fails also; theory of evolution expels the absolute everywhere and leads necessarily to psychologism, relativism, pragmatism and even to pluralism, which is literally polytheism in a religious sense. The unity of the human race, on the other hand, as it is taught in holy Scripture, is not an indifferent physical question, but an important intellectual, moral and religious one; it is a “postulate” of the whole history of civilization, and expressly or silently accepted by nearly all historians. And conscience bears witness to it, in so far as all men show the work of the moral law written in their hearts, and their thoughts accuse or excuse one another (Romans 2:15); it shows back to the Fall as an “Urthatsache der Geschichte.”

4. The Character of the Fall:

What the condition and history of the human race could hardly lead us to imagine, holy Scripture relates to us as a tragic fact in its first pages. The first man was created by God after His own image, not therefore in brutish unconscioness or childlike naivete, but in a state of bodily and spiritual maturity, with understanding and reason, with knowledge and speech, with knowledge especially of God and His law. Then was given to him moreover a command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. This command was not contained in the moral law as such; it was not a natural but a positive commandment; it rested entirely and only on God’s will and must be obeyed exclusively for this reason. It placed before man the choice, whether he would be faithful and obedient to God’s word and would leave to Him alone the decision as to what is good or evil, or whether he would reserve to himself the right arbitrarily to decide what is good or evil. Thus the question was: Shall theonomy or autonomy be the way to happiness? On this account also the tree was called the tree of knowledge of good and evil. It did not bear this name in the sense that man might obtain from it the empirical knowledge of good and evil, for by his transgression he in truth lost the empirical knowledge of good. But the tree was so named, because man, by eating of it and so transgressing God’s commandment, arrogated to himself “die Fahigkeit zur selbstandigen Wahl der Mittel, durch die man sein Gluck schaffen will”: “the capacity of independent choice of the means by which he would attain his happiness” (Koberle, Sunde und Gnade im relig. Leben des Volkes Israel bis auf Christenrum, 1905, 64). Theonomy, as obedience to God from free love,
includes as such the idea and the possibility of autonomy, therefore that of antinomy also.

But it is the free act and therefore the guilt of man that has changed the possibility into reality. For the mind, there remains here an insoluble problem, as much in the question, why God allowed this Fall to take place, as in the other, how man, created in the likeness of God, could and did fall. There is a great deal of truth in the often-expressed thought, that we can give no account of the origin of sin, because it is not logical, and does not result as a conclusion drawn from two premises. But facts are brutal. What seems logically impossible often exists in reality. The laws of moral life are different from those of thought and from those also of mechanical nature. The narrative in Genesis 3, in any case, is psychologically faithful in the highest degree. For the same way as it appears there in the first man, it repeatedly takes place among ourselves (Jas 1:14,15). Furthermore we ought to allow God to justify Himself. The course of revelation discovers to faith how, through all the ages, He holds sin in its entire development in His own almighty hands, and works through grace for a consummation in which, in the dispensation of the fullness of times, He will gather together in one all things in Christ (Ephesians 1:10). (J. Orr, Sin as a Problem of Today, London, 1910.)

Herman Bavinck

FALLING STARS

See ASTRONOMY.

FALLOW

<fal’-o> ([µ m” D; damam]): Damam is translated only once in the sense of “fallow” (Exodus 23:11). The law required that the Israelites allow their ground to lie fallow one year in, seven, the King James Version is (Deuteronomy 14:5) [r ní nir], and is translated “fallow” in its more obsolete sense of “tilled ground” in the King James Version (Jeremiah 4:3; Hosea 10:12).

FALSE, CHRISTS

<fols>.
See **CHRISTS, FALSE.**

**FALSEHOOD**

<fol's'-hood>.

See **LYING.**

**FALSE PROPHETS**

See **PROPHESYINGS, FALSE.**

**FALSE SWEARING, WITNESS**

See **OATH; PERJURY; CRIMES.**

**FAME**

<\textit{fam}> ([\textit{με\v{e}shem}], [[ m” v e\, shem`a]]; [\textit{áko\,n}}, akoe], [\textit{φήμη}, pheme]):

“Fame” has the twofold meaning,

1. of report or rumor,
2. of renown or reputation (in the Old Testament it is not always easy to distinguish the two senses).

“Fame,” \textit{shema`}, “fame,” “rumor,” “reports” (Numbers 14:15; Job 28:22, the Revised Version (British and American) “rumor”) probably means “report”; but in 1 Kings 10:1; 2 Chronicles 9:1; Isaiah 66:19, it is most probably “renown,” or “reputation”; \textit{shemu`ah} (1 Kings 10:7; 2 Chronicles 9:6) may have either meaning; \textit{shoma`} (Joshua 6:27; 9:9; Nehemiah 9:4) seems to mean “fame” in the sense of reputation; but in Jeremiah 6:24 (as the American Standard Revised Version) “report”; \textit{shem}, “name,” has the sense of reputation (1 Kings 4:31; 1 Chronicles 14:17; 22:5; Zephaniah 3:19, the Revised Version (British and American) “name”); \textit{gol}, “voice,” is report (Genesis 45:16, the American Standard Revised Version “report”). In the New Testament \textit{akoe}, “hearing,” is “report,” so the Revised Version (British and American) (Matthew 4:24; 14:1; Mark 1:28); \textit{pheme}, “word,” “rumor,” is report, fame in this sense (Matthew 9:26; Luke 4:14); \textit{echos}, “a sound,” “noise” (Luke 4:37, the Revised Version (British and American) “rumor”), and logos, “word” (Luke 5:15, the Revised
Version (British and American) “report”) have the same meaning; diaphemizo, “to say throughout,” “to report publicly” (Matthew 9:31, “they .... spread abroad his fame”), seems to imply fame in the sense of reputation.

In 1 Macc 3:26, we have “fame” in the sense of reputation, “His fame (onoma, the Revised Version (British and American) “name”) came near even to the king”; so 3:41, “heard the fame of them.” ERV has “fame” for “report” (shema’), Jeremiah 50:43.

W. L. Walker

FAMILIAR

<fa-mil’yar>: Is found as an adjective qualifying “friend” and “spirit.”

(1) Used, in a number of Old Testament passages, of spirits which were supposed to come at the call of one who had power over them. [b וָח, ‘obh], literally, something “hollow”; compare [b וָח, ‘obh], “bottle” (Job 32:19 the King James Version); because the voice of the spirit might have been supposed to come from the one possessed, as from a bottle, or because of the hollow sound which characterized the utterance, as out of the ground (Isaiah 29:4); or, as some have conjectured, akin to [b וֹח, ‘ubah], “return” (nekro>mantiv, nekromantis). Probably called “familiar” because it was regarded as a servant (famulus), belonging to the family (familiaris), who might be summoned to do the commands of the one possessing it. The practice of consulting familiar spirits was forbidden by the Mosaic law (Leviticus19:31; 20:6,27; Deuteronomy 18:11). King Saul put this away early in his reign, but consulted the witch of Endor, who “had a familiar spirit” (1 Samuel 28:3,7,8,9; 1 Chronicles 10:13). King Manasseh fell into the same sin (2 Kings 21:6; 2 Chronicles 33:6); but Josiah put those who dealt with familiar spirits out of the land (2 Kings 23:24).

It seems probable, however, that the practice prevailed more or less among the people till the exile (Isaiah 8:19; 19:3). See “Divination by the ‘Ob” in The Expositor T, IX, 157; ASTROLOGY, 1; COMMUNION WITH DEMONS.

(2) “Familiars,” “familiar friend,” from [d ” y; yadha`], “to know,” hence, “acquaintance,” one intimately attached (Job 19:14); but more
frequently of ‘enosh shalom, “man of (my or thy) peace,” that is, one to whom the salutation of peace is given (Psalm 41:9; Jeremiah 20:10; 38:22; also in Obadiah 1:7, rendered “the men that were at peace with thee”).

Edward Bagby Pollard

**FAMILY**

The Bible is the world’s great teacher of monogamy — the union for life of one man and one woman in marriage as the basis of the family. Whatever may be said about the time of the writing of the books of the Bible, or of parts of them, the testimony of the whole is incontrovertibly to the point that marriage springs from the choice of one man and one woman of each other for a permanent family relation. Over and through the whole of the Bible this ideal is dominant. There may be instances shown here and there of violation of this rule. But such cases are to be regarded as contrary to the underlying principle of marriage — known even at the time of their occurrence to be antagonistic to the principle.

There may be times when moral principle is violated in high places and perhaps over wide reaches in society. The Bible shows that there were such times in the history of man. But it is undeniable that its tone toward such lapses of men and of society is not one of condonation but one of regret and disapproval. The disasters consequent are faithfully set forth. The feeling that finds expression in its whole history is that in such cases there had been violation of the ideal of right in the sex relation. The ideal of monogamic relation is put in the forefront of the history of man.

**2. MONOGAMY, THE IDEAL RELATION:**

The race is introduced synthetically as a species in the incoming of life. “And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (Genesis 1:27). But with the first particularization of the relation of the sexes to each other the great charter of monogamy was laid down so clearly that Jesus was content to quote it, when with His limitless ethical scrutiny He explained the marriage relation. “And the man said (when the woman was brought to him), This is
now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh” (Genesis 2:23,14). It is well to pause and look at the grammatical number of the nouns: “a man,” “his wife.” The words of the charter hold the sexes to monogamy. The subsequent words make marriage life-lasting. “They twain shall be one flesh.” A dualism becomes an individualism. So said Christ: “Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh” (Matthew 19:6 the King James Version). Nothing but death separates a man from his own flesh. Nothing but life-monogamy can find place in the language of this charter.

There is much in the setting of this charter in the account given in Genesis that is suggestive of the fine sentiment which we know has always gone along with love and marriage. That this account should have held the place in history that it has had adds testimony to the fine perception of sentiment and the strong grasp on principle out of which it came.

3. EQUALITY OF THE SEXES:

Eve, “the mother of all living,” comes out as distinctly as Adam on the canvas in the portraiture of the first pair. She is the feminine representative — ‘ishshah — of the race, as Adam is the masculine — ‘ish (Genesis 2:23). The personality of Eve is as complete as that of Adam. She is a rational and accountable creature, as Adam is. In primitive intellectual and moral transactions she has share on equality with Adam, and is equally involved in their results. Different physical consequences fall on her for “transgression,” because she is “woman,” “the mother of all living” (Genesis 3:16). But Adam does not escape retribution for sin, and it may be questioned whether its burden did not fall hardest on him (Genesis 3:18,19), for motherhood has its joy as well as its pain, in the companionship of new-born child-life; but the wrestler for subsistence from a reluctant earth must bear his hardship alone. It cannot but be that much of the primitive conjugal love survived the fall.

4. POLYGAMY:

According to the record, monogamy seems long to have survived the departure from Eden. It is not till many generations after that event that we find a case of polygamy — that of Lamech (Genesis 4:19-24). Lamech
is said to have had “two wives.” The special mention of “two” seems to show that man had not yet wandered far away from monogamy. The indications seem to be that as the race multiplied and went out over the face of the earth they forgot the original kinship and exhibited all manner of barbarities in social relations. Lamech was a polygamist, but he was also a quarrelsome homicide: “I have slain a man for wounding me, and a young man for bruising me” (Genesis 4:23). If such acts and dispositions as are disclosed in the case of Lamech become common, it will certainly not be a long while before the only apt description of the condition of society must be that upon which we come in Genesis 6:5: “And Yahweh saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” Out of such condition will come war and slavery, and polygamy — and come they did. It is a straight road from Genesis 6:5 to “The Koran, tribute or the sword,” and the polygamy of Mohammedans.

5. THE COMMANDMENTS AND THE FAMILY (5TH COMMANDMENT):

The commandments (Exodus 20:12; Deuteronomy 5:16) are a succinct summary of the supreme moral relations and duties of man. The first four pertain to our relationship to God. The six following concern human relations. Of these six, three have considerations of the family involved in them. Commandments do not come to people ignorant of the subjects to which they relate. A commandment to cover an unknown moral relation is an absurdity. The text of the Fifth Commandment is, “Honor thy father and thy mother.” This refers to the relation of children to parents. This commandment could scarcely have arisen when polygamy was a common practice, certainly never from promiscuity. The equality of father and mother is stamped on its face. That idea never could have had strength and solemnity enough, except in a prevailing condition of monogamy, to entitle the command in which it appeared to rank with the important subjects covered by the other commands. Before the gaze of the children to whom this commandment came, the family stood in monogamic honor — the mother a head of the family as well as the father. There is no question about the position of the mother in this commandment. She stands out as clear as Sinai itself. There is no cloud on her majesty. Such honor as goes to the father goes to the mother. She is no chattel, no property, no inferior being, but the mother; no subordinate to the father, but his equal in rank
and entitled to equal reverence with him. The commandment would not and could not have so pictured the mother had she been one of the inmates of a harem.

6. THE COMMANDMENTS AND THE FAMILY (7TH COMMANDMENT):

The Seventh Commandment (Exodus 20:14; Deuteronomy 5:18) gives the family. It secures the home. It says that whatever children are born to the race shall be born in a home and of the home — shall be family-born. The terms adultery and fornication have now become synonymous. Under the influence of polygamous practices a distinction was made in respect to unlawful sex union as to whether one or both of the parties thereto were married or not, or whether one or both were single. Such distinction will not hold in morals. All or any sex union out of marriage is barred by the family idea. Outside of that all sex union is sin.

While it is true that in the laws of Israel sex sin outside the family relation was treated as a subject by itself, yet when we remember how early in life marriage came in those ancient days, and that betrothal in childhood was deemed as sacred as marriage itself, we see that even then the sweep of the commandment was well-nigh universal and over what a broad range it protected the family. The family is the primal eldest institution of man — the greatest and the holiest. Over this institution this commandment stands sentry. It prevents men from breaking up in complete individual isolation, from reverting to solitary savagery. Think to what a child is born outside of the family relation! Then think of all children being so born, and you have the picture of a low plane of animalism from which all trace of the moral responsibility of fatherhood has disappeared, and where even motherhood will be reduced to simple care during the short period of helpless infancy, to such care as belongs to animal instinct. Put up now the idea that marriage shall be universal and that the children born in marriage shall belong genuinely to it, and you have a new heaven and a new earth in the sex relations of the race of man.

7. THE COMMANDMENTS AND THE FAMILY (10TH COMMANDMENT):

The Tenth Commandment seems almost out of place on the list of the commandments. All the others enjoin specific acts. This tenth seems to be a
foregleam of the Savior’s method — going to the thoughts and intents of the heart. It is an attempt at regulation in man. It goes beyond outward acts and deals with the spirit. Its purpose seems not regulation of man in society but in himself. So far as it has outward relation it seems to apply primarily to the rights of property. We have at common law the expression, “rights of persons; and rights of things,” i.e. to property. But the list of things enumerated in the commandment comprises the things most common to family life: house, servants, animals. One is forbidden not only to take but even to desire such things. They are necessary to family life. In this list of things belonging to a neighbor that a man is forbidden to desire occurs the term “wife.” To first thought it may seem strange that she should be listed with property in house and chattels. But it may not be very singular. One of woman’s greatest blessings to man is helpfulness. Eve, the mother of all living, came as a helpmeet for Adam. Sarah is mistress of domestic operations. A wife quick of thought, accurate in judgment and deft of hand is usually the key to a man’s material prosperity. As such help a man’s desire might stray to his neighbor’s wife as well as to his cattle. Even on this lower plane she is still a constituent element of the family. Here the thought of sex is scarcely discernible. Covetousness unlimited in the accumulation of property is what comes under ban. To treat of that matter would lead too far astray.

See COVETOUSNESS.

It is well to remember in taking leave of the commandments that half of those pertaining to human relations hold the family plainly in view. This is as it should be. The race is divided equally between male and female, and their relations to each other, we might expect, would call for half of the directions devoted to the whole.

8. PRIMITIVE MONOGAMIC IDEAL:

The laws against adultery and incest (Leviticus20 and the like) may seem barbarously severe. Be it so; that fact would show they were carried along by a people tremendously in earnest about the integrity of the family. Beneath pioneer severity is usually a solemn principle. That the children of Israel had a tough grasp on the primitive monogamic ideal is not only apparent in all their history, but it comes out clear in what they held as history before their own began. Mr. Gladstone said the tenth chapter of Genesis is the best document of ancient ethnography known to man. But it
is made up on family lines. It is a record of the settlement of heads of families as they went forth on the face of the earth. The common statement for the sons of Noah as they filed out over the lands of which they took possession is, `these are the sons of .... after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, in their nations.’ Mr. Gladstone called attention to the fact that modern philology verifies this classification of the nations which rests on outgrowth from families.

9. REFORMS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH:

Turning now to a very distant point in history — the return of the Jews from captivity in Babylon — we find in Ezra and Nehemiah the most critical regard for genealogy. The effort to establish “pure blood” was fairly a fanaticism and might even be charged with injustice. Yet this effort was ratified by the people — sufferers in degraded name though many of them must have been. This could never have been done had not the monogamic family idea rested in their hearts as just and right. Nehemiah (13:26) unsparingly condemned the mighty Solomon for his polygamy, and Israel upproved the censure.

10. THE NEW TESTAMENT

When we come to the times of the New Testament, contemporaneous polygamy in Jewish society was dead. Wherever New Testament influences have gone, contemporaneous polygamy has ceased to be.

There has been in the United States by Mormonism a belated attempt to revive that crime against the family. But it has had its bad day, and, if it lives at all, it is under the ban of social sentiment and is a crime by law. Consecutive polygamy still exists in nations that are called Christian by the permission of divorce laws. But the tide of Christian sentiment is setting strongly against it, and it takes no special clearness of vision to see that it must go to extinction along with polygamy contemporaneous.

Jesus reaffirmed the original charter of the monogamic family (<sup>δ</sup>Matthew 19:1-12; <sup>δ</sup>Mark 10:2-12). It is to be noticed that He affirmed the indissolubility of the family not only against the parties thereto but against the power of society.

See DIVORCE.
11. THE TEACHING OF JESUS:

At first sight it seems a little strange that Jesus said so little about the family. But as we reflect on the nature of His mission we shall catch the explanation of His silence. He said, “Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill” (Matthew 5:17), that is, to fill out, to expound and expand. He also said, “For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost” (Matthew 18:11 the King James Version), and, “I came not to call the righteous, but sinners” (Matthew 9:13), that is, to rectify what was wrong. To what was right He gave the right of way — let it go on in its own course. When the law was right, He said, not one jot or tittle of it should fail (Matthew 5:18). With regard to the family, He held the old charter written in the heart of man, before it was burned in brick or committed to manuscript, was right. It was comprehensive, would and ought to stand. So He stood by that, and that sufficed His purpose. Christ did not try to regulate the family so much as to regulate the persons who entered into family life. This may explain why we have no utterance from Him in regard to the conduct and duties of children toward parents. Still stood the ancient statute, “Honor thy father and thy mother.” He came not to destroy but to fulfill that. That still indicated the right relation of children to parents. If a child had asked about his relation to his parents, Christ would doubtless have referred him to that commandment, as He did other inquirers about duties to the commandments that cover so large a part of the ethical realm.

12. THE TEACHING OF PAUL:

Paul, who particularizes so much in explanation of duties in all relations, scarcely gets beyond the old commandment, “Honor thy father and thy mother,” when he says, “Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing in the Lord.” It has always been well-pleasing in the Lord. To be sure there was new inspiration to obedience from the new revelation of duty which came to them in Christ, but the duty was enforced by the Fifth Commandment, and that was copied from the deeper revelation in the heart of man.

13. MODERN DANGERS:

In modern society the two great foes of the family are Divorce and Migration. Families no longer live a continuous life together. We have less
family life than the old pastoral nomads. They had to keep together for several generations in order to protect their lives and their flocks and herds. So arose the clan, the tribe and the nation. Family influence can be detected through them. Modern Industries are very much localized. We should easily think that families would be under their controlling influence. But they are not; the industries are localized, the workers are becoming rovers. When trouble comes in an industry, a workman’s first resort is to try somewhere else. Cheapness of transportation gives him the opportunity he desires. So with a satchel he goes hunting, much as a barbarian roams the forest for game, alone. He may take his family or leave it behind. He may be separated from his family for months or years — possibly abandon it forever. A very common cause of divorce is abandonment of family by its male head.

In fact, those engaged in a great deal of legitimate industry are looking out for a better place quite as much as to develop the capacities of business in their own locations. The signs over places of business are few that carry the same name in town or city for a generation. Moving is perhaps more the order of the day than movement. The families are few that can be found in the same place for a quarter of a century. The wealthy cannot stay in the same house six months at a time. They have a house in the city for the winter and one in the country for the summer, and then forsake both and fly over the sea, perhaps to remain for years — traveling. How can family ties survive under such migratory life? Society supersedes the family.

Even education is subject to this malign influence. At their most impressive age, when they need family influence most around them, children are sent away to prepare for or to enter upon higher courses of education. This fits them for something else than life in the family from which they sprang and they rarely return to it. We may not be able to check this drift, but we ought to see its tendency to degrade the estimate of the value of the family.
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C. Caverno

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS
See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

FAMINE

\(<\text{fam}'-\text{in}>\) ([b [ ᶠ; ra`abh]; [λιμός, limos]):

The common Old Testament word for “famine” is ra`abh; re`abhon also occurs (Genesis 42:19,33; Psalm 37:19), and kaphan (Job 5:22; 30:3), all meaning “hunger” and “famine”; in the New Testament the word is limos, meaning primarily “failure,” “want of food.”

1. NATURAL CAUSES:

In early times, especially in lands dependent on their own productions, famines were not infrequent. They were generally caused by local irregularities of the rainfall, by destructive hail storms (Exodus 9:23,11,32), by ravages of insects (Exodus 10:15; Joel 1:4) and by enemies (Deuteronomy 28:51); in a city a famine might be caused by a siege (2 Kings 6:25); pestilence often followed in its wake, and the suffering was great.

2. FAMINES MENTIONED:

Famines are recorded in the time of Abraham (Genesis 12:10, etc.), of Isaac (Genesis 26:1), of Jacob, when Joseph was in Egypt — seven years of famine even in Egypt after seven of plenty (Genesis 41:54), which also affected Canaan (Genesis 42:1), and, indeed, “was over all the face of the earth” (Genesis 41:56); in the time of the Judges (Ruth 1:1), of David, for three years (2 Samuel 21:1), of Ahab and Elijah (1 Kings 17:1; 18:2; Ecclesiasticus 48:2,3), of Elisha (2 Kings 4:38), during the siege of Samaria (2 Kings 6:25), the seven years foretold by Elisha (2 Kings 8:1), in the reign of Zedekiah in Jerusalem when besieged by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 25:3; Jeremiah 52:6; compare 14:1), its great severity is referred to (Lamentations 5:10; Baruch 2:25); a “dearth” is also mentioned after the return from Captivity (Nehemiah 5:3); when the city was besieged by Antiochus Eupator (1 Macc 6:54), after the death of Judas (1 Macc 9:24), when Jerusalem was besieged by Simon (1 Macc 13:49), in the time of Claudius (Acts 11:28, in his reign there were frequent famines, one of which in 45 AD severely affected Palestine; Josephus, Ant, XX, v); Christ predicted “famines .... in divers places” as characterizing the end of the age (Matthew 24:7;
in the siege of Jerusalem by Titus a terrible famine raged, the consequences of which to the people have never been surpassed.

3. DIVINE RELATIONS:

Famines are frequently said to be sent as punishments sometimes threatened as such (Leviticus 26:19 f.; Deuteronomy 28:49-51; 2 Kings 8:1; Psalm 105:16; Isaiah 14:30; 51:19, Jeremiah 14:12, 15; 18:21, etc.; Ezekiel 5:16, etc.; Amos 8:11; 2 Esdras 15:5, 49; 16:19; Tobit 4:13; Ecclesiasticus 39:29; 40:9).

The righteous or godly should be preserved by God in time of famine (Job 5:20, “In famine he will redeem thee from death”; Psalm 33:19, “to keep them alive in famine”; 37:19, “In the days of famine they shall be satisfied”); this was a special mark of the Divine favor and power.

4. FIGURATIVE USES:

A famine is used by Amos to indicate the absence of Divine communications as a punishment that should come on the people, a “famine .... of hearing the words of Yahweh” (8:11; compare 1 Samuel 3:1; 28:6; 2 Chronicles 15:3; Ezekiel 7:26; Micah 3:6); by Zephaniah of the destruction of heathen deities (2:11).

The Revised Version (British and American) has “dearth” for “famine” (Job 5:22); “famine” for “dearth” (Genesis 41:54b; 2 Chronicles 6:28; Acts 7:11; 11:28); for “hunger” (Jeremiah 38:9; Ezekiel 34:29; Revelation 6:8); “famines” for “famines and pestilences” (Matthew 24:7), “famines and troubles” (Mark 13:8), revised texts.

W. L. Walker

FAMISH

“To famish” as a transitive verb is the translation of ra‘ebh, “to hunger” (Genesis 41:55): “All the land of Egypt was famished”; of ra‘abh, “hunger” (Isaiah 5:13), “Their honorable men are famished,” margin “Hebrew their glory are men of famine”; of razah, “to make lean,” “famish” (Zephaniah 2:11), “For he will famish all the gods of the earth”; it is intransitive as the translation of ra‘ebh (Proverbs 10:3), “Yahweh will not suffer the soul of the righteous to famish.”
FAN, FANNER

<fan' er>: The word “fan” occurs 3 times only in the American Standard Revised Version (Jeremiah 15:7; Matthew 3:12; Luke 3:17). In Isaiah 30:24 mizreh is translated “fork,” which is a much better translation if the instrument referred to was shaped like the winnowing fork used by the Syrian farmer today and still so called. In Isaiah 41:16; Jeremiah 4:11; 15:7, the verb zarah is rendered “winnow” in the American Standard Revised Version. In Jeremiah 51:2, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes “strangers” for “fanners.”

FANCY

<fan' si> ([φαντάζω, phantazo], “to cause to appear,” “show”): In Ecclesiasticus 34:5, “And the heart fancieth, as a woman’s in travail” (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 6:16; Hebrews 12:21).

FAR; FARTHER

<far>, <far' ther>: “Far” (adj.), distant, remote; (advb.) widely removed, is most frequently in the Old Testament the translation of [qal; rachoq], and in the New Testament of [μακράν, makran], but also of other Hebrew and Greek words. The word chalilah, an exclamation of abhorrence or aversion Septuagint me genoito; see FORBID), is rendered “far from me,” “far from thee,” etc. (Genesis 18:25; 1 Samuel 2:30; 20:9; 22:15; 2 Samuel 20:20; 23:17; Job 34:10). Besides its literal sense, distance in a spiritual sense is expressed by “far,” as “Salvation is far from the wicked” (Psalm 119:155; compare Proverbs 15:29), “far from righteousness” (Isaiah 46:12), “not far from the kingdom of God” (Mark 12:34), etc. For “far” the Revised Version (British and American) has “aloof” in Job 30:10; in several places the word in the King James Version is omitted (Judges 9:17; Psalm 27:9; Isaiah 19:6; 26:15; Mark 13:34); “a far country” is changed to “another” (Matthew 21:33; 25:14; Mark 13:34), etc. For “God forbid” the Revised Version (British and American) has “far be it,” “far be it from me” (Galatians 6:14; in the American Standard Revised Version, Genesis 44:7,17; 1 Samuel 12:23; Job 27:5, etc.).

The comparative “farther” occurs only once in the Old Testament (Ecclesiastes 8:17), and thrice in the New Testament (Matthew
26:39; Mark 1:19; 10:1), and in each case is replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by another word or phrase. The Revised Version (British and American), on the other hand, has “its farthest height” for “the height of his border” (Isaiah 37:24), and “his farthest lodging-place” for “the lodgings of his borders” (2 Kings 19:23).

W. L. Walker

FAR HOUSE

The marginal explanation in the Revised Version (British and American) of Beth-merhak ([q j r M, ty Beth ha-merchag], “house of distance”), which is given in the text of 2 Samuel 15:17 instead of “a place that was far off.”

See BETH-MERHAK.

FARE

<far>: Occurs twice in the Old Testament as the translation of two Hebrew words, [µwOlv; shalom], “peace,” “prosperity,” “completeness” (1 Samuel 17:18), found in the section on David’s family history omitted by the Septuagint translators, and [rk c; sakhar], “hire,” “reward,” Septuagint [ναδολον, naulon], “passage-money,” “fare” (Jonah 1:3). In Hebrew both words are substantives; in English the former is a verb meaning “to go,” or “get on as to circumstances” (Century Dict.), the latter, a substantive meaning the price which Jonah paid for a sea-voyage to Tarshish.

In Apocrypha the English verb “fare” helps in the translation of three Greek words, [κακόω, kakoo], “fare evil” (the Revised Version (British and American) “fare ill”), Sirach 3:26; [ἐλαττόω, elatoo], “fare worse” (the Revised Version (British and American) “suffer loss”), 32:24; [ρόννυμι, rhonnumi], “be strong,” “prosper,” in 2 pers. (singular) imperat. ([ἐρρωσο, err(h)oso]) or plural ([ἐρρωσθε, err(h)osthe]) as a farewell salutation, or at the close of a letter, or to describe the welfare (usually physical or social) of a friend (2 Macc 9:20; 11:21,28, etc.). Compare Acts 15:29; 23:30 margin.

In the New Testament the English verb “fare,” in addition to its occurrence in the word “farewell” (which see), occurs only once (Luke 16:19),
where it is said that the rich man “fared sumptuously every day” (the Revised Version, margin “living in mirth and splendor every day”).

The Greek is εὐφραίνομαι, euphrainomai, “be merry,” and occurs 14 times in the New Testament, 10 in a good sense (Luke 15:23,14,29,32, all referring to the merry-making over the return of the lost son; Acts 2:26, translation of Hebrew [y m” c; samach], “be glad”; Romans 15:10, translation of Hebrew [h n; ranah], “to sing”; 2 Corinthians 2:2; Galatians 4:27, translation of Hebrew [h n; ranah], “to sing”; Revelation 12:12; 18:20); 4 in a bad, or less favorable, sense (Luke 12:19; 16:19; Acts 7:41; Revelation 11:10). The Greek word is variously translated in the New Testament, “be merry,” “make merry,” “be glad,” “rejoice,” “make glad,” and only once “fare” (Luke 16:19). In the last passage it means the general physical and material welfare of the rich man (so the Geneva (1560), the Bishops’ and Rhemish Bibles, the Revised Version (British and American) (1881), and not simply partaking of rich food so Vulgate, Wyclif, Coverdale, Cranmer, Geneva (1557) and the King James Version). Luther translates Luke 16:19, “lebte alle Tage herrlich und in Freuden”; Weizsacker, “genoss sein Leben alle Tage in Glanze”; Ostervald, “se traitoit bien et magnifiquement”; Oltremare, “faisait brillante chere”; Segond, “menait joyeuse et brillante vie”; Weymouth, “enjoyed a splendid banquet every day,” all of which virtually agree with the view taken by us as to meaning of “fare.” The λαμπρὸς, “sumptuously,” shows that the rich man’s manner of living was “brilliant,” “magnificent.”

The Revised Version (British and American) has “fare” for “do” (Acts 15:36), “fared” for “did” (2 Samuel 11:7), “hath fared” for “was” (Genesis 30:29).

Charles B. Williams

FAREWELL

<far-wel’> ([χαίρω, chairo]), Fare ye, or thou, well: Originally a wish at parting for those faring forth (traveling):

(1) As a parting wish at the close of a letter it represents the Greek [ἐρróσσο, err(h)oso], “Be strong,” imperative of [ῥόννυμι, rhonnumi], “to make strong” (Acts 15:29; 23:30 the King James Version; see the Revised Version, margin; 2 Macc 11:21); once [χαίρετε, chairete] (imperative of [χαίρω, chairo]), “Rejoice!” (2 Corinthians 13:11, the Revised Version, margin “Rejoice: be perfected”).
(2) As equivalent to our saying “good-bye,” it represents the Greek 
[ἀποτάσσομαι, apotassomai], “to separate one’s self,” “to take leave,” “to bid farewell” (Luke 9:61, “to bid farewell to them that are at my house”; Acts 18:21, “bade them farewell,” the Revised Version (British and American) “taking his leave of them”).

See FARE; GREETING.

W. L. Walker

FARM

<farm>: Matthew 22:5 is the only passage where [ἀγρός, agros], has been rendered “farm.” In the many other passages where the same word occurs it is rendered “field” or “piece of ground.” Farms such as the Occidental is accustomed to see, namely, isolated dwellings with their groups of outbuildings, surrounded by walls or hedges and overlooking the planted fields, were probably unknown in Palestine. For protection against wild beasts and Arab marauders everyone lived in a village and went out to his fields, located perhaps miles away, only as occasion required.

James A. Patch

FARTHING

<far’-thing>: The rendering of two words in the Greek of the New Testament, [ἀσσαρίον, assarion], and [κοδράντης, kodrantes], Latin quadrans. The assarion was the tenth part of the denarius, and hence in value about one penny or two centuries The quadrans was the fourth part of the Roman as, and worth only about three mills, or less than the English farthing, and is the only term rendered farthing by the American Standard Revised Version. It occurs in Matthew 5:26 and Mark 12:42, while assarion, which occurs in Matthew 10:29 and Luke 12:6, is rendered “penny” by the American Standard Revised Version.

FASHION

<fash’-un> ([ם פ נ hî mishpaT]; [σχῆμα, schema], the make, pattern, shape, manner or appearance of a thing (from Latin faction-em, “a making,” through Old French fatson, fachon)): In the Old Testament the noun “fashion” represents 3 Hebrew words:
(1) *MishpaT* = literally, “judgment,” hence, judicial sentence, right, custom, manner; usually translated “judgment” (very frequent), but also a few times “sentence,” “cause,” “charge,” and more frequently “manner” (nearly 40 times in the King James Version). In 3 passages it is translated “fashion,” in the sense of style, shape, make, in each case of a building or part of a building (<Exodus 26:30; 1 Kings 6:38; Ezekiel 42:11>).

(2) *Tekhunah* = literally, “arrangement,” “adjustment” (compare [takhan], “to set right,” “adjust,” from *kun, hekhin*, “to set up,” “establish”); Ezekiel 43:11, “the form of the house, and the fashion thereof.” A cognate word in the preceding verse is translated “pattern” (the Revised Version, margin “sum”).

(3) *Demuth* = “resemblance” (from *damah*, “to be similar”), generally translated “likeness” in English Versions of the Bible, but “fashion” in 2 Kings 16:10, where it means pattern or model. The verb “to fashion” stands for

(a) *yatsar*, “to form,” “fashion” (<Psalm 33:15; 139:16 the King James Version; Isaiah 22:11 the King James Version; Isaiah 44:12; 45:9);

(b) *`asah*, “to work,” “make,” “form” (<Job 10:8>);

(c) *kun*, “to set up,” “establish,” “prepare” (<Job 31:15; Psalm 119:73; Ezekiel 16:7>);

(d) *tsur*, “to bind up together,” “compress” (<Exodus 32:4, of Aaron fashioning the golden calf out of the golden rings>).

In the New Testament, the noun represents 5 Greek words:

(1) Of these, the most interesting is *schema*, “figure,” “shape,” “fashion” (from [*σχέν, schein*], aorist of [*ἐχειν, echein*], “to have,” compare Latin habitus, from habeo, “I have”). Schema denotes a transient, external semblance or fashion, and so it may be distinguished from its synonym [*μορφή, morphe*], which denotes the essential intrinsic form of a thing, expressing its real nature. (See Lightfoot, Detached Note on Philippians 2; Trench, New Testament Syn., 252 ff; Gifford, Incarnation, 22 ff. The distinction is rejected by Meyer, on Romans 12:2, and by others.) In the New Testament, the noun *schema* occurs but twice: 1 Corinthians 7:31,
“The fashion of this world passeth away,” where there seems to be an allusion to theatrical scenes, which are in their very nature transitory (compare 2 Macc 4:13); and ὄλογος Philippians 2:8, “being found in fashion as a man,” i.e. having the outward figure and bearing of a man, such marks of human nature as strike the senses (contrast morphe Theou, “form of God,” ὄλογος Philippians 2:6, and morphe doulou, “form of servant,” 2:7, which describe Christ’s real inner nature). The word schema is found in compound verbs in the following passages: Ῥωμ. 12:2, “Be not fashioned (sunschematizesthe) according to this world: but be ye transformed (metamorphousthe) by the renewing of your mind” (so the Revised Version (British and American)), paraphrased by Sanday and Headlam, “Do not adopt the external and fleeting fashion of this world, but be ye transformed in your inmost nature” (Comm. in the place cited.); 2 Corinthians 11:13 f, metaschematizomai, the King James Version “transformed,” better the Revised Version (British and American) “fashioned,” the reference being to “the fictitious, illusory transformation whereby evil assumes the mask of good” (Lightfoot, Commentary on Phil, 131); 1 Peter 1:14, “not fashioning yourselves according to your former lusts,” paraphrased by Lightfoot, “not falling in with the capricious guidance of the passions” (same place). In Ὄλογος Philippians 3:21, the adjective summorphos is translated “fashioned” in the King James Version, but better “conformed” as in Revised Version (British and American).

(2) ἔνδος, Eioos, eidos], literally, “thing seen,” “external appearance,” “shape,” is translated “fashion” in Ἰω. 9:29, of the glorified appearance of the transfigured Christ.

(3) Ἰσεωπον, prosopon], literally, “face,” hence, look, appearance, Jas 1:11, “The grace of the fashion of it perisheth.”

(4) Ὑπος, tupos], type, model, translated “fashion” in Ἀκ. 7:44 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “figure”), the Greek word being taken from the Septuagint of the quoted passage, Exodus 25:40. The same phrase, kata ton tupon, in the parallel passage, Hebrews 8:5, is translated “according to the pattern.”

(5) In one instance the phrase “on this fashion,” “in this manner,” represents the Greek adverb ὅτως, houtos], “thus” (Mark 2:12).

D. Miall Edwards
FAST; FASTING

<fast>, <fast-ing> ([μ Ἥκικος, tsum]; [ה נוֹפָּל, `innah nephesh], “afflict soul or self,” i.e. practice self-denial; [νηστεία, nesteia], [νηστεύειν, nesteuein]): It is necessary to get rid of some modern notions associated with fasting before we can form a correct idea of its origin and significance in the ancient world. For instance, in the case of many ailments the dieting of the patient is an essential part of the remedy. But we may readily assume that originally fasting was not based on the salutary influence which it exercised on the health of the subject. Considerations of therapeutics played no part in the institution. The theory that fasting, like many other ancient customs, had a religious origin, is in favor with scholars, but we must not assume a religious origin for all practices which in process of time came to be associated with religion.

Many customs, purely secular in their origin, have gradually obtained a religious significance, just as purely religious customs have been dissociated from religion. It is also possible and, in the light of some usages, probable, that different motives operated in the association of fasting, as of some other customs, with religion. Scholars have been too ready to assume that the original significance of fasting was the same in all countries and among all nations. Robertson Smith in his Religion of the Semites advanced and defended theory that fasting was merely a mode of preparation for the tribal meal in which sacrifice originated, and came to be considered at a later stage as part of the sacrificial act. This hypothesis apparently accounts for the otherwise strange fact that both fasting and feasting are religious acts, but it does not give a satisfactory explanation of the constant association of fasting with the “wearing of sackcloth,” the “putting of ashes on the head,” and other similar customs. It is obvious that very different motives operated in the institution of fasting and of feasting religious observances.

It is a matter of common observation and experience that great distress causes loss of appetite and therefore occasions abstinence from food. Hannah, who was greatly distressed on account of her childlessness, “wept, and did not eat” (1 Samuel 1:7). Violent anger produces the same effect (1 Samuel 20:34). According to 1 Kings 21:4, Ahab, “heavy and displeased” on account of Naboth’s refusal to part with his estate, sulked and “would eat no bread.” Fasting, originally the natural expression of grief, became the customary mode of proving to others the inner emotion
of sorrow. David demonstrated his grief at Abner’s death (2 Samuel 3:35) by fasting, just as the Psalmist indicated his sympathy with his adversaries’ sorry plight in the same way (Psalm 35:13). In such passages as Ezr 10:6; Nehemiah 4:3, it is not clear whether fasting is used in its religious significance or simply as a natural expression of sorrow (compare also Luke 5:33 and see below). This view explains the association of fasting with the mourning customs of antiquity (compare 1 Samuel 31:13; 2 Samuel 1:12). As fasting was a perfectly natural and human expression and evidence of the subject’s grief, it readily claimed a place among those religious customs whose main object was the pacification of the anger of God, or the excitation of His compassion. Any and every act that would manifest the distressful state of the suppliant would appeal to the Deity and move Him to pity. The interesting incident recorded in 2 Samuel 12:16-23 suggests the twofold significance of fasting as a religious act or a mode of appealing to the Deity and as a funeral custom. David defends his fasting before and not after the child’s death on the ground that while the child was alive David’s prayer might be answered. His fasting was intended to make his petition effectual (compare also 1 Kings 21:27; Ezr 8:21; Nehemiah 4:16). Occasionally fasting was proclaimed on a national scale, e.g. in case of war (Judges 20:26; 2 Chronicles 20:3) or of pestilence (Joel 1:13 f). Fasting having thus become a recognized mode of seeking Divine favor and protection, it was natural that it should be associated with confession of sin, as indisputable evidence of penitence or sorrow for sin.

Fasting might be partial, i.e. abstinence from certain kinds of food, or total, i.e. abstinence from all food as well as from washing, anointing, sleeping. It might be of shorter or longer duration, e.g. for one day, from sunrise to sunset (Judges 20:26; 1 Samuel 14:24; 2 Samuel 1:12; 3:35). In 1 Samuel 31:13 allusion is made to a seven days’ fast, while Daniel abstained from “pleasant bread,” flesh, wine and anointing for three weeks (Daniel 10:3). Moses (Exodus 34:28) and Elijah (1 Kings 19:8) fasted for 40 days. It is probable that these last three references presuppose a totally different conception of the significance of fasting. It is obvious that dreams made a deep impression on primitive man. They were communications from the departed members of the family. At a later stage they were looked upon as revelations from God. During sleep there is total abstinence from food. It was easy to draw the inference that fasting might fit the person to receive these communications from the world of spirits.
The close connection between fasting and insight — intellectual and spiritual — between simple living and high thinking is universally recognized.

See further under ABSTINENCE; FEASTS AND FASTS.

**LITERATURE.**

Nowack, Hebadische Archaologie; Benzinger, Hebadische Archaologie; Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites.

*T. Lewis*

**FASTS AND FEASTS**

See FEASTS AND FASTS.

**FAT**

([bl j כהלאב, [bl j כהלאב]): The layer of subcutaneous fat and the compact suet surrounding the viscera and imbedded in the entrails, which, like the blood, was forbidden as food in the Mosaic code (Leviticus 3:17). It was to be sacrificed to God by being burnt upon the altar (Leviticus 3:16; 30). This had to be done on the very day on which a beast had been slaughtered, to remove temptation from the Israelite to use it otherwise (Exodus 23:18). The law was probably a sanitary restriction, for, at an early date, leprosy, scrofula and disfiguring cutaneous diseases were thought to be caused by the use of fat as food. It was, moreover, an important pedagogical provision teaching the idea of self-denial, and the maxim that the richest and best meat of the edible animal belonged to Yahweh.

See also FATLING; FOWL, FATTED.

The expression “fat” is often used in figurative senses, e.g. abundant, exuberant, lusty, fertile, robust, outwardly successful (Deuteronomy 32:15; Psalm 92:14 the King James Version; Psalm 119:70; Proverbs 11:25; 13:4, etc.).

*H. L. E. Luering*

**FAT (VAT)**

*WINE, WINE PRESS, II.*
FATHER

<fa’-ther> (Anglo-Saxon, Foeder; German, Vater; Hebrew [ba; ‘ab']h], etymology uncertain, found in many cognate languages; Greek [πατήρ, pater], from root pa, “nourisher,” “protector,” “upholder”):

1. IMMEDIATE MALE ANCESTOR:

Immediate male ancestor. The father in the Hebrew family, as in the Roman, had supreme rights over his children, could dispose of his daughter in marriage (Genesis 29), arrange his son’s marriage (Genesis 24), sell his children (Exodus 21:7), but not his daughter to a stranger (Nehemiah 5:5), had power of life and death, as in the case of Isaac (Genesis 22), Jephthah’s daughter (Judges 11:34 ff), the sacrificing of his children to Molech (Leviticus 18:21; 20:3-5), etc. Respect, reverence and affection for fathers (and equally for mothers) is most tenderly, explicitly and sternly prescribed from the earliest times (Exodus 20:12; Leviticus 19:3; Deuteronomy 5:16; Micah 7:6; Ezekiel 22:7, etc.). A symmetrical and beautiful picture of the duties and character of the ideal human father may be built up from the Old Testament, with added and enlarged touches from the New Testament. He loves (Genesis 37:4); commands (Genesis 50:16; Proverbs 6:20); instructs (Proverbs 1:8, etc.); guides, encourages, warns (Jeremiah 3:4; I Thessalonians 2:11); trains (Hosea 11:3); rebukes (Genesis 34:30); restrains (Eli, by contrast, I Samuel 3:13); punishes (Deuteronomy 21:18); chastens (Proverbs 3:12; Deuteronomy 8:5); nourishes (Isaiah 1:2); delights in his son (Proverbs 3:12), and in his son’s wisdom (Proverbs 10:1); is deeply pained by his folly (Ephesians 6:4, “Provoke not your children to wrath”); considerate of his children’s needs and requests (Matthew 7:10); considerate of their burdens, or sins (Malachi 3:17, “As a man spareth his own son”); tenderly familiar (“Luke 11:7, “with me in bed”); considerately self-restrained (Ephesians 6:4, “Provoke not your children to wrath”); having in view the highest ends (ibid., “Nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord”); pitiful (Psalm 103:13, “as a father pitieth his children”); the last human friend (but one) to desert the child (Psalm 27:10: “When (a thing to the psalmist incredible) my father and my mother forsake me, then Yahweh will take me up”).
2. ANCESTORS, IMMEDIATE OR REMOTE:

(a) Ancestor, immediate or remote: <ins>Genesis 28:13</ins>, “Abraham thy father” (grandfather); <ins>1 Kings 22:50</ins>, “Jehoshaphat .... David his father”; <ins>Jeremiah 35:6</ins>, “Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father”; <ins>Daniel 5:11</ins>, “Nebuchadnezzar thy father” (personal or official ancestor); <ins>Genesis 15:15</ins>, “Go to thy fathers in peace” (and so (in the plural) in over 500 passages). The expressions “slept with his fathers,” “go down to his fathers,” “buried with his fathers,” “gathered to his fathers,” are self-explanatory euphemisms.

(b) The founders of the (Hebrew) race, specifically the patriarchs:’ <ins>Romans 9:5</ins>, “whose are the fathers,” considered here also as in a sense the religious ancestors of all believers.

(c) Progenitors of clans, i.e. (Revised Version (British and American)) “fathers’ houses”: <ins>Exodus 6:14</ins>; <ins>1 Chronicles 27:1</ins>, etc.

(d) Gods as progenitors of men: <ins>Jeremiah 2:27</ins>, “Who say to a stock, thou art my father.”

3. FIGURATIVE AND DERIVED USES:

(a) A spiritual ancestor, one who has infused his own spirit into others, whether good, as Abraham, the father of the faithful, <ins>Romans 4:11</ins>; or bad, as <ins>John 8:44</ins>, “Ye are of your father the devil.”

(b) Indicating closest resemblance, kinship, affinity: <ins>Job 17:14</ins>, “If I have said to corruption, Thou art my father.”

(c) A source: <ins>Ephesians 1:17</ins>, “Father of glory”; <ins>Job 38:28</ins>, “Hath the rain a father?”

(d) Creator: <ins>Job 1:17</ins>, “the Father of lights.”

(e) The inventor or originator of an art or mode of life: <ins>Genesis 4:20</ins>, “father of such as dwell in tents” (a hint here of hereditary occupations? Probably not).

(f) One who exhibits the fatherly characteristics: <ins>Psalm 68:5</ins>, “a father of the fatherless.”
(g) One who occupies a position of counsel, care, or control (frequently applied by sultans to their prime ministers):  \textit{Genesis} 45:8, “a father to Pharaoh”;  \textit{Judges} 17:10, “Be unto me a father and a priest.”

(h) A revered or honored superior:  \textit{2 Kings} 5:13, “My father, if the prophet had bid thee”; but especially applied to prophets:  \textit{2 Kings} 2:12, “My father, my father!” also to elderly and venerable men:  \textit{1 John} 2:13, “I write unto you, fathers”; hence also, with perhaps an outlook on (2) (a), deceased early Christians:  \textit{2 Peter} 3:4, “from the day that the fathers fell asleep.” An ecclesiastical title, condemned (in principle) by our Lord:  \textit{Matthew} 23:9, “Call no man your father on the earth”; but applied, under the power of the Spirit, to members of the Sanhedrin (probably) by Stephen:  \textit{Acts} 7:2; and by Paul: 22:1, but the latter, perhaps also the former, may simply refer to the elderly among his hearers. Christ’s condemnation is clearly of the praise-seeking or obsequious spirit, rather than of a particular custom.

Father,” used by Mary of Joseph, in relation to Jesus, equals “putative father,” a necessary reserve at a time when the virgin birth could not yet be proclaimed (  \textit{Luke} 2:49). But note Jesus’ answer: “my Father’s house.”

\textit{Philip Wendell Crannell}

\textbf{FATHER, GOD THE}

In the Christian religion God is conceived of as “Father,” “Our Father .... in heaven” (  \textit{Matthew} 6:9,14,26, etc.), “the God and Father of the Lord Jesus” (  \textit{2 Corinthians} 11:31, etc.). The tenderness of relation and wealth of love and grace embraced in this profound designation are peculiar to Christ’s gospel. Pagan religions also could speak of God as “Father” (Zeus Pater), and in the general sense of Creator God has a universal fatherly relation to the world (  \textit{Acts} 17:24-28). In the Old Testament God was revealed as Father to the chosen nation (  \textit{Exodus} 4:22), and to the special representative of the nation, the king (  \textit{2 Samuel} 7:14), while fatherly love is declared to be the image of His pity for those who fear Him (  \textit{Psalm} 103:13). In the gospel of Jesus alone is this Fatherhood revealed to be of the very essence of the Godhead, and to have respect to the individual. Here, however, there is need for great discrimination. To reach the heart of the truth of the Divine Fatherhood it is necessary to begin, not with man, but with the Godhead itself, in whose
eternal depths is found the spring of that Fatherly love that reveals itself in
time. It is first of all in relation to the eternal Son — before all time — that
the meaning of Fatherhood in God is made clear (John 1:18). In “God
the Father” we have a name pointing to that relation which the first Person
in the adorable Trinity sustains to “Son” and “Holy Spirit” — also Divine
(Matthew 28:19). From this eternal fountain-head flow the relations of
God as Father

1 to the world by creation;

2 to believers by grace. Man as created was designed by affinity of
nature for sonship to God. The realization of this — his true creature-
destiny — was frustrated by sin, and can now only be restored by
redemption. Hence, the place of sonship in the gospel, as an
unspeakable privilege (John 3:1), obtained by grace, through
regeneration (John 1:12,13), and adoption (Romans 8:14,19). In
this relation of nearness and privilege to the Father in the kingdom of
His Son (Colossians 1:13), believers are “sons of God” in a sense
ture of no others. It is a relation, not of nature, but of grace.
Fatherhood is now the determinative fact in God’s relation to them
(Ephesians 3:14 ff). It is an error, nevertheless, to speak of
fatherhood as if the whole character of God was therein sufficiently
expressed. God is Father, but equally fundamental is His relation to His
world as its Moral Ruler and Judge. From eternity to eternity the holy
God must pronounce Himself against sin (Romans 1:18); and His
fatherly grace cannot avert judgment where the heart remains hard and
impenitent (Romans 2:1-9). For the fuller discussion of these points
see GOD; CHILDREN OF GOD; TRINITY.

James Orr

FATHER-IN-LAW

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

FATHERLESS

The fatherless are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, generally in association with
the widow and the stranger, as typical instances of the unprotected and
necessitous, who are, specially subject to oppression, and also to God’s special protection. Great philanthropic regard is bestowed on this class throughout. In early legislation there is a special clause to guard them against affliction (Exodus 22:22-24). They have a still more prominent place in the Deuteronomic legislation, which gives instructions that a charitable fund be formed out of the tithe, once every three years, for the relief of the destitute (Deuteronomy 14:28,29; 26:12-14), and that gleanings be left in the cornfield, the olive garden, and the vineyard for the benefit of this class (Deuteronomy 24:19-22; compare Leviticus19:9 f; 23:22, where, however, the “fatherless” are not specially mentioned). The Deuteronomist declares that God is on their side (Deuteronomy 10:18), and strongly condemns those who would oppress them (Deuteronomy 24:17; 27:19). The prophets and psalmists are equally emphatic in pleading for mercy and justice to the fatherless, and in declaring that God is their special guardian (Isaiah 1:17; Jeremiah 7:6 f; 22:3; Hosea 14:3; Zec 7:10; Psalm 10:14; 68:5; 82:3; 146:9; compare Proverbs 23:10). Oppressing the fatherless is frequently mentioned as a typical act of cruelty and injustice (compare Job 6:27; 22:9; 24:3,1; 29:12 f; 31:16,17,21; Psalm 94:6; Isaiah 1:23; 10:2; Jeremiah 5:28; Ezekiel 22:7; Malachi 3:5). Here we have instances of the prophetic passion for righteousness and compassion for the helpless, inspired by a profound sense of the value of human life. Passages in the Apocrypha reflect the same spirit (2 Esdras 2:20; Ecclesiasticus 4:10).

In the New Testament the word “fatherless” occurs but once, where James declares, in the spirit of the Old Testament prophets, that true religious ritual consists in visitation of the fatherless and widows and in moral purity (Jas 1:27). Here the word for “fatherless” is orphans (“bereft,” “orphaned”), which is the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament yathom. In the New Testament the Greek word is found besides only in John 14:18, where it means destitute of a teacher or guide (compare Lamentations 5:3).

D. Miall Edwards

FATHERS’ BROTHER

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.
FATHER’S HOUSE, FATHERS’ HOUSE

([b a; t y; b e beth ‘abh], [t wO a; t y; b e beth ‘abhoth]): Father’s house in the Old Testament is

(1) a dwelling, the family home (Genesis 12:1; 31:14,30; 38:11; 1 Samuel 18:2);

(2) a family or household (Genesis 41:51; 46:31; Exodus 12:3, the Revised Version (British and American) “fathers’ houses”);

(3) the group of households, of several of which the “family” or “clan” was constituted, aggregations of which formed the “tribe,” generally “fathers’ houses” (Numbers 1:18,20 ff; 17:2; Ezr 2:59; Nehemiah 10:34, etc.);

(4) the “family” (clan), mishpachah, “fathers’ houses” (Exodus 6:14 f; Numbers 3:20 ff);

(5) the tribe, “fathers’ house,” “houses” (Numbers 7:2; 17:1-3, etc.).

In the New Testament “father’s house” ([oɪkoς τοῦ πατρός, oikos tou patros]) occurs in the sense of dwelling, house (Luke 16:27; compare 16:4). our Lord also uses the phrase

(1) of the earthly temple-dwelling of God at Jerusalem (John 2:16, “Make not my Father’s house a house of merchandise”; compare Psalm 11:4; Isaiah 63:15);

(2) of heaven as the abode of God and His children (John 14:2, “In my Father’s house are many mansions,” the Revised Version, margin “abiding places,” oikia “house,” “dwelling,” also household, family; compare Psalm 33:13; Isaiah 63:15; Matthew 6:9). The phrase occurs also (Acts 7:20) of Moses, “nourished .... in his father’s house” (oikos). Revised Version has “father’s house” for “principal household” (1 Chronicles 24:6), “heads of the fathers’ houses” for “chief fathers” (Numbers 31:26; 32:28; 36:1; 1 Chronicles 9:34, etc.); “one prince of a father’s house,” for “each of” (Joshua 22:14); “the heads of the fathers’ (houses)” for “the chief of the fathers,” and “the fathers’ houses of the chief,” for “the principal fathers” (1 Chronicles 24:31).

W. L. Walker
FATHOM

<\textit{fath-}'um> ([\textit{ὀργυιά}, \textit{orguia}]): The literal meaning is the length of the outstretched arms, and it was regarded as equal to 4 cubits, or about 6 feet. (Acts 27:28).

\textit{See} WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

FATLING, FATTED

\textit{See} CALF.

FATNESS

<\textit{fat-}'nes> ([\textit{דשֶּן}, \textit{deshen}]; [\textit{πίοτες}, \textit{piotes}]):

1. LITERAL:


2. FIGURATIVE:

“Fatness” is used figuratively for the richness of God’s goodness; as such it is the translation of \textit{deshen} (“They shall be abundantly satisfied (margin “Hebrew watered”) with the fatness of thy house” (Psalm 36:8); “Thy paths drop fatness” (Psalm 65:11; compare Isaiah 55:2; Jeremiah 31:14).

“With fatness” is supplied, Deuteronomy 32:15 the King James Version, “covered with fatness”; the Revised Version (British and American) has “become sleek”; for “The yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing” (Isaiah 10:27) the American Standard Revised Version has “by reason of fatness,” margin “Hebrew oil”; the English Revised Version as the King James Version, with margin as the American
Standard Revised Version; the text is believed to be corrupt; Septuagint has “from your shoulders.”

W. L. Walker

FAUCHION

<fo’-shun>.

See SCIMITAR.

FAULT

<foɪt> ([a f j ; chaTa’]; [αίτια, aitia], [μέμφομαι, memphomai]): Implies defect, of less moral weight than crime or sin. It is the translation of chaTa’, “error,” “failure,” “sin” (Exodus 5:16); of cheT, same meaning (Genesis 41:9, “I do remember my faults this day”); of awon, “perversity,” “iniquity” (2 Samuel 3:8; Psalm 59:4); of rish’ah, “wrongness,” “wickedness” (Deuteronomy 25:2, the Revised Version (British and American) “wickedness”); of shechath (Aramaic) “corruption” (Daniel 6:4 twice); me’umah, “anything” (1 Samuel 29:3, “no fault in him,” literally, “not anything”); of aitia, “cause,” “case,” “guilt,” (John 18:38; 19:4,6; Pilate of Jesus, “I find no fault in him,” the Revised Version (British and American) “no crime”; the same word is rendered “accusation,” i.e. “legal cause for prosecution,” Matthew 27:37; Mark 15:26; compare Acts 25:18,27); of aition, same meaning (Luke 23:4,14; 23:22, aition thanatou “cause of death”); of hettema, “a worse condition,” “defect” (1 Corinthians 6:7, the Revised Version (British and American) “a defect,” margin “a loss to you”); of paraptoma, “a falling aside” (Galatians 6:1, “If a man be overtaken in fault,” the Revised Version (British and American) “in any trespass,” margin “by”); Jas 5:16, “Confess your faults one to another,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Confess therefore your sins one to another”); hamartano, “to miss,” “err,” “sin,” is translated “your faults” (1 Peter 2:20 the Revised Version (British and American), “when ye sin”); memphomai, “to blame,” is translated “to find fault” (Mark 7:2 omitted the Revised Version (British and American); Romans 9:19; Hebrews 8:8); elegcho, “to convict,” “to tell one’s fault” (Matthew 18:15, the Revised Version (British and American) “show him his fault”); amomos, “without blemish,” “spotless,” is translated “without fault” (Revelation 14:5, the Revised Version (British and American) “without blemish,” “faultless”);
Jude 1:24, “able to present you faultless,” the Revised Version (British and American) “without blemish”); amemptos, “blameless,” “without reproach” (Hebrews 8:7, “for if that first covenant had been faultless”). “Faulty” is the translation of ‘ashem, “guilty” (2 Samuel 14:13, “as one which is faulty,” the Revised Version (British and American) “guilty”); of ‘asham, “to be or become guilty” (Hosea 10:2, Revised Version “guilty”).

W. L. Walker

FAVOR

<fa'-ver> ([ἐ]chen, [ᵊ县政府 ; ratson], with other Hebrew words; [χάρις, charis]): Means generally good will, acceptance, and the benefits flowing from these; in older usage it meant also the countenance, hence, appearance. Alternating in English Versions of the Bible with “grace,” it is used chiefly of man, but sometimes also of God (Genesis 18:3; 30:27; 39:21; Exodus 3:21; 2 Samuel 15:25, “in the eyes of Yahweh,” etc.). It is used perhaps in the sense of “countenance” in Proverbs 31:30, “Favor is deceitful, and beauty is vain” (the King James Version), where for “favor” the Revised Version (British and American) has “grace”; the reference is to external appearance. “Favored” is used in the sense of “appearance” in the phrase “well-favored” (Genesis 29:17; 39:6; 41:2,4); conversely, “ill-favored” (Genesis 41:3,4). For “favor” the Revised Version (British and American) has “have pity on” (Psalm 109:12), “good will” (Proverbs 14:9), “peace” (Song of Solomon of Solomon 8:10); the English Revised Version “grace” (Ruth 2:13), the American Standard Revised Version “kindness” (Nehemiah 2:17; Daniel 1:9), etc. In the American Standard Revised Version “the acceptable year of the Lord” (Isaiah 61:2) is changed Into “the year of Yahweh’s favor”; “Do I now persuade men” (Galatians 1:10) into, “Am I now seeking the favor of men,” and there are other the Revised Version (British and American) changes.

W. L. Walker

FAWN

See DEER.
FEAR

<fer> ([h a r ā yir’ah], [ā r ę; yare’]; [φόβος, phobos], [φοβεω, phobeo]):

TERMS, ETC.:

“Fear” is the translation of many words in the Old Testament; the chief are: yir’ah, “fear,” “terror,” “reverence,” “awe,” most often “the fear of God,” “fear of Yahweh” (Genesis 20:11; 2 Chronicles 19:9, etc.); also of “fear” generally (Job 22:4; Isaiah 7:25; Ezekiel 30:13, etc.); yare’, “to be afraid,” “to fear,” “to reverence” (Genesis 15:1; Leviticus 19:3, 14; Deuteronomy 6:2, etc.); pachadh, “fear,” “terror,” “dread” (Genesis 31:42, 53; Deuteronomy 11:25; 1 Samuel 11:7 the King James Version; Job 4:14; Isaiah 2:10 the King James Version, etc.).

“Fearful” (timid) is the translation of yare’ (Deuteronomy 20:8; Judges 7:3); “to be feared,” yare’ (Exodus 15:11; Deuteronomy 28:58; compare Psalm 130:4); in Isaiah 35:4, it is the translation of mahar, “hasty,” “them that are of a fearful heart,” margin “Hebrew hasty”; perhaps, ready to flee (for fear).

“Fearfully” (Psalm 139:14): yare’, “I am fearfully (and) wonderfully made,” so the Revised Version (British and American); “and” is not in the text, so that “fearfully” may be equivalent to “extremely,” to an awesome degree; compare Psalm 65:5, “by terrible things .... in righteousness”; 66:3, “How terrible are thy works (yare’ ‘fearful ‘); the Septuagint, Peshitta, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) have “Thou art fearfully wonderful.”

“Fearfulness” occurs in Psalm 55:5 (yir’ah); Isaiah 21:4 (pallatsuth), the Revised Version (British and American) “horror”; Isaiah 33:14 (re’adhah, “trembling”), “Fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Trembling hath seized the godless ones.”

In the New Testament the chief words are phobos, “fear,” “terror,” “affright” (Matthew 14:26; 28:4, 8; Luke 21:26; 1 John 4:18, etc.), and phobeo, “to put in fear” (both used of ordinary fear) (Matthew 1:20; 10:26; 28:5; 2 Corinthians 12:20, etc.); of the fear of God, the noun (Romans 3:18; 2 Corinthians 7:1), the verb
Luke 18:4; 23:40, etc.); deilia, “timidity,” “fear,” occurs in 2 Timothy 1:7, “God hath not given us the spirit of fear,” the Revised Version (British and American) “a spirit of fearfulness”; ekphobos, “frightened out of one’s senses),” “greatly terrified” (Hebrews 12:21; compare Deuteronomy 9:19; The Wisdom of Solomon 17:9 the King James Version); apo tes eulabeias is translated (Hebrews 5:7) “(of Christ) who was heard in that he feared,” the Revised Version (British and American) “having been heard for his godly fear”; so all the Greek commentators; eulabeia, properly, “caution,” “circumspection,” is used in the New Testament for godly fear (Hebrews 12:28, the Revised Version (British and American) “reverence and awe,” margin as the King James Version); compare eulabes (Luke 2:25; Acts 2:5; 8:2); eulabeomai, “to act with caution” (Acts 23:10). Deilos, “fearful,” “timid,” occurs in Matthew 8:26; Mark 4:40; Revelation 21:8, “Their part shall be .... the second death”; phoberos, “fearful,” “terrible” (Hebrews 10:27,31); phobetron, “something fearful,” “a terrible sign or portent” (Luke 21:11, Revised Version (British and American) “terrors”).

Fear is a natural and, in its purpose, beneficent feeling, arising in the presence or anticipation of danger, and moving to its avoidance; it is also awakened in the presence of superiors and of striking manifestations of power, etc., taking the form of awe or reverence. Fear has been said to be the source of religion, but religion can never have originated from fear alone, since men are impelled to draw nigh with expectation to the object of worship.

“Fear” is certainly a prominent element in Old Testament religion; the “fear of God” or of Yahweh, “the fear of the Lord,” is indeed synonymous with religion itself (Psalm 34:11; Proverbs 1:7; Isaiah 11:2,3; Jeremiah 2:19; Ecclesiastes 12:13, “the whole duty of man,” the Revised Version, margin “the duty of all men”). But although the element of dread, or of “fear” in its lower sense, is not always absent and is sometimes prominent in the earlier stages especially, though not exclusively (Exodus 23:27, ‘emah; 1 Samuel 11:7, 2 Chronicles 20:29; Psalm 119:120; Isaiah 2:10,19,21), it is more the feeling of reverent regard for their God, tempered with awe and fear of the punishment of disobedience. As such it is a sentiment commanded and to be cherished toward Yahweh (Exodus 20:20; Deuteronomy 6:13; Joshua 4:24; 1 Samuel 12:24; Job 6:14; Psalm 33:8; 34:9; Proverbs 23:17; Ecclesiastes 5:7, etc.). It is an essential element in the worship
and service of Yahweh (2 Kings 17 often; Psalm 2:11, etc.); it is a Divine qualification of the Messiah (Isaiah 11:2,3). This “fear of Yahweh” is manifested in keeping God’s commandments, walking in His ways, doing His will, avoiding sin, etc. (Exodus 20:20; Deuteronomy 6:13,14; 2 Samuel 23:3; Psalm 34:4,9 parallel Proverbs 8:13; 16:6). It is the true wisdom (Job 28:28; Psalm 25:14; Proverbs 1:7; 15:33); it gives life (Proverbs 10:27, etc.), blessedness (Psalm 128:1,4), sufficiency (Psalm 34:9), Divine friendship (Psalm 25:14), protection (Psalm 34:7), deliverance (Psalm 85:9), forgiveness (Psalm 130:4). In Psalm 90:11 the King James Version has “According to thy fear so is thy wrath,” the Revised Version (British and American) “and thy wrath according to the fear that is due unto thee”; the meaning probably is “thy wrath is in proportion to thy fear.”

The “fear of the Lord” is a frequent phrase in Apocrypha, and is highly exalted, e.g. Ecclesiasticus 1:11-30; the idea of it became gradually more and more elevated; in 2:15,16 it is joined with the love of God.

“Fear” is the natural consequence of sin (Genesis 3:10; 4:13,14; Proverbs 28:1); it comes as a punishment (Deuteronomy 28:25,28). The fear of man and of evils are dangers to be avoided, from which the fear of God delivers (Numbers 14:9; 21:34; Psalm 23:4; 31:14, etc.).


In the New Testament dread, or fear of God in the lower sense, is removed; He is revealed as the loving and forgiving Father, who gives to men the spirit of sonship (Romans 8:15; 2 Timothy 1:7; 1 John 4:18); we are invited even to come “with boldness unto the throne of grace,” with confidence, assurance (parrhesia), which, however, may have its literal meaning of free “utterance” (Hebrews 4:16; 10:19); but there remains a filial fear and sense of awe and of the greatness of the issues involved (Romans 11:20; Ephesians 5:21, the Revised Version (British and American) “of Christ”; 1 Timothy 5:20; Hebrews 4:1); all other fears should be dismissed (Matthew 8:26; 10:26-28,31; Luke 12:32); in Matthew 10:28; Luke 12:5, “fear” is used in the sense of “stand in awe of,” so perhaps Luke 23:40; to “fear God” is
sometimes used in the New Testament as equivalent to religion (Luke 18:4; Acts 10:2,35; 13:16,26, used of proselytes); in Hebrews 10:27, it is said that if Christ be willfully rejected, nothing remains but “a fearful looking for (the Revised Version (British and American) “expectation”) of judgment,” and 10:31, “It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,” in which places “fearful” means “terrible,” something well to be feared. the Revised Version (British and American) gives frequently a more literal rendering of the words translated “fear.”

W. L. Walker

FEASTS, AND FAST

<fests> ([ד [ אָד, mo`edh], “an appointed day” or “an assembling,” [ג] , chagh], from [גָּג" j ; chaghagh], “to dance” or possibly “to make a pilgrimage”; [ם וּ, tsom], “fast,” [ת ינ[ר" , ta`anith], “a day of affliction”):

THE NATURE OF THE HEBREW FESTIVALS:

The Hebrews had an abundance of holidays, some based, according to their tradition, on agriculture and the natural changes of times and seasons, some on historical events connected with the national or religious life of Israel, and still others simply on immemorial custom. in most instances two or more of these bases coexist, and the emphasis on the natural, the agricultural, the national, or the religious phase will vary with different writers, different context, or different times. Any classification of these feasts and fasts on the basis of original significance must therefore be imperfect.

We should rather classify them as preexilic and post-exilic, because the period of the Babylonian captivity marks a complete change, not only in the kinds of festivals instituted from time to time, but also in the manner of celebrating the old.

I. PRE-EXILIC.

The pre-exilic list includes the three pilgrimage festivals, the Passover week, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, together with the Eighth Day of Assembly at the conclusion of the last of these feasts, and New Year and Atonement Days, the weekly Sabbath and the New Moon.
1. Observances Common to All:

The preexilic festivals were “holy convocations” (Leviticus 23; Numbers 28). Special sacrifices were offered on them in addition to the daily offerings. These sacrifices, however, varied according to the character of the festival (Numbers 28; 29). On all of them trumpets (chatsosseroth) were blown while the burnt offerings and the peace-offerings were being sacrificed (Numbers 10:10). They were all likened to the weekly Sabbath as days of rest, on which there must be complete suspension of all ordinary work (Leviticus 16:29; 23:7,8,21,24,25,28,35,36).

2. Significance of the Festivals:

The three pilgrimage festivals were known by that name because on them the Israelites gathered at Jerusalem to give thanks for their doubly joyful character. They were of agricultural significance as well as commemorative of national events. Thus, the Passover is connected with the barley harvest; at the same time it is the zeman cheruth, recalling the Exodus from Egypt (Exodus 12:6; Leviticus 23:5,8; Numbers 28:16-25; Deuteronomy 16:1-8).

Pentecost has an agricultural phase as chagh habikkurim, the celebration of the wheat harvest; it has a religious phase as zeman mattan Thorah in the Jewish liturgy, based on the rabbinical calculation which makes it the day of the giving of the Law, and this religious side has so completely overshadowed the agricultural that among modern Jews the Pentecost has become “confirmation day” (Exodus 34:26; Leviticus 23:10-14; Numbers 28:26-31).

The Feast of Tabernacles is at once the general harvest festival, chagh he’aciph, and the anniversary of the beginnings of the wanderings in the wilderness (Exodus 23:16; Leviticus 23:33 ff; Deuteronomy 16:13-15). The Eighth Day of Assembly immediately following the last day of Tabernacles (Leviticus 23:36; Numbers 29:35 ff; John 7:37) and closing the long cycle of Tishri festivals seems to have been merely a final day of rejoicing before the pilgrims returned to their homes.

New Year (Leviticus 23:23-25; Numbers 29:1-6) and the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16:1 ff; 23:26-32; Numbers 29:7-11) marked the turning of the year; primarily, perhaps, in the natural phenomena of Palestine, but also in the inner life of the nation and the individual. Hence,
the religious significance of these days as days of judgment, penitence and forgiveness soon overshadowed any other significance they may have had. The temple ritual for these days, which is minutely described in the Old Testament and in the Talmud, was the most elaborate and impressive of the year. At the same time Atonement Day was socially an important day of rejoicing.

In addition to these annual festivals the pre-exilic Hebrews celebrated the Sabbath (Numbers 28:9,10; Leviticus 23:1-3) and the New Moon (Numbers 10:10; 28:11-15). By analogy to the weekly Sabbath, every seventh year was a Sabbath Year (Exodus 23:11; Leviticus 25:1-7; Deuteronomy 15:1), and every cycle of seven Sabbath years was closed with a Jubilee Year (Leviticus 25:8-18) somewhat after the analogy of the seven weeks counted before Pentecost.

For further details of all of these preexilic festivals see the separate articles.

II. POST-EXILIC.

In post-exilic times important historical events were made the basis for the institution of new fasts and feasts. When the first temple was destroyed and the people were carried into captivity, “the sacrifice of the body and one’s own fat and blood” were substituted for that of animals (see Talmud, Berakhoth 17a). With such a view of their importance, fasts of all sorts were as a matter of course rapidly multiplied. (Note that the Day of Atonement was the only pre-exilic fast.) Of these post-exilic fasts and feasts, the Feast of Dedication (1 Macc 4:52-59; John 10:22; Mishna, Ta`anith 2 10; Mo`edh QaTon 3 9; Josephus, Ant, XII, vii; Apion, II, xxxix) and the Feast of Purim (Nehemiah 3:7; 9:24 ff; 2 Macc 15:36); and the fasts of the fourth (Zec 8:19; Jeremiah 39; 52; Mishna, Ta`anith 4 6), the fifth (Zec 7:3,1; 8:19; Ta`anith 4 6), the seventh (Zec 7:5; 8:19; Jeremiah 41:1 ff; 2 Kings 25:25; Cedher `Olam Rabba` 26; Meghillath Ta`anith c. 12), the tenth months (Zec 8:19; 2 Kings 25), and the Fast of Esther (Nehemiah 4:16 f; 9:31) have been preserved by Jewish tradition to this day. (The Feast of Dedication, the Feast of Purim and the Fast of Esther are described in separate articles.)

Significance:

The fasts of the fourth, fifth, seventh and tenth months are based on historical incidents connected with one or more national calamities. In
several instances the rabbis have by close figuring been able to connect with the dates of the fasts as well as the feasts other important national events than those for which the days were primarily instituted. Not less than four incidents are connected with the fasts of the fourth month (17th of Tammuz):

(a) on this day the Israelites made the golden calf;

(b) Moses broke the tables of law;

(c) the daily sacrifices ceased for want of cattle when the city was closely besieged prior to the destruction of Jerusalem; and

(d) on this day Jerusalem was stormed by Nebuchadnezzar. The fast of the fifth month (9th day of ‘Abh) receives its significance from the fact that the First Temple was destroyed upon this day by Nebuchadnezzar, and the Second Temple on the same day of the year by Titus. In addition it is said that on this day Yahweh decreed that those who left Egypt should not enter the land of promise; the day is also the anniversary of the capture of the city of Bether by the Emperor Hadrian. The fast of the seventh month (the 3rd day of Tishri) commemorates the murder of Gedaliah at Mizpah. That of the tenth month (10th day of Tebheth) commemorates the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

Other fasts and feasts no doubt were instituted on similar occasions and received a local or temporary observance, for example, the Feast of Acra (1 Macc 13:50-52; compare 1:33), to celebrate the recapture of Acra (“the citadel”) on the 23rd of ‘Iyar 141 BC, and the Feast of Nicanor, in celebration of the victory over Nicanor on the 13th day of ‘Adhar 160 BC (1 Macc 7:49).

Several other festivals are mentioned in the Talmud and other post-Biblical writings which may have been of even greater antiquity. The Feast of Woodcarrying (Midsummer Day: Nehemiah 10:34; Josephus, BJ, II, vii, 6; Meghillath Ta`anith c.v, p. 32, Mishna, Ta`anith 4 8a), for example, is referred to as the greatest day of rejoicing of the Hebrews, ranking with Atonement Day. It was principally a picnic day to which a religious touch was given by making it the woodgatherers’ festival for the Temple. A New Year for trees is mentioned in the Talmud (Ro’sh ha-Shdnah 1 1). The pious, according both to the Jewish tradition and the New Testament,
observed many private or semi-public fasts, such as the Mondays, Thursdays and following Monday after Nisan and Tishri (the festival months: Luke 18:12; Matthew 9:14; 6:16; Mark 2:18; Luke 5:33; Acts 10:30; Meghillah 31a; Ta`anith 12a; Bdbha` Qama’ 8 2). The day before Passover was a fast day for the firstborn (Copherim 21 3). In post-Biblical times the Jews outside of Palestine doubled each of the following days: the opening and closing day of Passover and Tabernacles and Pentecost, because of the capheq, or doubt as to the proper day to be observed, growing out of the delays in the transmission of the official decree of the Sanhedrin in each season. Differences in hours of sunrise and sunset between Palestine and other countries may have had something to do at least with the perpetuation of the custom. New Year’s Day seems to have been doubled from time immemorial, the forty-eight hours counting as one “long day.”

Many new modes of observance appear in post-exilic times in connection with the old established festivals, especially in the high festival season of Tishri. Thus the cimchath beth ha-sho’ebah, “water drawing festival,” was celebrated during the week of Tabernacles with popular games and dances in which even the elders took part, and the streets were so brilliantly illuminated with torches that scarcely an eye was closed in Jerusalem during that week (Talmud, Chullin).

The last day of Tabernacles was known in Talmudic times as yom chibbuT `arabhoth, from the custom of beating willow branches, a custom clearly antedating the various symbolical explanations offered for it. Its festivities were connected with the dismantling of the booth. In later times the day was known as hosh`a`na’ rabba’, from the liturgical passages beginning with the word hosh`a`na’, recited throughout the feast and “gathered” on that day. The day after Tabernacles has been made cimchath Torah, the Feast of the Law, from the custom of ending on that day the cycle of fifty-two weekly portions read in the synagogues.

In general it may be said that although the actual observance has changed from time to time to meet new conditions, the synagogal calendar of today is made up of the same festivals as those observed in New Testament times.

Ella Davis Isaacs

FEASTS, SEASONS FOR
Regulated by the sun and moon.

See **ASTRONOMY, I, 5.**

**FEATHERS**

<fe'th'-erz> ([h x n̂otsah]; Latin *penna*): “Gavest thou the goodly wings unto the peacocks? or wings (the Revised Version (British and American) “pinions”) and feathers (the American Standard Revised Version “plumage”) unto the ostrich?” (<Job 39:13 the King James Version); “He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust; his truth shall be thy shield and buckler” (<Psalm 91:4 the King James Version). In the Revised Version (British and American) this is again changed to pinions. in <Daniel 4:33 the word “feathers” is left. The wonderful plumage of birds was noted and prized in those days, just as now. Old ostriches were too tough and rank of flesh for food. They were pursued for their feathers, which were used for the headdressing and shield ornaments of desert princes. No one doubts that the ships of Solomon introduced peacocks because of their wonderful feathers. Those of the eagle were held in superstitious reverence as late as the days of Pliny, who was ten years old at the time of the crucifixion of Christ. Pliny wrote that the eagle was so powerful that if its feathers be laid in a box with those of other birds, the eagle feathers would “devour and consume all the rest.”

*Gene Stratton-Porter*

**FEEBLE KNEES**

<fe'-b'-l nez>: The expression. is found in three places (one being a free quotation of another): <Job 4:4, “Thou hast made firm the feeble ([r” K; kara`], “bending,” “bowing”) knees,” and <Hebrews 12:12, “Wherefore lift up the hands that hang down, and the palsied (the King James Version “feeble”) knees.” The Greek word used here ([παραλέλυμένα, paralelumenena], “paralyzed,” “motionless”) implies the loss of junction, interrupted articulation, the cutting off of vital strength; compare Greek [χωλός, cholos], “lame,” and see Delitzsch in his Commentary on Heb, in the place cited

Such an affection of the knees may be due to different causes. It is, e.g., a very frequent symptom of the disease known in the Orient as beriberi, when the muscles of the lower leg shrink to such a degree as to render
voluntary locomotion impossible. It always disables its victim, and is therefore often expressive of general debility, e.g. in Psalm 109:24, where such weakness is described as the outcome of protracted fasting in Ezekiel 7:17 and 21:7, “All knees shall be weak as water,” the expression indicates a complete relaxation of the muscles. Fear effected the same condition in Belshazzar’s case, when he saw the writing on the wall (Daniel 5:6), “The joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another” (compare Nahum 2:10).

The “sore boil .... in the knees, and in the legs,” a disease announced in Deuteronomy 28:35 as a punishment upon Israel for disobedience, cannot now be fully determined. Driver (in his commentary on the passage) thinks of elephantiasis, which is possible but not probable on account of the additional statement, “whereof thou canst not be healed, from the sole of thy foot unto the crown of thy head” which would be unexplained, as elephantiasis rarely presents a form in which the whole body is sympathetically affected. I rather think of some form of bubonic plague, which causes very high fever all over the body. In Deuteronomy 28:27 in the enumeration of plagues mention is made of the “boil of Egypt,” and some commentators have explained this as “bubonic plague.” There is, however, no doubt that the “boil or botch of Egypt” is identical with the disease known to modern medicine as bouton du Nil, Biskra button, Bagdad or Aleppo sore.

H. L. E. Luering

FEELING

<fe’-b’-l-min’-ded> ([ὀλιγόψυχος, oligopsuchos]): Only in Thessalonians 5:14 the King James Version, in the sense of “fainthearted,” as in the Revised Version (British and American). In Septuagint it is used as the equivalent of koshel, the tottering or feeble-kneed in Isaiah 35:3; 54:6; oligopsuchia occurs in Septuagint twice (Exodus 6:9; Psalm 54:7), for “anguish of spirit” and “trouble.” The term refers to weakness of will and vacillation of purpose rather than to idiocy or morbid imbecility.

FEELING

<fel’-ing>: The following varieties of meaning are to be noted:

(1) “To touch,” “handle,” “grop after” ([ו ו ] m; mashash)
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(2) “To know,” “understand,” “experience” ([γινώσκω, ginosko], Mark 5:29).

(3) “To have a fellow feeling,” “to place one’s self into the position of another,” especially while suffering, “to have compassion” ([συμπαθείν, sumpathein], Hebrews 4:15; compare 10:34; which is to be carefully distinguished from the similar verb [συμπάσχειν, sumpaschein], which means “to share in the same suffering with another,” Romans 8:17; 1 Corinthians 12:26). See Delitzsch, Commentary on Hebrews 4:15.

(4) “To feel harm,” “pain,” “grief,” “to be sensitive” ([πάσχειν, paschein], with the roots path- and penth-, Acts 28:5); or with the negation: “to have ceased to feel,” “to be apathetic,” “past feeling,” “callous,” [ἀπελγήκως, apelgekos], perfect participle of [ἀπαλγέω, apalgeo] (Ephesians 4:19) which describes the condition of the sinner, who by hardening his heart against moral influences is left without a sense of his high vocation, without an idea of the awfulness of sin, without reverence to God, without an appreciation of the salvation offered by Him, and without fear of His judgment.

H. L. E. Luering

FEET, WASHING OF

See FOOT; WASHING OF FEET.

FEIGN

<fan> ([α δ Β; badha], [r k " n; nakhar]; [πλαστός, plastos]): Occurs

(1) in the sense of “to devise,” “invent” as the translation of badha’, “to form,” “to fashion” (Nehemiah 6:8, “Thou feignest them out of thine own heart”; compare 1 Kings 12:33, English Versions of the Bible “devised of his own heart”); of plastos, “formed,” “molded” (2 Peter 2:3, “with reigned words make merchandise of you”);

(2) in the sense of “pretense,” nakhar, “to be foreign,” “strange” (1 Kings 14:5, “feign herself to be another woman,” 14:6; compare Genesis 42:7; Proverbs 26:24); ‘abhal, “to mourn,” “to act as a mourner” (2 Samuel 14:2); halal, “to make a show,” Hithpael, “to
be mad,” “to feign madness” (of David, 1 Samuel 21:13; compare Jeremiah 25:16; 50:38); *hupokrinomai*, “to give judgment, or act, under a mask” (Luke 20:20, “who feigned themselves to be righteous”);

(3) in the sense of “deceit” “fraud,” “insincerity,” *mirmah*, “prayer, that goeth not out of feigned lips” (Psalm 17:1); *sheqer*, “falsehood,” “a lie,” “Judah hath not returned unto me with her whole heart, but feignedly” (Jeremiah 3:10; compare 2 Esdras 8:28); *kahash*, “to lie,” “to feign, or flatter” (2 Samuel 12:45; Psalm 18:44; 66:3; 81:15), where the text of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), “shall submit themselves,” is rendered the margin (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), “yield feigned obedience, Hebrew *lie*.” the Revised Version (British and American) has “feign” for “make” (2 Samuel 13:5), and “feigned” for “made” (2 Samuel 13:6).

**W. L. Walker**

**FELIX; ANTONIUS**

<fe'-liks>, <an-to'-ni-us> ([Φῆλιξ, Phelix], from Latin *felix*, “happy”): A Roman procurator of Judea, appointed in succession to Cumanus by the emperor Claudius. The event which led to the introduction of Felix into the narrative of Acts was the riot at Jerusalem (Acts 21:27). There Paul, being attacked at the instigation of the Asiatic Jews for alleged false teaching and profanation of the temple, was rescued with difficulty by Lysias the chief captain. But Lysias, finding that Paul was a Roman citizen, and that therefore the secret plots against the life of his captive might entail serious consequences upon himself, and finding also that Paul was charged on religious rather than on political grounds, sent him on to Felix at Caesarea for trial (Acts 21:31 through 23:34). On his arrival, Paul was presented to Felix and was then detained for five days in the judgment hall of Herod, till his accusers should also reach Caesarea (Acts 23:33-35). The trial was begun, but after hearing the evidence of Tertullus (see TERTULLUS) and the speech of Paul in his own defense, Felix deferred judgment (Acts 24:1-22). The excuse he gave for delay was the non-appearance of Lysias, but his real reason was in order to obtain bribes for the release of Paul. He therefore treated his prisoner at first with leniency, and pretended along with Drusilla to take interest in his teaching. But these attempts to induce Paul to purchase his freedom failed ignominiously; Paul
sought favor of neither Felix nor Drusilla, and made the frequent interviews which he had with them an opportunity for preaching to them concerning righteousness and temperance and the final judgment. The case dragged on for two years till Felix, upon his retirement, “desiring to gain favor with the Jews .... left Paul in bonds” (Acts 24:27). According to the Bezan text, the continued imprisonment of Paul was due to the desire of Felix to please Drusilla.

Felix was the brother of Pallas, who was the infamous favorite of Claudius, and who, according to Tacitus (Annals 13:14), fell into disgrace in 55 AD. Tacitus implies that Felix was joint procurator of Judea, along with Cumanus, before being appointed to the sole command, but Josephus is silent as to this. Both Tacitus and Josephus refer to his succeeding Cumanus, Josephus stating that it was at the instigation of Jonathan the high priest. There is some doubt as to the chronology of Felix’ tenure of office. Harnack and Blass, following Eusebius and Jerome, place his accession in 51 AD, and the imprisonment of Paul in 54-56 AD; but most modern commentators incline to the dates 52 AD and 56-58 AD. These latter interpret the statement of Paul, “Thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation” (Acts 24:10), as referring to some judicial office, not necessarily that of co-procurator (see Tacitus), previously held by Felix in the time of Cumanus, and argue that this earlier connection of Felix with Judea supplied a reason for the advocacy by Jonathan of Felix’ claims to the procuratorship on the deposition of Gumanus. The testimony of Acts as to the evil character of Felix is fully corroborated by the writings of Josephus (BJ, II, xiii). Although he suppressed the robbers and murderers who infested Judea, and among them the “Egyptian” to whom Lysias refers (Acts 21:38), yet “he himself was more hurtful than them all.” When occasion offered, he did not hesitate to employ the sicarii (see ASSASSINS) for his own ends. Trading upon the influence of his brother at court, his cruelty and rapacity knew no bounds, and during his rule revolts became continuous, and marked a distinct stage in that seditious movement which culminated in the outbreak of 70 AD (so Schurer). His leaving Paul in bonds was but a final instance of one who sacrificed duty and justice for the sake of his Own unscrupulous selfishness. For more detailed information as to dates, etc., compare Knowling (Expos Greek Test., II, 477 ff).

C. M. Kerr
FELLOES

<fel'-oz> (1 Kings 7:33).

See WHEEL.

FELLOW

<fel'-o> ([r b j ; chabher], [[f e rea']]; [ɛταίρος, hetairos]): Meant originally a “partner,” from fe, “property,” and lag, “to lay,” then “a companion,” “an equal,” “a person or individual,” “a worthless person.”

(1) As “companion” it is the translation of chabher, “associate,” “companion,” “friend” (also chabbar, Job 41:6 (Hebrew 40:30), where we have the original sense of partnership, translated “bands” the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version “companions”); Psalm 45:7, “God hath anointed thee .... above thy fellows”; of habhrah (Ecclesiastes 4:10; Daniel 7:20); of rea’, “companion,” “friend,” “another” (Exodus 2:13; Judges 7:13,14,22); re’ah (or ra`yah), “a female friend” (Judges 11:37, “I and my fellows,” the Revised Version (British and American) “companions”; here the King James Version applies “fellow” to a female; compare Baruch 6:43, “She reproacheth her fellow,” his plesion); in Judges 11:38, “companions” is the translation of `amith, “fellowship”; `amith (Zec 13:7, “the man that is my fellow,” literally, “the man of my fellowship”); hetairos, “companion” (Matthew 11:16); metochos, “partner”; (compare Luke 5:7; Hebrews 1:9, quoted from Psalm 45:7, Septuagint for chabher).

(2) As an individual or person “fellow” is the translation of `ish, “a man,” “an individual”: “make this fellow return” (1 Samuel 29:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “the man”); in the same verse “fellow” is supplied instead of “he”; “fellow” in 1611 meant simply “a man,” and it is difficult to say in what passages the ideas of “worthless,” etc., are meant to be implied; probably, however, in Judges 18:25, where the Hebrew is simply `enosh, “man,” and the text is almost the only deviation from the rendering “man,” “men,” “lest angry (margin, Revised Version “bitter of soul”) fellows fall upon you”; also Acts 17:5, aner, “a man,” “certain lewd fellows of the baser sort,” the Revised Version (British and American) “vile fellows”; compare 2 Samuel 6:20, “vain (req) fellows” (supplied); 1 Macc 10:61, “contain pestilent fellows” (aner); Ecclesiasticus 8:15, “a bold fellow” (tolmeros), the Revised
Version (British and American) “a rash man”; in several places of the Old Testament “fellow” represents zeh, “this,” and in these instances there seems to be something of worthlessness or contempt implied (1 Samuel 21:15 bis; 25:21; 2 Kings 9:11, and, as before, 1 Samuel 29:4 the Revised Version (British and American)); in the New Testament also “fellow” often represents houtos, “this,” and in most of these cases the King James Version seems to intend something depreciatory to be understood; the Revised Version (British and American) gives simply “man” (Matthew 12:24; 26:61,71; Luke 22:59; 23:2; John 9:29; Acts 18:13); so Ecclesiasticus 13:23, “If the poor man speaks, they say, What fellow is this?” the Revised Version (British and American) “who is this?” 1 Macc 4:5, “These fellows flee from us,” the Revised Version (British and American) “these men.” the Revised Version (British and American) has “fellows” for “persons” (Judges 9:4), for “men” (Judges 11:3); “base fellows” for “men the children of Belial” (Deuteronomy 13:13), margin, “sons of worthlessness”; the American Standard Revised Version “worthless fellow” for “son of Belial” (1 Samuel 25:17,25), “base fellows” for “sons of Belial” (Judges 19:22; 20:13, etc.); the Revised Version (British and American) has also “companions” for “fellows” (Judges 11:37, as above; Ezekiel 37:19; Daniel 2:13), “each man his fellow” for “one another” (2 Kings 3:23); “fellow by” for “neighbor in” (1 Kings 20:35).

Fellow-citizen, Fellow-disciple, Fellow-heirs, Yokefellow, etc. In composition, “fellow” always means partner or companion.

W. L. Walker

FELLOWSHIP

<fel’-o-ship>.

See COMMUNION.

FEMALE

<fe’-mal>: Two Hebrew words are thus translated:

(1) [h b q e] neqebhah, which is merely a physiological description of the sexual characteristic (from [b q r n; naqabh], “to perforate”), and which corresponds to [r k z; zakhar], “male” (see under the word).
With the irregular plural [m y v h; nashim] (only Genesis 7:2, in all other places “wife,” “woman”), the feminine form of [v y a i; ish], “man.”

The Greek word is [θηλαζω, thelazō], literally, “the nursing one,” “the one giving suck” (from [θηλαζω, thelazo], “to suckle”).

Israelitic law seems frequently guilty of unjust partiality in favor of the male sex, but we have to consider that most of these legal and religious disabilities of women can be explained from the social conditions prevailing at the time of legislation. They are therefore found also in contemporaneous Gentile religions. Though traces of this prejudice against the weaker sex are found in the New Testament, the religious discrimination between the sexes has practically ceased, as is evident from Galatians 3:28: “There can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus”; compare also 1 Peter 3:7.

**H. L. E. Luering**

**FENCE**

([r x ” B; batsar], [r x h mibhtsar]): Commonly used in the King James Version in the description of fortified places, as the translation of batsar, “to cut off,” “to separate,” “to fortify” (and forms) (Deuteronomy 3:5; 9:1; 28:52, etc.); mibhtsar, “fenced city,” is a fortified place (Numbers 32:17,36; Joshua 10:20; 19:35, etc.); matsor, “fenced cities,” means “bulwark,” “citadel” (2 Chronicles 8:5); metsurah, “fortification” (2 Chronicles 11:23; 12:4; 14:6; 21:3); for “fenced” the American Standard Revised Version substitutes “fortified” in all these instances; in Daniel 11:15, mibhtsar is “a well-fortified city,” margin “the fortified cities,” the English Revised Version “well-fenced”; “fence” is also the translation of gadher, “a wall” or “fence” (Job 19:8 the American Standard Revised Version, “walled up” (gadhar), Psalm 62:3); azaq, “to loosen” (the ground) as with a mattock (Isaiah 5:2, where the King James Version has “fenced” it (the vineyard), the American Standard Revised Version “digged it,” the English Revised Version “made a trench about it,” it” margin “digged it” sukh, “to interweave” or “interlace” (Job 10:11, the Revised Version (British and American) “clothed”); male’, “to be or become full” (2 Samuel 23:7, the Revised Version (British and American) “armed,” margin “Hebrew filled”).
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ERV has “fence” for “wall” (<042224>Numbers 22:24; <230505>Isaiah 5:5; <280206>Hosea
2:6; the American Standard Revised Version retains “wall”), for “hedge”
(<211008>Ecclesiastes 10:8; <261305>Ezekiel 13:5; 22:30; the American Standard
Revised Version “wall”); “fenced” for “walled” (<041328>Numbers 13:28;
<050128>
Deuteronomy 1:28; the American Standard Revised Version
“fortified”); compare for “strong” <061929>Joshua 19:29; <160925>Nehemiah 9:25;
<19A810>
Psalm 108:10 (margin <061929>Joshua 19:29, “the city of Mibzar-zor, that is,
the fortress of Tyre,” the English Revised Version ,”fenced”), for “hedged”
(<250307>Lamentations 3:7, American Revised Version, “walled”); compare for
“defenced,” the English Revised Version “fenced,” the American Standard
Revised Version “fortified” (<233601>Isaiah 36:1; 37:26, etc.); “fences” for
“hedges” (<198012>Psalm 80:12, the American Standard Revised Version
“walls”); in <244903>Jeremiah 49:3, the English Revised Version and the
American Standard Revised Version have “fences.”
See also HEDGE.
W. L. Walker

FENCED CITIES
See FORTIFICATION.

FERRET
<fer’-et> ([hq;n;a}, ‘anaqah], the Revised Version (British and American)
GECKO): Occurs only in Leviticus11:30 the King James Version, in the
list of animals which are unclean “among the creeping things that creep
upon the earth.” the Revised Version (British and American) has “gecko”
with the marginal note, “Words of uncertain meaning, but probably
denoting four kinds of lizards.” The list of animals in Leviticus11:29,30
includes
(1) choledh, English Versions of the Bible “weasel”;
(2) `akhbar, English Versions of the Bible “mouse”;
(3) tsabh, the King James Version “tortoise,” the Revised Version
(British and American) “great lizard”;
(4) ‘anaqkah, the King James Version “ferret,” the Revised Version
(British and American) “gecko”;


(5) *koach* the King James Version “chameleon,” the Revised Version (British and American) “land crocodile”;

(6) *leTa’ah*, English Versions of the Bible “lizard”;

(7) *chomeT*, the King James Version “snail,” the Revised Version (British and American) “sand lizard”;

(8) *tinshemeth*, the King James Version “mole,” the Revised Version (British and American) “chameleon.”

It will be noted that while Revised Version makes the first two mammals and the remaining six reptiles, the King James Version makes not only (1) and (2) but also (4) and (8) mammals, and (7) a mollusk. So far as this general classification is concerned the King James Version follows the Septuagint, except in the case of (7). It must be borne in mind that all these words except (2) and (8) occur only in this passage, while (2) and (8) occur each in only a few passages where the context throws but uncertain light upon the meaning. Under these circumstances we ought to be content with the rendering of the Septuagint, unless from philology or tradition we can show good reason for differing. For ‘*anaqah*, Septuagint has [\(\mu\nu\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta, \ muga\ell\)], which occurs in Herodotus and Aristotle and may be a shrew mouse or a field mouse. Just as the next word, *koach*, is found in other passages (see CHAMELEON) with the meaning of “strength,” so ‘*anaqah* occurs in several places signifying “moaning” or “sighing” (\(\text{\textcopyright Psa}\)lms 12:5; 79:11; 102:20; \(\text{\textcopyright Mal}\)achi 2:13). It seems to be from the root, ‘*anaq*, “to choke,” “to be in anguish” (compare ‘*anaq*, “a collar”; *chanaq*, “to choke”; Arabic ‘\(\text{\textcopyright unq}\), “neck”; Arabic *khanaq*, “to strangle”; Greek [\(\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta, \ anagke\)]; Latin angustus; German enge, Nacken; English “anxious,” “neck”). Some creature seems to be meant which utters a low cry or squeak, and neither “ferret” (the King James Version) nor “gecko” (Revised Version (British and American)) seems to have a better claim than the older Septuagint rendering of [\(\mu\nu\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta, \ muga\ell\)] = “shrew mouse” or “field mouse.”

Alfred Ely Day

**FERRY-BOAT**

<fer’-i-bot> (\(\text{\textcopyright 2 Sam}\)uel 19:18).

See SHIPS AND BOATS.
FERVENT

<fur'-vent> ([fərˈvɛnt]; dalaq; [ɛ̃kˈtɛnəs, ɛktenes], [ζɛo, ɛzo]): “Fervent” (from Latin fervere, “to boil”) does not occur in the King James Version of the Old Testament, but the Revised Version (British and American) gives it as the translation of dalaq, “to burn” (Proverbs 26:23), instead of “burning,” “fervent lips and a wicked heart.” In the New Testament it is the translation of ektenes, “stretched out,” hence, intent, earnest (1 Peter 4:8, “being fervent in your love among yourselves”); of zeo, “to boil,” “to be hot” (Romans 12:11, “fervent in spirit,” Acts 18:25); of zelos, “zeal,” “fervor” (2 Corinthians 7:7, the Revised Version (British and American) “zeal”), in Jas 5:16 the King James Version has: “The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much,” where the Greek is: polu ischuei deesis dikaiou energoumene, which the Revised Version (British and American) renders, “The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working.”

“Fervently” is the translation of agonizomai, “to strive or struggle” (agonize), Colossians 4:12 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “Epaphras .... striving for you in his prayers”; of ektenos, literally, in an outstretched manner (1 Peter 1:22, the Revised Version (British and American) “Love one another from the heart fervently”; compare 1 Peter 4:8, “fervent in your love among yourselves”). Christian love too often lacks this fervency, but Christ’s love for us was “stretched out” to the uttermost.

The Revised Version (British and American) has “fervently” for “earnestly” (Jas 5:17, margin “with prayer”).

W. L. Walker

FESTIVAL

<fes’-tı-val>.

See FEASTS AND FASTS.

FESTUS; PORCIUS

<fes’-tus>, <por’-shi-us> [Πόρκιος Φήστος, Porkios Phestos]): The Roman governor or procurator who succeeded Felix in the province of Judea (Acts 24:27), and was thus brought into prominence in the dispute between Paul and the Sanhedrin which continued after the
retirement of Felix (Acts 25; 26). Upon the arrival of Festus in Jerusalem, the official capital of his province, the Jews besought of him to send Paul from Caesarea to Jerusalem to appear before them, intending to kill him on the way (Acts 25:3). Festus at first refused their request, and upon his return to Caesarea proceeded himself to examine Paul (Acts 25:6). But on finding that the evidence was conflicting, and reflecting that, as the accused was apparently charged on religious rather than on political grounds, the Sanhedrin was a more suitable court for his case than a Roman tribunal, he asked Paul if he were agreeable to make the journey to Jerusalem (Acts 25:7-9). But Paul, who knew well the nefarious use that the Jews would make of the pleasure which Festus was willing to grant them, made his appeal unto Caesar (Acts 25:10,11). To this request of a Roman citizen accused on a capital charge (compare Acts 25:16), Festus had perforce to give his consent (Acts 25:12). But the manner of his consent indicated his pique at the apparent distrust shown by Paul. By the words “unto Caesar shalt thou go,” Festus implied that the case must now be proceeded with to the end; otherwise, had it been left in his own hands, it might have been quashed at an earlier stage (compare also Acts 26:32). Meantime King Agrippa and Bernice had arrived in Caesarea, and to these Festus gave a brief explanation of the circumstances (Acts 25:13-21). The previous audiences of Festus with Paul and his accusers had, however, served only to confuse him as to the exact nature of the charge. Paul was therefore summoned before the regal court, in order both that Agrippa might hear him, and that the governor might obtain more definite information for insertion in the report he was required to send along with the prisoner to Rome (Acts 25:22-27). The audience which followed was brought to an abrupt conclusion by the interruption of Paul’s speech (Acts 26:1-23) by Festus: “Paul, thou art mad; thy much learning is turning thee mad” (Acts 26:24). Yet the meeting was sufficient to convince both Agrippa and Festus that “this man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds” (Acts 26:31). While Festus displayed a certain contempt for what he regarded as the empty delusions of a harmless maniac, his conduct throughout the whole proceeding was marked by a strict impartiality; and his straightforward dealing with Paul formed a marked contrast to the dilatoriness of Felix. The praise bestowed upon the latter by Tertullus (Acts 24:2) might with better reason have been bestowed on Festus, in that he freed the country from many robbers (Sicarii: Josephus, Ant, XX, viii-x; BJ, II, xiv, 1); but his procuratorship was too short to undo the harm wrought by his predecessor. The exact
date of his accession to office is uncertain, and has been variously placed at 55-61 AD (compare Knowling in Expositor’s Greek Testament, II, 488-89; see also FELIX).

C.M. Kerr

FETCH

<fech> ([j q” l ; laqach]): Has generally the meaning of “to bring”; it is commonly the translation of Hebrew laqach, “to take” or “lay hold of,” Hoph. “to be brought, seized or snatched away” (Genesis 18:4, etc.; 27:9, etc.; 42:16; 1 Samuel 4:3; 1 Kings 17:10, etc.); twice of nasa’, “to lift up” (2 Chronicles 12:11, the American Standard Revised Version “bare”; Job 36:3); of bo’, “to come in” (2 Chronicles 1:17; Nehemiah 8:15); of `alah, “to cause to come up” (1 Samuel 6:21; 7:1); of yatsa’, “to cause to come out” (Numbers 20:10, the American Standard Revised Version “bring forth”; Jeremiah 26:23), and of a number of other words.

In the New Testament it is the translation of exago, “to lead out” (Acts 16:37, “Let them come themselves and fetch us out,” the Revised Version (British and American) “bring”); “to fetch a compass” is the translation of cabhabh (Numbers 34:5; Joshua 15:3, the Revised Version (British and American) “turn,” “turned about”; 2 Samuel 5:23, the Revised Version (British and American) “make a circuit”; 2 Kings 3:9, the Revised Version (British and American) “made a circuit”); of perierchomai (aor. 2, perielthon), “to go about,” “to wander up and down” (of a ship driven about, Acts 28:13, the Revised Version (British and American) “made a circuit,” margin “some ancient authorities read cast loose”).

The Revised Version (British and American) has “fetch” for “bring” (1 Kings 3:24), for “call for” (Acts 10:5; 11:13); “fetched” for “called for” (Nehemiah 5:10), for “took out” (Jeremiah 37:17); “fetched” for “took” (2 Chronicles 8:18).

W. L. Walker

FETTER

<fet’-er>: Found only in the plural in both Old Testament and New Testament; fetters of iron (Psalm 105:18; 149:8; so probably Mark 5:4; Luke 8:29) or brass (Judges 16:21; 2 Kings 25:7) were frequently used for securing prisoners.
See CHAIN.

Figurative: of trouble (Job 36:8).

FEVER

<fe'-ver> ([t j " D" q", qaddachath], [t q L D", dalleqeth]; [πυρετός, puretos], derived from a root signifying “to burn”): A generic term, applied to all diseases characterized by high temperature of body. Several forms of febrile disease are among the commonest of all maladies in Palestine today, as they were also in the period covered by the Bible history. Of these the most prevalent is ague or intermittent malarial fever, which is common in all parts but especially in low-lying districts or places where there are pools or marshes in which mosquitoes breed, these insects being the commonest carriers of the malaria bacillus. These fevers are generally more severe in late summer and autumn, when the mosquitoes are most numerous, and when there is a liability to chill, owing to the sudden drop of temperature at sunset. During the day one uses as light clothing as possible, but immediately after sunset the air becomes chilly and damp, and the physiological resistance to the influence of the parasite is remarkably diminished. On this account travelers in Palestine at this season should be particular to avoid exposure to these evening damps, and to use mosquito curtains invariably at night. In most tropical countries now houses are rendered mosquito-proof by close wire netting, and thereby the risk of infection is much diminished. In Palestine the marshes of the north about Banias and the Water of Merom, the Shephelah, and the Jordan valley are the most fever-stricken regions of the country. The word qaddachath is translated burning ague in Leviticus 26:16 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “fever”), and is coupled with dalleqeth, translated inflammation in Deuteronomy 28:22. Septuagint renders the former word puretos, and the latter rhigos in this passage, a collocation which is interesting as Galen uses these words together rhigopuretos in his description of a fever identical with that common in Palestine. In Leviticusthe word in Septuagint is ikteros which literally means jaundice, a disease otherwise not mentioned in the Bible. In Palestine as in other malarious countries the condition of jaundice or yellowing of the skin frequently accompanies repeated and protracted attacks of fever which cause organic disease of the liver. On this account Hippocrates describes all fevers as due to a perverted secretion of bile.
These fevers begin with severe shivering fits, hence, the name *rhigos* which is used by Hippocrates. This is followed by a period of burning dry heat, ending in a period of profuse perspiration. Such attacks may take place daily, a few hours of interval with normal temperature separating the end of one fit from the onset of the next. The commonest type however is that called tertian, in which a whole day separates one fit from the next. In some of the severe fevers which are rife in the Jordan valley the temperature never falls to the normal, and while there is a short remission between the attacks with a body heat a little above the normal, there is no intermission. Rarer febrile conditions which have been met with in Palestine, such as the Malta fever, present the same characteristics and may continue for months. Cases also of genuine blackwater fever have been recorded by several authorities. It is probable that in former days these fevers were even worse than they are now, as ancient medicine knew of no certain remedy for them. At present they generally yield at once to treatment by quinine, and in my own experience I believe that the administration of this remedy in large and repeated doses is the most effectual treatment.

Other febrile diseases are rife in certain districts in Palestine, and probably existed in Bible times. Typhoid is common in some crowded towns and villages, and considering how little protected the wells are from contamination, the wonder is that it is not much more prevalent. It is probable also that typhus then, as now, was present as an occasional epidemic in the more crowded cities, but even the physicians of Greece and Rome did not differentiate these diseases. All these fevers seem also to have existed in Egypt to much the same extent as in Palestine. The Papyrus Ebers speaks of “a fever of the gods” (46) and another called “a burning of the heart” (102). Its causation is attributed to the influence of the “god of fever,” and the evil sequelae of the disease as it affects the heart, stomach, eyes and other organs are described in terms which remind us of the minatory passages in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. The conditions there mentioned, such as consuming the eyes and causing sorrow of heart or pining away of the soul, graphically describe the state frequently seen affecting those in the Shephelah villages who have suffered from frequent returns of fever, and who in consequence have developed serious local affections of the liver, spleen and other organs. Before the introduction of quinine, cases of this kind must have been much more commonly met with
than they are now. It is probable that this state is that called *shachepheth*, or consumption, in these passages.

Another form of fever, *charchur*, the “extreme burning” of the King James Version or “fiery heat” of the Revised Version (British and American), is coupled with the other forms of fever in Deuteronomy 28:22. This is called in Septuagint *erethismos* or irritation, and may have been a feverish condition with a reddened skin, possibly erysipelas or else one of the eruptive fevers. At present outbreaks of scarlatina, measles and erysipelas are of fairly frequent occurrence and are often very severe.

In the New Testament fever is mentioned eight times. The disease which affected Simon’s wife’s mother is called a “great fever” (Luke 4:38), and that which nearly proved fatal to the nobleman’s son in the same district was also a fever (John 4:52). Cases of the kind are common all round the Sea of Galilee at the present day.

Alexander Macalister

**FIELD**

<feld>. See AGRICULTURE.

**FIERY HEAT**

<fi’-er-i>, <fir’-i het>: In Deuteronomy 28:22, where the King James Version has “an extreme burning.” See FEVER.

**FIERY SERPENT**

See SERPENT.

**FIG, FIG-TREE**

<fig’-tre> ([ח נא ת] te’enah], plural [ע נא ת] te’enim], specially “figs”; [ע גפ” , paggim], “green figs” only in Song of Solomon of Solomon 2:13; [סוקה, suke], “fig-tree,” [סוקון, sukon], “fig”):
1. FIG-TREES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

The earliest Old Testament reference to the fig is to the leaves, which Adam and Eve converted into aprons (Genesis 3:7). The promised land was described (Deuteronomy 8:8) as “a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates,” etc. The spies who visited it brought, besides the cluster of grapes, pomegranates and figs (Numbers 13:23). The Israelites complained that the wilderness was “no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates” (Numbers 20:5). When Egypt was plagued, the fig-trees were smitten (Psalm 105:33); a similar punishment was threatened to unfaithful Israel (Jeremiah 5:17; Hosea 2:12; Amos 4:9). It is only necessary to ride a few miles among the mountain villages of Palestine, with their extensive fig gardens, to realize what a long-lasting injury would be the destruction of these slow-growing trees. Years of patient labor — such as that briefly hinted at in Luke 13:7 — must pass before a newly planted group of fig-trees can bear profitably. Plenitude of fruitful vines and fig-trees, specially individual ownership, thus came to be emblematical of long-continued peace and prosperity. In the days of Solomon “Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig-tree” (1 Kings 4:25). Compare also 2 Kings 18:31; Isaiah 36:16; Micah 4:4; Zec 3:10; 1 Macc 14:12. Only a triumphal faith in Yahweh could rejoice in Him “though the fig-tree shall not flourish” (Habakkuk 3:17).

2. NATURAL HISTORY OF THE FIG-TREE:

The Ficus carica, which produces the common fig, is a tree belonging to the Natural Order. Urticaceae, the nettle family, which includes also the banyan, the India rubber fig-tree, the sycamore fig and other useful plants. Fig-trees are cultivated all over the Holy Land, especially in the mountain regions. Wild fig-trees — usually rather shrubs than trees — occur also everywhere; they are usually barren and are described by the fellahin as “male” trees; it is generally supposed that their presence is beneficial to the cultivated variety. The immature flowers harbor small insects which convey pollen to the female flowers and by their irritating presence stimulate the growth of the fruit. Artificial fertilization has been understood since ancient times, and there may be a reference to it in Amos 7:14.

Fig-trees are usually of medium height, 10 or 15 ft. for full-grown trees, yet individual specimens sometimes attain as much as 25 ft. The summer
foliage is thick and surpasses other trees of its size in its cool and dense shade. In the summer owners of such trees may be seen everywhere sitting in their shadow (John 1:48). Such references as Mac 4:4; Zec 3:10, etc., probably are to this custom rather than to the not uncommon one of having a fig-tree overhanging a dwelling.

3. FIGS:

The fruit of the fig-tree is peculiar. The floral axis, instead of expanding outward, as with most flowers, closes, as the flower develops, upon the small internal flowers, leaving finally but a small opening at the apex; the axis itself becomes succulent and fruit-like. The male flowers lie around the opening, the female flowers deeper in; fertilization is brought about by the presence of small hymenopterous insects.

There are many varieties of figs in Palestine differing in sweetness, in color and consistence; some are good and some are bad (compare Jeremiah 24:1,8; 29:17). In Palestine and other warm climates the fig yields two crops annually — an earlier one, ripe about June, growing from the “old wood,” i.e. from the midsummer sprouts of the previous year, and a second, more important one, ripe about August, which grows upon the “new wood,” i.e. upon the spring shoots. By December, fig-trees in the mountainous regions of Palestine have shed all their leaves, and they remain bare until about the end of March, when they commence putting forth their tender leaf buds (Matthew 24:32; Mark 13:28,32; Luke 21:29-33), and at the same time, in the leaf axils, appear the tiny figs. They belong to the early signs of spring:

“The voice of the turtle-dove is heard in our land; The fig-tree ripeneth her green figs” (paggim) — Song of Solomon 2:12,13.

4. EARLY FIGS:

These tiny figs develop along with the leaves up to a certain point — to about the size of a small cherry — and then the great majority of them fall to the ground, carried down with every gust of wind. These are the “unripe figs” (olunthos) — translated, more appropriately in the King James Version, as “untimely figs” — of Revelation 6:13. Compare also Isaiah 34:4 the King James Version — in the Revised Version (British and American) “leaf” has been supplied instead of “fig.” These immature figs are known to the fellahin as taksh, by whom they are eaten as they fall;
they may even sometimes be seen exposed for sale in the markets in Jerusalem. In the case of many trees the whole of this first crop may thus abort, so that by May no figs at all are to be found on the tree, but with the best varieties of fig-trees a certain proportion of the early crop of figs remains on the tree, and this fruit reaches ripe perfection about June. Such fruit is known in Arabic as dafur, or “early figs,” and in Hebrew as bikkurah, “the first-ripe” (Isaiah 28:4; Jeremiah 24:2; Hosea 9:10). They are now, as of old, esteemed for their delicate flavor (Micah 7:1, etc.).

5. THE CURSING OF THE BARREN FIG-TREE:

The miracle of our Lord (Matthew 21:18-20; Mark 11:12,13,10,21) which occurred in the Passover season, about April, will be understood (as far as the natural phenomena are concerned) by the account given above of the fruiting of the fig-tree, as repeatedly observed by the present writer in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. When the young leaves are newly appearing, in April, every fig-tree which is going to bear fruit at all will have some taksh (“immature figs”) upon it, even though “the time of figs” (Mark 11:13 the King James Version), i.e. of ordinary edible figs — either early or late crop — ”was not yet.” This taksh is not only eaten today, but it is sure evidence, even when it falls, that the tree bearing it is not barren. This acted parable must be compared with Luke 13:6,9; now the time of judgment was surely coming, the fate of the fruitless Jewish nation was forcibly foretold.

6. DRIED FIGS:

While fresh figs have always been an important article of diet in their season (Nehemiah 13:15) the dried form is even more used. They are today dried in the sun and threaded on strings (like long necklaces) for convenience of carriage. A “cake of figs” (debelah, literally, “pressed together”) is mentioned (1 Samuel 30:12); Abigail gave 200 such cakes of figs to David (1 Samuel 25:18); the people of North Israel sent, with other things, “cakes of figs” as a present to the newly-crowned David (1 Chronicles 12:40). Such masses of figs are much used today — they can be cut into slices with a knife like cheese. Such a mass was used externally for Hezekiah’s “boil” (Isaiah 38:21; 2 Kings 20:7); it was a remedy familiar to early medical writers.
FIGHT

See WAR; GAMES.

FIGURE

<fig’-ur>, <fig’-yur> ([l mš , l mš e cemel, cemel]; [τύπος, tupos]): The translation of cemel, or cemel, “a likeness or image”; perhaps a transposition of tselem, the usual word for likeness; it is elsewhere translated “idol” and “image” (Deuteronomy 4:16, “the similitude of any figure,” the Revised Version (British and American) “in the form of any figure”); of tabhnith, “form or likeness” (Isaiah 44:13, “shapeth it (the idol) .... after the figure of a man”; compare Deuteronomy 4:16); of miqla’ath, “carving,” “carved work” (1 Kings 6:29: “And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubim and palm-trees and open flowers, within and without,” only here and in 1 Kings 6:32; 7:31 where the word is translated “carving” and “graying”); in the New Testament “figure” is the translation of tupos, primarily “a mark,” “print,” “impression,” “something made by blows,” hence, “figure,” “statue,” tropically “form,” “manner”; a person bearing the form or figure of another, having a certain resemblance, preceding another to come, model, exemplar (Acts 7:43), “the figures (images) which ye made to worship them”; Romans 5:14, “who is the figure (Revised Version, “a figure”) of him that was to come,” that is, the first Adam was a type of the second Adam, Christ; of antitupon, that which corresponds to a type or model (Hebrews 9:24 the King James Version, “Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself”); the meaning is simply the correspondence, or likeness (of the tabernacle to heaven), therefore the Revised Version (British and American) renders “like in pattern to the true” (1 Peter 3:21, “the like figure whereunto (even) baptism doth also now save us,” i.e. baptism is the antitype of the ark “wherein .... eight souls were saved (or brought safely) through water,” Revised Version “which also after a true likeness (m “in the antitype”) doth now save you even baptism”); of parabole, “a placing alongside”, a “comparison,” “similitude,” hence, image, figure, type (Hebrews 9:9, “which was a figure for the time then present,” the American Standard Revised Version “which is a figure for the time present,” the English Revised Version “parable” and “(now) present,”
namely, the entrance of the high priest into the Holy of Holies was a type
of Christ’s entrance into heaven; 11:19, “from whence (from the dead) also
he received him in a figure,” i.e. Abraham received Isaac back from the
dead as it were, in the likeness of a resurrection, he not being actually
dead, the American Standard Revised Version “from whence he did also in
a figure receive him back,” the English Revised Version “in a parable”);
metaschematizo, “to change the form or appearance,” “to transfer
figuratively” (1 Corinthians 4:6,”These things, brethren, I have in a
figure transferred to myself and Apollos”; the Geneva version reads “I have
figuratively described in my own person”). Paul is “substituting himself and
Apollos for the teachers most in repute at Corinth that he might thus avoid
personality.”

“Figure” is supplied in Ecclesiasticus 49:9, with en  ombro, “He made
mention of the enemies under the figure of the rain,” the Revised Version
(British and American) “He remembered the enemies in storm,” margin
“(Greek) rain.”

The Revised Version (British and American) has “a figure” margin “an
interpretation,” for “the interpretation” (Proverbs 1:6; the word is
melitsah, only here and Habakkuk 2:6, meaning properly what is
involved and needs interpretation; in Habakkuk 2:6 it is translated
“taunting proverb,” the Revised Version, margin “riddle”); “figured stone”
for “image of stone” (Leviticus26:1); “figured stones” for “pictures”
(Numbers 33:52).

W. L. Walker

FILE

<fil>: Found only in 1 Samuel 13:21, but the text here is obscure. The
Hebrew (petsirah phim) signifies “bluntness of edge,” and is so rendered in
the Revised Version, margin.

See TOOLS.

FILLET

<fil’-et> ([ chut], [ chashuq]):

(1) Chut, from a root not used, meaning probably “to sew,” therefore a
string or a measuring rod or cord, and so a line, tape, thread, fillet.
Jeremiah 52:21 translated “line” (the King James Version “fillet”),
measuring 12 cubits long, encircling brass pillars standing 18 cubits high, part of the temple treasure plundered by the Chaldeans; and many other things “that were in the house of Yahweh, did the Chaldeans break in pieces.” Translated “thread,” used by Rahab, in Joshua 2:18, and “cord,” “three fold .... is not quickly broken,” in Ecclesiastes 4:12.

(2) Chashuq, from a root meaning “to join” and therefore something joined or attached, and so a rail or rod between pillars, i.e. a fillet. The hangings of the court of the tabernacle were supported by brass pillars set in brass sockets, “The hooks of the pillars and their fillets shall be of silver” (Exodus 27:10,11). The embroidered screen for the door of the Tent was supported by five pillars socketed in brass: “And he overlaid their capitals and their fillets with gold” (Exodus 36:38). The pillars for the court and the gate of the court had fillets of silver (Exodus 38:10 ff). The verb is used in Exodus 27:17; 38:17, “All the pillars of the court were filleted with silver.”

William Edward Raffety

FILTH; FILTHINESS; FILTHY

The word once translated “filth” in the Old Testament is tso’ah, “excrement” or “dung,” elsewhere translated “dung” (Isaiah 4:4, used figuratively of evil doings, sin, “the filth of the daughters of Zion”; compare Proverbs 30:12); in the New Testament we have perikatharma “cleansings” “sweepings,” offscourings (1 Corinthians 4:13, “We are made as the filth of the world,” the Revised Version, margin “or refuse”); rhupos, “filth,” “dirt,” Septuagint for tso’ah in Isaiah 4:4 (1 Peter 3:21, “the filth of the flesh”).

“Filthiness” is the translation of tum’ah, “uncleanness” (ritual, Leviticus5:3; 7:20, etc.), used figuratively of moral impurity, translated “filthiness” (Ezr 6:21; Lamentations 1:9; Ezekiel 22:15; 24:11,13 bis; 36:25); niddah, “impurity” (2 Chronicles 29:5); figuratively (Ezr 9:11); the Revised Version (British and American) has “ uncleanness,” but “filthiness” for uncleanness at close of verse (niddah); nechosheth, “brass,” figuratively (for “impurity” or “impudence”) (Ezekiel 16:36); aischrotes, primarily “ugliness,” tropical for unbecomingness, indecency (only Ephesians 5:4, “nor filthiness, nor foolish talking”; Alford has “obscenity,” Weymouth, “shameful”); akathartes, “uncleanness”
Revelation 17:4 the King James Version), corrected text, *ta akatharta*, “the unclean things,” so the Revised Version (British and American).

“Filthy” is the translation of ‘*alach*, “to be turbid,” to become foul or corrupt in a moral sense (*Job* 15:16 the King James Version; *Psalm* 14:3; 53:3); ‘*iddim*, plural of ‘*iddah*, from ‘*adhadh*, “to number or compute (monthly courses)”; *Isaiah* 64:6, “All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags,” the Revised Version (British and American) “as a polluted garment”; compare *Ezekiel* 36:17; *aischros*, “ugly,” tropical for unbecoming, shameful (*Titus* 1:11, “for filthy lucre’s sake”; compare 1:7); shameful discourse *aischrologia* (*Colossians* 3:8 the King James Version); *rhupoo*, “filthy,” in a moral sense polluted (*Revelation* 22:11, “He that is filthy, let him be filthy still,” the Revised Version (British and American) “let him be made filthy still” (corrected text), margin “yet more”; Alford, “Let the filthy (morally polluted) pollute himself still” (in the constant middle sense of passive verbs when the act depends on the man’s self)).

In Apocrypha we have (Ecclesiasticus 22:1): “A slothful man is compared to a filthy (ardaloo) stone,” the Revised Version (British and American) “a stone that is defiled,” 22:2 “A slothful man is compared to the filth (bolbiton) of a dunghill”; 27:4 “So the filth (skubalon) of a man in his talk (the Revised Version (British and American) “of man in his reasoning”) remaineth.”

*See UNCLEANNESS.*

*W. L. Walker*

**FIN**

*See FISH.*

**FINE**

<fin> (adj., from Latin finire, “to finish”): Indicates superior quality. Only in a few instances does “fine” represent a separate word:

(1) *Tobh*, “good,” qualifies gold (*2 Chronicles* 3:5,8, “fine gold”; compare *Genesis* 2:12, “good”); fine gold (*Lamentations* 4:1, the King James Version “most fine gold,” the Revised Version (British and American) “most pure gold,” literally, “good fine gold”), copper (*Ezr*

(2) *paz*, “refined” (<paz> Song of Solomon 5:11, “the most fine gold”).

(3) *chelebh*, “fatness,” “the best of any kind”; compare <cheleb> Genesis 45:18; <cheleb> Deuteronomy 32:14, etc. (<cheleb> Psalm 81:16, “the finest of the wheat,” the Revised Version, margin Hebrew “fat of wheat”).

(4) *sariq*, “fine combed” (<sariq> Isaiah 19:9, “fine flax,” the Revised Version (British and American) “combed flax”).

In other places it expresses a quality of the substantive: *kethem*, “fine gold” (<kethem> Job 31:24; <kethem> Daniel 10:5, the Revised Version (British and American) “pure gold”); *paz*, used as a noun for refined gold (<paz> Job 28:17; <paz> Psalm 19:10; <paz> Proverbs 8:19; <paz> Isaiah 13:12; <paz> Lamentations 4:2); *charuts*, “fine gold” (<charuts> Proverbs 3:14; compare <charuts> Psalm 68:13, “yellow gold”); *coleth*, “flour,” rendered “fine flour,” rolled or crushed small (<coleth> Leviticus 2:1,4,5,7, etc.); *semidalis*, “the finest wheaten flour” (<semidalis> Revelation 18:13); *gemach coleth*, “fine meal” (<gemach coleth> Genesis 18:6); *cadhin*, “linen garment” (Septuagint *sindon*, <cadhin> Proverbs 31:24 the King James Version; <cadhin> Isaiah 3:23); *shesh*, “white,” “fine linen” (<shesh> Genesis 41:42; <shesh> Exodus 25:4, etc.); in <shesh> Proverbs 31:22 the King James Version has “silk”; *sheshi* (<sheshi> Ezekiel 16:13, “fine flour”); ‘*eTun*, “what is twisted or spun,” “yarn” (<eTun> Proverbs 7:16 the King James Version, “fine linen of Egypt” the Revised Version (British and American) “yarn of Egypt”); *buts*, “fine white cloth,” “cotton or linen,” “fine linen” (<buts> 1 Chronicles 4:21; <buts> Ezekiel 27:16, etc.; <buts> 2 Chronicles 5:12, King James Version “white,” the Revised Version (British and American) “fine”); *bussos*, “byssus,” “linen” from *buts* Septuagint for which, <bussos> 2 Chronicles 2:14; 3:14), deemed very fine and precious, worn only by the rich (<bussos> Luke 16:19; Revelation 18:12); *bussinos*, “byssine” made of fine linen, Septuagint for *buts* (<bussinos> 1 Chronicles 5:27) (<bussinos> Revelation 18:16, “clothed in fine linen,” the Revised Version (British and American) “arrayed,” Revelation 19:8,14); *sindon*, “fine linen” (<sindon> Mark 5:46, “He bought fine linen,” the Revised Version (British and American) “a linen cloth”; compare <sindon> Mark 14:51,52; <sindon> Matthew 27:59; <sindon> Luke 23:53); it was used for wrapping the body at night, also for wrapping round dead bodies; *sindon* is Septuagint for *cadhin* (<sindon> Judges 14:12,13; <sindon> Proverbs 31:24);
chalkolibanon (Revelation 1:15; 2:18, the King James Version “fine brass”).

The meaning of this word has been much discussed; chalkos is “brass” in Greek (with many compounds), and libanos is the Septuagint for lebhonah, “frankincense,” which word was probably derived from the root labhan, “to burn”; this would give glowing brass, “as if they burned in a furnace”; in Daniel 10:6 it is nehosheth qalal, the King James Version “polished brass,” the Revised Version (British and American) “burnished” (qalal is “to glow”). Plumptre deemed it a hybrid word composed of the Greek chalkos, “brass,” and the Hebrew labhan, “white,” a technical word, such as might be familiar to the Ephesians; the Revised Version (British and American) has “burnished brass”; Weymouth, “silver-bronze when it is white-hot in a furnace”; the whiteness being expressed by the second half of the Greek word. See Thayer’s Lexicon (s.v.).

In Apocrypha we have “fine linen,” bussinos (1 Esdras 3:6), “fine bread”; the adjective katharos, separate (Judith 10:5, the Revised Version, margin “pure bread”); “fine flour” (Ecclesiasticus 35:2; 38:11); semidalis (Bel and the Dragon verse 3; 2 Macc 1:8, the Revised Version (British and American) “meal offering”).

W. L. Walker

FINER; FINING

<fin’-er>, <fin’-ing> (Proverbs 25:4 the King James Version).

See REFINER.

FINES

<finz>.

See PUNISHMENTS.

FINGER

<fin’-ger> (Hebrew and Aramaic [[ב”וח, ‘etsba’]; [δάκτυλος, daktulos]): The fingers are to the Oriental essential in conversation; their language is frequently very eloquent and expressive. They often show what the mouth does not dare to utter, especially grave insult and scorn. The scandalous person is thus described in Proverbs 6:13 as “teaching” or
“making signs with his fingers.” Such insulting gestures (compare e.g. the
gesture of Shimei in throwing dust or stones at David, 2 Samuel 16:6)
are even now not infrequent in Palestine. The same habit is alluded to in
Isaiah 58:9 by the expression, “putting forth of fingers. “

The fingers were decorated with rings of precious metal, which, with other
jewelry worn ostentatiously on the body, often formed the only possession
of the wearer, and were therefore carefully guarded. In the same way the
law of Yahweh was to be kept: “Bind them (my commandments) upon thy
fingers; write them upon the tablet of thy heart” (Proverbs 7:3).

Figurative: In 1 Kings 12:10 and 2 Chronicles 10:10 Rehoboam
gives the remarkable answer to his dissatisfied people, which is, at the same
time, an excellent example of the use of figurative language in the Orient:
“My little finger is thicker than my father’s loins,” a figure explained in the
next verse: “Whereas my father did lade you with a heavy yoke, I will add
to your yoke: my father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you
with scorpions.” The Hebrew word used here for little finger is [qoTen], literally, “pettiness,” “unimportant thing.”

The “finger of God,” like the “hand of God,” is synonymous with power,
omnipotence, sometimes with the additional meaning of the infallible
evidence of Divine authorship visible in all His works (Psalm 8:3;
Luke 11:20), especially in His law (Exodus 8:19; 31:18;
Deuteronomy 9:10; compare Exodus 32:15,16).

The finger or digit as a linear measure is mentioned in Jeremiah 52:21
(Greek daktulos; Josephus, Ant, VIII, in, 4). It is equal to one finger-
breadth, 1/4 of a hand-breadth (palm) = 18.6 millimeters or .73 inches.

H. L. E. Luering

FINGER

<fin’ger> ([B x ȩ, ‘etsba`]): The smallest of the Hebrew linear
measures. It was equal to the breadth of the finger, or about 3/4 inches,
four of which made a palm (Jeremiah 52:21).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.
FINISH

<fin'-ish> ([ḥl ; kalah]; [τελέω, teleo], with other Hebrew and Greek words): The proper sense of “finish” is to end or complete; so for “finish,” “finished,” in the King James Version, there is sometimes met with in the Revised Version (British and American) the change to “complete” (<Luke 14:28; <2 Corinthians 8:6), “accomplish” (<John 4:34; 5:36; 17:4), “made an end of doing” (<2 Chronicles 4:11; compare 24:14), etc. In Jas 1:15, for “sin, when it is finished,” the Revised Version (British and American) reads “sin when it is full-grown,” corresponding to “conceived” of the previous clause. On the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American) has frequently “finished” for other words, as “ended” (<Genesis 2:2; <Deuteronomy 31:30), “accomplished” (<John 19:28), “filled up,” “fulfilled” (<Revelation 15:1,8), etc. The grandest Scriptural example of the word is the cry upon the cross, “It is finished” (Tetelestai, <John 19:30).

W. L. Walker

FINISHER

<fin'-ish-er> ([τελειωτής, teleiotes]): This word is applied to Jesus (<Hebrews 12:2), and comes from teleioo, “to complete,” “to make perfect”; hence, it means finisher in the sense of completing; the King James Version “the author and finisher of our faith,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the author (margin “captain”) and perfecter of our faith”; but “our” is supplied, and in the connection in which the passage stands — after the examples which have been adduced of the power of faith — most probably the best rendering is “the Leader (or Captain) and Perfecter of the Faith,” that is of the faith which has been illustrated by those mentioned in Hebrews 11, who are as “a great cloud of witnesses” to the power of faith; but above all “looking to Jesus, our Leader” in whom it was perfected, as is shown in what follows: “who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross,” etc. “In His human nature He exhibited Faith in its highest form, from first to last, and placing Himself as it were at the head of the great army of heroes of Faith, He carried Faith, the source of their strength, to its most complete perfection and to its loftiest triumph” (Westcott).

W. L. Walker
FIR; FIR-TREE

<fur>, (the Revised Version, margin “cypress”; [v wÔB] berosh], 2 Samuel 6:5; 1 Kings 5:8,10, etc.; ([µyt iw B] berothem] (plural only), an Aramaic form, Song of Solomon 1:17):

1. OLD TESTAMENT REFERENCES:

This tree was one of the chief trees of Lebanon (Isaiah 60:13); one of usefulness (Isaiah 41:19; 55:13); associated with the cedar (2 Kings 19:23; Psalm 104:17; Isaiah 14:8; Zec 11:2); its boughs were wide and great (Ezekiel 31:8); it was evergreen (Hosea 14:8); it could supply boards and timber for doors (1 Kings 6:15,24); beams for roofing the temple (2 Chronicles 3:5); planks for shipbuilding (Ezekiel 27:5). In 2 Samuel 6:5 we read: “David and all the house of Israel played before Yahweh with all manner of instruments made of fir-wood,” etc. It is practically certain that the reading in the parallel passage in 1 Chronicles 13:8 is more correct: “David and all Israel played before God with all their might, even with songs,” etc. This view is supported by the Septuagint translation (en pase dunamei). There is therefore no necessity to suppose that berosh was a wood used for musical instruments.

2. THE IDENTITY OF “BEROSH”:

The identity of berosh is uncertain. It was a name applied either to several of the Coniferae in common or to one or more outstanding species. If the latter is the case we can only seek for the most suited to Old Testament requirements. The Aleppo pine, Pinus Halepensis, is a fine tree which flourishes in the Lebanon, but its wood is not of special excellence and durability. A better tree (or couple of trees) is the sherbin of the Syrians; this name includes two distinct varieties in the suborder Cypressineae, the fine tall juniper, Juniperis excelsa and the cypress, Cypressus sempervirens. They both still occur in considerable numbers in the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; they are magnificent trees and produce excellent wood — resinous, fragrant, durable. If these trees were not classed locally, as now, under one name, then the cypress is of the two more probably the berosh. The coffins of Egyptian mummies were made of cypress; a compact variety of this cypress is cultivated all over the Turkish empire by the Moslems as
an ornament in cemeteries. From early times the cypress has been connected with mourning.

In the Apocrypha there are two definite references to the cypress ([κοπάρισσος, kuparissos]). In Sirach 24:13, Wisdom says:

“I was exalted like a cedar in Libanus,
And as a cypress tree on the mountains of Hermon.”

And in Sirach 50:10 the high priest Simon is said to be

“As an olive tree budding forth fruits,
And as a cypress growing high among the clouds.”

These passages, especially the former, certainly favor the idea that berosh was the cypress; the name may, however, have included allied trees.

E. W. G. Masterman

FIRE

<fir> ([נָא אֶשֶׁת]; [πῦρ, pur]): These are the common words for fire, occurring very frequently. ‘Ur, “light” (<יִשָּׂא Isaiah 24:15 the King James Version; compare the Revised Version (British and American); 31:9, and see FIRES), nur (Aramaic) (<דניאל Daniel 3:22 ff) are found a few times, also ‘eshshah (<יהוה Jeremiah 6:29), and be’erah (<אֲבָר Exodus 22:6), once each. Acts 28:2, 3 has pura, “pyre,” and Mark 14:54; Luke 22:56, phos, “light,” the Revised Version (British and American) “in the light (of the fire).” “To set on fire,” yatsath (<סָמַע 2 Samuel 14:31), lahat (<דָּרָה Deuteronomy 32:22, etc.), phlogizo (Jas 3:6).

Fire was regarded by primitive peoples as supernatural in origin and specially Divine. Molech, the fire-god, and other deities were worshipped by certain Canaanitish and other tribes with human sacrifices (<תֹּרֶה Deuteronomy 12:31; 2 Kings 17:31; Psalm 106:37), and, although this was specially forbidden to the Israelites (Leviticus 18:21; Deuteronomy 12:31; 18:10), they too often lapsed into the practice (<יִשָּׂא 2 Kings 16:3; 21:6; Jeremiah 7:31; Ezekiel 20:26,31).

See MOLECH; IDOLATRY.
1. LITERAL USAGE:

Fire in the Old Testament is specially associated with the Divine presence, e.g. in the making of the Covenant with Abraham (Genesis 15:17), in the burning bush (Exodus 3:2-4), in the pillar of fire (Exodus 13:21), on Sinai (Exodus 19:18), in the flame on the altar (Judges 13:20). Yahweh was “the God that answereth by fire” (1 Kings 18:24,38). In the Law, therefore, sacrifices and offerings (including incense) were to be made by fire (Exodus 12:8,9,10; Leviticus 1). Fire from Yahweh signified the acceptance of certain special and separate sacrifices (Judges 6:21; 1 Kings 18:38; I Chronicles 21:26). In Leviticus 9:24 the sacrificial fire “came forth from before Yahweh.” The altar-fire was to be kept continually burning (Leviticus 6:12,13); offering by “strange fire” (other than the sacred altar-fire) was punished by “fire from before Yahweh” (Leviticus 10:1,2). Fire came from heaven also at the consecration of Solomon’s Temple (2 Chronicles 7:1).

According to 2 Macc 1:19-22, at the time of the Captivity priests hid the sacred fire in a well, and Nehemiah found it again, in a miraculous way, for the second Temple. Later, Maccabeus is said to have restored the fire by “striking stones and taking fire out of them” (10:3).

Fire was a frequent instrument of the Divine primitive wrath (Genesis 19:24; Exodus 9:23 (lightning); Numbers 11:1; 16:35, etc.; Psalm 104:4, the American Standard Revised Version “Who maketh .... flames of fire his ministers”). Fire shall yet dissolve the world (2 Peter 3:12). It was frequently used by the Israelites as a means of destruction of idolatrous objects and the cities of their enemies (Deuteronomy 7:5,25; 12:3; 13:16; Joshua 6:24; Jgs, frequently); sometimes also of punishment (Leviticus 20:14; 21:9; Joshua 7:25; 2 Macc 7:5).

The domestic use of fire was, as among other peoples, for heating, cooking, lighting, etc., but according to the Law no fire could be kindled on the Sabbath day (Exodus 35:3). It was employed also for melting (Exodus 32:24), and refining (Numbers 31:23; 3:2,3, etc.). For the sacrificial fire wood was used as fuel (Genesis 22:3,1; Leviticus 6:12); for ordinary purposes, also charcoal (Proverbs 25:22; Isaiah 6:6, the Revised Version, margin “or hot stone”; Habakkuk 3:5, the Revised Version (British and American) “fiery bolts,” margin “or burning coals”; John 21:9, “a fire of coals” the Revised Version, margin “Gr, a fire of
charcoal” (Romans 12:20); branches (Numbers 15:32; 1 Kings 17:12); thorns (Psalm 58:9; 118:12; Ecclesiastes 7:6; Isaiah 33:12); grass and other herbage (Matthew 6:30; Luke 12:28).

2. FIGURATIVE USE:

Fire was an emblem

(1) of Yahweh in His glory (Daniel 7:9);

(2) in His holiness (Isaiah 6:4);

(3) in His jealousy for His sole worship (Deuteronomy 4:24; Hebrews 12:29; Psalm 79:5; perhaps also Isaiah 33:14);

(4) of His protection of His people (2 Kings 6:17; Zec 2:5);

(5) of His righteous judgment and purification (Zec 13:9; Malachi 3:2,3; 1 Corinthians 3:13,15);

(6) of His wrath against sin and punishment of the wicked (Deuteronomy 9:3; Psalm 18:8; 89:46; Isaiah 5:24; 30:33, “a Topheth is prepared of old”; Matthew 3:10-12; 5:22, the Revised Version (British and American) “the hell of fire,” margin “Greek, Gehenna of fire”; see Isaiah 30:33; Jeremiah 7:31; Matthew 13:40,42; 25:41, “eternal fire”; Mark 9:45-49; see Isaiah 66:24; 2 Thessalonians 1:7; Hebrews 10:27; Jude 1:7);

(7) of the word of God in its power (Jeremiah 5:14; 23:29);

(8) of Divine truth (Psalm 39:3; Jeremiah 20:9; Luke 12:49);

(9) of that which guides men (Isaiah 50:10,11); (10) of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:3); (11) of the glorified Christ (Revelation 1:14);

(12) of kindness in its melting power (Romans 12:20); (13) of trial and suffering (Psalm 66:12; Isaiah 43:2; 1 Peter 17; 4:12); (14) of evil (Proverbs 6:27; 16:27; Isaiah 9:18; 65:5); lust or desire (Hosea 7:6; Sirach 23:16; 1 Corinthians 7:9); greed (Proverbs 30:16); (15) of the tongue in its evil aspects (Jas 3:5,6);

(16) of heaven in its purity and glory (Revelation 15:2; see also 21:22,23).

W. L. Walker
FIRE BAPTISM

See BAPTISM OF FIRE; MOLECH.

FIRE, LAKE OF

See LAKE OF FIRE.

FIRE, STRANGE

See FIRE.

FIRE, UNQUENCHABLE

See UNQUENCHABLE FIRE.

FIREBRAND

<fir’-brand> ([d Va , ‘udh], used for a burning stick taken out of the fire):

In Judges 15:4,5 describing the “brands” (margin “torches”) which Samson tied to the foxes’ tails, the word is lappidh (“lamp”; see Judges 7:16,20 the Revised Version (British and American), “torches”). Other words are ziqqim, “sparks,” “flames” (fiery darts; Proverbs 26:18), and ziqoth (Isaiah 50:11); ‘udh is used figuratively of angry men (Isaiah 7:4), and of those mercifully rescued from destruction (Amos 4:11; Zec 3:2; the Revised Version (British and American) “brand”). the Revised Version (British and American) gives “firebrand” as translation of moqedh (the King James Version “hearth”) in Psalm 102:3, “My bones are burned as a firebrand” (margin “as a hearth”).

See BRAND.

W. L. Walker

FIREPAN

<fir’-pan> ([h T j m” , machtah], “firepan,” “censer,” “snuffdish,” from [h t j ; chathah], “to snatch up”): A vessel for carrying coals. Brazen firepans were part of the furnishings of the altar of burnt offerings (Exodus 27:3; 38:3, and in Numbers 4:14, where the King James Version wrongly reads “censers,” the context indicating a vessel belonging to the brazen altar).
The same word is translated “snuffdishes” in Exodus 25:38; 37:23; Numbers 4:9, where it refers to golden firepans which belonged to the golden candlestick or lamp stand, and were used to receive the burnt ends of the wicks. In 1 Kings 7:50 and 2 Chronicles 4:22, although the King James Version reads “censers,” the context points to the firepans belonging to the candlestick; as also in 2 Kings 25:15 and Jeremiah 52:19, translated “firepans” in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American). A similar firepan designated by the same Hebrew word but translated “censer” was used to carry the burning coals upon which the incense was thrown and burned (Leviticus 10:1; 16:12; Numbers 16:6,17 ff).

See CENSER.

The firepan or censer of the Hebrews was doubtless similar to the censer of the Egyptians, pictures of which have been found. It consisted of a pan or pot for the coals, which was held by a straight or slightly curved long handle. The style of censer used in recent centuries, swung by three chains, came into use about the 12th century AD.

George Rice Hovey

FIRES

<firz>: In Isaiah 24:15 the King James Version translates [μυρίον μυρίων] (“lights,” especially Urim in the phrase “Urim and Thummim”) “fires.” The Revised Version (British and American), understanding the word to mean the region of light, translates “east,” which satisfies the context far better, and is adopted by many modern scholars. In Ezekiel 39:9,10 the Revised Version (British and American) has “fires”; in 39:9 “make fires” is a translation of a verb of different root; in 39:10 “fires” translates the common singular noun for fire.

FIRKIN

<fur’-kin> ([μετρητής, metretes]): The liquid measure used in John 2:6 to indicate the capacity of the water-pots mentioned in the narrative of the miracle of turning the water into wine. It is regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew bath, and thus contained about nine gallons.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.
FIRMAMENT

<fur'-ma-ment>

See ASTRONOMY. III, 3.

FIRST

<first> ([dj a, ‘echadh], [ъвра и ri’shon]; [πρῶτον, proton], [τὸ πρῶτον, to proton], [πρῶτος, protos]): Of these words, which are those most frequently used for “first,” ri’shon is from rosh, “the head, and is used for the highest, chief, etc.; also of time, the beginning, e.g. Genesis 8:13, in the first month”; in Isaiah 44:6; 48:12, it is used of Yahweh as Eternal and solely Supreme — the First and the Last (compare 41:4). Special usages are in connection with “firstborn,” “first-fruit,” etc.; proton is used of that which is first in order; but also of that which is first or chief in importance, etc. (Matthew 6:33; Jas 3:17). In 1 Timothy 1:15, Paul says Jesus came “to save sinners; of whom I am chief,” literally, “first”; the same word is used by Jesus of the “first” of the commandments (Mark 12:29); where we read in 1 Corinthians 15:3, “I delivered unto you first of all,” it is en protois (“in the foremost place”); “The first and the last” is applied to Christ as Eternal and Supreme (Revelation 1:17; 2:8; 22:13); protos is “the first day” (Matthew 26:17; Mark 16:9); in Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1,19; Acts 20:7, it is mia (“one”).

W. L. Walker

FIRST-BEGOTTEN

<first-be-got’-’-n> ([πρωτότοκος, prototokos]): This Greek word is translated in two passages in the King James Version by “first-begotten” (Hebrews 1:6; Revelation 1:5), but in all other places in the King James Version, and always in the Revised Version (British and American), by “firstborn.” It is used in its natural literal sense of Jesus Christ as Mary’s firstborn (Luke 2:7; Matthew 1:25 the King James Version); it also bears the literal sense of Jesus Christ as Mary’s firstborn (Luke 2:7; Matthew 1:25 the King James Version); it also bears the literal sense of the firstborn of the firstborn of men and animals (Hebrews 11:28). It is not used in the New Testament or Septuagint of an only child, which is expressed by monogenes (see below).
Metaphorically, it is used of Jesus Christ to express at once His relation to man and the universe and His difference from them, as both He and they are related to God. The laws and customs of all nations show that to be “firstborn” means, not only priority in time, but a certain superiority in privilege and authority. Israel is Yahweh’s firstborn among the nations (Exodus 4:22; compare Jeremiah 31:9). The Messianic King is God’s firstborn Septuagint prototokos, “the highest of the kings of the earth” (Psalm 89:27). Philo applies the word to the Logos as the archetypal and governing idea of creation. Similarly Christ, as “the firstborn of all creation” (Colossians 1:15), is not only prior to it in time, but above it in power and authority. “All things have been created through him, and unto him” (Colossians 1:16). He is “sovereign Lord over all creation by virtue of primo-geniture” (Lightfoot). It denotes His status and character and not His origin; the context does not admit the idea that He is a part of the created universe. So in His incarnation He is brought into the world as “firstborn,” and God summons all His angels to worship Him (Hebrews 1:6). In His resurrection He is “firstborn from the dead” (Colossians 1:18) or “of the dead” (Revelation 1:5), the origin and prince of life. And finally He is “firstborn among many brethren” in the consummation of God’s purpose of grace, when all the elect are gathered home. Not only is He their Lord, but also their pattern, God’s ideal Son and men are “foreordained to be conformed to (his) image” (Romans 8:29). Therefore the saints themselves, as growing in His likeness, and as possessing all the privileges of eldest sons, including the kingdom and the priesthood, may be called the “church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven” (Hebrews 12:23).

See also BEGOTTEN, and Lightfoot on Colossians 1:15.

T. Rees

FIRSTBORN; FIRSTLING

The Hebrew word denotes the firstborn of human beings as well as of animals (Exodus 11:5), while a word from the same root denotes first-fruits (Exodus 23:16). All the data point to the conclusion that among the ancestors of the Hebrews the sacrifice of the firstborn was practiced, just as the firstlings of the flocks and the first-fruits of the produce of the earth were devoted to the deity. The narrative of the
Moabite war records the sacrifice of the heir to the throne by Mesha, to Chemosh, the national god (2 Kings 3:27). The barbarous custom must have become extinct at an early period in the religion of Israel (Genesis 22:12). It was probably due to the influence of surrounding nations that the cruel practice was revived toward the close of the monarchical period (2 Kings 16:3; 17:17; 21:6; Jeremiah 7:31; Ezekiel 16:20; 23:37; Micah 6:7). Jeremiah denies that the offering of human beings could have been an instruction from Yahweh (7:31; 19:5). The prophetic conception of God had rendered such a doctrine inconceivable. Clear evidence of the spiritualization and humanization of religion among the Israelites is furnished in the replacement, at an early stage, of the actual sacrifice of the firstborn by their dedication to the service of Yahweh. At a later stage the Levites were substituted for the firstborn. Just as the firstlings of unclean animals were redeemed with money (Exodus 13:13; 34:20), for the dedication of the firstborn was substituted the consecration of the Levites to the service of the sanctuary (Numbers 3:11-13,15). On the 30th day after birth the firstborn was brought to the priest by the father, who paid five shekels for the child’s redemption from service in the temple (compare Luke 2:27; Mishna Bekhoroth viii.8). For that service the Levites were accepted in place of the redeemed firstborn (Numbers 3:45). See note. According to Exodus 22:29-31 the firstborn were to be given to Yahweh. (The firstborn of clean animals, if free from spot or blemish, were to be sacrificed after eight days, Numbers 18:16 ff.) This allusion to the sacrifice of the firstborn as part of the religion of Yahweh has been variously explained. Some scholars suspect the text, but in all probability the verse means no more than similar references to the fact that the firstborn belonged to Yahweh (Exodus 13:2; 34:19). The modifying clause, with regard to the redemption of the firstborn, has been omitted. The firstborn possessed definite privileges which were denied to other members of the family. The Law forbade the disinheriting of the firstborn (Deuteronomy 21:15-17). Such legislation, in polygamous times, was necessary to prevent a favorite wife from exercising undue influence over her husband in distributing his property, as in the case of Jacob (Genesis 25:23). The oldest son’s share was twice as large as that of any other son. When Elisha prayed for a double portion of Elijah’s spirit, he simply wished to be considered the firstborn, i.e. the successor, of the dying prophet. Israel was Yahweh’s firstborn (Exodus 4:22; compare Jeremiah 31:9 (Ephraim)). Israel, as compared with other nations, was entitled to special privileges. She occupied a unique position in virtue of
the special relationship between Yahweh and the nation. In three passages (Romans 8:29; Colossians 1:15; Hebrews 1:6), Jesus Christ is the firstborn — among many brethren (Romans 8:29); of every creature (Colossians 1:16). This application of the term to Jesus Christ may be traced back to Psalm 89:27 where the Davidic ruler, or perhaps the nation, is alluded to as the firstborn of Yahweh.

See CHILD; CIRCUMCISION; FIRST-BEGOTTEN; PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

NOTE — The custom of redeeming the firstborn son is preserved among the Jews to this day. After thirty days the father invites the “Kohen,” i.e. a supposed descendant of Aaron, to the house. The child is brought and shown to the “Kohen,” and the father declares the mother of the child to be an Israelite. If she is a “Kohen,” redemption is not necessary. The “Kohen” asks the father which he prefers, his child or the five shekels; the father answers that he prefers his son, and pays to the “Kohen” a sum equivalent to five shekels. After receiving the redemption-money, the “Kohen” puts his hands on the child’s head and pronounces the Aaronite blessing (Numbers 6:22-27).

T. Lewis

FIRST-FRUILTS

<first-fruits> ([τ γαρ ῶ οτε ῶ shith], [μυρ Β βικκυριμ]; [ἀπαρχή, aparche]. Septuagint translates re’shith by aparche, but for bikkurim it uses the word protogennemata; compare Philo 22 33): In acknowledgment of the fact that the land and all its products were the gift of Yahweh to Israel, and in thankfulness for His bounty, all the first-fruits were offered to Him. These were offered in their natural state (e.g. cereals, tree fruits, grapes), or after preparation (e.g. musk, oil, flour, dough), after which the Israelite was at liberty to use the rest (Exodus 23:19; Numbers 15:20; 18:12; Deuteronomy 26:2; Nehemiah 10:35,37). No absolute distinction can be made between re’shith and bikkurim, but re’shith seems generally to mean what is prepared by human labor, and bikkurim the direct product of Nature. The phrase “the first of the first-fruits” (Exodus 23:19; 34:26; Ezekiel 44:30), Hebrew re’shith bikkure, Greek aparchai ton protogennematon, is not quite clear. It may mean the first-ripe or the choicest of the first-fruits. The re’shith offerings were
individual, except that a re’shith of dough was to be offered as a heave offering (Numbers 15:17-21). The priest waved a re’shith of corn before the Lord on the morrow after the Sabbath in the week of unleavened bread (Leviticus23:9-11). These offerings all fell to the priest (Numbers 18:12). Bikkurim refers specially to things sown (Exodus 23:16; Leviticus2:14). At the Feast of Weeks, seven weeks after the offering of the sheaf, bikkurim of corn in the ear, parched with fire and bruised, were brought to the House of the Lord as a meal offering (Exodus 34:22-26; Leviticus2:14-16). The bikkurim also fell to the priest, except a portion which was burned as a memorial (Leviticus2:8-10,16). The beautiful ceremony of the offering of the re’shith in the House of God is described in Deuteronomy 26:1-11, and is enlarged upon in the Talmud (Bikkurim 3 2). According to the Talmud (Terumoth 4 3) a sixtieth part of the first-fruits in a prepared form was the minimum that could be offered; the more generous brought a fortieth part, and even a thirtieth. The fruits of newly planted trees were not to be gathered during the first three years; the fruits of the fourth year were consecrated to Yahweh, and from the fifth year the fruits belonged to the owner of the trees (Leviticus19:23-25). According to Mishna, `Orlah i.10, even the shells of nuts and pomegranates could not be used during the first three years as coloring matter or for the lighting of fires. It is held by some scholars that the institution of the tithe (see TITHE) is a later development from the first-fruits.

Figurative: In the Old Testament, in Jeremiah 2:3, Israel is called “the re’shith of his increase.” In the New Testament aparche is applied figuratively to the first convert or converts in a particular place (Romans 16:5; 1 Corinthians 16:15); to the Christians of that age (Jas 1:18; 2 Thessalonians 2:13, WHm), and to the 144,000 in heaven (Revelation 14:4); to Christ, as the first who rose from the dead (1 Corinthians 15:20,23); also to the blessings which we receive now through the Spirit, the earnest of greater blessings to come (Romans 8:23).

Paul Levertoff

FIRSTLING

See FIRSTBORN.
1. NATURAL HISTORY:

Fishes abound in the inland waters of Palestine as well as the Mediterranean. They are often mentioned or indirectly referred to both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, but it is remarkable that no particular kind is distinguished by name. In Leviticus 11:9-12 and Deuteronomy 14:9 f, “whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters” is declared clean, while all that “have not fins and scales” are forbidden. This excluded not only reptiles and amphibians, but also, among fishes, siluroids and eels, sharks, rays and lampreys. For our knowledge of the inland fishes of Palestine we are mainly indebted to Tristram, NHB and Fauna and Flora of Palestine; Lortet, Poissons et reptiles du Lac de Tiberiade; and Russegger, Reisen in Europa, Asien, Afrika, 1835-1841. The most remarkable feature of the fish fauna of the Jordan valley is its relationship to that of the Nile and of East Central Africa. Two Nile fishes, Chromis nilotica Hasselquist, and Clarias macracanthus Gunth., are found in the Jordan valley, and a number of other species found only in the Jordan valley belong to genera (Chromis and Hemichromis) which are otherwise exclusively African. This seems to indicate that at some time, probably in the early Tertiary, there was some connection between the Palestinian and African river systems. No fish can live in the Dead Sea, and many perish through being carried down by the swift currents of the Jordan and other streams. There are, however, several kinds of small fish which live in salt springs on the borders of the Dead Sea, springs which are as salt as the Dead Sea but which, according to Lortet, lack the magnesium chloride which is a constituent of the Dead Sea water and is fatal to the fish. Capoeta damascina Cuv. and Val., one of the commonest fishes of Syria and Palestine, has been taken by the writer in large numbers in the Arnon and other streams flowing into the Dead Sea. This is surprising in view of the fact that the Dead Sea seems to form an effective barrier between the fishes of the different streams flowing into it. The indiscriminate mention of fishes without reference to the different kinds is well illustrated by the numerous passages in which “the fishes of the sea, the birds of the heavens, and the beasts of the field,” or some equivalent expression, is used to
denote all living creatures, e.g. Genesis 1:26; 9:2; Numbers 11:22; Deuteronomy 4:18; 1 Kings 4:33; Job 12:8; Psalm 8:8; Ezekiel 38:20; Hosea 4:3; Zephaniah 1:3; 1 Corinthians 15:39.

2. JONAH’S FISH:
An unusually large shark might fulfill the conditions of Jonah’s fish (dagh, daghah; but Matthew 12:40, κῆτος, ketos, “whale” or “sea monster”). The whale that is found in the Mediterranean (Balaena australis) has a narrow throat and could not swallow a man. No natural explanation is possible of Jonah’s remaining alive and conscious for three days in the creature’s belly. Those who consider the book historical must regard the whole event as miraculous. For those who consider it to be a story with a purpose, no explanation is required.

3. FISHING:
The present inhabitants of Moab and Edom make no use of the fish that swarm in the Arnon, the Hisa and other streams, but fishing is an important industry in Galilee and Western Palestine. Now, as formerly, spear hooks and nets are employed. The fish-spear (Job 41:7) is little used. Most of the Old Testament references to nets have to do with the taking of birds and beasts and not of fishes, and, while in Habakkuk 1:15 cherem is rendered “net” and mikhmereth “drag,” it is hot clear that these and the other words rendered “net” refer to particular kinds of nets. In the New Testament, however, [σαγήνη, sagene] (Matthew 13:47), is clearly the dragnet, and [ἀμφίβληστρον, amphiblestron] (Matthew 4:18), is clearly the casting net. The word most often used is [δίκτυον, diktuon]. Though this word is from dikein, “to throw,” or “to cast,” the context in several places (e.g. Luke 5:4; John 21:11) suggests that a dragnet is meant. The dragnet may be several hundred feet long. The upper edge is buoyed and the lower edge is weighted. It is let down from a boat in a line parallel to the shore and is then pulled in by ropes attached to the two ends, several men and boys usually pulling at each end. The use of the casting net requires much skill. It forms a circle of from 10 to 20 feet in diameter with numerous small leaden weights at the circumference. It is lifted by the center and carefully gathered over the right arm. When well thrown it goes to some distance, at the same time spreading out into a wide circle. A cord may be attached to the center, but this is not always the case.
When lifted again by the center, the leads come together, dragging over the bottom, and sometimes a large number of fish may be enclosed. The novice has only to try, to realize the dexterity of the practiced fishermen.

Figurative: The fact that so many of our Lord’s disciples were fishermen lends a profound interest to their profession. Christ tells Simon and Andrew (Matthew 4:19; Mark 1:17) that He will make them fishers of men. The Kingdom of Heaven (Matthew 13:47) is likened unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which, when it was filled, they drew up on the beach; and they sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but the bad they cast away. Tristram (NHB) says that he has seen the fishermen go through their net and throw out into the sea those that were too small for the market or were considered unclean. In Jeremiah 16:16, we read: “Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith Yahweh, and they shall fish them up; and afterward I will send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the clefts of the rocks.” In the vision of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 47:9 f), the multitude of fish and the nets spread from En-gedi to En-eglaim are marks of the marvelous change wrought in the Dead Sea by the stream issuing from the temple. The same sign, i.e. of the spreading of nets (Ezekiel 26:5,14), marks the desolation of Tyre. It is a piece of broiled fish that the risen Lord eats with the Eleven in Jerusalem (Luke 24:42), and by the Sea of Galilee (John 21:13) He gives the disciples bread and fish.

Alfred Ely Day

FISHER; FISHERMAN

<fish'-er> <fish'-er-man> ([gY]" , dayyagh], [gW]" , dawwagh]; [âλεός, halieus]; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek haleeus): Although but few references to fishermen are made in the Bible, these men and their calling are brought into prominence by Jesus’ call to certain Galilee fishermen to become His disciples (Matthew 4:18,19; Mark 1:16,17). Fishermen, then as now, formed a distinct class. The strenuousness of the work (Luke 5:2) ruled out the weak and indolent. They were crude in manner, rough in speech and in their treatment of others (Luke 9:49,54; John 18:10). James and John before they became tempered by Jesus’ influence were nicknamed the “sons of thunder” (Mark 3:17). The fishermen’s exposure to all kinds of weather
made them hardy and fearless. They were accustomed to bear with patience many trying circumstances. They often toiled for hours without success, and yet were always ready to try once more (Luke 5:5; John 21:3). Such men, when impelled by the same spirit as filled their Master, became indeed “fishers of men” (Matthew 4:19; Mark 1:17).

One of the striking instances of the fulfillment of prophecy is the use by the Syrian fishermen today of the site of ancient Tyre as a place for the spreading of their nets (Ezekiel 26:5,14).

Figurative: Fish were largely used as food (Habakkuk 1:16), hence, the lamentation of the fishermen, who provided for all, typified general desolation (Isaiah 19:8). On the other hand, abundance of fish and many fishermen indicated general abundance (Ezekiel 47:10). Our modern expression, “treated like a dog,” had its counterpart in the language of the Old Testament writers, when they portrayed the punished people of Judah as being treated like fish. Yahweh would send many fishers to fish them up and put sticks or hooks through their cheeks as a fisherman strings his fish (Jeremiah 16:16; Job 41:2). Such treatment of the people of Judah is depicted on some of the Assyrian monuments.

James A. Patch

FISHER’S COAT

<kot>: This expression is found in John 21:7 where the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have “coat.” John here, after representing Peter as “naked” ([γυμνός, gumnos]), pictures him as girding on his “coat” ([ἐπενδύτης, ependutes]), literally, “upper garment,” and not at all specifically a “fisher’s coat.”

See DRESS; UPPER GARMENT etc.

FISH GATE

See JERUSALEM.

FISHHOOK

<fish'-hook> ([ח g WD י r  יס י cir dugkah], [ח K י ], chakkah]): The word “fishhooks” occurs but twice in the American Standard Revised Version
(Job 41:1; Amos 4:2). In other passages the word hook or “angle” is applied to this instrument for fishing (Isaiah 19:8; Job 41:2). The ancient Egyptian noblemen used to amuse themselves by fishing from their private fishpools with hook and line. The Egyptian monuments show that the hook was quite commonly used for catching fish. The hook is still used in Bible lands, although not as commonly as nets. It is called a cinnararat, probably from the same root as tsinnah, the plural of which is translated hooks in Amos 4:2. In Matthew 17:27, [agkistron] (literally, “fishhook”), is rendered “hook.”

James A. Patch

FISHING

Several methods of securing fish are resorted to at the present day along the seashores of Palestine. Two of these, dynamiting and poisoning with the juice of cyclamen bulbs or other poisonous plants, can be passed over as having no bearing on ancient methods.

(1) WITH HOOKS:

Some fishing is done with hooks and lines, either on poles when fishing from shore, or on trawls in deep-sea fishing. The fishhooks now used are of European origin, but bronze fishhooks of a very early date have been discovered. That fishing with hooks was known in Jesus’ time is indicated by the Master’s command to Peter (Matthew 17:27).

See FISHHOOK.

(2) WITH SPEARS:

Job 41:7 probably refers to an instrument much like the barbed spear still used along the Syrian coast. It is used at night by torchlight.

(3) WITH NETS:

In the most familiar Bible stories of fisherman life a net was used. Today most of the fishing is done in the same way. These nets are homemade. Frequently one sees the fishermen or members of their families making nets or repairing old ones during the stormy days when fishing is impossible.

Nets are used in three ways:
(a) A circular net, with small meshes and leaded around the edge, is cast from the shore into the shallow water in such a manner that the leaded edge forms the base of a cone, the apex being formed by the fisherman holding the center of the net in his hand. The cone thus formed encloses such fish as cannot escape the quick throw of the fisher.

(b) A long net or seine of one or two fathoms depth, leaded on one edge and provided with floats on the other, is payed out from boats in such a way as to surround a school of fish. Long ropes fastened to the two ends are carried ashore many yards apart, and from five to ten men on each rope gradually draw in the net. The fish are then landed from the shallow water with small nets or by hand. This method is commonly practiced on the shore of the Sea of Galilee.

(c) In deeper waters a net similar to that described above, but four or five fathoms deep, is cast from boats and the ends slowly brought together so as to form a circle. Men then dive down and bring one portion of the weighted edge over under the rest, so as to form a bottom. The compass of the net is then narrowed, and the fish are emptied from the net into the boat. Sometimes the net with the fish enclosed is towed into shallow water before drawing. The above method is probably the one the disciples used (Matthew 4:18; Mark 1:16; Luke 5:2-10; John 21:3-11). Portions of nets with leads and floats, of early Egyptian origin, may be seen in the British Museum.

See NET.

The fishermen today usually work with their garments girdled up about their waists. Frequently they wear only a loose outer garment which is wet much of the time. This garment can be quickly removed by pulling it over the head. When occasion requires the fisherman to jump into the sea. If methods have not changed, Peter had probably just climbed back into the boat after adjusting the net for drawing when he learned that it was Jesus who stood on the shore. He was literally naked and pulled on his coat before he went ashore (John 21:7).

James A. Patch
FISHPOLS

\textit{<fish'-pools>}: This is a mistranslation. The Hebrew \(\text{תָּוֹקְרֹת} \) \(\text{(Song of Solomon 7:4)}\) simply means “pools” (Revised Version); “fish” is quite unwarrantably introduced in the King James Version. In \(\text{יִשָּׂאֲנָא} \) Isaiah 19:10, again, instead of “all that make sluices and ponds for fish” (the King James Version), we should certainly read, with the Revised Version (British and American), “All they that work for hire shall be grieved in soul.”

FIT, FITLY

\textit{<fit'-li>}: The word “fit” (adjective and verb) occurs a few times, representing nearly as many Hebrew and Greek words. the Revised Version (British and American) frequently alters, as in Leviticus 16:21 (\(\text{יִתְיָה}, \) “timely,” “opportunie,” “ready”), where for “fit” it reads “in readiness,” margin “appointed.” In \(\text{יהוּה} \) 1 Chronicles 7:11 the Revised Version (British and American) has “that were able”; in \(\text{יִשָּׂא} \) Isaiah 44:13, “shapeth”; in \(\text{יִשָּׂא} \) Proverbs 24:27, “ready,” etc. “Fitly” in \(\text{יִשָּׂא} \) Proverbs 25:11 is in the Revised Version, margin “in due season”; in \(\text{יִשָּׂא} \) Song of Solomon 5:12, “fitly set” is in the Revised Version, margin “sitting by full streams.” In the New Testament “fit” is the translation of euthetos, “well placed” (\(\text{לֵו} \) Luke 9:62; 14:35), of \(\text{קָתֵכון} \), “suitable” (\(\text{אָמִס} \) Acts 22:22), and of \(\text{כָּתָרִזְזָו} \), “to make quite ready” (\(\text{רומ} \) Romans 9:22, “vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction”).

W. L. Walker

FITCHES

\textit{<fich'-iz>} (the English word “fitch” is the same as “vetch”):

\(\text{1} [\text{יָח} \text{א} \text{א}, \text{קֵטָצָח}] \) (\(\text{יִשָּׂא} \) Isaiah 28:25,27; the Revised Version, margin has “black cummin” (\(\text{בָּנָאֵל} \) Nigella sativa)). This is the “nutmeg flower,” an annual herb (Natural Order, \(\text{Ranunculaceae} \)), the black seeds of which are sprinkled over some kinds of bread in Palestin. They were used as a condiment by the ancient Greeks and Romans. These seeds have a warm aromatic flavor and are carminative in their properties, assisting digestion. They, like all such plants which readily yield their seed, are still beaten out with rods. The contrast between the stouter staff for the “fitches” and the
lighter rod for the cummin is all the more noticeable when the great similarity of the two seeds is noticed.

(2) [מַמִּיס קְסֵסֶים] (pl.) (Ezekiel 4:9) the Revised Version (British and American) “spelt” (which see).

E. W. G. Masterman

**FIVE**

&lt;fīv&gt; ([מֶּה; chamesh]; [πέντε, pente]).

*See NUMBER.*

**FLAG**

Two Hebrew words:

(1) [כֻפֶּה, cuph] (Exodus 2:3,1, “flags”; Isaiah 19:6, “flags”; Jonah 2:5, “weeds”). This is apparently a general name which includes both the fresh-water weeds growing along a river bank and “seaweeds.” The Red Sea was known as *Yam cuph*.

(2) [אַחֵך, ‘achu] (Genesis 41:2,18, the King James Version “meadow,” the Revised Version (British and American) “reed-grass”; Job 8:11, “Can the rush grow up without mire? Can the flag (margin “reed-grass”) grow without water?”). Some such general term as “sedges” or “fens” would better meet the requirements.

**FLAGON**

&lt;flag’-un&gt;: The translation of [חַ יִשָּׁה] ‘ashishah], in the King James Version in 2 Samuel 6:19; 1 Chronicles 16:3; Song of Solomon 2:5; Hosea 3:1. In all, these passages the Revised Version (British and American) reads “cake of raisins” or “raisins.” It was probably a pressed raisin cake. the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) read “flagons,” in Isaiah 22:24 as a rendering of [בָּנָה] *nebhalim*, which is elsewhere (1 Samuel 1:24; 10:3; 2 Samuel 16:1, etc.) rendered “bottles,” the Revised Version, margin “skins.” These were the bags or bottles made of the whole skin of a kid, goat or other animal. the Revised Version (British and American) has “flagons” in Exodus
25:29 and 37:16 as translation of [т ω q] qeshawoth, a golden jug or jar used in the tabernacle from which the drink offerings were poured out. The same word is translated “cups” in Numbers 4:7.

George Rice Hovey

FLAKE

<flak> ([l ʰ m” , mappal], a word of uncertain meaning): It is used in the sense of “refuse (husks) of the wheat” in Amos 8:6. With regard to the body we find it used in Job 41:23 in the description of leviathan (the crocodile): “The flakes of his flesh are joined together: they are firm upon him; they cannot be moved.” Baethgen in Kautzsch’s translation of the Old Testament translates “Wampen,” i.e. the collops or lateral folds of flesh and armored skin. A better translation would perhaps be: “the horny epidermic scales” of the body, differentiated from the bony dermal scutes of the back (Hebrew “channels of shields,” “courses of scales”), which are mentioned in Job 41:15 margin.

H. L. E. Luering

FLAME

<flam> ([b h ” l” , lahabh], and other forms from same root; [φλόξ, phlox]): In Judges 13:20 bis; Job 41:21; Isaiah 29:6; Joel 2:5, the word is lahabh. Various other words are translated “flame”; mas’eth, “a lifting or rising up” (Judges 20:38,40 the King James Version), the Revised Version (British and American) “cloud” (of smoke); kalil, “completeness” (Judges 20:40b King James Version margin, “a holocaust, or offering wholly consumed by fire”; compare Leviticus6:15); shalhebheth (Job 15:30; Song of Solomon 8:6; the American Standard Revised Version “a very flame of Yahweh,” margin “or, a most vehement flame”; Ezekiel 20:47, the Revised Version (British and American) “the flaming flame”); shabhibh (Job 18:5; the Revised Version, margin); shebhibh, Aramaic (Daniel 3:22; 7:9). In Psalm 104:4 the American Standard Revised Version has “maketh .... flames of fire his ministers”; the Revised Version (British and American) “flame” for “snare” (Proverbs 29:8).

Figuratively: “Flame” is used to denote excitement (Proverbs 29:8 the Revised Version (British and American)), shame, astonishment, “faces of
flame” (Isaiah 13:8); in Revelation 1:14, the glorified Christ is described as having eyes “as a flame of fire,” signifying their searching purity (compare 2:18; 19:12). Flame is also a symbol of God’s wrath (Psalm 83:14; Isaiah 5:24; 10:17).

See also FIRE.

W. L. Walker

FLAT NOSE

([μρέ; charum]; Septuagint [κολοβόριν, koloborin]): Used only in Leviticus 21:18 as the name of a deformity which disqualified a member of a priestly family for serving the altar. The root of the word signifies “to cut off” or “to cut flat,” and in the Revised Version, margin “slit nose” is substituted. The condition indicated is most probably the depressed, flattened nose which so often accompanies harelip, especially in its double form. A mere snub-nose can scarcely be regarded as a blemish of sufficient importance to unfit a priest for the service of “offering the bread of God”; but harelip, like blindness or the other congenital malformations or deformities enumerated in this passage, might well render a son of Aaron unfit or unsuitable for public religious duty.

Alexander Macalister

FLAX

<flaks> [t v P, pesheth], also [ḥ T y P i pishtah]; [λίβον, linon] (Matthew 12:20): The above Hebrew words are applied

(1) to the plant: “The flax was in bloom” (the King James Version “bolled”; Exodus 9:31);

(2) the “stalks of flax,” literally, “flax of the tree,” put on the roof to dry (Joshua 2:6);

(3) to the fine fibers used for lighting: the King James Version “tow,” “flax,” the Revised Version (British and American). “A dimly burning wick will he not quench” (Isaiah 42:3); “They are quenched as a wick” (Isaiah 43:17). The thought is perhaps of a scarcely lighted wick just kindled with difficulty from a spark.
(4) In Isaiah 19:9 mention is made of “combed flax,” i.e. flax hackled ready for spinning (compare Hosea 2:5,9; Proverbs 31:13). The reference in Judges 15:14 is to flax twisted into cords.

(5) In Judges 16:9; Isaiah 1:31, mention is made of [t [ o] ne`oreth], “tow,” literally, something “shaken off” — as the root implies — from flax.

(6) The plural form pishtim is used in many passages for linen, or linen garments, e.g. Leviticus 13:47,48,52,59; Deuteronomy 22:11; Jeremiah 13:1 (“linen girdle”); Ezekiel 44:17 f. Linen was in the earliest historic times a favorite material for clothes. The Jewish priestly garments were of pure linen. Egyptian mummies were swathed in linen. Several other Hebrew words were used for linen garments.

See LINEN.

Flax is the product of Linum usitatissimum, a herbaceous plant which has been cultivated from the dawn of history. It is perennial and grows to a height of 2 to 3 ft.; it has blue flowers and very fibrous stalks. The tough fibers of the latter, after the decay and removal of the softer woody and gummy material, make up the crude “flax.” Linseed, linseed oil and oilcake are useful products of the same plant.

E. W. G. Masterman

FLAYING

See PUNISHMENTS.

FLEA

<i>fla’-ing</i>.

See GNAT; LICE): In 1 Samuel 24 Saul seeks David in the wilderness of En-gedi, and David, after cutting off the skirt of Saul’s robe in the cave, calls out to him, “After whom is the king of Israel come out? after whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea” (24:14). Again in 1 Samuel
26:20 Saul seeks David in the wilderness of Ziph, and David after taking the spear and cruse from beside Saul while he slept, cries out to him, “.... the king of Israel is come out to seek a flea, as when one doth hunt a partridge in the mountains.” The flea is here used as a symbol of David’s insignificance, coupled perhaps, in the second passage, with a thought of the difficulty that Saul had in laying hands on him. In Encyclopedia Biblica Cheyne finds fault with a similar interpretation given in DB on the ground that it is absurd that David should refer to hunting “a single flea,” and proposes to change par`osh ‘echadh “a flea,” to pere’ midhbar, “wild ass of the desert.” The writer will only say that no observant resident of Palestine would consider the textual alteration to be called for.

Linnaeus recognized two species of flea, Pulex irritans, the common parasite of man, and Pulex (Sarcopsylla) penentrans, the tropical and sub-tropical jigger flea. More than a hundred species are now listed, and the recent discovery that certain fleas are instrumental in the transmission of the plague has given a new impetus to the study of these tiny pests. A flea that is often commoner in houses than Pulex irritans is the “dog and cat flea,” variously known as Pulex serraticeps, Pulex canis, Pulex felis or Ctenocephalus canis.

Alfred Ely Day

FLEE

<fle>.

See FLY.

FLEECE

<fles>.

See GIDEON; SHEEP; WOOL.

FLESH

[r c B; basar], [r a e] she’er]):

1. ETYMOLOGY:

Used in all senses of the word, the latter, however, most frequently in the sense of kin, family, relationship (compare [h r a y” , sha’arah], “kins-
woman,” Leviticus 18:17): Leviticus 18:6; 25:49; Proverbs 11:17; Jeremiah 51:35, and probably Psalm 73:26. In all other places she’er means “flesh” = body (Proverbs 5:11) or = food (Psalm 78:20,27; Micah 3:2,3). [םַּר חַי [Tibhchah], is “(slaughtered) flesh for food,” “butcher’s meat” (1 Samuel 25:11). The word [ר פ ו א, ‘eshpar], found only in two parallel passages (2 Samuel 6:19 = 1 Chronicles 16:3), is of very uncertain meaning. The English versions translate it with “a good piece (portion) of flesh,” the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) with “a piece of roast meat,” others with “a portion of flesh” and “a measure of wine.” It probably means simply “a measured portion.” [מ י ל” , מ וי ל” , lachum], literally, “eaten,” then food (compare [מ י ] , lechem), “bread”), has been rarely specialized as flesh or meat (compare Arabic lachm, “meat,” “flesh,” so in Zephaniah 1:17, where it stands in parallelism with “blood”). The Greek terms are [σάρξ, sarx], and [κρέας, kreas], the latter always meaning “butcher’s meat” (Romans 14:21; 1 Corinthians 8:13).

We can distinguish the following varieties of meaning in Biblical language:

2. ORDINARY SENSE:

In a physical sense, the chief substance of the animal body, whether used for food and sacrifice, or not; also the flesh of man (Genesis 2:21; Exodus 21:10 m; Isaiah 31:3; Ezekiel 23:20; 1 Corinthians 15:39; Revelation 19:18,21).

3. THE BODY:

The whole body. This meaning is the extension of the preceding (pars pro toto). This is indicated by the Septuagint, where basar is often translated by the plural [αἱ σάρκες, hai sarkes] (Genesis 40:19; Numbers 12:12; Job 33:25), and occasionally by [σῶμα, soma], i.e. “body” (Leviticus 15:2; 1 Kings 21:27). This meaning is also very clear in passages like the following: Exodus 4:7; Leviticus 17:14; Numbers 8:7; 2 Kings 4:34; Proverbs 5:11, where basar and she’er are combined; and Proverbs 14:30; Ecclesiastes 12:12.
4. THE TERM “ALL FLESH”:

Flesh, as the common term for living things, animals and men, especially the latter (Genesis 6:13,17,19; Numbers 16:22; Jeremiah 12:12; Mark 13:20); often in the phrase “all flesh” (Psalm 65:2; Isaiah 40:5,6; Jeremiah 25:31; Ezekiel 20:48; Joel 2:28; Luke 3:6).

5. AS OPPOSED TO THE SPIRIT:

Flesh as opposed to the spirit, both of which were comprised in the preceding meaning (Genesis 6:3; Psalm 16:9; Luke 24:39, where “flesh and bones” are combined; John 6:63). Thus we find in John 1:14, “The Word became flesh”; 1 Timothy 3:16, “He who was manifested in the flesh”; 1 John 4:2, and all passages where the incarnation of Christ is spoken of. The word in this sense approaches the meaning of “earthly life,” as in Philippians 1:22,24, “to live in the flesh,” “to abide in the flesh”; compare Philem 1:16 and perhaps 2 Corinthians 5:16. Under this meaning we may enumerate expressions such as “arm of flesh” (2 Chronicles 32:8; Jeremiah 17:5), “eyes of flesh” (Job 10:4), etc. Frequently the distinction is made to emphasize the weakness or inferiority of the flesh, as opposed to the superiority of the spirit (Isaiah 31:3; Matthew 26:41; Mark 14:38; Romans 6:19). In this connection we mention also the expression “flesh and blood,” a phrase borrowed from rabbinical writings and phraseology (see also Sirach 14:18, “the generation of flesh and blood,” and 17:31, “man whose desire is flesh and blood” the King James Version). The expression does not convey, as some have supposed, the idea of inherent sinfulness of the flesh (a doctrine borrowed by Gnostic teachers from oriental sources), but merely the idea of ignorance and frailty in comparison with the possibilities of spiritual nature. The capabilities of our earthly constitution do not suffice to reveal unto us heavenly truths; these must always come to us from above. So Peter’s first recognition of the Divine sonship of Jesus did not proceed from a logical conviction based upon outward facts acting upon his mind, but was based upon a revelation from God vouchsafed to his inner consciousness. Christ says therefore to him: “Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven” (Matthew 16:17). Similarly the kingdom of God, being a realm of perfect spiritual submission to God, cannot be inherited by flesh and blood (1 Corinthians 15:50), nor was the richly endowed mind a competent tribunal to which Paul could refer his heaven-wrought
conviction of his great salvation and the high calling to be a witness and
apostle of Christ, so he did well that he “conferred not with flesh and
blood” (Galatians 1:16). That “flesh and blood” does not imply a sense
of inherent sinfulness is moreover shown in all passages where Christ is
declared a partaker of such nature (Ephesians 6:12; Hebrews 2:14,
where, however, we find in the original text the inverted phrase “blood and
flesh”).

6. APPLIED TO THE CARNAL NATURE:

Flesh in the sense of carnal nature ([σάρκικος, sarkikos], “carnal”; the
King James Version uses sarkinos in Romans 7:14). Human nature,
being inferior to the spiritual, is to be in subjection to it. If man refuses to
be under this higher law, and as a free agent permits the lower nature to
gain an ascendancy over the spirit, the “flesh” becomes a revolting force
(Genesis 6:3, 12; John 1:13; Romans 7:14; 1 Corinthians 3:1, 3; Colossians 2:18; 1 John 2:16). Thus, the fleshly or carnal mind,
i.e. a mind in subjection to carnal nature, is opposed to the Divine spirit,
who alone is a sufficient corrective, Christ having secured for us the power
of overcoming (Romans 8:3), if we manifest a deep desire and an
earnest endeavor to overcome (Galatians 5:17,18).

7. IN THE SENSE OF RELATIONSHIP:

Flesh in the sense of relationship, tribal connection, kith and kin. For
examples, see what has been said above on Hebrew she’er. The following
passages are a few of those in which basar is used: Genesis 2:24; 37:27;
Job 2:5; compare the New Testament passages: Matthew 19:5,6;
Romans 1:3; 9:3,5,8. The expressions “bone” and “flesh” are found in
combination (Genesis 2:23; 29:14; Judges 9:2; 2 Samuel 5:1; 19:12,13; Ephesians 5:31, the latter in some manuscripts only).

8. OTHER MEANINGS:

Some other subdivisions of meanings might be added, for example where
“flesh” takes almost the place of “person,” as in Colossians 2:1: “as
many as have not seen my face in the flesh,” i.e. have not known me
personally, or 2:5, “absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit,” etc.

H. L. E. Luering
FLESH AND BLOOD

See FLESH, 5.

FLESH-HOOK

<fl‘h’k> ([ɡ l e’zn” , mazlegh], and plural [t wɔl zɔni mizlaghoth]): One of the implements used around the sacrificial altar. According to Divine direction given to Moses (Exodus 27:3; 38:3), it was to be made of brass, but later David felt impelled by “the Spirit” or “in his spirit” to determine that for use in the magnificent Temple of Solomon it should be made of gold (1 Chronicles 28:17). But Huram made it, with other altar articles, of “bright brass” (2 Chronicles 4:16). In Samuel’s time, it was made with three hook-shaped tines, and was used in taking out the priests’ share of the meat offering (1 Samuel 2:13,14). With the other altar utensils, it was in the special charge of the Kohathites (Numbers 4:14). The hooks mentioned in Ezekiel 40:43 were altogether different and for another purpose.

See HOOK.

Leonard W. Doolan

FLESH-POT

<fl‘p’> ([r c B h” rys ᵀ i cir ha-basar], “pot of the flesh”): One of the six kinds of cooking utensils spoken of as pots or pans or caldrons or basins. Probably usually made of bronze or earthenware. The only mention of flesh-pots, specifically so named, is in Exodus 16:3.

See FOOD.

FLIES

<fliz>.

See FLY.

FLINT

<flnt> ([v yml j ” , challamish] (Deuteronomy 8:15; 32:13; Job 28:9; Psalm 114:8), [r x tsor] (Exodus 4:25; Ezekiel 3:9), [r x e
tsur] (Isaiah 5:28), [t wsz, tsur] (Job 22:24; Psalm 89:43), [tsurim] (Joshua 5:2 f); (κόχλαξ, = κόχλης, kechlex “pebble”), [kochlax] (1 Macc 10:73): The word challamish signifies a hard stone, though not certainly flint, and is used as a figure for hardness in Isaiah 50:7, “Therefore have I set my face like a flint.” A similar use of [tsor] is found in Ezekiel 3:9, “As an adamant harder than flint have I made thy forehead,” and Isaiah 5:28, “Their horses’ hoofs shall be accounted as flint”; and of tsela` in Jeremiah 5:3, “They have made their faces harder than a rock.” The same three words are used of the rock from which Moses drew water in the wilderness: challamish (Deuteronomy 8:15; Psalm 114:8); tsur (Exodus 17:6; Deuteronomy 8:15; Psalm 78:20; Isaiah 48:21); cela` (Numbers 20:8, Nehemiah 9:15; Psalm 78:16). Tsur and cela` are used oftener than challamish for great rocks and cliffs, but tsur is used also for flint knives in Exodus 4:25, “Then Zipporah took a flint (the King James Version “sharp stone”), and cut off the foreskin of her son,” and in Joshua 5:2 f, “Yahweh said unto Joshua, Make thee knives of flint (the King James Version “sharp knives”), and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time.” Surgical implements of flint were used by the ancient Egyptians, and numerous flint chippings with occasional flint implements are found associated with the remains of early man in Syria and Palestine. Flint and the allied mineral, chert, are found in great abundance in the limestone rocks of Syria, Palestine and Egypt.

See ROCK.

Alfred Ely Day

FLOAT (FLOTE)

See RAFT; SHIPS AND BOATS

FLOCK

See CATTLE.

FLOOD

: In the King James Version not less than 13 words are rendered “flood,” though in the Revised Version (British and American) we find in
some passages “river,” “stream,” “tempest,” etc. The word is used for: the
deluge of Noah, [ল্যাটিন "m" , mabbul] (בַּ֣בּ ָלֶ֥) Genesis 6:17 ff); [κατακλυσμός, kataklusmos] (κατακλυσμός Matthew 24:38,39; Luke 17:27); the waters of the
Red Sea, [ס " n; nazal] (בֵּית הָעָם Exodus 15:8); the Euphrates, nahar, “Your
fathers dwelt of old time on the other side of the flood”. (the Revised
Version (British and American) “beyond the River” Joshua 24:2): the
Nile, [ר " n; ye’or], “the flood (the Revised Version (British and
American) “River”) of Egypt” (גּוֹמֵר Amos 8:8); the Jordan, [ר ה n; nahar],
“They went through the flood (the Revised Version (British and American)
“river”) on foot” (בט שלם Psalm 66:6); torrent, [ם " z, zerem], “as a flood (the
Revised Version (British and American) “tempest”) of mighty waters”
(גּוֹמֵר Isaiah 28:2); [ποταμός, potamos], “The rain descended and the floods
came” (מַתָּם Matthew 7:25); [πλημμυρά, plemmura], “When a flood arose,
the stream brake against that house” (לְוִי Luke 6:48).

Figurative: [ס " n, nachal], “The floods of ungodly men (the Revised
Version (British and American) “ungodliness,” the Revised Version,
margin “Hebrew Belial”) made me afraid” (ר א 0 ‘or) (גּוֹמֵר 2 Samuel 22:5; Psalm
18:4); also [ר א 0 ‘or] (גּוֹמֵר Amos 8:8 (the King James Version)); [ט ל fi shibboleth] (גּוֹמֵר Psalm 69:2); [ט f y, sheTeph] (דניאֵל Daniel 11:22 (the King
James Version)); [ט f y 0 sheTeph] (דניאֵל Psalm 32:6 (the King James
Version)); [ποταμοφόρητος, potamophoretos] (רәv 12:15 (the
King James Version)).

See DELUGE OF NOAH.

Alfred Ely Day

FLOOR
<flor>.

See HOUSE; THRESHING-FLOOR

FLOTE (FLOAT)

See RAFT; SHIPS AND BOATS.

FLOUR
<flour>. 
See BREAD; FOOD.

**FLOURISH**

<flur'-ish> ([r " P; parach], [6Wk, tsuts]; [αναθάλλω, anathallo]): The translation of parach, “to break forth” (Psalm 72:7; 92:12,13; Proverbs 14:11; Isaiah 66:14; Song of Solomon 6:11; 7:12; the Revised Version (British and American) “budded”); of tsuts “to bloom” (Psalm 72:16, 90:6; 92:7; 103:15; 132:18); ra`anan, “green,” “fresh,” is translated “flourishing” in Psalm 92:14, the Revised Version (British and American) “green,” and ra`anan, Aramaic in Daniel 4:4; nubh, “to sprout” (Zec 9:17, the King James Version “cheerful”).

In an interesting passage (Ecclesiastes 12:5 the King James Version), the Hiphil future of na`ats, meaning properly “to pierce or strike,” hence, to slight or reject, is translated “flourish”; it is said of the old man “The almond tree shall flourish,” the Revised Version (British and American) “blossom” (so Ewald, Delitzsch, etc.); na`ats has nowhere else this meaning; it is frequently rendered “contemn;” “despise,” etc. Other renderings are, “shall cause loathing” (Gesenius, Knobel, etc.), “shall be despised,” i.e. the hoary head; “The almond tree shall shake off its flowers,” the silvery hairs falling like the fading white flowers of the almond tree; by others it is taken to indicate “sleeplessness,” the name of the almond tree (shaqedh) meaning the watcher or early riser (compare Jeremiah 1:11, “a rod of an almond-tree,” literally, “a wakeful (or early) tree”), the almond being the first of the trees to wake from the sleep of winter.

See ALMOND.

“Flourish” appears once only in the New Testament, in the King James Version, as translation of anathallo, “to put forth anew,” or “to make put forth anew” (Philippians 4:10): “Your care for me hath flourished again,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Ye have revived your thought for me.”

W. L. Walker

**FLOWERS**

<flou’-erz> (BLOOM, BLOSSOM, etc.):
(1) gibh’ol, literally, “a small cup,” hence, calyx or corolla of a flower (Exodus 9:31, “The flax was in bloom”).

(2) Genesis 40:10, nitstsah, “a flower” or “blossom”; Job 15:33; Isaiah 18:5. These words are used of the early berries of the vine or olive.

(3) nitstsan, “a flower”; plural only, nitstsanim (Song of Solomon 2:12, “The flowers appear on the earth”).

(4) perach, root to “burst forth” expresses an early stage of flowering; “blossom” (Isaiah 5:24; 18:5); “flower” (Nahum 1:4, “The flower of Lebanon languisheth”). Used of artificial flowers in candlesticks (Exodus 25:31 ff).

(5) Isaiah 40:6; plural tsitstsim, flowers as architectural ornaments (1 Kings 6:18); tsitsah, “the fading flower of his glorious beauty” (Isaiah 28:1,4; also Numbers 17:8; Job 14:2, etc.).

(6) anthos, in Septuagint equivalent of all the Hebrew words (Jas 1:10,11; 1 Peter 1:24).

The beauty of the profusion of flowers which cover Palestine every spring receives but scant reference in the Old Testament; Song of Solomon 2:12 is perhaps the only clear reference. It is noticeable that the native of Syria thinks little of flowers unless it be for their perfume. Our Lord’s reference to the flowers (“lilies”) is well known (Matthew 6:28; Luke 12:27). For details of the flowers of modern Palestine, see BOTANY. The aptness of the expression “flower of the field” for a type of the evanescence of human life (Job 14:2; Psalm 103:15; Isaiah 40:6; Jas 1:10) is the more impressive in a land like Palestine where the annual display of wild flowers, so glorious for a few short weeks, is followed by such desolation. The fresh and brilliant colors fade into masses of withered leaves (not uncommonly cleared by burning), and then even these are blown, away, so that but bare, cracked and baked earth remains for long months where once all was beauty, color and life.

E.W.G. Masterman
FLUE; NET

See FISH; FISHING.

FLUTE

See MUSIC.

FLUX

See BLOODY FLUX; DYSENTERY.

FLY; FLIES

[br ṭ ; `arobh] (Exodus 8:21 ff; Psalm 78:45; 105:31; Septuagint [κυνόμυια, kunomuia]; “dog-fly”), [ב ו z] zebhubh [Ecclesiastes 10:1; Isaiah 7:18; Septuagint [μυιαί, muiai], “flies”); compare [ב ומ] [ ב”, ba`al-zebhubh], “Baal-zebub” (2 Kings 1:2 ff), and [βεελζεβούλ, beelzeboul], “Beelzebul,” or [βεελζεβούβ, beelzeboub], “Beelzebub” (Matthew 10:25; 12:24,27; Luke 11:15,18,19); compare Arabic dhubab, “fly” or “bee”; (Note: dh for Arabic dhal, pronounced like d or z or like th in “the”): The references in Psalms as well as in Exodus are to the plague of flies, and the word `arobh is rendered “swarm of flies” throughout, except in Psalm 78:45; 105:31 the King James Version, where we find “divers sorts of flies” (compare Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) omne genus muscarum). In Exodus 8:21 we read, “I will send swarms of flies upon thee, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people, and into thy houses: and the houses of the Egyptians shall be full of swarms of flies, and also the ground whereon they are”; in Exodus 8:24, .... “the land was corrupted by reason of the swarms of flies”; in Psalm 78:45, “He sent among them swarms of flies, which devoured them.” There has been much speculation as to what the insects were, but all the texts cited, including even Psalm 78:45, may apply perfectly well to the common house fly (Musca domestica). Some species of blue-bottle fly (Calliphora) might also suit.
The other word, *zebhubbh*, occurs in<br><sup>211001</sup>Ecclesiastes 10:1, “Dead flies cause the oil of the perfumer to send forth an evil odor; so doth a little folly outweigh wisdom and honor”; and<br><sup>230718</sup>Isaiah 7:18, “And it shall come to pass in that day, that Yahweh will hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria:”<br><br>The house fly would fit perfectly the reference in each, but that in Isaiah would seem to suggest rather one of the horse flies (*Tabanidae*) or gad flies (*Oestridae*). Whatever fly may be meant, it is used as a symbol for the military power of Egypt, as the bee for that of Assyria.<br><br>Owing to deficiencies in public and private hygiene, and also for other reasons, house flies and others are unusually abundant in Palestine and Egypt and are agents in the transmission of cholera, typhoid fever, ophthalmia and anthrax. Glossina morsitans, the tsetse fly, which is fatal to many domestic animals, and Glossina palpalis which transmits the sleeping sickness, are abundant in tropical Africa, but do not reach Egypt proper.<br><br>See *PLAGUES.*

**FLY**

(Verb; [ת ו, `uph] [πετάομαι, *petaomai*], or, contracted, *ptaomai*): Used in preference to “flee” when great speed is to be indicated. “To fly” is used:<br><br>(1) Literally, of birds, `uph` (<sup>010120</sup>Genesis 1:20; <sup>0556</sup>Psalm 55:6); *da’ah* (<sup>2849</sup>Deuteronomy 28:49), of sparks (<sup>0707</sup>Job 5:7); of the arrow (<sup>915</sup>Psalm 91:5); of the *seraphim* (<sup>16</sup>Isaiah 6:2,6); of an angel (<sup>921</sup>Daniel 9:21, *ya’aph*, “to be caused to fly”); of swift action or movement (<sup>1810</sup>Psalm 18:10; <sup>3000</sup>Jeremiah 48:40); of people (<sup>1114</sup>Isaiah 11:14); of a fleet (<sup>608</sup>Isaiah 60:8; <sup>1519</sup>1 Samuel 15:19, `it; 14:32, `asah, “to do,” etc.).

(2) Figuratively, of a dream (<sup>208</sup>Job 20:8); of man’s transitory life (<sup>9010</sup>Psalm 90:10); of riches (<sup>235</sup>Proverbs 23:5); of national glory (<sup>911</sup>Hosea 9:11).

For “fly” the Revised Version (British and American) has “soar” (<sup>2626</sup>Job 39:26) “fly down” (<sup>1114</sup>Isaiah 11:14); for “flying” (<sup>315</sup>Isaiah 31:5) the American Standard Revised Version has “hovering.”

---

*W. L. Walker*
FOAL

<fol>.

See COLT.

FOAM

<fom> ([ת x 같이, qetseph] (Hosea 10:7); [ἀφρός, aphros] (Luke 9:39), [ἀφρίζω, aphrizo] (Mark 9:18,20), [ἐπαφρίζω, epaphrizo] (Jude 1:13)): Qetseph from qatsaph, “to break to pieces,” or “to break forth into anger,” “to be angry,” occurs often in the sense of “wrath” or “anger” (e.g. Numbers 1:53; Psalm 38:1, etc.), and in this passage has been rendered “twigs” or “chips,” “As for Samaria, her king is cut off, as foam (the Revised Version, margin “twigs”) upon the water” (Hosea 10:7). The other references are from the New Testament. In Jude, evil-doers or false teachers are compared to the “wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame.” In Mark and Luke the references are to the boy with a dumb spirit who foamed at the mouth.

Alfred Ely Day

FODDER

<fold’-er>.

See PROVENDER.

FOLD; FOLDING

<fold> <fold’-ing> (verb; [ק b” j ; chabhaq], [É b” s ; sabhakh]; [ἐλίσσω, helisso]): The verb occurs only 3 times in the King James Version, and in each instance represents a different word; we have chabhaq “to clasp” (Ecclesiastes 4:5), “The fool foldeth his hands together” (compare Proverbs 6:10); cabhak, “to interweave” (Nahum 1:10, “folded together as thorns,” the English Revised Version “like tangled thorns” the American Standard Revised Version “entangled like thorns”; see ENTANGLED); helisso “to roll or fold up” (Hebrews 1:12, quoted from Psalm 102:26 (Septuagint), the Revised Version (British and American) “As a mantle shalt thou roll them up”). Folding occurs as translation of galil, “turning” or “rolling” (1 Kings 6:34 bis, folding leaves of door).
See also HOUSE.

W. L. Walker

FOLK

<fo IPS>: The translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν πλῆθῳ, ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ le’om, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ, ἐν λαῷ “a people or nation” (Genesis 33:15, “some of the folk that are with me”; Proverbs 30:26, “The conies are but a feeble folk”); of ἐν τῷ ἐν λαῷ, with the same meaning (Jeremiah 51:58, “the folk in the fire,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the nations for the fire”); “sick folk” is the translation of ἐν τῷ ἐν λα_ISRIPS, arrhostos], “not strong” (Mark 6:5); of τῶν ἄσθενοντων, τῶν ἄσθενοντων, participle of ἄσθενεω, astheneo], “to be without strength,” “weak,” “sick” (John 5:3, the Revised Version (British and American) “them that were sick”); “sick folks,” of ἄσθενεις, astheneis] plural of ἄσθενες, asthenes], “without strength,” the Revised Version (British and American) “sick folk” (Acts 5:16).

W. L. Walker

FOLLOW

<fol’-o> ([r j " a" , ‘achar], [t d” r ; radhaph]; ἀκολουθέω, akoloutheo], [διώκω, dioko]) : Frequently the translation of ‘achar, “after,” e.g. Numbers 14:24, “hath followed me fully,” literally, “fulfilled after me” Numbers 32:11,12; Deuteronomy 1:36; Amos 7:15); radhaph is “to pursue,” and is often so translated; it is translated “follow” (Psalm 23:6; Isaiah 5:11, etc.); “follow after” (Genesis 44:4; Exodus 14:4); reghel, “foot,” is several times translated “follow” (literally, “at the foot of”; Exodus 11:8; Judges 8:5, etc.); halakh ‘achar, “to go after” (Deuteronomy 4:3; 1Kings 14:8, etc.); yalakh ‘achar, “to go on after” (Genesis 24:5; Judges 2:19, etc.); dabheq, “to cause to cleave to” is “follow hard after” (1 Samuel 14:22; Psalm 63:8, etc.).

In the New Testament, in addition to akoloutheo (Matthew 4:20,22,25, etc.) various words and phrases are rendered “follow,” e.g. Deute opiso mou, “Come after me” (Matthew 4:19, “Follow me,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Come ye after me”); dioko, “to pursue” (Luke 17:23; 1 Thessalonians 5:15, the Revised Version (British and American) “follow after,” etc.); mimeomai, “to imitate” (Hebrews 13:7, “whose faith follow,” the Revised Version (British and American) “imitate
their faith; 2 These 3:7,9; 3 John 1:11); compounds of akoloutheo with ex, para sun, etc. (2 Peter 1:16; Mark 16:20; Acts 16:17; Mark 5:37, etc.).

English Revised Version, “Follow after faithfulness” makes an important change in Psalm 37:3, where the King James Version has “and verily thou shalt be fed”; but the American Standard Revised Version has “feed on his faithfulness,” margin “feed securely or verily thou shalt be fed.” For “attained” (1 Timothy 4:6) the Revised Version (British and American) gives “followed until now.”

W. L. Walker

FOLLOWER

<fol'-o-er> ([μιμητής, mimetes]): “Followers” is in the King James Version the translation of mimetes, “to imitate” (in the New Testament in the good sense of becoming imitators, or following an example), rendered by the Revised Version (British and American) “imitators” (1 Corinthians 4:16; 11:1; Ephesians 5:1; 1 Thessalonians 1:6; 2:14; Hebrews 6:12); summimetai, “joint imitators” (Philippians 3:17); in 1 Peter 3:13, the King James Version “followers of that which is good,” the word, according to a better text, is zelotis, the Revised Version (British and American) “if ye be zealous of that which is good.”

FOLLY

<fol’-i>.

See FOOL.

FOOD

<food>:

In a previous article (see BREAD) it has been shown that in the Bible “bread” usually stands for food in general and how this came to be so. In a complementary article on MEALS the methods of preparing and serving food will be dealt with. This article is devoted specifically to the foodstuffs of the Orient, more especially to articles of food in use among the Hebrews in Bible times. These are divisible into two main classes.
I. VEGETABLE FOODS.

1. Primitive Habits:

Orientals in general are vegetarians, rather than flesh eaters. There is some reason to believe that primitive man was a vegetarian (see Genesis 2:16; 3:2,6). It would seem, indeed, from a comparison of Genesis 1:29 f with 9:3 f that Divine permission to eat the flesh of animals was first given to Noah after the Deluge, and then only on condition of drawing off the blood in a prescribed way (compare the kosher (kasher) meat of the Jews of today).

2. Cereals:

The chief place among the foodstuffs of Orientals must be accorded to the cereals, included in the American Standard Revised Version under the generic term “grain,” in the King James Version and the English Revised Version “corn.” The two most important of these in the nearer East are wheat (chiiTTah) and barley (se`orim). The most primitive way of using the wheat as food was to pluck the fresh ears (Leviticus23:14; 2 Kings 4:42), remove the husks by rubbing in the hands (Deuteronomy 23:25; Matthew 12:1), and eat the grains raw. A common practice in all lands and periods, observed by the fellaheen of Syria today, has been to parch or roast the ears and eat the grain not ground. This is the parched corn (the American Standard Revised Version “‘grain”) so often mentioned in the Old Testament, which with bread and vinegar (sour wine) constituted the meal of the reapers to which Boaz invited Ruth (Ruth 2:14).

Later it became customary to grind the wheat into flour (kemach), and, by bolting it with a fine sieve, to obtain the “fine flour” (coleth) of our English Versions of the Bible, which, of course, was then made into “bread” (which see), either without leaven (matstsah) or with (lechem chamets Leviticus7:13).

Meal, both of wheat and of barley, was prepared in very early times by means of the primitive rubbing-stones, which excavations at Lachish, Gezer and elsewhere show survived the introduction of the hand-mill (see MILL; Compare PEFS, 1902, 326). Barley (se`orim) has always furnished the principal food of the poorer classes, and, like wheat, has been made into bread (Judges 7:13; John 6:9,13). Less frequently millet (Ezekiel 4:9) and spelt (kuccemeth; see FITCHES) were so used. (For details of baking, bread-making, etc., see BREAD. III, 1,2,3.)
Vegetable foods of the pulse family (leguminosae) are represented in the Old Testament chiefly by lentils and beans. The pulse of Daniel 1:12 (zeroʿim) denotes edible “herbs” in general (Revised Version margin, compare Isaiah 61:11, “things that are sown”). The lentils (ʿadhashim) were and are considered very toothsome and nutritious. It was of “red lentils” that Jacob brewed his fateful pottage (Genesis 25:29,34), a stew, probably, in which the lentils were flavored with onions and other ingredients, as we find it done in Syria today. Lentils, beans, cereals, etc., were sometimes ground and mixed and made into bread (Ezekiel 4:9). I found them at Gaza roasted also, and eaten with oil and salt, like parched corn.

The children of Israel, when in the wilderness, are said to have looked back wistfully on the “cucumbers .... melons .... leeks .... onions, and the garlic” of Egypt (Numbers 11:5). All these things we find later were grown in Palestine. In addition, at least four varieties of the bean, the chick pea, various species of chockory and endive, the bitter herbs of the Passover ritual (Exodus 12:8), mustard (Matthew 13:31) and many other things available for food, are mentioned in the Mishna, our richest source of information on this subject. Cucumbers (qishshuʿim) were then, as now, much used. The oriental variety is much less fibrous and more succulent and digestible than ours, and supplies the thirsty traveler often with a fine substitute for water where water is scarce or bad. The poor in such cities as Cairo, Beirut and Damascus live largely on bread and cucumbers or melons. The cucumbers are eaten raw, with or without salt, between meals, but also often stuffed and cooked and eaten at meal time. Onions (betsalim), garlic (shummim) and leeks (chatsir) are still much used in Palestine as in Egypt. They are usually eaten raw with bread, though also used for flavoring in cooking, and, like cucumbers, pickled and eaten as a relish with meat (ZDPV, IX, 14). Men in utter extremity sometimes “plucked saltwort” (malluah) and ate the leaves, either raw or boiled, and made “the roots of the broom” their food (Job 30:4).

4. Food of Trees:

In Leviticus 19:23 f it is implied that, when Israel came into the land to possess it, they should “plant all manner of trees for food.” They doubtless found such trees in the goodly land in abundance, but in the natural course
of things needed to plant more. Many olive trees remain fruitful to extreme old age, as for example those shown the tourist in the garden of Gethsemane, but many more require replanting. Then the olive after planting requires ten or fifteen years to fruit, and trees of a quicker growth, like the fig, are planted beside them and depended on for fruit in the meantime. It is significant that Jotham in his parable makes the olive the first choice of the trees to be their king (Judges 9:9), and the olive tree to respond, “Should I leave my fatness, which God and man honor in me, and go to wave to and fro over the trees?” (American Revised Version margin). The berries of the olive (zayith) were doubtless eaten, then as now, though nowhere in Scripture is it expressly so stated. The chief use of the berries, now as ever, is in furnishing “oil” (which see), but they are eaten in the fresh state, as also after being soaked in brine, by rich and poor alike, and are shipped in great quantities. Olive trees are still more or less abundant in Palestine, especially around Bethlehem and Hebron, on the borders of the rich plains of Esdraelon, Phoenicia, Sharon and Philistia, in the vale of Shechem, the plain of Moreh, and in the trans-Jordanic regions of Gilead and Bashan. They are esteemed as among the best possessions of the towns, and the culture of them is being revived around Jerusalem, in the Jordan valley and elsewhere throughout the land. They are beautiful to behold in all stages of their growth, but especially in spring. Then they bear an amazing wealth of blossoms, which in the breeze fall in showers like snowflakes, a fact that gives point to Job’s words, “He shall cast off his flower as the olive-tree” (Job 15:33). The mode of gathering the fruit is still about what it was in ancient times (compare Exodus 27:20).

Next in rank to the olive, according to Jotham’s order, though first as an article of food, is the fig (in the Old Testament te’enah, in the New Testament suke), whose “sweetness” is praised in the parable (Judges 9:11). It is the principal shade and fruit tree of Palestine, growing in all parts, in many spontaneously, and is the emblem of peace and prosperity (Deuteronomy 8:8; Judges 9:10; 1 Kings 4:25; Micah 4:4; Zec 3:10; 1 Macc 14:12). The best fig and olive orchards are carefully plowed, first in the spring when the buds are swelling, sometimes again when the second crop is sprouting, and again after the first rains in the autumn. The “first-ripe fig” (bikkurah, Isaiah 28:4; Jeremiah 24:2), i.e. the early fig which grows on last year’s wood, was and is esteemed as a great delicacy, and is often eaten while it is young and green. The late fig (te’enim) is the kind dried in the sun and put up in quantities for use out of
season. Among the Greeks and the Romans, as well as among the
Hebrews, dried figs were most extensively used. When pressed in a mold
they formed the “cakes of figs” (debelah) mentioned in the Old Testament
(1 Samuel 25:18; 1 Chronicles 12:40), doubtless about such as are
found today in Syria and Smyrna, put up for home use and for shipment. It
was such a fig-cake that was presented as a poultice (the King James
Version “plaster”) for Hezekiah’s boil (Isaiah 38:21; compare 2 Kings
20:7). As the fruit-buds of the fig appear before the leaves, a tree full
of leaves and without fruit would be counted “barren” (Mark 11:12 f;

Grapes (‘anabhim), often called “the fruit of the vine” (Matthew
26:29), have always been a much-prized article of food in the Orient. They
are closely associated in the Bible with the fig (compare “every man under
his vine and under his fig-tree,” 1 Kings 4:25). Like the olive, the fig,
and the date-palm, grapes are indigenous to Syria, the soil and climate
being most favorable to their growth and perfection. Southern Palestine
especially yields a rich abundance of choice grapes, somewhat as in
patriarchal times (Genesis 49:11,12). J. T. Haddad, a native Syrian, for
many years in the employment of the Turkish government, tells of a variety
in the famous valley of Eshcol near Hebron, a bunch from which has been
known to weigh twenty-eight pounds (compare Numbers 13:23). Of the
grapevine there is nothing wasted; the young leaves are used as a green
vegetable, and the old are fed to sheep and goats. The branches cut off in
pruning, as well as the dead trunk, are used to make charcoal, or for
firewood. The failure of such a fruit was naturally regarded as a judgment
from Yahweh (Psalm 105:33; Jeremiah 5:17; Hosea 2:12; Joel 1:7). Grapes, like figs, were both enjoyed in their natural state, and
by exposure to the sun dried into raisins (tsimmuqim), the “dried grapes”
of Numbers 6:3. In this form they were especially well suited to the use
of travelers and soldiers (1 Samuel 25:18; 1 Chronicles 12:40). The
meaning of the word rendered “raisin-cake,” the American Standard
Revised Version “a cake of raisins” (2 Samuel 6:19 and elsewhere), is
uncertain. In Bible times the bulk of the grape product of the land went to
the making of wine (which see). Some doubt if the Hebrews knew grape-
syrup, but the fact that the Aramaic dibs, corresponding to Hebrew
debhash, is used to denote both the natural and artificial honey (grape-
syrup), seems to indicate that they knew the latter (compare Genesis 43:11; Ezekiel 27:17; and see HONEY).

Less prominent was the fruit of the mulberry figtree (or sycomore) (shiqmah), of the date-palm (tamar), the dates of which, according to the Mishna, were both eaten as they came from the tree, and dried in clusters and pressed into cakes for transport; the pomegranate (tappuach), the “apple” of the King James Version (see APPLE), or quinch, according to others; the husks (Luke 15:16), i.e. the pods of the carob tree \( \kappa \epsilon \rho \alpha \tau \iota \omega \nu \), are treated elsewhere. Certain nuts were favorite articles of food — pistachio nuts (boTnim), almonds (sheqedhim) and walnuts (‘eghoz); and certain spices and vegetables were much used for seasoning: cummin (kammon), anise, dill (the King James Version) (qetsach), mint (\( \eta \delta \upsilon \sigma \mu \omicron \nu \), heduosmon) and mustard (\( \sigma \iota \nu \alpha \pi \iota \), \( \sinapi \)), which see. Salt (melach), of course, played an important part, then as now, in the cooking and in the life of the Orientals. To “eat the salt” of a person was synonymous with eating his bread (Ezr 4:14), and a “covenant of salt” was held inviolable (Numbers 18:19; 2 Chronicles 13:5).

II. ANIMAL FOOD.

Anciently, even more than now in the East, flesh food was much less used than among western peoples. In the first place, in Israel and among other Semitic peoples, it was confined by law to the use of such animals and birds as were regarded as “clean” (see CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS), or speaking according to the categories of Leviticus11:2,3; Deuteronomy 14:4-20, domestic animals and game (see Driver on Deuteronomy 14:4-20). Then the poverty of the peasantry from time immemorial has tended to limit the use of meat to special occasions, such as family festivals (chaggim), the entertainment of an honored guest (Genesis 18:7; 2 Samuel 12:4), and the sacrificical meal at the local sanctuary.

The goat (‘ez, etc.), especially the “kid of the goats” (Leviticus4:23,18 the King James Version), was more prized for food by the ancient Hebrews than by modern Orientals, by whom goats are kept chiefly for their milk — most of which they supply (compare Proverbs 27:27). For this reason they are still among the most valued possessions of rich and poor (compare Genesis 30:33; 32:14 with 1 Samuel 25:2). A kid, as less valuable
than a lamb, was naturally the readier victim when meat was required (compare Luke 15:29).

The sheep of Palestine, as of Egypt, are mainly of the fat-tailed species (Ovis aries), the tail of which was forbidden as ordinary food and had to be offered with certain other portions of the fat (Exodus 29:22; Leviticus 3:9). To kill a lamb in honor of a guest is one of the highest acts of Bedouin hospitality. As a rule only the lambs are killed for meat, and they only in honor of some guest or festive occasion (compare 1 Samuel 25:18; 1 Kings 1:19). Likewise the “calves of the herd” supplied the daintiest food of the kind, though the flesh of the neat cattle, male and female, was eaten. The “fatted calf” of Luke 15:23 will be recalled, as also the “fatlings” and the “stalled” (stall-fed) ox of the Old Testament (Proverbs 15:17). Asharp contrast suggestive of the growth of luxury in Israel is seen by a comparison of 2 Samuel 17:28 f with 1 Kings 4:22 f. The food furnished David and his hardy followers at Mahanaim was “wheat, and barley, and meal, and parched grain, and beans, and lentils, and parched pulse, and honey, and butter, and sheep, and cheese of the herd,” while the daily provision for Solomon’s table was “thirty measures of fine flour, and threescore measures of meal, ten fat oxen, and twenty oxen out of the pastures, and a hundred sheep, besides harts, and gazelles, and roebucks, and fatte fowl.” Nehemiah’s daily portion is given as “one ox and six choice sheep” (Nehemiah 5:18).

Milk of large and small animals was a staple article of food (Deuteronomy 32:14; Proverbs 27:27). It was usually kept in skins, as among the Syrian peasants it is today (Judges 4:19). We find a generic term often used (chem’ah) which covers also cream, clabber and cheese (Proverbs 30:33). The proper designation of cheese is gebhinah (Job 10:10), but chalabh also is used both for ordinary milk and for a cheese made directly from sweet milk (compare 1 Samuel 17:18, charitse hechalabh, and our “cottage cheese”).

See MILK.

Honey (debash, nopheth ha-tsuphim), so often mentioned with milk, is ordinary bees’ honey (see HONEY). The expression “honey” in the combination debash wechalabh, for which Palestine was praised, most likely means debash temarim, i.e. “date-juice.” It was much prized and
relished (Psalm 19:10; Proverbs 16:24), and seems to have been a favorite food for children (Isaiah 7:15).

Of game seven species are mentioned (Deuteronomy 14:5). The gazelle and the hart were the typical animals of the chase, much prized for their flesh (Deuteronomy 12:15), and doubtless supplied the venison of Esau’s “savory meat” (Genesis 25:28; 27:4).

Of fish as food little is said in the Old Testament (see Numbers 11:5; Jeremiah 16:16; Ezekiel 47:10; Ecclesiastes 9:12). No particular species is named, although thirty-six species are said to be found in the waters of the Jordan valley alone. But we may be sure that the fish which the Hebrews enjoyed in Egypt “for nought” (Numbers 11:5) had their successors in Canaan (Kennedy). Trade in cured fish was carried on by Tyrian merchants with Jerusalem in Nehemiah’s day (Nehemiah 13:16), and there must have been a fish market at or near the fish gate (Nehemiah 3:3). The Sea of Galilee in later times was the center of a great fish industry, as is made clear by the Gospels and by Josephus In the market of Tiberias today fresh fish are sold in great quantities, and a thriving trade in salt fish is carried on. The “small fishes” of our Lord’s two great miracles of feeding were doubtless of this kind, as at all times they have been a favorite form of provision for a journey in hot countries.

As to the exact price of food in ancient times little is known. From 2 Kings 7:1,16 we learn that one ce’ah of fine flour, and two of barley, sold for a shekel (compare Matthew 10:29). For birds allowed as food see Deuteronomy 14:11 and articles on CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS.

Pigeons and turtle doves find a place in the ritual of various sacrifices, and so are to be reckoned as “clean” for ordinary uses as well. The species of domestic fowl found there today seem to have been introduced during the Persian period (compare 2 Esdras 1:30; Matthew 23:37; 26:34, etc.). It is thought that the fatted fowl of Solomon’s table (1 Kings 4:23) were geese (see Mish). Fatted goose is a favorite food with Jews today, as it was with the ancient Egyptians.

Of game birds used for food (see Nehemiah 5:18) the partridge and the quail are prominent, and the humble sparrow comes in for his share of mention (Matthew 10:29; Luke 12:6). Then, as now, the eggs of domestic fowls and of all “clean” birds were favorite articles of food (Deuteronomy 22:6; Isaiah 10:14; Luke 11:12).
Edible insects (Leviticus 11:22 f) are usually classed with animal foods. In general they are of the locust family (see LOCUST). They formed part of the food of John the Baptist (Matthew 3:4, etc.), were regarded by the Assyrians as delicacies, and are a favorite food of the Arabs today. They are prepared and served in various ways, the one most common being to remove the head, legs and wings, to drop it in meal, and then fry it in oil or butter. It then tastes a little like fried frogs’ legs. In the diet of the Baptist, locusts were associated with wild honey (see HONEY).

As to condiments (see separate articles on SALT; CORIANDER, etc.) it needs only to be said here that the caperberry (Ecclesiastes 12:5 margin) was eaten before meals as an appetizer and, strictly speaking, was not a condiment. Mustard was valued for the leaves, not for the seed (Matthew 13:31). Pepper, though not mentioned in Scripture, is mentioned margin the Mishna as among the condiments. Before it came into use, spicy seeds like cummin, the coriander, etc., played a more important role than since.

The abhorrence of the Hebrews for all food prepared or handled by the heathen (see ABOMINATION) is to be attributed primarily to the intimate association in early times between flesh food and sacrifices to the gods. This finds conspicuous illustration in the case of Daniel (Daniel 1:8), Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 5:27), Josephus (Vita, III), and their compatriots (see also Acts 15:20,29; 1 Corinthians 8:1-10; 10:19,28). As to sources of food supply and traffic in food stuffs, for primitive usages see Genesis 18:7; 27:9; 1 Kings 21:2. As to articles and customs of commerce adopted when men became dwellers in cities, see Jeremiah 37:21, where bakers were numerous enough in Jerusalem to give their name to a street or bazaar, where doubtless, as today, they baked and sold bread to the public (compare Mishna,passim). Extensive trade in “victuals” in Nehemiah’s day is attested by Nehemiah 13:15 f, and by specific mention of the “fish gate” (3:3) and the “sheep gate” (3:1), so named evidently because of their nearby markets. In John’s Gospel (John 4:8; 13:29) we have incidental evidence that the disciples were accustomed to buy food as they journeyed through the land. In Jerusalem, cheese was clearly to be bought in the cheesemakers’ valley (Tyrpoeon), oil of the oil merchants (Matthew 25:9), and so on; and Corinth, we may be sure, was not the only city of Paul’s day that had a provision market (“shambles,” 1 Corinthians 10:25 the Revised Version (British and American)).
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FOOL; FOLLY

<nfool> [l  b  n; nabhal], [l  ywâ ] ‘ewil], [l  ys  k  ] kecil], [l  k  s ; cakhal] and
forms; [ávpow, apatron], [ávposvyn, aphrosune], [mporos, moro]):

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. General:

Taking the words generally, apart from the Wisdom literature, we find
nabhal frequently translated “fool” and nebhalah, “folly”; nabhal,
however, denotes a wicked person, an evil character, “shamelessly
immoral,” equivalent to “a son of Belial” (Cheyne), rather than a merely
“foolish” person, and nebhalah, “wickedness,” “shameless impropriety,”
rather than simple folly. We have almost a definition of nabhal in Isaiah
32:6: “For the fool will speak folly, and his heart will work iniquity, to
practice profaneness, and to utter error against Yahweh, to make empty
the soul of the hungry, and to cause the drink of the thirsty to fail.” Abigail
described her husband, Nabhal, as “a son of Belial” (the Revised Version
(British and American) “worthless fellow”), “for as his name is, so is he”
(1 Samuel 25:25), and what we read of him bears out this character.
Other occurrences of the words support the above meaning; they are
generally associated with some form of wickedness, frequently with base
and unnatural lewdness (Genesis 34:7; Deuteronomy 22:21;
Joshua 7:15; Judges 19:23,14; 20:6,10; 2 Samuel 13:12). When
in Psalm 14:1; 53:1 it is said, “The fool hath said in his heart, There is
no God,” it is followed by the statement, “They are corrupt, they have
done abominable works,” showing that more than “folly” is implied. In
Isaiah 32:5,6 the King James Version nabhal is translated “vile person”
and nebhalah “villany,” the Revised Version (British and American) “fool”
and “folly,” Jeremiah 29:23; halal, implying loud boasting is in the King
James Version translated “foolish,” but it means, rather, “arrogant,” which
the Revised Version (British and American) adopts (Psalm 5:5; 73:3;
75:4, margin “fools”); cakhal, “a fool,” also occurs (Genesis 31:28;
1 Samuel 13:13, etc.) for which word see (4) below; also ya’al “to be empty,” “to be or become foolish” (Numbers 12:11; Isaiah 19:13; Jeremiah 5:4; 50:36).

2. The Wisdom Literature:

In the Chokhmah or Wisdom literature, which, within the Bible, is contained in Job, Proverbs (especially), Ecclesiastes, Canticles, some Psalms and certain portions of the prophetic writings, “fool” and “folly” are frequent and distinctive words. Their significance is best seen in contrast with “Wisdom.” This was the outcome of careful observation and long pondering on actual life in the light of religion and the Divine revelation. Wisdom had its seat in God and was imparted to those who “feared” Him (“The fear of Yahweh is the beginning (chief part) of knowledge” Proverbs 1:7). Such wisdom was the essence of life, and to be without it was to walk in the way of death and destruction. The fool was he who was thoughtless, careless, conceited, self-sufficient, indifferent to God and His Will, or who might even oppose and scoff at religion and wise instruction. See WISDOM. Various words are used to designate “the fool” and his “folly.”

(1) nabhal (Job 2:10; 30:8; Psalm 53:1; Proverbs 17:7-21); [nebhalah] (Job 42:8; Isaiah 9:17) (see above).

(2) ‘ewil, one of the commonest, the idea conveyed by which is that of one who is hasty, impatient, self-sufficient (Proverbs 12:15; 15:5; 16:22); despising advice and instruction (Proverbs 1:7; 14:9; 24:7); ready to speak and act without thinking (Proverbs 10:14; 12:16; 20:3); quick to get angry, quarrel and cause strife (Proverbs 11:29; 14:17 ‘iwweleth; 29:9); unrestrained in his anger (Job 5:2; Proverbs 17:12); silly, stupid even with brute stupidity (Proverbs 7:22; 26:11; 27:22; compare Isaiah 19:11; Jeremiah 4:22); he is associated with “transgression” (Psalm 107:17; Proverbs 13:15; 17:18,19), with “sin” (Proverbs 24:9), with the “scoffer” (same place) ; ‘iwweleth, “foolishness” occurs (Psalm 38:5; 69:5; Proverbs 13:16; “folly,” 14:8,24,29, etc.).

(3) kecil is the word most frequent in Proverbs. It is probably from a root meaning “thickness,” “sluggishness,” suggesting a slow, self-confident person, but it is used with a wide reference. Self-confidence appears (Proverbs 14:16; 28:26); ignorance (Ecclesiastes 2:14); hate of instruction (Proverbs 1:22; 18:2); thoughtlessness (Proverbs 10:23;
17:24); self-exposure (Proverbs 14:33; 15:2; 18:7; 29:11; Ecclesiastes 5:1; 10:12); anger and contention (Proverbs 18:6; 19:1; Ecclesiastes 7:9); rage (Proverbs 14:16; 17:12); indolence and improvidence (Ecclesiastes 4:5; Proverbs 21:20); silly merriment (Ecclesiastes 7:4, 5, 6); brutishness (Proverbs 26:11; compare Psalm 49:10; 92:6); it is associated with slander (Proverbs 10:18), with evil (Proverbs 13:19).

(4) cakhal, cekhel, cikhluth, also occur. These are probably from a root meaning “to be stopped up” (Cheyne), and are generally taken as denoting thickheadedness; but they are used in a stronger sense than mere foolishness (compare 1 Samuel 26:21; 2 Samuel 24:10, etc.). These words do not occur in Prov, but in Ecclesiastes 2:12; 7:25; cikhluth is associated with “madness” (“Wickedness is folly, and .... foolishness is madness”).

(5) pethi, “simple,” is only once translated “foolish” (Proverbs 9:6 the King James Version).

(6) ba`ar, “brutish,” is translated “foolish” (Psalm 73:22 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “brutish”).


(8) toholah (Job 4:18: “Behold, he putteth no trust in his servants; and his angels he chargeth with folly” (Delitzsch, “imperfection,” others, “error”), the King James Version margin “nor in his angels in whom he put light”).

II. IN THE APOCRYPHA.

In the continuation of the Wisdom literature in The Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclus, “fool” frequently occurs with a signification similar to that in Proverbs; in The Wisdom of Solomon we have aphron (12:24; 15:5, etc.), in Ecclesiasticus, moros (18:18; 19:11, etc.; 20:13; 21:16, etc.).
III. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the New Testament we have various words translated “fool,” “foolish,” “folly,” etc., in the ordinary acceptation of these terms; *aphron*, “mindless,” “witless” (Luke 11:40; 12:20; 1 Corinthians 15:36); *aphrosune*, “want of mind or wisdom” (2 Corinthians 11:1; Mark 7:22); *anoia*, “want of understanding” (2 Timothy 3:9); *moraino*, “to make dull,” “foolish” (Romans 1:22; 1 Corinthians 1:20); *moros*, “dull,” “stupid” (Matthew 7:26; 23:17; 25:2; 1 Corinthians 1:25, 27); *moria*, “foolishness” (1 Corinthians 1:18, etc.); *morologia*, “foolish talk” (Ephesians 5:4).

In Matthew 5:22 our Lord says: “Whosoever shall say (to his brother), Thou fool (more), shall be in danger of the hell of fire (the Gehenna of fire).” Two explanations of this word are possible:

1. That it is not the vocative of the Greek *moros* — a word which was applied by Jesus Himself to the Pharisees (Matthew 23:17, 19), but represents the Hebrew *morah*, “rebel” applied in Numbers 20:10 by Moses to the people, “ye rebels” (for which he was believed to be excluded from the promised land; compare 20:12; hence, we have in the Revised Version, margin “or *moreh*, a Hebrew expression of condemnation”); or

2. That, as our Lord spake in the Aramaic it is the Greek translation of a word representing the Hebrew *nabhal*, “vile, or worthless fellow,” atheist, etc. (Psalm 14:1; 53:1).

W. L. Walker

FOOLERY

The plural “fooleries” occurs Ecclesiasticus 22:13 King James Version: “Talk not much with a fool .... and thou shalt never be defiled with his fooleries.” The Greek word is [ἐντιναγμός, entinagmos], “a striking or throwing in,” “an attack,” from *entinasso*, “to strike into,” “cast at,” etc. (1 Macc 2:36; 2 Macc 4:41; 11:11). the Revised Version (British and American) renders “Thou shalt not be defiled in his onslaught,” margin “defiled: in his onslaught turn.” The meaning is most probably “with what he throws out,” i.e. his foolish or vile speeches, as if it were slaver.
FOOT

<foot> ([λ gr , reghel], [l s o q” , qarcol] (only twice in parallel passages: 2 Samuel 22:37 = Psalm 18:36, where it probably means ankle); [ποῦς, pous]): The dusty roads of Palestine and other eastern lands make a much greater care of the feet necessary than we are accustomed to bestow upon them. The absence of socks or stockings, the use of sandals and low shoes rather than boots and, to an even greater degree, the frequent habit of walking barefoot make it necessary to wash the feet repeatedly every day. This is always done when entering the house, especially the better upper rooms which are usually carpeted. It is a common dictate of good manners to perform this duty to a visitor, either personally or through a servant; at least water for washing has to be presented (Genesis 18:4; Luke 7:44). This has therefore become almost synonymous with the bestowal of hospitality (1 Timothy 5:10). At an early date this service was considered one of the lowest tasks of servants (1 Samuel 25:41), probably because the youngest and least trained servants were charged with the task, or because of the idea of defilement connected with the foot. It was, for the same reason, if rendered voluntarily, a service which betokened complete devotion. Jesus taught the greatest lesson of humility by performing this humble service to His disciples (John 13:4-15). The undoing of the latches or leather thongs of the sandals (Mark 1:7; Luke 3:16; John 1:27) seems to refer to the same menial duty.

Often the feet and shoes were dusted on the highway, as is being done in the Orient to this day, but if it were done in an ostentatious manner in the presence of a person or a community who had refused hospitality to a stranger, it was understood in the same sense in which the cutting in two of the tablecloth was considered in the days of knighthood: it meant rejection and separation (Matthew 10:14; Acts 13:51).

The roads of the desert were not only dusty but rough, and the wanderer was almost sure to ruin his ill-made shoes and wound his weary feet. A special providence of God protected the children of Israel from this experience during the long journey through the wilderness. “Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, these forty years” (Deuteronomy 8:4; 29:5).

In the house shoes and sandals were never worn; even the most delicate would put on shoes only when going out (Deuteronomy 28:56). The shoes were left outside of the house or in a vestibule. This was especially
done in the house of God and at the time of prayer, for whenever or wherever that might be, the law was: “Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground” (Exodus 3:5; Joshua 5:15; Acts 7:33). This custom still prevails among the Moslems of our day. Probably it was the idea of defilement through contact with the common ground which gave rise to its moral application by the Preacher, “Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God” (Ecclesiastes 5:1 (Hebrew 4:17)).

Nakedness of the feet in public, especially among the wealthier classes, who used to wear shoes or sandals, was a token of mourning (Ezekiel 24:17 and probably also Jeremiah 2:25 and Isaiah 20:2-4). A peculiar ceremony is referred to in Deuteronomy 25:9,10, whereby a brother-in-law, who refused to perform his duty under the Levirate law, was publicly put to shame. “And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed.” See also Ruth 4:7,8.

Numerous are the phrases in which the word “foot” or “feet” is used in Biblical language. “To cover the feet” (1 Samuel 24:3) is synonymous with obeying a call of Nature. “To speak with the feet” is expressive of the eloquence of abusive and obscene gesticulation among oriental people, where hands, eyes and feet are able to express much without the use of words (Proverbs 6:13). “To sit at the feet,” means to occupy the place of a learner (Deuteronomy 33:3; Luke 10:39; Acts 22:3). Vanquished enemies had to submit to being trodden upon by the conqueror (a ceremony often represented on Egyptian monuments; Joshua 10:24; Psalm 8:6; 110:1; compare Isaiah 49:23). James warns against an undue humiliation of those who join us in the service of God, even though they be poor or mean-looking, by bidding them to take a lowly place at the feet of the richer members of the congregation (Jas 2:3). We read of dying Jacob that “he gathered up his feet into the bed,” for he had evidently used his bed as a couch, on which he had been seated while delivering his charge to his several sons (Genesis 49:33). “Foot” or “feet” is sometimes used euphemistically for the genitals (Deuteronomy 28:57; Ezekiel 16:25). In Deuteronomy 11:10 an interesting reference is made to some Egyptian mode of irrigating the fields, “the watering with the foot,” which mode would be unnecessary in the promised land of Canaan which “drinketh water of the rain of heaven.” It is, however, uncertain whether this refers to the water-wheels worked by a treadmill arrangement or whether reference is made to the many tributary channels, which, according
to representations on the Egyptian monuments, intersected the gardens and fields and which could be stopped or opened by placing or removing a piece of sod at the mouth of the channel. This was usually done with the foot. Frequently we find references to the foot in expressions connected with journeyings and pilgrimages, which formed so large a part in the experiences of Israel, e.g. Psalm 91:12, “lest thou dash thy foot against a stone”; 94:18, “My foot slippeth”; 121:3, “He will not suffer thy foot to be moved,” and many more. Often the reference is to the “walk,” i.e. the moral conduct of life (Psalm 73:2; Job 23:11; 31:5).

Figurative: In the metaphorical language of Isaiah 52:7 “the feet” are synonymous with “the coming.”

H. L. E. Luering

FOOTMAN

<foot'-man>.

See WAR.

FOOTSTOOL

<foot'-stool> ([כ ב ק, kebhes]; [ὑποπόδιον, hupopodion], “trodden on”):

The 15 Scripture references to this term may be classified as literal or figurative. Of the former are the two passages: 2 Chronicles 9:18 and Jas 2:3. In these the footstool was a sort of step or support for the feet placed before the throne or any pretentious seat.

Of figurative uses, there are the following groups:

(1) Of the earth: Isaiah 66:1; Matthew 5:35; Acts 7:49.
(2) Of the ark: 1 Chronicles 28:2.
(3) Of the Temple: Psalm 99:5; 132:7; Lamentations 2:1; compare Isaiah 60:13.

(4) Of heathen enemies subdued by the Messianic King: Psalm 110:1; Matthew 22:44 the King James Version; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:43; Acts 2:35; Hebrews 1:13; 10:13. Thus the uses of this term are mainly metaphorical and symbolic of subjection, either to God as universal Lord or to God’s Son as King by redemptive right. Compare 1 Corinthians 15:25-27, in which all things, including death, are
represented as subject to Christ and placed beneath His feet.

_Leonard W. Doolan_

**FOR**

<for> ([γικι] (conjunction), [λε] (preposition), and various other words. In the New Testament also the words are various, chiefly [γάρ, gar,] [καὶ γάρ, kai gar], [ὅτι, hoti] (conjunctions); [ἀντὶ, and] [ἀπό, apo] [εἰς, eis] [διὰ, dia] (accusative), [ἐπί, epi] (dative and accusative), [περί, peri] (genitive), [πρὸς, pros] (genitive and accusative), [ὑπὲρ, huper] (genitive) (prepositions)): the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version give in many cases more literal or more accurate renderings than those in the King James Version.

In the New Testament the most important preps. from a doctrinal point of view are _and_, “face to face,” “over against,” “instead,” “on behalf of,” _peri_, “around,” “about,” “concerning,” _huper_, “over,” “on behalf of.” The first has been claimed as stating the substitutionary nature of Christ’s sacrifice as contrasted with _huper_ and _peri_, more frequently used of it. But, although _and_ in the New Testament often means “instead of,” “answering to,” it does not necessarily imply substitution. On the other hand, in classical Greek _huper_ is sometimes used in that sense (see Trench, Synonyms). “Here as always the root idea of the preposition, the root idea of the case, and the context must all be considered” (Robertson, Grammar, 124). _Anti_ is found in this connection only in _Matthew 20:28_, and _Mark 10:45_. In _Matthew 26:28_; _Mark 14:24_, we have _peri_, also in _Hebrews 10:6,8,18,26_; _1 Peter 3:18_; _1 John 2:2_; _4:10_.

_Luke 22:19,20_ has _huper_, which is the word commonly used by Paul, as in _Romans 5:6,8; 8:32; 14:15_; _1 Corinthians 15:3_, etc., also by John in his Gospel, _6:51; 10:11_, etc., and _1 John 3:16_; also _Hebrews 2:9; 10:12_; _1 Peter 2:21; 3:18; 4:1_; in _Romans 8:3_ it is _peri_.

_W. L. Walker_

**FORAY**

<for’a> (<2 Samuel 3:22>).

_See_ WAR.
FORBEAR

<for-bar’> ([l D’ j ; chadhal]; [ἀνέχομαι, anechomai]): In the Old Testament chadhal, “to leave off,” is the word most frequently translated “forbear” (<Exodus 23:5, etc.); damam, “to be silent,” chasakh, “to keep back,” mashakh, “to draw or stretch out,” occur once each; the Revised Version (British and American) renders Ezekiel 24:17 (damam), “Sigh, but not aloud,” margin “Hebrew be silent,”; Proverbs 24:11 (chasakh), “See that thou hold back,” margin “or forbear thou not to deliver,” the King James Version “if thou forbear to deliver”; Nehemiah 9:30 (mashakh), “bear” instead of “forbear”; ‘aph literally, “breathing,” the “nose,” hence, from violent breathing, “anger” (’erekh, “long,” understood), and kul “to hold,” are translated “forbearing” (Proverbs 25:15; Jeremiah 20:9, respectively).

In the New Testament we have anechomai, “to hold self back or up,” “with longsuffering, forbearing one another” (Ephesians 4:2, Colossians 3:13); aniemi “to send back,” the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “forbear threatening” (Ephesians 6:9); pheidomai, “to spare,” “but I forbear” (2 Corinthians 12:6); meergazesthai, “not to work,” “to forbear working” (1 Corinthians 9:6); stego, “to cover,” “conceal”: “when I could no longer forbear” (1 Thessalonians 3:1,5).

W. L. Walker

FORBEARANCE

<for-bar’-ans> ([ἀνοχή, anoche]): “Forbearance” (anoche, “a holding back”) is ascribed to God (Romans 2:4, “the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering”; 3:25 the Revised Version (British and American), “the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God,” the King James Version “remission” (margin “passing over”) of sins, that are past, through the forbearance of God”); in Philippians 4:5, to epieikes is translated by the Revised Version (British and American) “forbearance,” margin “gentleness”; it is a Christian grace in likeness to God. “Forbearing” (The King James Version, margin) is substituted by the Revised Version (British and American) for “patient” (anexikakos, “holding up under evil”) in 2 Timothy 2:24.

W. L. Walker
FORBID

<for-bid'> ([a l K; kala]; [κολύω, koluo]): Occurs very seldom in the Old Testament except as the rendering of chalilah (see below); it is once the translation of kala’, “to restrain” (<0411>Numbers 11:28, “Joshua .... said My lord Moses forbid them”); twice of tsawah, “to command” (<0430>Deuteronomy 2:37, “and wheresoever Yahweh our God forbade us”; 4:23, “Yahweh thy God hath forbidden thee,” literally, “commanded”); once of lo’, “not,” the Revised Version (British and American) “commanded not to be done” (Leviticus 5:17). In the phrases, “Yahweh forbid” (<0924>1 Samuel 24:6; 26:11; <1121>1 Kings 21:13), “God forbid” (<0441>Genesis 44:7; <0502>Joshua 22:29; 24:16; <0411>1 Samuel 12:23; <0376>Job 27:5, etc.), “My God forbid it me” (<1311>1 Chronicles 11:19), the word is chalilah, denoting profanation, or abhorrence (rendered, <0118>Genesis 18:25 the King James Version, “that be far from thee”); the English Revised Version leaves the expressions unchanged; the American Standard Revised Version substitutes “far be it from me,” “thee,” etc., except in <1914>1 Samuel 14:45; 20:2, where it is, “Far from it.”

In the New Testament koluo, “to cut short,” “restrain” is the word commonly translated “forbid” (<0319>Matthew 19:14, “forbid them not,” etc.); in <0319>Luke 6:29, the Revised Version (British and American) has “withhold not”; diakoluo, with a similar meaning, occurs in <0319>Matthew 3:14, “John forbade him,” the Revised Version (British and American) “would have hindered him”; akolutos, “uncut off” (<0345>Acts 28:31), is translated “none forbidding him.” The phrase “God forbid” (me genoito, “let it not be,” <0200>Luke 20:16; <0305>Romans 3:4, etc.) is retained by the Revised Version (British and American), with margin “Be it not so,” except in <0306>Galatians 6:14, where the text has “Far be it from me”; me genoito is one of the renderings of chalilah in Septuagint. “God forbid” also appears in Apocrypha (1 Macc 2:21, the Revised Version (British and American) “Heaven forbid,” margin, Greek “may he be propitious,” 1 Macc 9:10, the Revised Version (British and American) “Let it not be”).

W. L. Walker

FORCES

<for'-sis> ([l y']", chayil]:
(1) The word is used as a military term, equivalent to army, in 2 Kings 25:23,16 (where the King James Version reads “armies”); 2 Chronicles 17:2; Jeremiah 40:7, etc.

See ARMY.

(2) In Isaiah 60:5,11, it is rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) by “wealth,” and in Obadiah verse 11, by “substance.”

Two other Hebrew words are also translated “forces” in the King James Version, ma’amatstsim (Job 36:19), and ma’oz (Daniel 11:38), the latter being rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) “fortresses.”

FORD

(\texttt{r \ b \ \{ \ h \}} , ma’abhar) (Genesis 32:22; “pass” (of Michmash), 1 Samuel 13:23; “stroke” (the Revised Version, margin “passing”), Isaiah 30:32); [\texttt{h \ r \ B \ \{ \ h \}} , ma’barah] (Joshua 2:7; Judges 3:28; 12:5,6; Isaiah 16:2; “pass” (of Michmash), 1 Samuel 14:4; “passages” (the Revised Version, margin “fords”), Jeremiah 51:32); [\texttt{h \ r \ B \ \{ \ h \}} `abharah] (2 Samuel 15:28; 17:16; “ferry-boat” (the Revised Version, margin “convoy”), 2 Samuel 19:18); from [\texttt{r \ b \ " \ ; \ `abhar}], “to pass over”; compare Arabic `abar, “to pass over” and ma`bar, “a ford”): In the journeyings of the children of Israel, in addition to the miraculous passages of the Red Sea and the Jordan, they had other streams to pass over, especially the Zered (Chisa’) and the Arnon (Maujib) (Numbers 21:12,13; Deuteronomy 2:24). The Jabbok (Zarqa) is frequently referred to, particularly in connection with Jacob (Genesis 32:22). The most frequent references are to the Jordan which, in time of flood, was impassable (Joshua 3:15). The lower Jordan is about 100 ft. wide, and from 5 to 12 ft. deep, so that in the absence of bridges, the places where it was possible to ford were of great importance. The passage of the Jordan is referred to in connection with Jacob (Genesis 32:10), Gideon (Judges 8:4), the children of Ammon (Judges 10:9), Abner and his men (2 Samuel 2:29), David (2 Samuel 10:17; 17:22), Absalom (2 Samuel 17:24), and others. Jesus undoubtedly crossed the Jordan, and John is thought to have baptized at the ford of the Jordan near Jericho. The fords of the Jordan are specifically mentioned in Joshua 2:7 in connection with the pursuit of the spies who were hidden in Rahab’s
house, and in 2 Samuel 15:28; 17:16 in connection with the flight of David. In the last two passages we have abharah, the same word which, in the account of David’s return (2 Samuel 19:18), is rendered “ferry-boat” (the Revised Version, margin “convoy”).

*See JORDAN.*

**FORECAST**

*<for-kast’>*; (vb.) ([b v” j; chashabh]): To forecast is both to plan or scheme beforehand and to consider or see beforehand. It is in the first sense that it is used in Daniel 11:24,25 (the King James Version) as the translation of chashabh, “to think,” “meditate,” “devise,” “plot,” “He shall forecast his devices (The King James Version, margin “Hebrew think his thoughts”) against the strongholds”; “They shall forecast devices against him,” the Revised Version (British and American) “devise his devices”; compare Nahum 1:9, “What do ye devise against Yahweh?” In the second sense, the word occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 17:11 the Revised Version (British and American), “Wickedness …. always forecasteth the worst lot” (proeilephen), margin “Most authorities read hath added” (proeilephen).

**W. L. Walker**

**FOREFAATHER**

*<for’-fa-ther>*:

(1) [ˆc a r i b a ; ‘abh ri’shon], “first father,” “chief father,” hence, “early ancestor”: “turned back to the iniquities of their forefathers” (Jeremiah 11:10).

(2) [πρόγονος, progonos], “born before,” “ancestor”: “whom I serve from my forefathers” (2 Timothy 1:3). It is translated “parents” (including grandparents) in 1 Timothy 5:4: “and to requite their parents.”

**FOREFRONT**

*<for’-frunt>* ([µ ynP ; panim]): For “forefront,” “front” is now generally used, since “back-front” has gone out of use. “Forefront” is the translation of panim, “face” (2 Kings 16:14; Ezekiel 40:19 bis; 47:1); of mul
panim, “over against the face” (Exodus 26:9; Leviticus 8:9, “And he put the mitre upon his head; also upon the mitre even upon his forefront, did he put the golden plate”); for “upon his forefront” the Revised Version (British and American) has “in front”; 2 Samuel 11:15, “in the forefront of the hottest battle”); of ro’sh, “head” (2 Chronicles 20:27); of shen, “tooth” (1 Samuel 14:5, “The forefront (The King James Version, margin “Hebrew tooth”) of the one was situated northward over against Michmash,” the Revised Version (British and American) “The one crag rose up on the north in front of Michmash”); in 1 Macc 4:57 margin it is the translation of prosopon, “face”: “They decked the forefront of the temple with crowns of gold.”

The Revised Version (British and American) has “forefront” for “face” (Ezekiel 40:15), “in the forefront of” for “over against” (Joshua 22:11).

W. L. Walker

FOREGO

<for-go’>.

See FORGO.

FOREHEAD

<for’-ed> ([] x "memtsach]; [μέτωπον, metopon]):

(1) In a literal sense the word is used frequently in the Scriptures. Aaron and after him every high priest was to wear on the forehead the golden frontlet having the engraved motto, “Holy to Yahweh” (Exodus 28:36,38). The condition of the forehead was an important criterion in the diagnosis of leprosy by the priest (Leviticus 13:42,43; 2 Chronicles 26:20). It was in the forehead that brave young David smote Goliath with the stone from his sling (1 Samuel 17:49). The faulty translation of the King James Version in Ezekiel 16:12 has been corrected in the Revised Version (British and American), reference being had in the passage to a nose-ring, not to an ornament of the forehead. While the cutting or tattooing of the body was strictly forbidden to the Israelite on account of the heathen associations of the custom (Leviticus 19:28), we find frequent mention made of markings on the forehead, which were especially used to designate slaves (see Philo, De Monarchia, I) or devotees of a godhead
In 3 Macc 2:29 we read that Ptolemy IV Philopator branded some Jews with the sign of an ivy leaf, marking them as devotees of Bacchus-Dionysos. Possibly we may compare herewith the translation of Isaiah 44:5 (Revised Version margin): “And another shall write on his hand, Unto Yahweh” (or Yahweh’s slave). Very clear is the passage Ezekiel 9:4,6 (and perhaps Job 31:35), where the word used for “mark” is taw, the name of the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet which in its earliest form has the shape of an upright plus sign (Baal Lebanon Inscr; 11th century BC) or of a lying (St Andrew’s) cross X (Moabite Inscr, 9th century BC), the simplest sign in the old Israelite alphabet, and at the same time the character which in the Greek alphabet represents the X, the initial of Christ. In the New Testament we find a clear echo of the above-mentioned Old Testament passage, the marking of the foreheads of the righteous (Revelation 7:3; 9:4; 14:1; 22:4). The godless followers of the beast are marked on the (right) hand and on the forehead (Revelation 13:16; 14:9; 20:4), and the apocalyptic woman dressed in scarlet and purple has her name written on her forehead (Revelation 17:5).

In a metaphorical sense the expression, “a harlot’s forehead,” is used (Jeremiah 3:3) to describe the shameless apostasy and faithlessness of Israel. Ezekiel speaks of the stiff-necked obstinacy and the persistent unwillingness of Israel to hear the message of Yahweh: “All the house of Israel are of a hard forehead and of a stiff heart” (Jeremiah 3:7), and God makes his prophet’s “forehead hard .... as an adamant harder than flint,” whereby an unflinching loyalty to God and a complete disregard of opposition is meant (Jeremiah 3:8,9). Compare the phrase: “to harden the face,” under the word FACE.

FOREIGN DIVINITIES

<for’-in di-vin’-i-tiz> (Acts 17:18 margin).
See GOD(s), STRANGE.

FOREIGNER

<for’-in-er> “The translation of [yr k], nokhri, “unknown,” “foreign,” frequently rendered “stranger” (Deuteronomy 15:3; Obadiah 1:11); of [b v w], toshabh, “a settler,” “an alien resident” (Exodus 12:45; the
Revised Version (British and American) “sojourner”; compare Leviticus 25:47; Psalm 39:12); of paroikos, “dwelling near,” “sojourner” (Ephesians 2:19, the Revised Version (British and American) sojourners”).

Revised Version has “foreigner” for “stranger” (Deuteronomy 17:15; 23:20; 29:22; Ruth 2:10; 2 Samuel 15:19), for “alien” (Deuteronomy 14:21); “the hand of a foreigner” for “a stranger’s hand” (Leviticus 22:25).

See ALIEN; STRANGER AND SOJOURNER.

FOREKNOW; FOREKNOWLEDGE

<for-no’>, <for-nol’-ej>:

1. MEANING OF THE TERM:

The word “foreknowledge” has two meanings. It is a term used in theology to denote the prescience or foresight of God, that is, His knowledge of the entire course of events which are future from the human point of view; and it is also used in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) to translate the Greek words proginoskein and prognosis in the New Testament, in which instances the word “fore-knowledge” approaches closely the idea of fore-ordination.

2. FORE-KNOWLEDGE AS PRESCIENCE:

In the sense of prescience foreknowledge is an aspect of God’s omniscience (see OMNISCIENCE). God’s knowledge, according to the Scripture, is perfect, that is, it is omniscience. It is true that the Scripture makes use of anthropomorphic forms of expression as regards the way in which God obtains knowledge (Genesis 3:8), and sometimes even represents Him as if He did not know certain things (Genesis 11:5; Genesis 18:21); nevertheless the constant representation of the Scripture is that God knows everything. This perfect knowledge of God, moreover, is not merely a knowledge which is practically unlimited for all religious purposes, but is omniscience in the strictest sense of the term. In the historical books of the Old Testament the omniscience of God is a constant underlying presupposition when it is said that God watches men’s actions, knows their acts and words, and discloses to them the future; while in the Psalms, Prophets and Wisdom literature, this Divine attribute
becomes an object of reflection, and finds doctrinal expression. It cannot, however, be said that this attribute of God appears only late in the history of special revelation; it is a characteristic of the Biblical idea of God from the very first, and it is only its didactic expression which comes out with especial clearness in the later books. God’s knowledge, then, is represented as perfect. Since He is free from all limits of space, His omniscience is frequently connected with His omnipresence. This is the thought which underlies the anthropomorphic expressions where God is represented as seeing, beholding and having eyes. God’s eyes go to and fro throughout the whole earth (2 Chronicles 16:9), and are every place beholding the evil and the good (Proverbs 15:3). Even Shed is naked and open to God’s sight (Proverbs 15:11; Job 26:6). The night and darkness are light to Him, and darkness and light for God are both alike (Psalm 139:12). All animals and fowls are His, and so are known by Him (Psalm 50:11), and as their Creator God knows all the hosts of the heavenly bodies (Psalm 147:4; Isaiah 40:26). He knows also the heart of man and its thoughts (1 Samuel 16:7; 1 Kings 8:39; Psalm 7:9 (Hebrew 10); 94:11; 139:2; Jeremiah 11:20; 17:9,10; 20:12; Ezekiel 11:5). Furthermore, God knows man entirely in all his ways (Psalm 139:1-5; Proverbs 5:21). He looks from heaven and sees all men (Psalm 11:4; 14:2; 33:13,14,15). Evil and sin are also known to God (Genesis 3:11; 6:5,9,13; 2 Samuel 7:20; Psalm 69:5 (Hebrew 6); Jeremiah 16:17; 18:23). In a word, God knows with absolute accuracy all about man (Job 11:11; 34:21; Psalm 33:15; Proverbs 5:21; Hosea 5:3; Jeremiah 11:20; 12:3; 17:9 f; 18:23). This perfect knowledge finds its classic expression in Psalm 139.

God is also, according to the Old Testament, free from all limitations of time, so that His consciousness is not in the midst of the stream of the succeeding moments of time, as is the case with the human consciousness. God is not only without beginning or end of days, but with Him a thousand years are as one day. Hence, God knows in one eternal intuition that which for the human consciousness is past, present and future. In a strict sense, therefore, there can be no foreknowledge or prescience with God, and the distinction in God’s knowledge made by theologians, as knowledge of reminiscence, vision and prescience, is after all an anthropomorphism. Nevertheless this is the only way in which we can conceive of the Divine omniscience in its relation to time, and consequently the Scripture represents the matter as if God’s knowledge of future events were a
foreknowledge or prescience, and God is represented as knowing the past, present and future.

It is God’s knowledge of events which from the human point of view are future that constitutes His foreknowledge in the sense of prescience. God is represented as having a knowledge of the entire course of events before they take place. Such a knowledge belongs to the Scriptural idea of God from the very outset of special revelation. He knows beforehand what Abraham will do, and what will happen to him; He knows beforehand that Pharaoh’s heart will be hardened, and that Moses will deliver Israel (Genesis 15:13 ff; Exodus 3:19; 7:4; 11:1 ff). The entire history of the patriarchal period of revelation exhibits plainly the foreknowledge of God in this sense. In prophecy this aspect of the Divine knowledge is made the subject of explicit assertion, and its religious significance is brought out. Nothing future is hidden from Yahweh (Isaiah 41:22 ff; 42:9; 43:9-13; 44:6-8; 46:10; Daniel 2:22; Amos 3:7), and this foreknowledge embraces the entire course of man’s life (Psalm 31:15 (Hebrew 16); 39:5 (Hebrew 6); 139:4-6,16; Job 14:5). These passages from Isaiah show that it is from the occurrence of events in accordance with Yahweh’s prediction that the Prophet will prove his foreknowledge; and that in contrast with the worshippers of idols which are taken by surprise, Israel is warned of the future by the omniscient Yahweh.

In the New Testament likewise, God’s omniscience is explicitly affirmed. Jesus taught that God knows the hidden secrets of man’s heart (Luke 16:15); and this is also the teaching of the apostles (Acts 1:24; 15:8; 1 Corinthians 2:10; 3:20; 1 Thessalonians 2:4; Revelation 2:23). In a word, according to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, everything is open to God, so that He is literally omniscient (Hebrews 4:13). And as in the Old Testament, so also in the New Testament, foreknowledge in the sense of prescience is ascribed to God. Jesus asserts a foreknowledge by God of that which is hidden from the Son (Mark 13:32), and James asserts that all God’s works are foreknown by Him (Acts 15:18). Moreover, the many references in the New Testament to the fulfillment of prophecy all imply that the New Testament writers ascribed foreknowledge, in this sense of foresight, to God.

Denials of the Divine foreknowledge, in this sense of prescience, have been occasioned, not by exegetical considerations, but by the supposed conflict of this truth with human freedom. It was supposed that in order to be free, an event must be uncertain and contingent as regards the fact of its
futurition, and that too in the most absolute sense, that is, from the Divine as well as the human point of view. Hence, the Socinians and some Arminians denied the foreknowledge of God. It was supposed either that God voluntarily determines not to foresee the free volitions of man, or else that since God’s omniscience is simply the knowledge of all that is knowable, it does not embrace the free acts of man which are by their nature uncertain and so unknowable. And upon this view of freedom, this denial of God’s foreknowledge was logically necessary. If the certainty of events with respect to the fact of their futurition is inconsistent with freedom, then human freedom does conflict with God’s foreknowledge, since God cannot know future events as certainly future unless they actually are so. Since, therefore, the Divine foreknowledge is quite as inconsistent with this view of freedom as is the Divine foreordination, the view of those who regard God as a mere onlooker on the course of future events which are supposed to be entirely independent of His purpose and control, does not help matters in the least. If God foreknows future events as certain, then they must be certain, and if so, then the certainty of their actually occurring must depend either upon God’s decree and providential control, or else upon a fate independent of God. It was to escape these supposed difficulties that the doctrine known as scientia media was propounded. It was supposed that God has a knowledge of events as conditionally future, that is, events neither merely possible nor certainly future, but suspended upon conditions undetermined by God. But this hypothesis is of no help and is not true. Besides being contrary to the Scripture in its idea that many events lie outside the decree of God, and that God must wait upon man in His government of the world, there is really no such class of events as this theory asserts. If God foreknows that the conditions on which they are suspended will be fulfilled, then these events belong to the class of events which are certainly future; whereas if God does not know whether or not the conditions will be fulfilled by man, then His foreknowledge is denied, and these events in question belong to the class of those merely possible. Nor do the Scripture passages to which appeal is made, such as Genesis 11:6; Exodus 3:19; Deuteronomy 7:3,4; 1 Samuel 23:10-13; 2 Samuel 12:8, etc., afford a basis for this doctrine. The Scripture of course recognizes that God has put all things in relations of mutual dependence, and speaks of what can or cannot happen under such and such conditions; but none of these passages assert or imply that the events are suspended upon conditions which are either unknown or undetermined by God.
3. FOREKNOWLEDGE BASED ON FOREORDINATION:

God’s foreknowledge, according to the Scripture teaching, is based upon His plan or eternal purpose, which embraces everything that comes to pass. God is never represented as a mere onlooker seeing the future course of events, but having no part in it. That God has such a plan is the teaching of the entire Scripture. It is implied in the Old Testament conception of God as an Omnipotent Person governing all things in accordance with His will. This idea is involved in the names of God in the patriarchal revelation, ‘El, ‘Elohim, ‘El Shadday, and in the prophetic name Yahweh of Hosts. This latter name teaches not only God’s infinite power and glory, but also makes Him known as interposing in accordance with His sovereign will and purpose in the affairs of this world, and as having also the spiritual powers of the heavenly world at His disposal for the execution of His eternal purpose. Hence, this idea of God comes to signify the omnipotent Ruler of the universe (Psalm 24:10; Isaiah 6:3; 51:5; 54:5; Jeremiah 10:16; Amos 9:5; compare Oehler, Theol. of the Old Testament, English translation, II, 280).

Not only in this conception of God as omnipotent and sovereign Ruler is the thought of His eternal plan evolved; it is explicitly asserted throughout the whole Old Testament. The purpose of God as determining human history in the Book of Genesis lies clearly upon the surface of the narrative, as, for example, in the history of Abraham and of Joseph. And where there is no abstract statement of this truth, it is evident that the writer regards every event as but the unfolding of the purpose of God. In the Psalms, Prophets, and Wisdom literature, this truth finds explicit and reiterated assertion. Yahweh has an eternal purpose (Psalm 33:11), and this purpose will certainly come to pass (Isaiah 14:27; 43:13). This purpose includes all events and renders certain their occurrence (Isaiah 14:24; 40:10; 46:9,10; Zec 1:6). In the Wisdom literature the ethical character of this plan is dwelt upon, as well as its all-embracing character, and the certainty of its fulfillment (Proverbs 16:4,33; 19:21; 20:24; Job 28:23). The providential control wherewith Yahweh executes this plan includes the heart of man (Proverbs 21:1).

The New Testament likewise regards all history as but the unfolding of God’s eternal purpose (Acts 4:28), which includes man’s salvation (Ephesians 1:4,5; 2 Timothy 1:9), the provision of Christ as Savior (1 Peter 1:20), and the good works of the Christian (Ephesians
Now while the writers of the Old Testament and the New Testament do not write in an abstract or philosophical manner nor enter into metaphysical explanations of the relation between God’s foreknowledge and foreordination, it is perfectly evident that they had a clear conception upon this subject. Although anthropomorphisms are used in regard to the manner in which God knows, He is never conceived as if He obtained His knowledge of the future as a mere onlooker gazing down the course of events in time. The idea that the omnipotent Creator and sovereign Ruler of the universe should govern the world and form His plan as contingent and dependent upon a mere foresight of events outside His purpose and control is not only contrary to the entire Scriptural idea of God’s sovereignty and omnipotence, but is also contrary to the Scriptural idea of God’s foreknowledge which is always conceived as dependent upon His sovereign purpose. According to the Scriptural conception, God foreknows because He has foreordained all things, and because in His providence He will certainly bring all to pass. His foreknowledge is not a dependent one which must wait upon events, but is simply the knowledge which God has of His own eternal purpose. Dillmann has called this “a productive foreknowledge” (Handbuch d. attest. Theol., 251). This is not exactly correct. The Old Testament does not conceive God’s foreknowledge as “producing” or causing events. But when Dillmann says that in the Old Testament there is no hint of an “idle foreknowledge” on God’s part, he is giving expression to the truth that in the Old Testament God’s foreknowledge is based upon His foreordination and providential control of all things. The Divine foreknowledge, therefore, depends upon the Divine purpose which has determined the world plan (Amos 3:7), and all its details (Job 28:26,27). Before man is born God knows him and chooses him for his work (Jeremiah 1:5; Job 23:13,14), and God’s thorough knowledge of man in Psalm 139 is made to rest upon the fact that God has determined man’s lot beforehand (Psalm 139:14-16).

The same thing is true of the New Testament teaching on this subject. The Divine foreknowledge is simply God’s knowledge of His own eternal purpose. This is especially clear in those cases where God’s eternal purpose of redemption through Christ is represented as a mystery which is known by God and which can be known by man only when it pleases God to reveal it (Ephesians 1:9; 3:4,9).
4. FOREKNOWLEDGE AS EQUIVALENT TO FOREORDINATION:

While, therefore, the foreknowledge of God in the sense of prescience is asserted in the New Testament, this is not the meaning of the term when used to translate the Greek words *proginoskein* and *prognosis*. These words which are translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) by the word “foreknowledge,” and once by the word “foreordain” (1 Peter 1:20 the King James Version), mean much more than mere intellectual foresight or prescience. Both the verb and the noun approach the idea of foreordination and are closely connected with that idea in the passages where these words occur. Thus, in Peter’s speeches in Acts the predestination which finds expression in 1 Peter 4:28 is practically identified with the term *prognosis* in 2:23. Everything which happened to Jesus took place in accordance with “the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,” so that nothing happened except that which God had foreordained. In this verse the term foreknowledge is an expansion of the idea of God’s “counsel” or plan, regarding it as an intelligent prearrangement, the idea of foreknowledge being assimilated to that of foreordination. The same idea is found in 1 Peter 1:20. Here the apostle speaks of Christ as a lamb “foreordained” by God before the foundation of the world. The Greek verb *proegnosmenou*, meaning literally, “foreknown” (as in the Revised Version (British and American)) is translated “foreordained” in the King James Version. It is evidently God’s foreordination of Jesus as Savior which Peter has in mind. Also in 1 Peter 1:2 those to whom the apostle is writing are characterized as “elect according to the foreknowledge (*prognosis*) of God,” where the election is based on the “foreknowledge.” By the *prognosis* or foreknowledge, however, far more is meant than prescience. It has the idea of a purpose which determines the course of the Divine procedure. If it meant simply previson of faith or love or any quality in the objects of the election, Peter would not only flatly contradict Paul (Romans 9:11; Ephesians 1:3,4; 2 Timothy 1:9); but also such a rendering would conflict with the context of this passage, because the objects of election are chosen “unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of .... Christ,” so that their new obedience and relation to Christ are determined by their election by God, which election springs from a “foreknowledge” which therefore cannot mean a mere prescience.
In view of the fact that there was a classical use of the simple verb ginoskein in the sense of “resolve,” and more especially of the fact that this word is used in the New Testament to denote an affectionate or loving regard or approbation in accordance with a common use of the Hebrew yadha` (Matthew 7:23; 1 Corinthians 8:3; Galatians 4:9; 2 Timothy 2:19), there is nothing arbitrary in giving it this sense when compounded with the preposition pro when the context clearly demands it, as it does in the above passage (compare Johnstone, Commentary on Peter in the place cited.; per contra Meyer on passages in Acts and Romans).

The word prognosis is, however, discriminated from “predestination.” It is that loving regard in God from which the Divine election springs, which election Peter evidently regarded as sovereign, since sanctification is only a confirmation of it (2 Peter 1:10), and stumbling and disobedience are referred to `appointment to unbelief’ (1 Peter 2:8). Here, then, we have a pregnant use of foreknowledge in which it is assimilated to the idea of purpose, and denotes a sovereign and loving regard.

The word prognosis is also found in this sense in the writings of Paul, in cases where it is manifestly impossible to regard it as a mere intellectual foresight, not only because of Paul’s doctrine that election is absolutely sovereign (Ephesians 1:3,4; Romans 9:11; 2 Timothy 1:9), but also because of the contexts in which the term occurs.

In Romans 8:29,30 the word “foreknow” occurs in immediate connection with God’s predestination of the objects of salvation. Those whom God foreknew, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His son. Now the foreknowledge in this case cannot mean a mere prescience or foresight of faith (Meyer, Godet) or love (Weiss) in the subjects of salvation, which faith or love is supposed to determine the Divine predestination. This would not only contradict Paul’s view of the absolutely sovereign and gracious character of election, but is diametrically opposed to the context of this passage. These verses form a part of the encouragement which Paul offers his readers for their troubles, including their own inward weakness. The apostle tells them that they may be sure that all things work together for good to them that love God; and these are defined as being those whom God has called in accordance with His purpose. Their love to God is evidently their love as Christians, and is the result of a calling which itself follows from an eternal purpose, so that their Christian love is simply the means by which they may know that they have been the subjects of this call. They have not come within the sphere of
God’s love by their own choice, but have been “called” into this relationship by God, and that in accordance with an eternal purpose on His part.

What follows, therefore, must have as its motive simply to unfold and ground this assurance of salvation by tracing it all back to the “foreknowledge” of God. To regard this foreknowledge as contingent upon anything in man would thus be in flat contradiction with the entire context of the passage as well as its motive. The word “foreknowledge” here evidently has the pregnant sense which we found it to have in Peter. Hence, those whom God predestinates, calls, justifies and glorifies are just those whom He has looked upon with His sovereign love. To assign any other meaning to “foreknowledge” here would be out of accord with the usage of the term elsewhere in the New Testament when it is put in connection with predestination, and would contradict the purpose for which Paul introduces the passage, that is, to assure his readers that their ultimate salvation depends, not on their weakness, but on God’s sovereign love and grace and power.

It is equally impossible to give the word *prognosis* any other sense in the other passage where Paul uses it. In *Romans* 11:2, speaking of the Jews, Paul says that “God did not cast off his people which he foreknew." It is quite impossible to regard this as meaning that God had a foresight or mere prevision of some quality in Israel which determined His choice of them, not only because it is the teaching of the entire Scripture that God’s choice of Israel was sovereign and gracious, and not only because of the actual history of Israel, but also because of the context. Paul says that it would be absurd to suppose that God had cast off His people because He foreknew them, His foreknowledge of them being adduced as a ground for His not casting them off. Hence, the argument would have no force if anything in Israel, foreseen by God, were supposed to ground an assurance that He had not cast them off, because the context is full of the hardness of heart and unbelief of Israel. The foreknowledge here has evidently the same sense as in the former passage.

Foreknowledge, therefore, in the New Testament is more than mere prescience. It is practically identical with the Divine decree in two instances, and in the other places where the term occurs it denotes the sovereign loving regard out of which springs God’s predestination or election of men to salvation.
See OMNISCIENCE; PREDESTINATION.
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Caspar Wistar Hodge

FOREORDAIN; FORORDINATION

<for-or-dan‘>, <for-or-di-na’-shun>: The word “foreordain” is uniformly used in the Revised Version (British and American) to render the Greek [προορίζω, proorizo], in the passages where this verb occurs (Acts 4:28; Romans 8:29,30; 1 Corinthians 2:7; Ephesians 15,11). In the passages in Romans and Ephesians it takes the place of the King James Version word “predestinate,” a return to the usage of the older English versions The word has simply the sense of determining beforehand. It is
thus kindred in meaning with a number of other New Testament words expressing the idea of Divine purpose, as “foreknow” (in pregnant sense, Acts 2:23; Romans 8:29, etc.); “determine” (Acts 17:26); “appoint” (1 Peter 2:8). Foreordination, in the widest sense, is coextensive with the sphere of God’s universal providence, being but another name for that Divine plan, purpose or counsel which embraces all things, great and small (Matthew 10:29,30), that happen in Nature, or fall out in human life. Man’s free actions are not regarded in Scripture as excluded from it (Acts 2:28). Foreordination, at the same time, is not to be conceived of as in any way overriding, or doing violence to, human freedom. Man acts freely, as Nature acts necessarily, but it is God who appoints the time, place and circumstances of the free act, permits its happening, and overrules it and its issues for the furthering of His own wise and holy ends. See PROVIDENCE. Foreordination in the sphere of grace has respect to the choice, calling and blessing of those who, through faith, are made partakers of eternal life (Romans 8:29,30; Ephesians 1:5,11). In this, its soteriological aspect, the subject is considered in special articles.

See CHOOSE; ELECTION; PREDESTINATION.

James Orr

FOREPART

<for’-part>: The translation of [μ]νιP; panim, “face” (Exodus 28:27; 39:20; 1 Kings 6:20, the Revised Version (British and American) “within”; Ezekiel 42:7, the Revised Version (British and American) “before”), and of [πρώρα, prora], the forward part of a ship, the prow (Acts 27:41, “the forepart stuck fast,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the foreship struck”). ARV has “its forepart into” for “with his face towards” (Joel 2:20 margin “with its forepart”); “in the forepart thereof” for “before it” (Exodus 28:25; 39:18).

FORERUNNER

<for-run’-er> ([πρόδρομος, prodromos]): This word occurs but once in the Bible: “Whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us” (Hebrews 6:20). The word signifies one who comes in advance to a place where the rest are to follow, or one who is sent on before as a scout to take
observations. In this sense Christ is our forerunner for He has gone into heaven to prepare a place for His people into which He will eventually lead them. The idea of a forerunner is peculiar to the Christian dispensation. The Old Testament Levitical economy knew nothing of such. The high priest was a representative, not a forerunner: where he led, namely, into the Holy of Holies, the people could not follow. He was not the pioneer of the people; Christ is. Christ goes nowhere but where His people may follow. He is the file-leader (compare Hebrews 12:2, “the author .... of faith”). He goeth before His people to prepare the way for them, to open the gates of heaven by His atoning blood and priestly intercession. The believer is led into full fellowship with God through Jesus Christ.

See also JOHN THE BAPTIST; RUNNER.

William Evans

FORESAIL

<for’sal>, <for’-s’-l> (Acts 27:40).
See SHIPS AND BOATS.

FORESHIP

<for’-ship> (Acts 9,7:30).
See FORE-PART; SHIPS AND BOATS.

FORESKIN

<for’-skin> ([h l r ]; `orlah]; Ακροβυστία, akrobustia], often euphemistically translated “uncircumcision”):

(1) In the literal sense the word is frequently mentioned owing to the rite of circumcision in vogue in Israel since the days of Abraham (Genesis 17:9-14) and among several other peoples of antiquity and modern times. The act of circumcision is represented in the temple of Khonsu, a medical deity, at Karnak. Among the Jews of antiquity circumcision had to be performed by means of a flint or stone knife (Exodus 4:25; Joshua 5:2,3) on the eighth day after birth (Genesis 17:12; 21:4; Leviticus12:3; Luke 2:21; Philippians 3:5), even if this day was the Sabbath (John 7:23).
Very early we find the practice one of which the descendants of Abraham became proud (Genesis 34:14), so that we see the uncircumcised despised and scorned (1 Samuel 17:26), and in the time of oppression under King Antiochus Epiphanes many Israelites suffered martyrdom rather than give up the distinctive sign of their people (1 Macc 1:48,60,61; 2 Macc 6:10). Among the Arabs and all Mohammedans the custom of circumcision prevails from pre-Islamic times, for it is nowhere ordered in the Koran, and the appellation “uncircumcised” ghalaft is considered the greatest possible insult.

A peculiar martial custom is mentioned in 1 Samuel 18:25,27 (compare 2 Samuel 3:14), where Saul is represented as asking “a hundred foreskins of the Philistines” as a dowry from David for the hand of Michal. This does not seem to have been an exceptional booty in war, especially if it meant that no very careful operation was expected to be performed, but the act became practically equivalent to extermination. We find in Egyptian history at the time of Ramses III, that an invasion into Egypt had been made by several Libyan tribes (see Diimichen, Histor. Inschr., I, plates I-VI, and II, plates 47 ff). The Egyptian army sent against the invaders defeated them and returned with a large number of karnatha which is a transcription into hieroglyphics of the Semitic word, [t wār ḫ] ḫ, qarenoth, the word being used euphemistically as is proven by the accompanying determinative sign of a phallus. See Chabas, Etudes sur l’antiquité historique d’apres lee sources egypienne,, etc., 234; Bondi, Hebr.-Phoen. Lehnworte im Egyptischen, Leipzig, 1886, 72-74.

(2) Metaphorically the word is used in a variety of ways:

(a) In the sense of “unlawful,” “forbidden as food,” “taboo.” The fruit of newly planted trees was not to be eaten (Leviticus 19:23-25).

(b) In the sense of “obstinacy,” “opposition to God’s law.” The rite of circumcision meant submission under the law. While an outward form could not be identical with an inward attitude toward God, the use of the word “circumcision” was soon extended to that of purity and obedience of the heart (Deuteronomy 10:16; 30:6; and Colossians 2:11, where this circumcision is called a “circumcision not made with hands, .... the circumcision of Christ”). The uselessness of outward circumcision, which does not include obedience and purity, is shown by Paul (Romans 2:25; 1 Corinthians 7:18; compare Acts 7:51).
In the sense of “Gentiles,” “non-Israelites” (Galatians 2:7; Ephesians 2:11; Colossians 3:11).

See CIRCUMCISION; CONCISION.

H. L. E. Luering

FOREST

<for'-est>:

(1) [vrj choresh] (compare proper name Harosheth), 2 Chronicles 27:4. In 1 Samuel 23:15 ff translated “wood”; in Isaiah 17:9, “wood”; in Ezekiel 31:3, “forest-like shade.” Applied to any thick growth of vegetation but not necessarily so extensive as (3).

(2) [s DeP” , pardec]: Nehemiah 2:8, margin “park”; Ecclesiastes 2:5, the King James Version “orchards,” the Revised Version (British and American) “parks”; Song of Solomon 4:13, English Versions of the Bible “orchard,” the Revised Version, margin “paradise.” A word of Persian origin signifying probably an enclosure.

See PARADISE.

(3) [r [ y” , ya`ar] from root meaning “rugged”; compare Arabic wa`ar, “a rugged, stony region.” It is sometimes rendered “forest” and sometimes (but less often in the Revised Version (British and American)) “wood.” It is used of certain definite wooded tracts: “the forest in Arabia” (Isaiah 21:13, margin “thickets”); “the forest of Carmel” (2 Kings 19:23 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “of his fruitful field”); “the forest of Hereth” (1 Samuel 22:5); “the forest of Lebanon” (1 Kings 7:2 f; 10:17-21; 2 Chronicles 9:16-20); “the forest of Ephraim,” East of the Jordan (2 Samuel 18:6,8,17). The word ya`ar appears also in well-known Kiriath-jearim, “the city of forests,” and Mr. Jearim (Joshua 15:10). Among numerous other references the following may be cited: Deuteronomy 19:5; Joshua 17:15,18; 1 Chronicles 16:33; 2 Kings 2:24; Psalm 80:13; 83:14; 96:12; 132:6; Ecclesiastes 2:6; Song of Solomon 2:3; 1 Samuel 7:2; 14:25,26; Jeremiah 4:29; 46:23; Ezekiel 34:29; Micah 3:12; 7:14.
(4) [Ē b “ s ] cebhakh], from root meaning “to interweave.” A “thicket” (Genesis 22:13; Jeremiah 4:7); “thicket of trees” (Psalm 74:5); “thickets of the forest” (Isaiah 9:18; 10:34).

(5) [µybi [ ; ‘adbhim], “thicket” (Jeremiah 4:29).

From many references it is evident that Palestine had in Old Testament times much more extensive forests and woodlands than today. For a discussion of the subject see BOTANY.

E. W. G. Masterman

FOREST OF EPHRAIM

See EPHRAIM.

FORETELL; FORETOLD

<for-tel’>, <for-told’>: The King James Version occurrences of these words in the New Testament represent as many Greek terms, and are in each case rendered differently in Revised Version:

(1) Mark 13:23 ([προείπων, proeipon]), the Revised Version (British and American) “told beforehand”;

(2) Acts 3:24 ([προκαταγγέλλω, prokataggello]), the Revised Version (British and American) simply “told”;

(3) 2 Corinthians 13:2 ([προλέγω, prolego]), the Revised Version (British and American) “said beforehand,” margin “plainly”; compare 1 Thessalonians 3:4. The foretelling of future events is claimed in the Old Testament as a prerogative of Yahweh (Isaiah 41:22,23; 42:9, etc.; compare Deuteronomy 18:22).

See PROPHECY.

FORFEIT

<for’-fit> ([µ r “ j ; charam]): “Forfeit” (from forisfacere, “to act beyond”) implies loss through transgression or non-observance of some law or rule. The word occurs only once as the translation of charam, “to shut in,” frequently to devote or consecrate a person or thing to God beyond redemption (compare Leviticus27:28,29; Micah 4:13; Ezr 10:8,
“That whosoever came not within three days, ... all his substance should be forfeited, and himself separated from the assembly of the captivity,” King James Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version (British and American) “devoted”; compare 1 Esdras 9:4, “Their cattle should be seized to the use of the temple” (anieroo, “to consecrate,” “devote”); 6:32, “all his goods seized for the king” (ta huparchonia autou einai (eis) basilika)).

The Revised Version (British and American) has “forfeited” (qadhesh, “consecrated,”; “devoted”) for “defiled” (Deuteronomy 22:9), margin “Hebrew consecrated”; “forfeit his life” for “lose his own soul” (psuche) (Matthew 16:26; Mark 8:36); “lose or forfeit his own self” for “lose himself or be cast away” (Luke 9:25, heauton de apolesas e zemiotheis; zemioo is the Septuagint for `anash, “to be mulcted,” or “fined,” Exodus 21:22; Deuteronomy 22:19; Proverbs 17:26 m; 19:19; 21:11; 22:3); Weymouth renders Luke 9:25, “to have lost or forfeited his own self” (or “had to pay his own self — his own existence — as a fine”); in the other instances of zemioo (1 Corinthians 3:15; Philippians 3:8), the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render “suffer loss,” “suffered .... loss”; 2 Corinthians 7:9 the King James Version, “receive damage.”

W. L. Walker

FORGE; FORGER

<forj>, <for'-jer> ([l p ” f ; Taphal]): “Forgers of lies” occurs in Job’s reply to his comforters (13:4; compare 14:17); the word is the translation of Taphal, “to patch,” “lay on,” “besmear,” hence, to impute, overcharge, etc.; in Psalm 119:69, “forged” occurs with a similar meaning: “The proud have forged a lie against me” (compare Sirach 51:2). “Forger,” in the sense of “one who forges, makes, anything,” is the Revised Version (British and American) rendering of laTas “to smite,” or “hammer,” in Genesis 4:22 King James Version: “Tubal-cain, an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron,” margin “an instructor of every artificer of copper and iron.”

W. L. Walker
FORGET; FORGETFUL

<for-get'>, <for-get'-ful> ([ʃ k ˈ v ; shakhach]; [ἐπιλανθάνωμαι, epilanthanomai]): “Forget” is to fail to hold in mind, and the forgetfulness may be either innocent or blameworthy. In the Old Testament the word is most frequently used as translation of *shakhach* in a blameworthy sense: to forget the covenant, the law, Yahweh their God (<Deuteronomy 4:9, 23, 11; 6:12; Judges 3:7; 1 Samuel 12:9; Psalm 44:20, etc.). In an innocent or neutral, sometimes good, sense it is used in Genesis 27:45; Deuteronomy 24:19; Job 9:27; 11:16; 24:20; Psalm 102:4, etc. It is also used of God forgetting or not seeming to care (Psalm 9:12; 10:11, 12; 13:1; 42:9; 77:9; Isaiah 49:15, etc.). To “forget” sometimes means to forsake (Psalm 45:10; 74:19, etc.).

In the New Testament *epilanthanomai* is used of simple forgetting (Matthew 16:5; Mark 8:14, etc.; in Luke 12:6 the sense of care is implied); Philippians 3:13, “forgetting the things which are behind,” has the force of leaving behind. “Forgetful” in Jas 1:25 is *epilesmone*, the Revised Version (British and American) “a hearer that forgetteth.”

“Forgetfulness” Psalm 88:12, “the land of forgetfulness,” is a synonym for Sheol, where all forget and are forgotten. the Revised Version (British and American) has “forget not” for “be ignorant of” (2 Peter 3:8; similarly 3:5).

W. L. Walker

FORGIVENESS

<for-giv’-nes> ([r p ˈ K; kaphar], [a c ] nasa’], [ʃ l ˈ s ; calach]; ἀπολύειν, apoluein] [χαρίζεις, charizesthai], [ἀφεσις, aphesis] [πάρεσις, paresis]):

1. ETYMOLOGY:

Of the seven words, three Hebrew and four Greek, which are used to express the idea of forgiveness, the last two occur in this sense only once each. *Apoluein* (Luke 6:37) is used because of the analogy of sin to debt, and denotes the release from it. It has the meaning “forgiveness” in 2 Macc 12:45 also, in which passage the word for sin is expressed. In Romans 3:25 Paul uses *paresis* instead of the usual *aphesis*. The former means “putting aside,” “disregarding,” “pretermission”; the latter, “putting
away” completely and unreservedly (Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, section xxxiii). It does not mean forgiveness in the complete sense, and in the King James Version is incorrectly translated “remission.” Nor does it mean that God had temporarily suspended punishment which at some later date He might inflict (Sanday on Romans 3:25). It was apparent that God had treated sins as though He had forgiven them, though in fact such an attitude on the part of God was without such a foundation as was later supplied by an adequate atonement, and so the apostle avoids saying that God forgave them. This passing over of sins had the tendency of destroying man’s conception of God’s righteousness, and in order to avert this Christ was set forth as a propitiation and God’s disregard of sin (paresis) became a real forgiveness (aphesis); compare Acts 14:16; 17:30. Charizesthai is not found outside of the writings of Luke and Paul, and in the sense “to forgive sins” is peculiarly Pauline (2 Corinthians 2:7; 12:13; Ephesians 3:2; Colossians 2:13; 3:13). It expresses, as no other of these words does, his conception of the graciousness of God’s pardon. Kaphar (Deuteronomy 21:8; Psalm 78:38; Jeremiah 18:23) and calah (Numbers 30:5,8,12; 1 Kings 8:30,34,36,39,50, etc.) are used only of Divine forgiveness, while nasa’ is used in this sense (Exodus 32:32; Numbers 14:19; Joshua 24:19; Psalm 25:18; 32:1,5; 99:8; Isaiah 2:9), and also of human forgiveness (Genesis 50:17; Exodus 10:17; 1 Samuel 25:28). Remission (Matthew 26:28; Mark 1:4; Luke 1:77; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 10:43; Hebrews 9:22; 10:18) and blotting out (Psalm 51:19; Isaiah 43:25; Jeremiah 18:23; Acts 3:19) are synonyms of forgiveness, and to understand it fully such words as save, justify, reconcile and atonement should also be considered.

2. PAGAN AND JEWISH IDEAS:

Forgiveness was not a pagan virtue. The large-souled man might disregard offenses in cases where he considered them beneath his notice, but to forgive was weak-spirited (F. W. Robertson on 1 Corinthians 4:12). Even in the Old Testament, man’s forgiveness of his fellow-man is infrequently mentioned. In every case the one asking forgiveness is in a position of subserviency, and is petitioning for that to which he has no just right (Genesis 50:17; Exodus 10:17; 1 Samuel 15:25; 25:28). The Imprecatory Psalms attest the fact that forgiveness of enemies was not esteemed as a virtue by Israel. They could appeal to the law which enjoined upon them to seek neither the peace nor the prosperity of their avowed
enemies (Deuteronomy 23:6; compare Ezr 9:12). Jesus gave the popular summing-up of the law and not its exact words when he said, “Ye have heard that it was said .... hate thine enemy” (Matthew 5:43), and this certainly does represent their attitude and their understanding of the teaching of the Scriptures.

3. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST:

Christ taught that forgiveness is a duty. No limit can be set to the extent of forgiveness (Luke 17:4) and it must be granted without reserve. Jesus will not admit that there is any wrong so gross nor so often repeated that it is beyond forgiveness. To Him an unforgiving spirit is one of the most heinous of sins (Bruce, Parabolaic Teaching, 376 ff). This is the offense which God will not forgive (Matthew 18:34,35). It is the very essence of the unpardonable sin (Mark 3:22-30). It was the one blemish of the elder son which marred an otherwise irreproachable life (Luke 15:28-30). This natural, pagan spirit of implacability Jesus sought to displace by a generous, forgiving spirit. It is so far the essence of His teaching that in popular language “a Christian spirit” is not inappropriately understood to be synonymous with a forgiving disposition. His answer to Peter that one should forgive not merely seven times in a day, but seventy times seven (Matthew 18:21,22), not only shows that He thought of no limit to one’s forgiveness, but that the principle could not be reduced to a definite formula.

4. CONDITIONS OF FORGIVENESS:

Jesus recognized that there are conditions to be fulfilled before forgiveness can be granted. Forgiveness is part of a mutual relationship; the other part is the repentance of the offender. God does not forgive without repentance, nor is it required of man. The effect of forgiveness is to restore to its former state the relationship which was broken by sin. Such a restoration requires the cooperation of both parties. There must be both a granting and an acceptance of the forgiveness. Sincere, deep-felt sorrow for the wrong which works repentance (2 Corinthians 7:10) is the condition of mind which insures the acceptance of the forgiveness. Hence, Jesus commands forgiveness when the offender turns again, saying, “I repent” (Luke 17:3,1). It was this state of mind which led the father joyfully to welcome the Prodigal before he even gave utterance to his newly formed purpose (Luke 15:21).
5. THE OFFENDED PARTY:

It is not to be supposed, however, that failure to repent upon the part of the offender releases the offended from all obligation to extend forgiveness. Without the repentance of the one who has wronged him he can have a forgiving state of mind. This Jesus requires, as is implied by, “if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts” (Matthew 18:35). It is also implied by the past tense in the Lord’s Prayer: “as we also have forgiven our debtors” (Matthew 6:12). It is this forgiving spirit which conditions God’s forgiveness of our sins (Mark 11:25; Matthew 6:14,15). In such a case the unforgiving spirit is essentially unrepentance (Matthew 18:23-35). “Of all acts, is not, for a man, repentance the most Divine?”

The offended is to go even farther and is to seek to bring the wrongdoer to repentance. This is the purpose of the rebuking commanded in Luke 17:3. More explicitly Jesus says, “If thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone” (Matthew 18:15-17). He is to carry his pursuit to the point of making every reasonable effort to win the wrongdoer, and only when he has exhausted every effort may he abandon it. The object is the gaining of his brother. Only when this is evidently unattainable is all effort to cease.

The power of binding and loosing, which means forbidding and allowing, was granted to Peter (Matthew 16:19) and to the Christian community (Matthew 18:18; John 20:23). It clearly implies the possession of the power to forgive sins. In the case of Peter’s power it was exercised when he used the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 16:19). This consisted in the proclamation of the gospel and especially of the conditions upon which men might enter into relationship with God (Acts 2:38; 10:34 ff). It was not limited to Peter only, but was shared by the other apostles (Matthew 16:19; 18:18). Christ left no fixed rules the observance or non-observance of which would determine whether one is or is not in the kingdom of God. He gave to His disciples principles, and in the application of these principles to the problems of life there had to be the exercise of discriminating judgment. The exercise of this judgment was left to the Christian community (2 Corinthians 2:10). It is limited by the principles which are the basis of the kingdom, but within these principles the voice of the community is supreme. The forgiveness here implied is not the pronouncing of absolution for the sins of individuals, but the determination of courses of conduct and worship which will be acceptable.
In doing this its decisions will be ratified in heaven (Westcott on John 20:23).

That there is a close analogy between human and Divine forgiveness is clearly implied (Matthew 5:23,14; 6:12; Mark 11:25; Luke 6:37; Colossians 1:14; 3:13). God’s forgiveness is conditional upon man’s forgiveness of the wrongs done him, not because God forgives grudgingly but because forgiveness alone indicates that disposition of mind which will humbly accept the Divine pardon.

6. DIVINE AND HUMAN FORGIVENESS:

Repentance is a necessary ingredient of the fully developed forgiveness. There is no essential difference between the human and the Divine pardon, though the latter is necessarily more complete. It results in the complete removal of all estrangement and alienation between God and man. It restores completely the relationship which existed prior to the sin. The total removal of the sin as a result of the Divine forgiveness is variously expressed in the Scriptures: “Thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back” (Isaiah 38:17); “Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea” (Micah 7:19); “I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more” (Jeremiah 31:34); “I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions” (Isaiah 43:25); “As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us” (Psalm 103:12).

Ideally this same result is attained in human forgiveness, but actually the memory of the sin remains with both parties as a barrier between them, and even when there is a complete restoration of amity the former state of alienation cannot entirely be removed from memory. When God forgives, however, He restores man to the condition of former favor. Release from punishment is involved, though Divine forgiveness is more than this. In most cases the consequences, which in some instances are spoken of as punishment, are not removed, but they lose all penal character and become disciplinary. Nor does the forgiveness remove from human mind the consciousness of sin and the guilt which that involved, but it does remove the mistrust which was the ground of the alienation. Mistrust is changed into trust, and this produces peace of mind (Psalm 32:5-7; Romans 5:1); consciousness of the Divine love and mercy (Psalm 103:2 ff); removes fear of punishment (2 Samuel 12:13); and awakens love to God.
7. FORGIVENESS AND JUSTIFICATION:

Paul rarely uses the term “forgiveness,” but in its place prefers justification. They are to his understanding practically synonymous (Stevens, Theology of the New Testament, 418). He preferred the latter, however, because it was better fitted to express the idea of secure, present and permanent acceptance in the sight of God. It connoted both a complete and a permanent state of grace. In popular thought forgiveness is not so comprehensive, but in the Biblical sense it means no less than this. It removes all of the guilt and cause of alienation from the past; it assures a state of grace for the present; and promises Divine mercy and aid for the future. Its fullness cannot adequately be conveyed by any one term or formula.

Divine, like human, forgiveness is always contingent upon the fulfillment of conditions. It must be preceded by repentance and a firmly fixed intention not to repeat the offense. In addition to this, one was required to conform to certain legal or formal acts before the assurance of pardon was his. These acts were expressive of the sinner’s state of mind. They consisted of certain acts of sacrifice in the pre-Christian times and of baptism during the ministry of John the Baptist (Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3) and under Christ (Acts 2:38; 22:16). These acts are never regarded as in any sense a quid pro quo in return for which the benefit of forgiveness is granted. It is an act of pure grace on God’s part, and these acts are required as expressions of the man’s attitude toward God. The state of mind required in order to obtain the gift of forgiveness is that to which the Prodigal Son came (Luke 15:17-19), and that of the sinner who went to his house justified rather than the Pharisee (18:9-14), because he realized that forgiveness was to him an act of pure favor.

There was real and actual forgiveness of sins in the Old Testament times as well as since Christ. Certain passages have been construed to teach that the Law provided only for a passing over or rolling back of sins, and that there was not then an actual forgiveness.

8. OLD TESTAMENT TEACHING:

The sacrifices prescribed by the Law were not adequate atonements, so that there was constant necessity of yearly remembrance of sin (Hebrews 10:3; compare Leviticus 16:21). The atonement of Christ is, however, of permanent adequacy, and became retroactive in the sense that
it unified in Christ the Divine arrangement for saving mankind in all ages (Hebrews 11:40). “The passing over of the sins done aforetime” (Romans 3:25) does not imply a partial or apparent forgiveness, but means that they were forgiven, though seemingly without adequate recognition on the part of God of their heinous character. In view of God’s righteous character men might naturally have expected punishment, but instead the offenders were spared (compare Acts 14:16; 17:30). No expression in the Old Testament suggests any inadequacy of the forgiveness extended to Israel, but on the other hand many passages may be quoted to show how rich and full it was deemed to be (Psalm 103; Micah 7:19; Isaiah 38:17, Jeremiah 31:34).

9. LIMITATIONS OF FORGIVENESS:

Two passages seem to limit God’s forgiveness. They are Christ’s discussion of the unpardonable sin (Matthew 12:31,32; Mark 3:28-30; Luke 12:10), and the one which mentions the sin unto death (1 John 5:16; compare Hebrews 6:4-6). In the former passage there is mentioned a sin which has no forgiveness, and in the latter, one on behalf of which the apostle cannot enjoin prayer that it be forgiven, though he does not prohibit it. In both cases the sin is excluded from the customary forgiveness which is extended to sins of all other classes.

The act of the Pharisees which led Jesus to speak of the unpardonable sin was the attributing of a good deed wrought by Him through the Spirit of God (Matthew 12:28) to Beelzebub. No one could do such a thing unless his moral nature was completely warped. To such a person the fundamental distinctions between good and evil were obliterated. No ordinary appeal could reach him, for to him good seemed evil and evil seemed good. The possibility of winning him back is practically gone; hence, he is beyond the hope of forgiveness, not because God has set an arbitrary line of sinfulness, beyond which His grace of forgiveness will not reach, but because the man has put himself beyond the possibility of attaining to that state of mind which is the essential condition of Divine forgiveness. It is practically certain that John did not have any particular sinful act in mind when he spoke of the sin which is unto death.

See BLASPHEMY.

There is no possible way of determining what specific sin, if any, he refers to. Probably the same principle applies in this case as in that of the
unpardonable sin. God’s forgiveness is limited solely by the condition that man must accept it in the proper spirit.

There are some passages which seem to imply that forgiveness was the principal Messianic task. This is suggested by the name given to the Messiah during His earthly career (Matthew 1:21), and by the fact that He was the Savior. The remission of sins was the preparation for the advent of the Messiah (Luke 1:77), and repentance and remission of sins were the prerequisites to a state of preparation for the kingdom.

10. CHRIST’S POWER TO FORGIVE SINS:

It is not surprising, therefore, that we find Jesus laying claim to the power to forgive sins. This provoked a bitter controversy with the Jews, for it was axiomatic with them that no one could forgive sins but God only (Mark 2:7; Luke 5:21; 7:49). This Jesus did not question, but He would have them infer from His power to forgive sins that He was the possessor of Divine power. Jesus asserted His possession of this power on two occasions only, though it has been insufficiently inferred from John 5:14; 8:11 that He was accustomed to pronounce absolution upon all of those He healed. On one of these occasions He not merely asserted that He possessed the power, but demonstrated it by showing Himself to be the possessor of the Divine gift of healing. The impostor might claim some such intangible power as the authority to forgive sins, but he would never assert the possession of such easily disproved power as the ability to heal the sick. But Jesus claimed both, and based His claim to be the possessor of the former on the demonstration that He possessed the latter. God would not support an impostor, hence, his aid in healing the paralytic proved that Jesus could forgive sins. The multitude accepted this logic and “glorified God, who had given such authority unto men” (Matthew 9:2-9; compare Mark 2:3-12; Luke 5:18-26).

On the other occasion when His possession of this power was under discussion (Luke 7:36-50), He offered no other proof than the forgiven woman’s deep gratitude and love. One expression that He uses, however, has raised some discussion as to the relative order in time of her love and forgiveness (Luke 7:47). Did she love because she was forgiven, or vice versa? Manifestly the forgiveness precedes the love, in spite of the fact that Luke 7:47 seems to assert the opposite, for this is the bearing of the parable of the Two Debtors (7:41-43), and the latter part of 7:47 has the
same implication. It is clear that she had previously repented and had been accepted, and the anointing of Jesus was an outpouring of her gratitude. The phrase of 7:47, “for she loved much,” is proof of the greatness of her sin rather than a reason why she was forgiven. In both cases where Jesus forgave sins, He did so because the state of mind of the person forgiven showed worthiness of the blessing. To this as a condition of forgiveness there is no exception. Christ’s prayer on the cross (Luke 23:34) would not avail to secure the pardon of His murderers without their repentance.

11. THE NEED OF AN ATONEMENT:

Though forgiveness is on God’s part an act of pure grace prompted by His love and mercy, and though He forgives freely all those who comply with the condition of repentance and abandonment of sin, yet this does not dispense with the necessity of an atonement. The parable of the Prodigal Son was spoken to teach the freedom of God’s forgiveness and acceptance of returning sinners, and the duty of men to assume the same attitude toward them. This much it teaches, but it fails to set forth entirely God’s attitude toward sin. With reference to the sinner God is love and mercy, but with reference to sin He is righteous, and this element of God’s nature is no less essential to Him than His love, and must be considered in any effort to set forth completely the doctrine of God’s forgiveness of sinners. The atonement of Christ and the many atonements of the Law were manifestations of this phase of God’s nature.

12. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT:

The idea of an atonement is fundamental in the teachings of the New Testament (Romans 5:10; 2 Corinthians 5:18-21; Colossians 1:21). It is very clearly implied in such terms as reconciliation and propitiation, and is no less present in pardon, remission and forgiveness. The doctrine of the atonement is not developed by Jesus, but it is strongly hinted at and is unmistakably implied in the language of Matthew 20:28; 26:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 24:46,47. John the Baptist’s salute, “Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!” (John 1:29), also implies it. In the writings of the apostles it is repeatedly and clearly affirmed that our forgiveness and reconciliation to God is based upon the death of Christ. “In none other is there salvation” (Acts 4:12); through Him is the redemption (Romans 3:24); God set Him forth to be a propitiation (Romans 3:25); through Him “we have
now received the reconciliation” (Romans 5:11); “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself” (2 Corinthians 5:19); “Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf” (2 Corinthians 5:21); and “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us” (Galatians 3:13). Such citations might be greatly multiplied. That which was so perfectly accomplished by the offering of Christ was in an analogous though imperfect way accomplished by the sacrifices required by the Law. It had “a shadow of the good things to come” (Hebrews 10:1).

The unvarying effect of sin is to produce an estrangement between the injurer and the wronged. The nature of God is such and the relationship between Him and man is of such a character that sin brings about an alienation between them. It is this presupposition of an estrangement between them which renders the atonement necessary before forgiveness can be extended to man. This estrangement must be removed, and the alienation be transformed into a reconciliation. In what then does the alienation consist?

The sin of man produces a changed attitude toward each other on the part of both God and man. God holds no personal pique against man because of his sin. The New Testament language is very carefully chosen to avoid any statement which would seem to convey such a conception. Yet God’s holy righteousness is such that He cannot be indifferent to sin. His wrath must rest upon the disobedient (John 3:36; Romans 1:18). It is not merely impersonal. It is not enough to say He hates the sin. Man’s unrighteousness has not merely alienated him from God, but God also from him. The word “enemies” (echthroi) of Romans 5:10 is passive, and means the object of God’s enmity (Sunday, at the place). It was because of this fact that God set forth Christ to be a propitiation to show His righteousness because of the passing over of sins done aforetime (Romans 3:25,26). God’s passing over, without inflicting punishment, the sins of pre-Christian times had placed in jeopardy His righteousness; had exposed Him to the implication that He could tolerate sin. God could not be true to Himself while He tolerated such an imputation, and so instead of visiting punishment upon all who sinned — which would have been one way of showing His righteousness — He set forth Christ to death (“in his blood”), and in this way placed Himself beyond the imputation of unrighteousness while it enabled Him to show mercy to sinners. The effect of sin upon man was to estrange him from God, to lead him farther and farther away from
his Maker. Each successive sin produced a greater barrier between the two. Now the atonement was designed to remove the cause of this estrangement and restore the former relationship between God and man. This too, it has been observed, is the purpose of forgiveness, so that the atonement finds its completion in forgiveness. It should be noted that the reconciliation originates with God and not with man (Romans 3:25; 2 Corinthians 5:19). God woos man before the latter seeks God. The effect of the atonement on man is to reconcile him, attract him, to God. It shows him God’s love for man, and the forgiveness, in that it removes sin completely, takes away the estranging factor between them and so wins man back to God. “We love, because he first loved us.” At the same time the atonement is such a complete expression of both the love and the righteousness of God that, while on the one hand it exhibits his yearning for man, on the other it shows that He is not tolerant toward sin. In the atonement of Christ, therefore, is the meeting-place and the reconciliation of God’s holy horror of sin and the free bestowal of forgiveness upon penitent believers.

William Charles Morro

FORGO

<for-go’> (from for, negative, and go): Occurs in Ecclesiasticus 7:19, as translation of [ἀστοχέω, astocheo], which means “to miss the mark,” “turn or swerve from.” “Forgo not a wise and good wife (the King James Version “woman”); for her grace is above gold,” meaning “Turn not away from her”; in Ecclesiasticus 8:9, the word is rendered “miss not”; compare 1 Timothy 1:6; 6:21; 2 Timothy 2:18.

FORK

<fork> ([א%ר|ל|ו|ק|יל|ו|ו] shelosh qilleshon]): This compound word, meaning strictly “three points” or “three prongs,” is found only once (1 Samuel 13:21), and doubtless there refers to the agricultural tool now known as the pitchfork. It might, however, also be a weapon.

FORM

<form> ([γ ρ | ν | ς | y; yatsar], [τ ο τ o’ar]; [μορφή, morphe]):

(1) To form is “to fashion,” “create,” “produce.” In the Old Testament it is for the most part the translation of yatsar, “to form,” “to fashion”
(Genesis 2:7, etc., “Yahweh God formed man of the dust of the ground,” etc.); also of chul and chil, “to be twisted” “turned round” “to bring forth (in pain)” (compare Isaiah 13:8; Micah 4:10; Deuteronomy 32:18 the King James Version, “God that formed thee”; Job 26:13 the King James Version; Psalm 90:2, “or ever thou hadst formed the earth” etc.; Proverbs 26:10 the King James Version). In the New Testament we have morphoo, “to form” (Galatians 4:19, “until Christ be formed in you”); plasso, “to form,” “to mold” (Romans 9:20, “him that formed it”; 1 Timothy 2:13, “Adam was first formed”; 2 Macc 7:23, “the Creator .... who formed the generation of man,” the Revised Version (British and American) “fashioned” 7:22, “that formed the members (diarrhuthmizo),” the Revised Version (British and American) “brought into order”).

(2) Form (noun) is used for

(a) appearance, mar’eh, “sight,” “appearance” (Job 4:16, “I could not discern the form thereof” the Revised Version (British and American) “appearance” with “form” for “image” (temunah) in next sentence); tselem, Aramaic “image” (Daniel 3:19, “The form of his visage was changed”); rew, “form,” “likeness” (Daniel 2:31; 3:25, the Revised Version (British and American) “aspect”); to’ar, “visage,” “form” (1 Samuel 28:14, “What form is he of?”);

(b) the fixed or characteristic form of anything, tabhnith, “model,” “form” (Ezekiel 8:3; 10:8, “the form of a hand”; 8:10, “every form of creeping things”); morphe, characteristic form as distinguished from schema, changing fashion (Philippians 2:6, “in the form of God”; 2:7, “the form of a servant”; less distinctly Mark 16:12, “in another form”);

(c) shape, model, pattern, mold, tsurah, “shape,” from tsur, “to cut or carve” (Ezekiel 43:11, ter, “the form of the house,” etc.); mishpat, “rule” (2 Chronicles 4:7 the King James Version); tupos, “type,” “impress” (Romans 6:17, the Revised Version, margin “pattern”); hupotuposis, “outline,” pattern (2 Timothy 1:13, the Revised Version (British and American) “pattern”); morphosis, “form,” “appearance” (Romans 2:20, “the form of knowledge”);
(d) orderly arrangement, giving shape or form (Genesis 1:2; Jeremiah 4:23, the earth was “without form,” tohu, the Revised Version (British and American) “waste”; The Wisdom of Solomon 11:17, amorphos); “form of speech” (2 Samuel 14:20, aspect, panim, “face,” the Revised Version (British and American) “to change the face of the matter”); as giving comeliness or beauty, to’ar (Isaiah 52:14; 53:2, “He hath no form nor comeliness”; compare Genesis 29:17; 39:6, etc.; The Wisdom of Solomon 15:5, “desiring the form (eidos) of a dead image,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the breathless form”);

(e) Show, without substance, morphosis, “form” (2 Timothy 3:5, “holding a form of godliness”).

ARV has “didst form” for “hast possessed” (Psalm 139:13, so the English Revised Version, margin; both have “formed” for “made” (Psalm 104:26), the American Standard Revised Version for “framed” twice (Isaiah 29:16); both for “formed thee,” “gave birth” (Deuteronomy 32:18); “pierced” (Job 26:13); “woundeth” (Proverbs 26:10); “fastened” (Isaiah 44:10); for “are formed from” (Job 26:5), “tremble”; for “their form” (2 Chronicles 4:7), “the ordinance concerning them”; “form” for “similitude” (Numbers 12:8; Deuteronomy 4:12,15); for “size” (1 Kings 6:25; 7:37); for “shape” (Luke 3:22; John 5:37); “in the form” for “similitude” (Deuteronomy 4:16); for “or the like” (Deuteronomy 4:23,15); the American Standard Revised Version “(beholding) thy form” for “thy likeness” (Psalm 17:15, the English Revised Version, margin); “every form” for “all appearance” (1 Thessalonians 5:22; so the English Revised Version, margin “appearance”).

W. L. Walker

FORMER

<for’-mer>: The word in the sense of “maker,” “framer,” occurs only in Jeremiah 51:19, “He is the former (from yatsar, “to form”) of all things.” The adjective, in the sense of preceding in the order of time, is commonly in Hob the translation of ri’shon, “first,” “foremost” (Genesis 40:13; Numbers 21:26; Deuteronomy 24:4, etc.); in Greek of proteros (Ephesians 4:22; Hebrews 10:32; 1 Peter 1:14); and in two cases (Acts 1:1; Revelation 21:4) of protos, where
the Revised Version (British and American) has (in Acts in the margin) “the first.” As denoting place or position the word occurs in the Old Testament in Zec 14:8, “the former sea” as translation of qadhimony, “in front,” where the Revised Version (British and American) has “eastern,” i.e. the Dead Sea, in contrast with the Mediterranean, or western sea (compare Ezekiel 47:18; Joel 2:20). For “former iniquities” (Psalm 79:8) the Revised Version (British and American) has simply “the iniquities”; Other changes may be seen in Numbers 6:12; Isaiah 65:7; Ezekiel 36:11; Micah 4:8; Haggai 2:3.

W. L. Walker

FORNICATION

<for-ni-ka’-shun>.  
See CRIMES.

FORSWEAR

<for-swar’>.  
See CRIMES.

FORTH

<forth>: “Forth,” adverb (from “for”), signifies movement

(1) forward,

(2) out of,

(3) beyond a certain boundary.

In a few instances in the Old Testament it is the translation of the preposition `al, properly “above,” “upon” (2 Kings 11:15; 2 Chronicles 23:14; Amos 7:17 the King James Version), and of chuts, “without” (Genesis 39:13; Judges 19:25). “Forth” is often used as an expletive of various verbs, as “break (forth),” “bring (forth),” “call (forth),” etc. In the Gospel of John it is the translation of exo, “without,” as “Lazarus, come forth” (11:43; so 15:6; 19:4 the King James Version, etc.; also Acts 5:34; 9:40). “Stand forth” in Mark 3:3 is the translation of egeire eis to meson, margin “Arise into the midst.” the Revised Version (British and American) has a great many changes, frequently substituting
“out,” “away,” “abroad,” etc.; “forth from” for “out of” (Job 41:21; Isaiah 45:23); “spread forth” for “stretched out” (Psalm 44:20; 88:9; 136:6), etc. In Colossians 1:6, for “bringeth forth fruit” the Revised Version (British and American) reads “bearing fruit.”

W. L. Walker

FORTIFICATION; FORT, FORTIFIED (FENCED) CITIES; FORTRESS

<for-ti-fi-ka’-shun> (including):

Has a number of words representing its various elements and aspects:

(1) [x b mi] mibhtsar, is the term generally rendered “fenced” or “defenced city.” In both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of Isaiah and Jeremiah we find for the most part the more formal “defenced city.” It is found by itself (Isaiah 17:3); with `ir, “city” (1 Samuel 6:18; 2 Kings 3:19; plural `are mibhtsar, “fenced (the American Standard Revised Version “fortified”) cities,” Numbers 32:17); with [x o tsor], “Tyre” (Joshua 19:29; 2 Samuel 24:7, where it is rendered “stronghold”).

(2) [G mi] misgabh, “high fort” (Isaiah 25:12; Jeremiah 48:1 the Revised Version, margin, Psalm 9:9, and many other places in the Pss).

(3) [m m; m`oz], “fortress,” “stronghold” (Judges 6:26; Psalm 31:2; Daniel 11:39).

(4) [h d m] metsudhah, “fort” the King James Version, “stronghold” the Revised Version (British and American) (2 Samuel 5:9,17).

(5) [h r m] metsurah, “fort” (Isaiah 29:3 the King James Version; plural the Revised Version (British and American) “siege works”).

(7) [q yD; dayeq], “fort” (for the siege of a city, the wall of circumvallation cast up by the besiegers, 2 Kings 25:1; Jeremiah 52:4; Ezekiel 4:2; 17:17; 21:22; 26:8).

(8) [r ym; mastsor], “fortress” (Jeremiah 10:17 margin, wall of circumvallation: Habakkuk 2:1, “tower” the King James Version, “fortress” the Revised Version, margin; Zec 9:3).

(9) [h r yB i birah], “palace” the King James Version, “castle” the Revised Version (British and American) (Nehemiah 2:8; 7:2). Birah Grecized is [βαρις, baris], which has the double meaning of “palace” and “fortress.” Nehemiah’s “castle” figures largely in the books of Maccabees and in Josephus, and is the Castle of Antonia of the Acts of the Apostles.

(10) [oχρωμα, ochuroma] (2 Corinthians 10:4, its only occurrence in the New Testament though it is the chief equivalent of mibhtsar in the Septuagint). In this connection it is to be noted that [h mWD, chomah], is Hebrew for “wall,” Greek [τειχος, teichos]; [l j e or l j e chel] is Hebrew for the “ditch,” or “rampart,” or “bastion” of a fortress; [l Dgni mighdal], “tower”; [h NP i pinnah] plural [t wNP i pinnoth], “corner towers.”

**FORTIFIED PLACES:**

From the very beginning of their history as a nation the Israelites were acquainted with fortified cities. The report of cities “great and fortified up to heaven,” inhabited by the sons of Anak, by Amalekites, Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites and Canaanites, struck terror into the hearts of the Israelites in the wilderness, and called forth murmurings from them on their way to Canaan (Numbers 13:28 ff; Deuteronomy 1:28). Not that these cities were at all of the extent or population of modern cities, or of Nineveh, Babylon and Memphis of old. But to a people who were as yet little better than a horde of fugitives accustomed to the simple camp life of the wilderness and unacquainted with appliances for siege and assault, the prospect of scaling the walls and conquering the inhabitants was appalling. The cities of the Canaanites were already old when Joshua led the Israelites to the conquest of the land. Not a little of their history has become known
to us, and the character of their defensive works has been disclosed by Palestinian excavation in recent years.

I. IN RECENT EXCAVATIONS.

1. Excavation of Tells:

It has been largely to the tells, or mounds of buried cities, chiefly in the southwest of the land, that exploration has been directed. The Palestine Exploration Fund, drawing its resources from Great Britain and also from America, was the first, and has all along been the foremost, in the work of excavation. Through the labors of Professor Flinders Petrie at Tell el-Hesy; of Dr. F. J. Bliss, and Professor Stewart Macalister at Tell Zakariyah, Tell ec-Safi, Tell ej-Judeideh, Tell Sandahannah, and more recently of Professor Macalister at Gezer, the Fund has added largely to our knowledge of the fenced cities of Canaan. The work of Sir Charles Warren, Sir Charles W. Wilson, Colonel Conder and other explorers at Jerusalem under the same auspices has been of great value for illustrating the defensive works of a later time. Germany and Austria have not been behind. The excavation, first, of Tell Ta’anek in the Plain of Esdraelon, and, at the present time (1911), of Jericho by Professor E. Sellin, formerly of Vienna, now of Rostock; and of Tell el-Mutesellim, the ancient Megiddo, by Gottlieb Schumacher, has yielded results of the highest importance. Since 1908 an American expedition from Harvard University, first under Schumacher and now under Dr. Reisner, who had previously excavated at the Pyramids and other places in Egypt, has explored with remarkable results the site of the capital of the Northern Kingdom, Samaria. Excavations have also been conducted by the German Orient Committee at Sinjerli which have thrown a flood of light upon the archaeology of Northern Syria and especially upon the wonderful Hittite people. The memoirs and reports of these excavations have furnished abundance of material for tracing the evolution and understanding the anatomy of the tell. They usefully supplement the Scripture narratives, and confirm them in many particulars.

2. Sites:

These cities of the primitive inhabitants of Canaan occupied sites easily capable of defense. They were built either upon a projecting spur of a mountain ridge, like Gezer, Megiddo, Tell ec-Safi (believed to be the ancient Gath) and primitive Jerusalem, or upon an isolated eminence in the plain like Tell el-Hesy (Lachish) or Taanach. Compared with modern cities
the area was small — in the case of Gezer about a quarter of a mile square, Lachish 15 acres, Megiddo and Taanach 12 to 13 acres. A sufficient water supply within easy reach was an essential feature. Speaking of Gezer, Professor Macalister says: “Water, the first necessity of life, was in abundance. The three primitive modes of livelihood — hunting, pasturing, and agriculture — could be practiced here better than in many places. Further, for defense — another prime necessity in early days — the hill is admirably fitted. It is steep and not easy to climb; and being fairly high it commands a wide prospect, so that the approach of enemies can be seen and prepared for” (Bible Side-Lights from Gezer, 25,26).

3. Primitive Character:

Their history goes back in most cases to a very remote antiquity. “It cannot have been much later than 3000 BC,” says Professor Macalister regarding Gezer, “when a primitive race of men first realized that the bare rocky hill (as it then was) would be a suitable dwelling-place. This tribe was a cave-dwelling race” (as above; and PEFS, 1904, 311 ff). The primitive race had occupied the hill perhaps five hundred years when the Canaanites drove them out, as they in turn were driven out by the Israelites. But the nature of their original habitations, the earliest relics of their social life, and what can be gathered of their religious rites all bear witness to a remote antiquity. From the mound of Tell el-Hesy, now almost certainly identified with the site of Lachish, eleven cities, one above the other have been disinterred, the eleventh or highest having nine cities between itself and the first Amorite buildings reared upon the original bluff. This lowest city is believed to go back some 2000 years BC, Professor Flinders Petrie having dated the successive cities by means of the pottery found in the strata of the mound. One of the eleven cities, possibly the fourth from the bottom, was that of Lachish, which fell a prey to Joshua (Joshua 10:32), the walls of which, built of crude brick and 10-12 ft. in thickness, are a witness to its character as a fenced city (Bliss, A Mound of Many Cities, chapter iv).

4. Walls:

While the site of the Canaanite city was chosen for its natural strength, the first settlers soon felt the need of some fortification. At Sinjerli the excavators have been able to trace the general growth of the site from a group of shepherds’ huts into a walled town. The earliest fortification
attempted was a rampart of earth following the natural contour of the hill (PEFS, 1903, 113). Within some such enclosing wall, houses were built and the inhabitants lived and pursued their avocations safely. The primitive earthbank in the case of Gezer was in course of time replaced first by an inner and then by an outer wall in succession. The outer wall when it was added to strengthen the inner was the chel, rendered in the English version “bulwark” (Isaiah 26:1) or “rampart” (Nahum 3:8, where the waters of the Nile served the same purpose). Professor Macalister estimates that the inner wall of Gezer had fallen into disuse and ruin by about 1450 BC and that it was the outer that saw the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites.

“Even in its present ruined form,” says Professor Macalister, “the outer city wall is an imposing structure. In places it still stands to a height of from 10 to 14 ft., and these can hardly be regarded as being much more than the underground foundations. The outer face of the city wall, towering above the hill on which the city was built, may well have seemed impregnable to the messengers of Moses” (Bible Side-Lights, 142). The walls of a later time, as we learn from Assyrian representations, were provided with battlements, very often crenellated, and “thy pinnacles of rubies” (Isaiah 54:12, the Revised Version (British and American), the Revised Version, margin “windows”) may refer to them. For the purpose of strengthening the walls, especially at the least defensible points, revetments or facings of stone or kiln-burnt bricks were sometimes added. Even these again would be rendered less assailable by a trench (chel) serving to cut off a fortress from adjacent level or sloping ground, as may still be seen outside the North wall of Jerusalem, and many parts of the walls of Constantinople.

5. Towers:

Towers were sometimes built at the corners or at points on the wall where attack was to be apprehended (Zephaniah 1:16; 2 Chronicles 14:7). Such towers have been disclosed on the crest of the hill at Tell Zakariyah. At Gezer 30 towers were found round the outer wall. On the walls of Sinjerli there rose no fewer than 800 towers (Garstang, Land of the Hittites, 273). On the evidence of the excavations at this ancient Hittite site we gather that the cities about the time of the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan “were already surrounded by masoned walls, supported by numerous external towers, and entered through gateways barred by a pair of double doors and guarded by wing towers on either hand” (Land of the Hittites, 367). For illustrations, see CITY.
6. Acropolis or Castle:

Every one of these ancient cities had an inner fortress which would be an internal means of protection, and the last refuge of the defenders in extremity. At Tell Zakariyah the acropolis wall has been traced, and its shape has been found to be conditioned by the contours of the hill on which it stood. In an old Hittite settlement a fortress has been found rectangular in shape and supported by an outer and lower wall at a distance of 12 to 30 yds. (Land of the Hittites, 162). There is evidence that the mound or bluff originally occupied remained the fortress or acropolis of the city when it spread out over a larger area, and this seems to have been the case for some time at least with the Jebusite fort taken by David and made the capital of the kingdom. At Sinjerli, while there was a wall surrounding the whole township, there was an outer as well as an inner defensive wall to the citadel. Upon this citadel were found palaces from which the Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser I, copied the plan of a Hittite palace, called in Assyrian Hilani.

7. Masonry:

The excavations enable us to see the progress of the art of fortification from very primitive beginnings. Crude brick and rough stone-work were the materials of the earliest walls. They are usually found of uncoursed masonry in which the large stones are undressed field boulders. The facings of stone and the joints in walls were often packed with pebbles or with limestone chippings, the stones themselves being more or less roughly trimmed and dressed to shape by a hammer. Corner-stones are found in the towers showing marks of the chisel, but it is not till well on in the Hebrew period that stones are found with bosses and marginal drafting. At Zakariyah the walls of the acropolis were of rubble laid in mud, mixed with straw without lime, and they contained some well-worked stones, irregularly intermingled with field stones of various sizes. At a later time mortar was used to cover the walls and give greater strength and support. But the clay used for the purpose was apt to crack unless it was given consistency by treading with the feet and mixing with water. Thus we read of a wall daubed with untempered mortar (Ezekiel 13:10-16; 22:28; compare Nahum 3:14). In the masonry of the Hittite fortress (see (6) above) the masonry of the inner wall is rough, dry stonewalling, while the outer is built of stones roughly pentagonal in shape, irregular in size, fitted
to one another and laid without mortar, somewhat like the Cyclopean walls of the earliest periods of Greek history.

See GEZER.

8. Gates:

The gates of the fenced cities of Canaan may not have had the social importance which the city gate came to possess in later times, but they were an important element in the defensive works of a city. They were as few as possible, so as to give only the necessary ingress and egress. The gate of Jericho was shut and secured at nightfall (Joshua 2:5). The gate of Gaza had two leaves which were not hinged to the two gate-posts, but turned on pins moving in sockets in the sill and lintel, the bar stretching between the two posts and let into them to secure the gate (Judges 16:3, with Moore’s notes). The hundred gates of Babylon, according to Herodotus, were all of brass (i.179); and Yahweh promises to Cyrus to break in pieces the doors of brass and to cut in sunder the bars of iron (Isaiah 45:2). That the bars were sometimes of wood is clear from what is said of the bars of Nineveh (Nab 3:13). To protect the gate it was supplied with towers. Uzziah built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate and at the valley gate, and fortillied them (2 Chronicles 26:9). In the inner wall of Gezer, to which reference has been made, a gate of very remarkable structure has been found. The wall is of stone, but the gateway consists of a passage between two solid towers of brick. The passage is 9 ft. wide and 42 ft. long, roughly paved with stones. Stone slabs on each side of the passageway bear traces of fire, and the absence of any wooden barrier may be due to a conflagration at the capture of the city. The towers remain standing and rise to a total height of about 16 ft. In later times watchmen were set on the tower over the gate to descry the approach of friend or foe or messenger (2 Samuel 18:24 ff), and the tower had chambers in it which might be occupied by visitors or by a guard. For the more general purposes see GATE.

9. Water Supply:

One of the essential requisites of the primitive Canaanite fortress was a supply of water. At Gezer a copious spring within easy reach was available. Tell el-Hesy commands the only springs in that region (A Mound of Many Cities, 16). It is a strong point in favor of the modern theory of the ridge of Ophel being the site of Zion or David’s town that the Virgin’s Fountain,
the only perennial spring in the whole circuit of Jerusalem, was close to it, and would have been an inducement to the Jebusites to build their fortress there. In the sites that have been excavated, cisterns, sometimes vaulted over and with steps down into them, have been constantly found. Traces have also been observed of concealed passages or tunnels by which access has been obtained to the nearest spring. Some such explanation has been given of the “gutter” (2 Samuel 5:8 the King James Version, “watercourse” the Revised Version (British and American)), by which Joab obtained access to the fortress of Jebus and enabled David to capture it (1 Chronicles 11:6; compare Vincent, Canaan d’apres l’exploration recente, 26). During an investment of a fortified city by an enemy, it was a point in strategy for the inhabitants to secure the fountain and to divert or conceal the stream flowing from it so that the besiegers might be left without a water supply (2 Kings 3:19,25; 2 Chronicles 32:3; compare also 2 Samuel 12:26,27, Century Bible, Kennedy’s note).

II. IN BIBLICAL HISTORY.

1. Before the Monarchy:

On the passage of the Jordan the Israelites found in Jericho a walled city of great strength barring their progress. The excavations recently made have disclosed the common features of Canaanite fortresses — an outer wall, surrounding the entire area, 6 1/2 ft. thick, a citadel and protecting walls of hardly less substantial workmanship. Nearby also is the essential spring to furnish the water supply. Within the citadel were found the walls and rooms of Canaanite houses, and in many cases remains of infants buried in jars under the clay floors (Driver, Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible, 91 ff). These examples of “foundation sacrifices” with which the excavations at Gezer have made us familiar give point to the account of the resettlement of the city in the days of Ahab, when Hiel the Bethelite rebuilt Jericho, laying the foundation thereof with the loss of Abiram, his firstborn, and setting up the gates thereof with the loss of his youngest son Segub (1 Kings 16:34).

See CORNER STONE; CANAAN.

In the Book of Judges we read of the strong tower, or citadel, of Thebez, into which the inhabitants had crowded and to which Abimelech was setting fire when a woman upon the wall hurled a millstone upon him and broke his skull (Judges 9:51 f). It does not appear that at this period the
Israelites were in possession of the strongholds of the land, for when the Philistines overran the country, they had no fortresses to flee to, but “did hide themselves in caves, and in thickets, and in rocks, and in coverts, and in pits” (1 Samuel 13:6).

2. In the Period of the Monarchy:

When David captured the Jebusite fortress (2 Samuel 5:6 ff) and transferred his capital from Hebron to Jerusalem, a new era of independence and even of conquest began. The natural strength of David’s town, with such fortification as had been added, made it impregnable to any Philistine or Syrian foe, and one of the strongest fortresses in Western Asia.

Although Solomon was a man of peace, he included among the great buildings which he executed fortresses and works of defense. He built the wall of Jerusalem round about. He built Millo (called Akra (“citadel”) in the Septuagint), and closed the breaches of the city of David, so that there might be no vulnerable point found in the defenses of the city (1 Kings 9:15). This fortification is represented in Septuagint, which has here an addition to the Massoretic Text, as securing the complete subjection of the original inhabitants who remained. Solomon also built Hazor to watch Damascus, Megiddo to guard the plain of Jezreel, and Gezer overlooking the maritime plain, his work being one of refortification rather than of building from the foundation. He fortified also Beth-horon, Upper and Nether, to block the way against Philistine invasion. The store cities, and cities to accommodate his chariots and horses, were also part of his military system (1 Kings 9:18 ff).

The disruption of the kingdoms, and the jealousy and hostility that followed between Judah and Israel, necessitated fresh undertakings of fortification, on the part of both kingdoms. Rehoboam dwelt in Jerusalem, and built cities for defense in Judah. He fortified the strongholds and provisioned them and stored arms within them in case of siege (2 Chronicles 11:5 ff). One of Jeroboam’s first acts on ascending the throne was to build the two fortresses, Shechem to guard Mr. Ephraim, and Penuel to protect Gilead (1 Kings 12:25 f). Baasha later pushed his frontier within a few miles of Jerusalem, fortifying Ramah to overawe Asa in his very capital. The long war which lasted through the reigns of Jeroboam, Nadab, Baasha and Elah, kings of Israel, was largely a war of
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siegés, one of them, that of Gibbethon, having apparently lasted 27 years (1 Kings 15:27, compared with 1 Kings 16:15 ff).

With Omri there arose in Israel a powerful ruler whose name is mentioned with respect in the Assyrian monuments, which designate the kingdom of Israel Mat Bit Khumri, “the land of the house of Omri.” He was the builder of Samaria which remained the capital of the Northern Kingdom till its fall in 722 BC. In excavations but recently carried on by the archaeological expedition of Harvard University, the walls of Omri’s palace and fortress were laid bare, giving an impression of the great strength of the place.

While Solomon built the wall of Jerusalem, we read that Uzziah built towers at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turning of the wall, and fortified them (2 Chronicles 26:9). Jotham his son, continued his father’s labors in the further fortification of the city (2 Chronicles 27:3,1). Hezekiah had good reason to add still further to the strength of the city, seeing that he had to bear the brunt of Sennacherib’s expedition to the west. Sennacherib boasts that of Hezekiah’s fortified towns, he captured 46, with innumerable fortresses besides (Schrader, Schrader, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, I, 286), but he cannot tell that Jerusalem was among them, for it came through the ordeal unscathed. In the reign of Manasseh Jerusalem was captured and the king himself carried away to Nineveh, but on his repentance he was restored to the throne and set himself to strengthen the fortifications of the city (2 Chronicles 33:14). The city was unable, however, to hold out against Nebuchadrezzar and his captains; for it was taken in 597 BC, and King Jehoiachin and the flower of the population were deported to Babylon. After a siege of two years it was again taken in 586 BC, and temple and city were destroyed, and the walls razed to the ground.

3. In the Period of the Return:

The patriotic labor of Nehemiah in the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem belongs properly to the history of the city (see JERUSALEM). In the Maccabean struggle, the Akra (1 Macc 1:33; 3:45, etc.), the citadel, was long held by a Syrian garrison, and was in the end delivered up to the high priest by Demetrius (1 Macc 10:32). Notable also still later was the castle of Antonia (Acts 22:24) on the site of the earlier castle of Nehemiah’s day (Nehemiah 2:8; 7:2).
III. IN THE PSALMS AND THE PROPHETS.

1. The Psalms

Under the image of a fortress, or mountain fastness, inaccessible to any common foot, where there is perfect safety from enemies and persecutors, the Psalmist delights to express his confidence in God. Yahweh, in virtue of His righteous judgments, is a high tower to the downtrodden, a place of refuge and security (misgabh) to those who are in trouble (Psalm 9:9). When he exults in the strength of God who has given him deliverance, he multiplies words to utter his confidence: “I love Thee, O Yahweh, my strength. Yahweh is my rock, and my fortress (metsudah), .... my God .... my high tower (misgabh)” (Psalm 18:1,2). Thirteen times in the Psalms we find this word: 9:9; 18:2; 46:7,11; 59:9,16,17 (where the King James Version translates “defense” and the Revised Version (British and American) “high tower”), etc. Elsewhere metsudah is employed (Psalm 31:2; literally, “house of fortresses”; 91:2; 144:2). If we were at liberty to accept such psalms as Psalms 18 and 59 as Davidic, the appropriateness of them to the circumstances of the Shepherd King when persecuted by Saul, taking refuge in the cave of Adullam and enduring the perils and anxieties of an outlaw’s life, would at once be apparent.

2. The Prophets:

Although Jeremiah has been called the weeping prophet, yet for the fearless fulfillment of his commission to a gainsaying people, God made him “a fortified city (ir mibhtsar), and an iron pillar, and brazen walls” (Jeremiah 1:18; compare 6:27; 15:20). Hosea in the Northern Kingdom predicted the destruction of its “fortresses” (mibhtsar) by the invading Assyrians (10:14; compare 8:14). The prophets in proclaiming God’s message to their day addressed themselves not only to Israel and Judah, but also to those great world-powers with which the Hebrew people had relations. In the oracles of the prophets to the nations — to Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Syria, Edom, and others — we obtain glimpses of great and fortified cities like No-amon (Thebes), Babylon, Nineveh, Damascus, whose natural defenses and added fortifications did not save them from capture and destruction. And the teaching of the prophets for the comfort of Israel and Judah is that Yahweh was a better defense to them than the great rivers of Assyria and Egypt were to those nations. When Nineveh was at the height of her pride, fierceness and worldly glory, Nahum asks
her: “Art thou better than No-amon (Thebes of Egypt), that was situate among the rivers, that had the waters round about her; whose rampart (chel) was the sea (the Nile), and her wall (chomah) was of the sea?” (Nahum 3:8). Of Nineveh itself we know that it was protected, not only by walls and fortresses of great strength, but also by canals and streams drawn round the city. Yet Nahum declares in his sublime apostrophe: “All thy fortresses shall be like figtrees with the first-ripe figs: if they be shaken, they fall into the mouth of the eater” (Nahum 3:12). Babylon had walls whose strength and height, as described by Herodotus and other historians, were fabulous. Its great monarch Nebuchadrezzar was in his day the greatest ruler of the East, and Sir Henry Layard has told that scarcely a brick unearthed in the mounds of the great Babylonian plain was without his name. Yet when the day of reckoning came, the wall, said to be mountain-high, and 80 ft. thick, with its moat so broad that an arrow could not be shot over it, and all its elaborate works of defense, were as if they had not been; it surrendered to Cyrus without a blow being struck. It is in the visions of the prophets, in the universal peace which is to accompany the restoration of Israel, that we hear of “them that are at rest, that dwell securely, all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates” (Ezekiel 38:11). “In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah: We have a strong city; salvation will he appoint for walls and bulwarks” (Isaiah 26:1). “Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, desolation nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise” (Isaiah 60:18). Building of fenced cities, with riding upon horses and military preparation, was a note of the false prophet, who urged alliances with foreign powers such as Assyria and Egypt, and relied too much upon the material resources of the nation. The true prophet realized that the strength of the nation lay in God and urged the people to put their trust in Him (Hosea 8:14). “Jerusalem,” says Zechariah in the days of the Return, “shall be inhabited as villages without walls, by reason of the multitude of men and cattle therein. For I, saith Yahweh, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and I will be the glory in the midst of her” (2:4,5; compare 8:4,5).

IV. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. In Paul’s Epistles:

In a well-known passage (2 Corinthians 10:3-5), Paul, as he often does, draws upon his knowledge of Roman methods of warfare, and introduces
for the enforcement of great spiritual lessons the pulling down of “strongholds” as the ultimate object of every campaign. The word employed (ochuromata) is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word commonly rendered “fortress” (mibhtsar). “The `strongholds’ are the rock forts, such as those which once bristled along the coast of his native Cilicia and of which he must often have heard when his father told him how they were ‘pulled down’ by the Romans in their wars against the pirates. Those `high things that exalt themselves’ — those high eminences of the pride of Nature — occupied in force by hostile troops — had been a familiar experience in many wars throughout Asia Minor, while one of the grandest of all was the Acropolis that towered over Corinth” (Dean Howson, The Metaphors of Paul, 34 f).

2. In the Acts of the Apostles:

From the stairs of the Castle of Antonia, Paul, by leave of Claudius Lysias, the commandant of the garrison at Jerusalem, in whose charge he was, addressed the excited crowd and told the story of his conversion. Antonia was the quarters, then, as it was in the time of our Lord, of the Roman garrison, which occupied the Jewish capital (Acts 21:37; John 18:28); and the same site is to this day covered with a Turkish barracks.

3. In the Gospel History:

Although it is not mentioned by name, the gloomy fortress of Macherus on the East of the Dead Sea is believed to have been the scene of the imprisonment and murder of John the Baptist. The description of it given by Josephus (BJ, VII, vi, 1) shows it to have been a place of immense strength. “It was quite necessary that that fortress should be demolished lest it might draw away many into rebellion because of its strength; for the nature of the place was very capable of affording sure hope of safety to those who held it, and delay and fear to those who attacked it. For what was defended by a fort was itself a rocky hill, rising to a very great height, which circumstance alone made it very difficult to capture it. It was also so contrived by Nature that it could not easily be approached; for it is entrenched by ravines on all sides, so deep that the eye cannot reach their bottoms, nor are they easy to cross over, and it is quite impossible to fill them up with earth.” Macherus, like the Herodium, Jotapata, Masada, figured largely in the tragic scenes of the Jewish War so graphically described by Josephus
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T. Nicol.

FORTUNATUS

<for-tu-na’-tus> ([Φορτουνάτος, Phortounatos]: A Roman proper name turned into Gr; same as Latin adjective fortunatus, meaning “blest,” or “fortunate.” Found only once in the Bible (1 Corinthians 16:17). Fortunatus, with Stephanas and Achaicus, was an ambassador of the Corinthian church, whose presence at Ephesus refreshed the spirit of the apostle Paul.

FORTUNE

<for’-tun> (Gad): A god of Good Luck, possibly the Hyades.

See ASTROLOGY, 10.

FORTY

<for’-ti> ([µ y[ B r f ”, ‘arba’im]; [τεσσαράκοντα, tessarakonta]).

See FOUR (5); NUMBER.

FORUM

<fo’-rum>: the King James Version Appii Forum (Acts 28:15), is in the Revised Version (British and American) MARKET OF APPIUS (which see).

FORWARD; FORWARDNESS

<for’-werd> <for’-werd-nes> ([h a l, hale’ah], [[ s ” n; naca`]; [σπουδαιός, spoudaios]): As an adverb “forward” has the meaning of “onward” in space or time, or in the movement of affairs. As an adjective it has the sense of “readiness,” “willingness,” etc. The adverb only is found in
the Old Testament. It is the translation of *hale’ah*, “distance,” “onward”; in space (Numbers 32:19; 1 Samuel 10:3); in time (Ezekiel 39:22, “from that day and forward”; 43:27); once of *halakh*, “to go on” (Genesis 26:13, “went forward,” the King James Version margin, Hebrew “went going,” the Revised Version (British and American) “grew more and more”); twice of *ma’al*, “above,” “upward” (1 Samuel 16:13; 30:25, “from that day forward”); once of *ya’al*, “to cause to go up,” “advance” (Job 30:13, “They set forward (advance or help on) my calamity”); twice of *lephanim*, “to the front” (Jeremiah 7:24; Ezekiel 10:22, “They went every one straight forward,” literally, “on the side of their face”); once of *qedhem*, “before” (Job 23:8, “Behold, I go forward, but he is not there”); once with *nakhah*, “to smite” (2 Kings 3:24); frequently in Nu, and once in Exodus, of *naca*’, “to lift up,” “remove,” “journey” (Exodus 14:15, “Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward”); Numbers 1:51, “when the tabernacle setteth forward”; 2:24 the King James Version. “They shall go forward,” etc.); it is also the translation of *natsach* (Piel), “to be over,” “to take the lead,” “to superintend” (1 Chronicles 23:4, “to set forward (to carry onward, to advance) the work of the house of the Lord,” the King James Version margin and text of the Revised Version (British and American) “to oversee”; 2 Chronicles 34:12, “to set it forward,” the Revised Version (British and American) retains, margin, “to preside over it”; Ezr 3:8 margin, “set forward the work”). This word means also “to lead” in music, to precent; hence, in the title of many psalms, *la-menatseach*, “For the chief musician.” *Proerchomai*, “to go forward,” etc., is translated “went forward” (Mark 14:35); *propempo*, “to send forward” (3 John 1:6, “bring forward,” the Revised Version (British and American) “set forward”); *proballo*, “to throw or put forward” (Acts 19:33, “putting him forward”); as adjective it is the translation of *thelo*, “to wish,” “will” (2 Corinthians 8:10, “to be forward a year ago”; the King James Version margin (Greek) “willing,” the Revised Version (British and American) “to will”); of *spoudaios*, “speedy,” “earnest” (2 Corinthians 8:17, “being more forward,” the Revised Version (British and American) “very earnest”); of *spoudazo*, “to make haste,” “to be earnest” (Galatians 2:10, “which I also was forward to do,” the Revised Version (British and American) “zealous to do”).

“Forward” occurs several times in Apocrypha, e.g. 1 Esdras 1:27, “The Lord is with me hasting me forward” (*epispeudo*); 2 Esdras 3:6, “before
ever the earth came forward” (adventaret), meaning, perhaps, before it was ready for planting.

Forwardness is the translation of spoude, “speed,” “zeal,” etc. (2 Corinthians 8:8, the Revised Version (British and American) “earnestness”); of prothumia “readiness of mind” (2 Corinthians 9:2, “the forwardness of your mind,” the Revised Version (British and American) “your readiness”; The Wisdom of Solomon 14:17, “that by their forwardness (spoude) they might flatter,” the Revised Version (British and American) “zeal”).

For “forward” the Revised Version (British and American) has “forth” (Numbers 2:24; compare 1 Corinthians 16:11); for “go forward” (Numbers 10:5), “take their journey”; for “set forward” (Numbers 21:10; 22:1), “journeyed”; “forward” for “ready” (Deuteronomy 1:41), for “forth” (Proverbs 25:6), for “farther” (Matthew 26:39); “put forward” for “appointed” (Acts 1:23): “set forward according to” for “took” (Numbers 10:12); “set forward” for “went” (Numbers 10:14,34), for “departed” (Numbers 10:33); “set me forward” for “bring me” (1 Corinthians 16:6).

W. L. Walker

FOUL

<foul> ([c p " r; raphas]; [άκαθαρτος, akthartos]): The verb “to foul” (defile) occurs as the translation of raphas, “to trample” or “muddle” (streams) (Ezekiel 32:2; 34:18); of chalmar, “to burn,” “to be red” (Job 16:16, “My face is foul with weeping,” the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version, margin “red”); of mirpas, “a treading” (Ezekiel 34:19). The adjective is the translation of akathartos, “unclean,” “impure,” “wicked” (Mark 9:25; Revelation 18:2, “foul spirit,” the Revised Version (British and American) “unclean”), and of cheimon, “winter,” “stormy or foul weather” (Matthew 16:3). the Revised Version (British and American) has “The rivers shall become foul” (Isaiah 19:6) instead of the King James Version “They shall turn the rivers far away,” the English Revised Version “The rivers shall stink.”

W. L. Walker

FOUNDATION

<foun-da’-shun>: In Hebrew the words for “foundation” are mostly
derivatives from [ד s " y; yacadḥ], “to found,” and in Greek two words are used: one, [καταβολή, katabole], of “foundation of the world” (Mark 13:35; 25:34; Luke 11:50; John 17:24, etc.); the other, [θεμέλιος, themelios], of the foundation of a building (Luke 6:48,49; 14:29; Acts 16:26, etc.), in which sense it is also used metaphorically in various connections (Christ the foundation of the church, 1 Corinthians 3:11; or the apostles and prophets the foundation, with Christ as cornerstone, Ephesians 2:20; the foundation of repentance, Hebrews 6:1, etc.). In Psalm 11:3, “if the foundations be destroyed,” the Hebrew word is shath. In Jeremiah 50:15, the Revised Version (British and American) reads “bulwarks” for “foundations”; conversely in Psalm 89:14; 97:2, for the King James Version “habitation,” the Revised Version (British and American) reads “foundation,” and in Isaiah 6:4 for the King James Version “posts,” reads “foundations.”

James Orr

FOUNDER

<found'-der> (from [ת r " x ; tsaraph]): A worker in molten metal (Judges 17:4, etc.). The word in the King James Version in Jeremiah 10:9,14; 51:17 is rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) “goldsmith,” and in 6:29 by a paraphrase, “They go on refining.”

See REFINER; GOLDSMITH.

FOUNTAIN

<found'-tin>, <found'-tan>: In a country where no rain falls for half of the year, springs sume an importance unknown in more favored lands. In both eastern and western Palestine and even in Lebanon there are many villages which depend entirely upon reservoirs or cisterns of rain water. Others are situated along the courses of the few perennial streams. But wherever a spring exists it is very apt to be the nucleus of a village. It may furnish sufficient water to be used in irrigation, in which case the gardens surrounding the village become an oasis in the midst of the parched land. Or there may be a tiny stream which barely suffices for drinking water, about which the village women and girls sit and talk waiting their turns to fill their jars, sometimes until far in the night. The water of the village fountain is often conveyed by a covered conduit for some distance from the source to a convenient spot in the village where an arch is built up, under
which the water gushes out. *See* CISTERN; SPRING; WELL; EN-, and place-names compounded with EN-.

Figurative:

1. **of God** (Psalm 36:9; Jeremiah 2:13; 17:13);
2. **of Divine pardon and purification**, with an obvious Messianic reference (Zec 13:1);
3. **of wisdom and godliness** (Proverbs 13:14; 14:27);
4. **of wives** (Proverbs 5:18);
5. **of children** (Deuteronomy 33:28; compare Psalm 68:26; Proverbs 5:16);
6. **of prosperity** (Psalm 107:35; 114:8; Hosea 13:15);
7. **of the heart** (Ecclesiastes 12:6; *see* CISTERN);

*Alfred Ely Day*

**FOUNTAIN GATE**

*See* JERUSALEM.

**FOUR**

<for> ([[B” r a” , ‘arba”; [τοσσαρες, tessares]]): “Four” (cardinal number) was a sacred and complete number with the Hebrews, as well as with several other peoples. It occurs very frequently in the Old Testament and the New Testament.

1. It indicates completeness. We have the four rivers of Paradise (Genesis 2:10); the four winds of heaven (Ezekiel 37:9; Daniel 7:2; 8:8; 11:4; Zec 6:5, the Revised Version, margin “spirits”; 2 Esdras 13:5); “the four winds” (Matthew 24:31; Mark 13:27); “the four corners of the earth” (Isaiah 11:12; Revelation 7:1; 20:8, the King James Version “quarters”); “the four corners of the house” (Job 1:19); Jephthah’s daughter was bewailed four days a year (Judges 11:40); “four cities” are several times mentioned in Joshua in the allotment of inheritances (19:7; 21:18, etc.); Nehemiah’s enemies sent to him “four
times” (Nehemiah 6:4); “four kinds” (the Revised Version, margin “families” of destroyers were threatened, Jeremiah 15:3); Yahweh’s “four sore judgments” (Ezekiel 14:21); “four generations” were seen by Job (42:16).

(2) “Four” is frequent in prophetic visions: Daniel saw “four .... beasts” arise, representing four kings (7:3,17); “four notable horns” (8:8,22; compare 2 Esdras 11:39); “four gates” (2 Esdras 3:19; four wings, 12:2 the King James Version); “four horns” were seen by Zechariah, as the powers that had scattered Israel, and “four smiths” (Revised Version) as powers that would cast the four horns down (1:18-21); “four chariots and .... horses” represented the “four spirits,” the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin (better than “winds”), that went “forth from standing before the Lord of all the earth” (Zechariah 6:1-5); in the visions of Ezekiel, “four living creatures,” each with four faces, four wings, etc., were the bearers of the throne of God (1:5 f,23); so, in the visions of John there were “four living creatures” before and around the throne (Revelation 4:6; 5:6,8,14; 6:1; 15:7; 19:4); John saw “four angels” of destruction loosed for their work (Revelation 9:14 f).

(3) “Four” occurs frequently in the measurements of the sacred buildings, etc.

(a) of the tabernacle (Exodus 25; 26; 27; 28:17; 36, etc.);

(b) of Solomon’s temple (1 Kings 7:2, etc., 1 Chronicles 9:24);

(c) of Ezekiel’s temple (Ezekiel 40:41; 41:5; 42:20; 43:14, etc.).

(4) “Four” is used as an alternative with “three” (Proverbs 30:15,18,21,24,29); we have “three or four” (2 Esdras 16:29,31); “the third and .... the fourth generation” (Exodus 20:5; 34:7; Numbers 14:18; Deuteronomy 5:9).

(5) Ten times four, or forty is also a special and sacred number, e.g. forty years did Israel eat manna (Exodus 16:35); forty years in the wilderness (Numbers 14:33; 32:13); “the land had rest forty years” (Judges 3:11; 5:31); Israel was delivered unto the hands of the Philistines for forty years (Judges 13:1); Eli judged Israel forty years (1 Samuel 4:18); Moses was forty years old when he visited his brethren (Acts 7:23); the flood continued for “forty days and forty nights” (Genesis 7:4); Moses
was in the Mount “forty days and forty nights” (Exodus 24:18; 34:28; Deuteronomy 9:9); Jesus fasted in the desert forty days and nights (Matthew 4:2, etc.); He remained with His disciples forty days after His resurrection (Acts 1:3).

(6) Fourscore is also frequent (shemonim) (Exodus 7:7; Judges 3:30; Jeremiah 41:5, etc.; ogdoekonta, Luke 2:37; 16:7).

(7) Four hundred represents a large number, e.g. the years of the oppression in Egypt (Genesis 15:13); Esau’s company (Genesis 33:1); the men with David (1 Samuel 22:2; 25:13; 30:10,17); the prophets of Baal “four hundred and fifty,” of Asherah, “four hundred” (1 Kings 18:19,22); the prophets of Israel (1 Kings 22:6). Four thousand represents a larger number, e.g. the musicians and porters of Solomon’s temple (1 Chronicles 23:5); the stalls for horses in Solomon’s stables (2 Chronicles 9:25); the Assassins who made insurrection under an Egyptian (Acts 21:38); Christ fed “four thousand men, besides women and children” (Matthew 15:38). Four hundred thousand represents a very large number, e.g. the congregation of Israel that gathered at Mizpah, “four hundred thousand footmen that drew sword” (Judges 20:2,17); Abijah’s army (2 Chronicles 13:3; Jeroboam’s, twice that number).

(8) The fourth part also frequently occurs (Exodus 29:40; Leviticus23:13; Numbers 23:10; Revelation 6:8, etc.).

W. L. Walker

FOUR HUNDRED
See FOUR.

FOUR THOUSAND
See FOUR.

FOURFOLD
<for-fold>: Occurs but twice in English Versions: 2 Samuel 12:6, “He shall restore the lamb fourfold”; and Luke 19:8 the King James Version, “If I have wrongfully exacted ought .... I restore fourfold.” From this statement of Zaccheus we are to understand that fourfold the amount of that which was stolen was the restoration the law required of a thief. This
was the extreme penalty the law imposed. In some cases double the amount was to be restored (Exodus 22:4,7); in others, a fifth of its value was added to the thing restored (Leviticus 6:5); still again, an amount equal to that taken was to be restored (1 Samuel 12:3).

FOURSCORE
<for’-skor>.

See FOUR; NUMBER.

FOUR SQUARE
<for’-skwar> ([rabha’]; [tetragōνος, tetragonos]): “Foursquare,” meaning equal in length and breadth, not round, is the translation of rabha’ (from obsolete rebha’, “four”); it occurs in the description of the altar of burnt offering (Exodus 27:1; 38:1); of the altar of incense (Exodus 30:2; 37:25); of the breastplate of the high priest (Exodus 28:16; 39:9); of the panels of the gravings upon the mouth of the brazen or molten sea in Solomon’s temple (1 Kings 7:31); of the inner court of Ezekiel’s temple (Ezekiel 40:47); of “the holy oblation” of the city of Ezekiel’s vision (Ezekiel 48:20, rebhi`i, “fourth”); of the new Jerusalem of John’s vision (Revelation 21:16, tetragonos), and conveys the idea of perfect symmetry. In the King James Version margin of 1 Kings 6:31, we have “five-square,” square being formerly used for equal-sided, as it still is in “three-square file.”

W. L. Walker

FOURTEEN
<for’-ten>.

See NUMBER.

FOURTH PART.

See FOUR.
FOWL

< foul > ([t w], `oph; [πετεινόν, peteinon]): The word is now generally restricted to the larger, especially the edible birds, but formerly it denoted all flying creatures; in Leviticus 11:20 the King James Version we have even, “all fowls that creep, going upon all four,” 11:21, “every flying creeping thing that goeth upon all four.”

1. OLD TESTAMENT TERMS AND REFERENCES:

The word most frequently translated “fowl” is `oph from `uph, “to cover,” hence, wing; it is used collectively for birds and fowl in general (Genesis 1:20, etc.; 2:19,20, etc.); `ayit (from `ut, “to rush”) means a ravenous beasts; or bird of prey, used collectively of ravenous birds (Genesis 15:11 the King James Version; Isaiah 18:6 the King James Version “fowls”; Job 28:7, “a path which no fowl knoweth,” the Revised Version (British and American) “no bird of prey”); in Isaiah 46:11 it is used as a symbol of a conqueror (compare Jeremiah 12:9, “bird,” “birds of prey”; Ezekiel 39:4, “ravenous birds”); tsippor, Aramaic tsippar (from tsaphar, “to twitter or chirp”), “a chirper,” denotes a small bird or sparrow (Deuteronomy 4:17 the King James Version; Nehemiah 5:18; Daniel 4:14); to give the carcasses of men to the fowls (birds) of the air was an image of destruction (Deuteronomy 28:26 the King James Version; 1 Samuel 17:44,46; Psalm 79:2; Jeremiah 7:33, etc.); barburim, rendered 1 Kings 4:23) “fatted fowl” (among the provisions for Solomon’s table for one day), is probably a mimetic word, like Greek barbaros, Latin murmuro, English babble, perhaps denoting geese from their cackle (Gesenius, from barar, “to cleanse,” referring to their white plumage; but other derivations and renderings are given). They might have been ducks or swans. They could have been guineas or pigeons. The young of the ostrich was delicious food, and no doubt when Solomon’s ships brought peafowl they also brought word that they were a delicacy for a king’s table. The domestic fowl was not common so early in Palestine, but it may have been brought by Solomon with other imports from the East; in New Testament times chickens were common; ba`al kanaph, “owner of a wing,” is used for a bird of any kind in Proverbs 1:17. “In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird,” the King James Version margin Hebrew, “in the eyes of everything that hath a wing.”
2. IN THE LEVITICAL LAW:

In the Levitical law fowls (birds) were distinguished as clean and unclean (Leviticus 11:13 f; Deuteronomy 14:11-20; compare Genesis 8:20); the first were allowed to be eaten because they fed on grains, seeds, and vegetables; the second were forbidden because they fed on flesh and carrion.

3. NEW TESTAMENT REFERENCES AND ILLUSTRATIVE USES:

In the New Testament the common word for “fowl” is *peteinon*, “winged fowl.” “The fowls of the air” (the Revised Version (British and American) “the birds of the heaven”) are pointed to by our Lord as examples of the providential care of God (Matthew 6:26; Luke 12:24); in another connection the “sparrows” (*strouthion*) sold cheap, probably for food, are so employed (Matthew 10:29, “Are not two sparrows sold for a penny?” Luke 12:6, “five .... for two pence”); their quickly picking up seeds from the ground is made to illustrate the influences which render “the word” powerless (Matthew 13:4); their being sheltered in the branches, the growth of the kingdom (Matthew 13:32, *peteinon*); the hen’s (*ornis*) sheltering care for her chickens, His desire to protect and save Jerusalem (Matthew 23:37; compare 2 Esdras 1:30; Ruth 2:12); the fowls were shown in vision to Peter as among the things made clean by God (Acts 10:12; 11:6); in Revelation 18:2; 19:17,21, *orneon*, “bird,” “fowl,” a carnivorous bird (the Revised Version (British and American) “bird”), is the representative of desolation and of destruction.

For “fowls” the American Standard Revised Version has “birds” (Genesis 6:7,20; 7:3; Leviticus 20:25b; Acts 10:12; 11:6; with the English Revised Version Matthew 6:26; 13:4; Mark 4:4,32; Luke 8:5; 12:24; 13:19); for “every feathered fowl” (Ezekiel 39:17), the Revised Version (British and American) has “the birds of every sort”; for “all fowls that creep” (Leviticus 11:20) and for “every flying creeping thing” (Leviticus 11:21), “all winged creeping things.”

W. L. Walker

**FOWL, FATTED**

*See preceding article.*
**FOWLER**

*<foul’-er> ([תנ יפ תוגטש]):* A professional birdcatcher. In the days previous to firearms, birds were captured with nets spread on the ground, in traps and snares. There was a method of taking young birds from a nest, raising them by hand, and when they had become very tame, they were confined in hidden cages so that their voices would call others of their kind to the spot and they could be killed by arrows of concealed bowmen or the use of the throw-stick (Ecclesiasticus 11:30) This was a stick 1 1/2 feet in length and 1/2 inches in diameter, hurled with a rotary motion at the legs of the birds and was very effective when thrown into flocks of ground birds, such as partridge or quail, especially if the birds were running up hill. There was also a practice of sewing a captured bird’s eyelids together and confining it so that its cries would call large numbers of birds through curiosity and they could then be taken in the several ways mentioned. The fowlers supplied the demand for doves and other birds used for caged pets, and furnished the market with wild pigeons and doves for sacrifice and such small birds as were used for food. *תנ פסחא 91:3: “For he will deliver thee from the snare of the fowler. And from the deadly pestilence.”*

This is David’s promise that the Almighty will deliver us from the evil plans laid to ruin us, as a bird sometimes in its struggles slips the hair and escapes from the “snare” (which see) set for it. *תנ פסחא 124:7:*

“Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowlers:

The snare is broken, and we are escaped.”

Here is the fulfillment of the former promise in a cry of rejoicing. Sometimes the snare held fast, sometimes it broke; then the joy in the heart of a freed man was like the wild exultation in the heart of the escaping bird. *תנ פרוברים 6:5:*

“Deliver thyself as a roe from the hands. of the hunter.

And as a bird from the hand of the fowler.”

With methods so primitive as these for taking birds, it must have occurred frequently that a stunned, wounded or entrapped bird slipped even from the hand that held it and made good its escape.
Jeremiah 5:26: “For among my people are found wicked men: they watch, as fowlers lie in wait; they set a trap, they catch men.” Here is the plain comparison strongly drawn between wicked men entrapping their fellows and fowlers taking unsuspecting birds.

The last reference is in Hosea 9:8: “Ephraim was a watchman with my God: as for the prophet, a fowler’s snare is in all his ways, and enmity in the house of his God.” Wherever he goes, the prophet is in danger of being trapped.

Gene Stratton-Porter

FOX

([l ['W, shu`al]; compare Arabic tha’lab (Judges 15:4; Nehemiah 4:3; Psalm 63:10; Song of Solomon 2:15; Lamentations 5:18; Ezekiel 13:4); [al`wpηζ, alopec] (Matthew 8:20, Luke 9:58; 13:32)): The foxes of different parts of Europe and Western Asia differ more or less from each other, and some authors have given the local types distinct specific names. Tristram, for instance, distinguishes the Egyptian fox, Vulpes nilotica, of Southern Palestine, and the tawny fox, Vulpes flavescens, of the North and East. It is possible that the range of the desert fox, Vulpes leucopus, of Southwestern Asia may also reach Syria. We have, however, the authority of the Royal Natural History for considering all these as merely local races of one species, the common fox, Vulpes alopec or Canis vulpes. The natives of Syria and Palestine do not always distinguish the fox and jackal although the two animals are markedly different. The jackal and wolf also are frequently confounded.

See DRAGON; JACKAL.

In Psalm 63:9 f we have, “Those that seek my soul, to destroy it, .... shall be given over to the power of the sword: they shall be a portion for foxes” (shu‘alim). It has been thought that the jackal is meant here (Revised Version margin), and that may well be, though it is also true that the fox does not refuse carrion. In the Revised Version, margin, “jackal” is suggested in two other passages, though why is not clear, since the rendering “fox” seems quite appropriate in both. They are Nehemiah 4:3, “.... if a fox go up, he shall break down their stone wall,” and Lamentations 5:17 f, “.... our eyes are dim; for the mountain of Zion which is desolate: the foxes walk upon it.” the Revised Version, margin
also has “jackals” in Judges 15:4 f, where Samson “caught three hundred foxes .... and put a firebrand in the midst between every two tails .... and let them go into the standing grain of the Philistines, and burnt up both the shocks and the standing grain, and also the oliveyards.” Jackals are probably more numerous than foxes, but the substitution does not appreciably diminish the difficulties in the way of any natural explanation of the story. In Song of Solomon 2:15 we have a reference to the fondness of the fox for grapes. In Matthew 8:20 and Luke 9:58 Jesus says in warning to a would-be follower, “The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.” Foxes differ from most of the Canidae in burrowing holes for their lairs, unless indeed they take possession of the burrow of another animal, such as the badger. In Luke 13:32 Jesus compares Herod to a fox.

Alfred Ely Day.

FRAGMENT

<frag’-ment> ([κλάσμα, klasma]): “Fragment,” a piece broken off, occurs only in the plural, in the accounts of the miracles of the Loaves in the Gospels and references thereto. It is the translation of klasma (from klao, “to break”), “a piece broken off” (Matthew 14:20 the King James Version); “broken meat” (Matthew 15:37).

The Revised Version (British and American) has in each instance “broken pieces.” The change is important because it shows that the pieces left over were not mere fragments or crumbs left by the people after eating, but some of the original pieces into which it is said in all the synoptic narratives and references Jesus “broke” the “loaves,” which, being thin cakes, were usually broken before distribution; hence, the phrase, “breaking of bread.” See Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), under the word “Fragment”; Weymouth translates “broken portions,” namely, “those into which the Lord had broken the loaves; not mere scraps or crumbs.”

W. L. Walker

FRAME

<fram>: 
(1) \(\text{rx} \times \gamma \text{yetser}\) (from root \(\text{yatsar}\), “to knead,” mold with the fingers): “For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust” (Psalm 103:14).

(2) \(\text{Êr} \ [\ e \ `erekh]\) (from root `arakh, “to put in order,” “to set in a row,” “to arrange”): “goodly frame” (Job 41:12, the King James Version “goodly proportion”).

(3) \(\mu \times \ [\ o \ `otsem]\) “bony frame” “body”: “My frame was not hidden from thee, when I was made in secret” (Psalm 139:15), the King James Version “my substance,” the King James Version margin “my strength, or, my body.”

See also BONE.

(4) \(\text{mibhneh}\), “building, frame” (Ezekiel 40:2, “frame of a city”).

(5) \(\text{nathan}\), “to give,” “to direct”: “They will not frame their doings” (Hosea 5:4, the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin).

(6) \(\text{sunarmologe\omega}, \text{sunarmologeo}\), “to fit or join closely together” (Ephesians 2:21).

(7) \(\text{katartiz\omega}, \text{katartizo}\), “to fit out,” “make fit,” “adjust” (Hebrews 11:3).

H. L. E. Luering

FRANKINCENSE

\(<\text{frants’-in-sens}>\) ([\(\text{lebhonah}\]), from root meaning “whiteness,” referring to the milky color of the fresh juice: Exodus 30:34; Leviticus 2:1 f, 15 f; 5:11; 6:15; 24:7; Numbers 5:15; 1 Chronicles 9:29; Nehemiah 13:5,9; Song of Solomon 3:6; 4:6,14; Isaiah 43:23; 60:6; 66:3; Jeremiah 6:20; 17:26; 41:5; translated in the last six references “incense” in the King James Version, but correctly in the Revised Version (British and American); [\(\text{libanos}\]): Matthew 2:11; Revelation 18:13. The English word is derived from old French franc encens, i.e. “pure incense”): The common frankincense of the pharmacopoeas is a gum derived from the common fir, but the frankincense
of the Jews, as well as of the Greeks and Romans, is a substance now called Olibanum (from the Arabic el luban), a product of certain trees of the genus Boswellia (Natural Order, Amyridaceae), growing on the limestone rocks of south Arabia and Somali-land (Isaiah 60:6; Jeremiah 6:20). The most important species are B. Carteri and B. Frereana. Some of the trees grow to a considerable height and send down their roots to extraordinary depths. The gum is obtained by incising the bark, and is collected in yellowish, semitransparent tears, readily pulverized; it has a nauseous taste. It is used for making incense for burning in churches and in Indian temples, as it was among the Jews (Exodus 30:34). See INCENSE. It is often associated with myrrh (Song of Solomon 3:6; 4:6) and with it was made an offering to the infant Savior (Matthew 2:11). A specially “pure” kind, lebhonah zakkah, was presented with the shewbread (Leviticus 24:7).

E. W. G. Masterman

FRANKLY

<frank′-li> ([χαριζωμαι, charizomai]): “Frankly” in the sense of “freely,” “readily,” “graciously,” occurs only in the translation of charizomai, properly “to gratify,” “to do that which is grateful or pleasing,” “to forgive” (Luke 7:42, “He frankly forgave them both,” the Revised Version (British and American) has simply “forgave”; the same word is translated in 7:43, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), “forgave,” in Luke 7:21 the King James Version it is “gave,” the Revised Version (British and American) “bestowed,” granted to see). It occurs in the New Testament only in Luke and Paul.

FRAY

<fra> ([d r ḫ; haradh], “to make afraid,” “cause to tremble”: the King James Version of Deuteronomy 28:26; Jeremiah 7:33; Zec 1:21; the Revised Version (British and American) “frighten,” “terrify”).

See WAR.
FRECKLED, SPOT

\(<\text{frek'-l\textquoteright}d\textgreater\), ([q h” B obohaq]; Septuagint [\(\alpha\lambdaφ\acute{o}ς, alphos\)], called in the Revised Version (British and American) “a tetter,” and described as a bright shining spot (\textit{beharoth lebhenoth}): These white eruptions did not render the person so marked ceremonially unclean (Leviticus13:39). This form of skin disease is described by Hippocrates as usually of no great importance and indicative of a sluggishness of body; it is probably some form of local psoriasis. There is a cognate modern Arabic word applied to a facial eczematous eruption. For other references to skin diseases, see \textit{LEPROSY}.

FREE; FREEDOM

See \textit{CHOICE}; \textit{WILL}.

FREEDMAN; FREEMAN

\(<\text{fred'-man}\>, \(<\text{fre'-man}\>): The term occurs in \textit{1 Corinthians 7:22; Colossians 3:11, and Revelation 6:15}, and represents two slightly different words. In \textit{1 Corinthians 7:22} the word is [\(\alpha\pi\epsilon\lambdaε\upsilon\thetaερος, apeleutheros\], “a freeman,” one who was born a slave and has received freedom. In this case it refers to spiritual freedom. He that was in bondage to sin has been presented with spiritual freedom by the Lord. In \textit{Revelation 6:15} the word is simply [\(\varepsilon\lambdaε\upsilon\thetaερος, eleutheros\], “a free man” as opposed to a slave.

FREELY

\(<\text{fre'-li}\> ([\(\mu\ N \mid chinnam\], [h b d n] nedhabhah]; [\(\delta\omega\rhoε\acute{\alpha}ν, dorean\] [\(\pi\alpha\rho\rhoισι\alpha\dot{\iota}ζομαι, parrhesiazomai\]): “Freely” occurs in three senses:

\(\text{(1)}\) Gratis, for nothing (\textit{Numbers 11:5, chinnam, “for nought,” “the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely,” the Revised Version (British and American) “for nought”}); \textit{Matthew 10:8, dorean, “Freely ye have received, freely give,” the Revised Version (British and American) omits “have”; Romans 3:24, “being justified freely by his grace”}; \textit{2 Corinthians 11:7, “I have preached to you the gospel freely,” the Revised Version (British and American) “for nought”; Revelation 21:6; 22:17, “Take the water of life freely”; charizomai (\textit{Romans 8:32}) is translated...
“freely give,” *ta charisthenta* (1 Corinthians 2:12), “the things that are freely given,” the American Standard Revised Version has “were” for “are.”

(2) Willingly, spontaneously: *nedhabhah*, “willing offering” (Psalm 54:6, “I will freely sacrifice unto thee,” the Revised Version (British and American) “with a freewill-offering”; Hosea 14:4, “I will love them freely”); *nadhabh*, “to give willingly” (Ezr 2:68, the Revised Version (British and American) “willingly offered”; compare 1:6); *nedabh* Aramaic (7:15; compare 7:13,16).

(3) Without hindrance or restraint, ‘*akhal*, “to eat” is rendered in Genesis 2:16, “Thou mayest freely eat,” the King James Version margin” Hebrew, eating thou shalt eat”; 1 Samuel 14:30, “if .... the people had eaten freely”; *parrhesiazomai*, “to speak freely, openly, boldly” (Acts 26:26, “Unto whom also I speak freely”); *meta parrhesias*, “with full speech” (Acts 2:29, “I may say unto you freely”). Revised Version has “have drunk freely” for “well drunk” (John 2:10). The word is *methusko*, Pass. “to become drunk.” Comparison with Luke 12:45; Ephesians 5:18; 1 Thessalonians 5:7; Revelation 17:2, where the same word is translated the King James Version “made drunk,” the Revised Version (British and American) “made drunken” (Matthew 24:49; Acts 2:15; 1 Corinthians 11:21; Revelation 17:6, “drunken”), will show that the meaning is “drunk,” which was the rendering of Tyndale and Cranmer; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has cum inebriati fuerint; Plummer renders “have become drunk, are drunk.”

**W. L. Walker**

**FREEWILL OFFERING**

<fre’-wil of-er-ing>.

*See SACRIFICE.*

**FREEWOMAN**

<fre’-woom-an> ([ελευθέρα, eleuthera]): Found but 4 times in the King James Version (Galatians 4:22,23,10,31). In the first three passages it refers to Sarah, the freewoman and true wife of Abraham as in contrast with Hagar, the Egyptian slave girl who became his concubine (Genesis 16:1).
In the last passage a metaphorical application of the term is made to the Christians who are the children of promise, of freedom, of the spirit, the children of the freewoman, in contrast with the Jews who are the children of the letter, of bondage, of the bondwoman.

**FREQUENT**

<fre’-kwent> ([περισσότερος, perissoteros]): “Frequent,” adjective (from Latin frequens, frequentis, “crowded”) occurs only once in the text of the King James Version, as the translation of perissoteros, adverb in comparative degree of perissos, “abundantly,” hence, “more abundantly” (compare 2 Corinthians 1:12); in 2 Corinthians 11:23, “in prisons more frequent,” the Revised Version (British and American) “more abundantly”; and once in the margin of the King James Version (Proverbs 27:6) as translation of `athar, “to be abundant,” the Revised Version (British and American) in text, “profuse.”

American Revised Version has “frequent” for “open” (1 Samuel 3:1, “The word of Yahweh was precious (margin, rare) in those days; there was no frequent vision,” margin “(Hebrew) widely spread” (the word is parac, “to break forth,” “to scatter,” etc.). the English Revised Version retains “open,” with “frequent, Hebrew widely spread” in the margin. “Frequent” (the verb) does not occur.

**FRESH**

Adj.: The translation of [חָדָשׁ, hadhash], “new,” “fresh” (Job 29:20, “My glory is fresh in me”); of [לְשֵׁדַח, leshadh], “sap,” “moisture” (Numbers 11:8, of the manna, “as the taste of fresh oil,” the Revised Version, margin “cakes baked with oil”); of [רָאָנָן, ra`anan], “to be fresh and green” (Psalm 92:10, “fresh oil”); of [γλυκός, glukus], “sweet” (Jas 3:12, “salt water and fresh,” the Revised Version (British and American) “sweet”). Freshier is the translation of [רֻתַפָּשׁ, rutaphash], “to become fresh” (Job 33:25; “His flesh shall be fresher than a child’s”).

Revised Version has “fresh” for “green” (Genesis 30:37; Leviticus23:14), for “moist” (Numbers 6:3), for “full” (Leviticus2:14;
2 Kings 4:42), for “new” (Judges 15:15; Matthew 9:17; Mark 2:22; Luke 5:38).

W. L. Walker

FRET, FRETTING

([ḥ r j ; charah], [r a " m; ma‘ar]): To “fret” is from for (prefix) and etan, “to eat,” “to consume.” The word is both transitive and intransitive in King James Version:

(1) transitive as translation of charah, “to burn,” Hithpael, “to fret one’s self,” “to be angry” (Psalm 37:1, “Fret not thyself because of evil-doers”; 37:7,8; Proverbs 24:19); of qatsaph, “to be angry,” etc. (Isaiah 8:21, “They shall fret themselves, and curse,” etc.); of raghaz, to be moved” (with anger, etc.) (Ezekiel 16:43, “Thou hast fretted me in all these things,” the American Standard Revised Version “raged against me”). For Leviticus13:55, see under Fretting below.

(2) Intransitive, it is the translation of ra‘am, “to rage,” Hiphil, “to provoke to anger” (1 Samuel 1:6, “Her rival provoked her sore, to make her fret”); of za‘aph, “to be sad,” “to fret” (Proverbs 19:3, “His heart frettesth against Yahweh”).

Fretting in the sense of eating away, consuming, is used of the leprosy, ma‘ar, “to be sharp, bitter, painful” (Leviticus13:51,52; 14:44, “a fretting leprosy”; in 13:55 we have “it (is) fret inward” (“fret” past participle), as the translation of pehetheth from pahath, “to dig” (a pit), the word meaning “a depression,” “a hollow or sunken spot in a garment affected by a kind of leprosy,” the Revised Version (British and American) “it is a fret.”

Revised Version has “fretful” for “angry” (Proverbs 21:19), margin “vexation.”

W. L. Walker

FRIED

See BREAD, III, 3, (2); FOOD, II; LOCUSTS.
FRIEND; FRIENDSHIP

In the Old Testament two words, variously translated “friend” or “companion”: [ḥ[r ʾreʿeh], indicating a mere associate, passing friend, neighbor, or companion; [b h” ʾaḥabeth], indicating affection natural or unnatural. In the New Testament also two words: [ἐταῖρος, hetairos], “a comrade,” or “fellow,” and [φίλος, philos], suggesting a more affectionate relation.

Literature abounds in concrete examples of friendship of either kind noted above, and of profoundly philosophic as well as sentimental and poetic expositions of the idea of friendship. Notable among these are the Old Testament examples. Abraham, because of the intimacy of his relations, was called “the friend of God” (2 Chronicles 20:7; Isaiah 41:8; Jas 2:23). “Yahweh spake unto Moses face to face, as a man ... unto his friend” (Exodus 33:11). The romantic aspect of the friendship of Ruth and Naomi is interesting (Ruth 1:16-18). The devotion of Hushai, who is repeatedly referred to as David’s friend (2 Samuel 15:37; 16:16), is a notable illustration of the affection of a subordinate for his superior. The mutual friendship of David and Jonathan (1 Samuel 18:1), from which the author is made to say, “The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul,” is another example. Again in his pathetic lament for Jonathan (2 Samuel 1:26), David says in highly emotional tones that his love “was wonderful, passing the love of women.” Elijah and Elisha form a unique illustration of semiprofessional affection (2 Kings 2).

In the New Testament, Jesus and His disciples illustrate the growth of friendship from that of teacher and disciple, lord and servant, to that of friend and friend (John 15:13-15). Paul and Timothy are likewise conspicuous (2 Timothy 1:2).

In general literature we have the classic incident, recorded by Plutarch, of Damon and Pythias during the rule of Dionysius. Pythias, condemned to death, was about to be executed but desired to see his family. Damon offered himself as a ransom in case he should not return in time for the hour of execution. Returning in time, both were released by the great Dionysius, who asked to be taken into the secret of such friendship. The writings on friendship are many. Plato and Cicero have immortalized themselves by their comments. Cicero held dearly the friendship of Scipio,
declaring that of all that Nature or Fortune ever gave him there was nothing which could compare with the friendship of Scipio. Bacon, Emerson, Black, Gladden, King, Hillis, and many others in later days have written extensively concerning friendship. The best illustration of the double use of the word (see above) is that in Proverbs 18:24, “He that maketh many friends doeth it to his own destruction; but there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.” Again, “Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend” (27:17). The honesty and frankness of genuine friends are set forth in the maxim, “Faithful are the wounds of a friend” (27:6).

Walter G. Clippinger

FRIENDS; CHIEF FRIENDS

([οἱ φίλοι πρῶτοι, hoi philoi proton]): Expressions used in 1 and 2 Macc to designate the favored courtiers of the Antiochi. Mattathias is promised enrollment among the king’s Friends, to tempt him to apostatize (1 Macc 2:18); Alexander Balas writes Jonathan among his Chief Friends (1 Macc 10:65). Compare also 1 Macc 3:38; 6:10,14; 10:60; 11:26,27; 2 Macc 8:9.

FRINGES

<frin’-jis> ([תְּקֵיחַ, tsitsith], “tassel, lock” (Numbers 15:38,39), [µυλίᾱ, gedhilim], “twisted threads,” “festoons” (Deuteronomy 22:12)): Tassels worn by the Israelites on the four corners of their garments as reminders of “all the commandments of Yahweh,” in accordance with the law set out in Numbers 15:37-41 and Deuteronomy 22:12. These tassels originally contained a thread of tekheleth, “violet.” Jewish tradition, however, has failed to retain the tekheleth, because of doubt as to the exact meaning of the term, and instead dark blue lines were dyed on the borders of the Tallith or garment in which the fringes were placed. According to tradition any garment having four corners required the mnemonic fringes, the importance of which was weighed against “all the commandments of the Lord.” In New Testament times such garments were still worn (compare Matthew 9:20; 14:36; 23:5). The later Jews, after adopting the garments of the Diaspora, in order to observe the tsitsith commandment began to use two extra four-cornered fringed garments: the large Tallith while at prayer, and
the small Tallith, or ‘arba` kanephoth, as an undergarment during the day. Their tradition prescribes the exact manner in which each tassel shall be made, and gives a symbolic meaning to the numbers of windings and knots, somewhat after the manner of the string-writing of several early civilizations (compare the Peruvian quipus). Thus in the tsitsith a long cord is wrapped around seven shorter cords first seven times, then eight, then eleven, and finally thirteen, each series being separated from the others by two knots. The numbers seven and eight constituting fifteen together suggest [h y, YH], and the number eleven, [h w, WH]. Together they make up the holy name YahWeH. The number thirteen stands for [d j a, echadh], the letters of which taken as numerals equal thirteen. The sentence Yahweh ‘echadh means “Yahweh is one.” Many other suggestions, more or less fanciful, have been worked out, all tending to associate the fringes with the Law in the mind of the wearer.

See DRESS.

Ella Davis Isaacs

FROCK

<frok> (i h | m | simlah); [ὁμόλινον, homolinon]): The hempen frock, mentioned in Ecclesiasticus 40:4 as a mark of the lowly, was a simple garment consisting of a square piece of cloth wrapped around the body. It is the same as the garment (simlah) which we find the poor man using as his only bed covering by night (Exodus 22:26 f); the traveler, as the receptacle for his belongings (compare Exodus 12:34); and the common people of both sexes as their general outer garments, though there was some difference in appearance between the simlah of the man and that of the woman (Deuteronomy 22:5).

See DRESS.

Ella Davis Isaacs

FROG

([[ De ] x] tsephardea`]; compare Arabic dafda` (Exodus 8:2 ff; Psalm 78:45; 105:30); [βατραχος, batrachos] (Revelation 16:13)): The references in Psalms, as well as in Exodus, are to the plague of flogs. In Revelation 16:13 we have, “And I saw coming out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the
false prophet, three unclean spirits, as it were frogs.” The word *tsephardea* probably referred both to frogs and to toads, as does the Arabic *dafda*'. In Palestine and Syria Rana esculenta, Bufo viridis and Hyla arborea are common. According to Mr. Michael J. Nicoll, assistant director of the Zoological Gardens at Gizah, near Cairo, the commonest Egyptian species are Rana mascariensis and Bufo regularis. Rana esculenta, Bufo viridis and Bufo vittatus are also found, but are much less common.

*Alfred Ely Day*

**FRONTIER**

<fron’-ter>, <frun’-ter> ([h x q; katseh]): The word occurs once in plural in Ezekiel 25:9. the Revised Version, margin has “in every quarter.”

**FRONTLETS**

<frunt’-lets> ([t ṭōf ṭō, ToTaphoth], from Tuph, “to bind”): Ornaments worn on the forehead, particularly phylacteries (which see), which were worn in this manner and also on the arms (Exodus 13:16; Deuteronomy 6:8; 11:18; compare also Exodus 13:9).

**FROST**

<frost> ([r ẓō k] kephor], “hoar-frost,” Exodus 16:14; Job 38:29; [l ẓōn] chanamal], perhaps “the aphis,” Psalm 78:47; [j r “ q, qerach], “cold,” Genesis 31:40; Job 37:10 the King James Version; Jeremiah 36:30):

1. **FORMATION:**

A temperature of freezing or lower is called frost. Dew forms when the temperature is decreased; and if below freezing, the dew takes the form of a white film or covering over rocks and leaves. This white covering is called hoar-frost. Like dew it is the result of condensation of the moisture of the air on objects which radiate their heat quickly. In order that condensation may take place the atmosphere must be saturated. Frost may be expected on clear, still nights when the radiation is sufficient to reduce the temperature below the freezing-point.
In Syria and Palestine frost is a very rare occurrence at sea-level; but on the hills and elevated plains it is usual in winter, beginning with November, and on the highest elevations throughout the year. Late spring frosts in March or early April do great damage to fruit.

2. IN SYRIA AND PALESTINE:

In clear weather there is often a great variation in the temperature of the day and the night, especially on the inland plains, so that literally, as Jacob said to Laban, “In the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night” (Genesis 31:40); “In the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost” (Jeremiah 36:30; compare 22:19), a passage which suggests that Jehoiakim’s corpse was left unburied.

3. IN EGYPT:

The meaning of chanamal, translated “frost” in Psalm 78:47 (see above), “He destroyed .... their sycomore-trees with frost” (m “great hail stones”), is uncertain. “Frost is unknown in Egypt, and Gesenius suggests ‘ants,’ comparing it with Arabic namal” (Temple, BD, S.V.).

4. FIGURATIVE USES:

The manna in the wilderness is compared to hoarfrost. “A small round thing, small as the hoarfrost” (Exodus 16:14). Manna is occasionally found in Syria now as a flaky, gelatinous substance formed on bushes and rocks. The elements of Nature are indications of God’s power, and are referred to as signs of His might: “By the breath of God frost is given” (Job 37:10 the King James Version). “The hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it?” (Job 38:29); “He destroyed their vines with hail, and their sycamore-trees with frost” (Psalm 78:47); “He scattereth the hoarfrost like ashes” (Psalm 147:16).

Alfred H. Joy

FROWARDNESS

The translation of the plural of tahpukhah, “perversity,” “foolishness” (from haphakh, “to turn about”) in Proverbs 2:14, “delight in the frowardness of the wicked,” the American Standard Revised Version “the perverseness of evil,” margin “the evil man” (compare 2:12; some render “deceit”); 6:14 the American

**FRUIT**

<fruit>.

See FOOD; BOTANY, and special articles on APPLE; FIG; VINE, etc.

**FRUSTRATE**

<frus’-trat> ([r r " P; parar]; [άθετέω, atheteo]): “Frustrate” (from frustra, “vain”) is the translation of parar, “to break,” “to make void,” “to bring to nothing” (Ezr 4:5), “to frustrate their purpose” (Isaiah 44:25, “that frustrateth the signs of the liars”); of atheteo, “to displace,” “to reject or make void or null”: Galatians 2:21, “I do not frustrate the grace of God” (by setting up the righteousness which is “through the law”), the Revised Version (British and American) “make void”; compare 1 Macc 11:36, “Nothing hereof shall be revoked,” the Revised Version (British and American) “annulled” (atheteo).

Revised Version has “frustrateth” for “disappointeth” (Job 5:12, parar).

The adjective appears (2 Esdras 10:34), “frustrate of my hope” (Judith 11:11, “frustrate of his purpose” (apraktos)).

---

**W. L. Walker**

**FRYING-PAN**

<fri’-ing-pan>.

See BREAD; PAN.

**FUEL**

<fu’-el> ([ḥ l k נ; ‘oklah], or [t l k א ל], “food”): Isaiah mentioned specifically only in the Old Testament, in Isaiah 9:5,19; Ezekiel 15:4,6; 21:32. Its general, literal meaning in these connections is “food for fire,” and might include any sort of combustible material. The common forms of fuel were wood of various sorts (even including thorns,
Psalm 58:9; 118:12; Ecclesiastes 7:6), and dried stalks of flowers or grass (Matthew 6:30), charred wood as charcoal (Leviticus 16:12; Isaiah 44:19, and frequently), and dried dung (Ezekiel 4:12,15). There is no certain indication that our coal was known to the Hebrews as fuel, and their houses, being without chimneys, were not constructed for the extensive use of fuel for warmth.

Leonard W. Doolan

FUGITIVE

<fu’-ji-tiv> ([f yl P; paliT], from [f l " P; palalT], “to escape”; [n; na`], from [M, nua`], “to waver”; [p onophel], from [l p n; naphal], “to fall”; [y r B; bariach], [y r B] bariach and [r b mi] mibhrach, from [r B; barach], “to flee”): One who flees from danger (Isaiah 15:5; Ezekiel 17:21); escapes from bondage (2 Macc 8:35 (as adjective)); deserts from duty (Judges 12:4; 2 Kings 25:11 the King James Version; compare Judith 16:12 the King James Version), or wanders aimlessly (Genesis 4:12,14).

FULFIL

<fool-fil’> ([a l; male]; [πληρόω, pleroo], [τελέω, teleo], with other words): “Fulfill” is used

(1) in a sense more or less obsolete, “to fill up,” complete (Genesis 29:21,28; Exodus 23:26; Job 36:17, the Revised Version (British and American) “full,” margin “filled up”; Matthew 3:15, “to fulfill all righteousness”; Philippians 2:2, “Fulfil ye my joy,” the American Standard Revised Version “make full”; compare 2 Corinthians 10:6);

(2) in the sense of “to accomplish,” “to carry into effect,” as to fulfill the word of Yahweh (1 Kings 2:27; 8:15,24; 2 Chronicles 36:21, etc.); in the New Testament very frequently used of the fulfillment of prophetic Scripture (Matthew 1:22; 2:15, etc.). Love is declared to be “the fulfillment (pleroma, “fullness”) of the law” (Romans 13:10). For “fulfill” the Revised Version (British and American) has “do” (Revelation 17:17); for “fulfilled” has “performed” (2

W. L. Walker

FULLER

<fool’-er> ([s b " K; khabac]; literally, “to trample,” [γναφεύς, gnaphēus]): The fuller was usually the dyer, since, before the woven cloth could be properly dyed, it must be freed from the oily and gummy substances naturally found on the raw fiber. Many different substances were in ancient times used for cleansing. Among them were white clay, putrid urine, and the ashes of certain desert plants (Arabic qali, Biblical “soap”; Malachi 3:2). The fuller’s shop was usually outside the city (2 Kings 18:17; Isaiah 7:3; 36:2), first, that he might have sufficient room to spread out his cloth for drying and sunning, and second, because of the offensive odors sometimes produced by his processes. The Syrian indigo dyer still uses a cleaning process closely allied to that pictured on the Egyptian monuments. The unbleached cotton is soaked in water and then sprinkled with the powdered ashes of the ishnan, locally called qali, and then beaten in heaps on a flat stone either with another stone or with a large wooden paddle. The cloth is washed free from the alkali by small boys treading on it in a running stream or in many changes of clean water (compare En-rogel, literally, “foot fountain,” but translated also “fuller’s fountain” because of the fullers’ method of washing their cloth). Mark describes Jesus’ garments at the time of His transfiguration as being whiter than any fuller on earth could whiten them (Mark 9:3).

James A. Patch

FULLER’S FIELD, THE

<fool’-ers feld>, ([s b h d e ] sedheh khobhec]): In all references occurs “the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller’s field”; this must have been a well-known landmark at Jerusalem in the time of the monarchy. Here stood Rabshakeh in his interview with Eliakim and others on the wall (2 Kings 18:17; Isaiah 36:2); clearly the highway was within easy earshot of the walls. Here Isaiah met Ahaz and Shear-jashub his son by command of Yahweh (Isaiah 7:3). An old view placed these events somewhere near the present Jaffa Gate, as here runs an aqueduct from the Birket Mamilla outside the walls of the Birket Hamam el Batrah,
inside the walls; the former was considered the “Upper Pool” and is traditionally called the “Upper Pool” of Gihon. But these pools and this aqueduct are certainly of later date (see JERUSALEM). Another view puts this highway to the North side of the city, where there are extensive remains of a “conduit” running in from the North. In favor of this is the fact that the North was the usual side for attack and the probable position for Rabshakeh to gather his army; it also suits the conditions of Isaiah 7:3. Further, Josephus (BJ, V, iv, 2) in his description of the walls places a “Monument of the Fuller” at the Northeast corner, and the name “fuller” survived in connection with the North wall to the 7th century, as the pilgrim Arculf mentions a gate. West of the Damascus gate called Porta Villae Fullonis. The most probable view, however, is that this conduit was one connected with Gihon, the present “Virgin’s Fountain” (see GIHON). This was well known as “the upper spring” (2 Chronicles 32:30), and the pool, which, we know, was at the source, would probably be called the “Upper Pool.” In this neighborhood — or lower down the valley near Enrogel, which is supposed by some to mean “the spring of the fuller” — is the natural place to expect “fulling.” Somewhere along the Kidron valley between the Virgin’s Fountain and the junction with the Tyropeon was the probable scene of the interview with Rabshakeh; the conversation may quite probably have occurred across the valley, the Assyrian general standing on some part of the cliffs now covered by the village of Siloam.

E. W. G. Masterman

FULLER’S FOUNTAIN

See EN-ROGEL.

FULLNESS

The translation of [πλήρωμα, pleroma, which is generally, but not invariably, rendered “fullness” in the New Testament. Etymologically, pleroma — which itself is derived from the verb pleroo, “I fill” — signifies “that which is or has been filled”; it also means “that which fills or with which a thing is filled”; then it signifies “fullness,” “a fulfilling.”

1. “FULLNESS” IN THE GOSPELS:

In the Gospels it occurs as follows: Matthew 9:16 and Mark 2:21: in both of these passages it means “the fullness,” that by which a gap or rent
is filled up, when an old garment is repaired by a patch; Mark 6:43, "They took up fragments, the fullness of twelve baskets"; 8:20, "The fullness of how many baskets of fragments did ye take up?" John 1:16, "out of his fullness we all received."

2. ITS USE IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES:

Elsewhere in the New Testament “fullness” is used by Paul alone, who employs it 12 times, in addition to the frequent use he makes of the verb “to fill.” Of these 12, no fewer than 6 are in Ephesians and Colossians. The references are these: Romans 11:12, “If .... their loss (is) the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fullness?” The “fullness” of Israel here refers to their being, as a nation, received by God to a participation in all the benefits of Christ’s salvation. Romans 11:25, “A hardening .... hath befallen Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in.” Romans 13:10, “Love .... is the fulfillment (the fulfilling) of the law”; that is, love is not a partial fulfillment, by obedience to this or that commandment, but a complete filling up of what the law enjoins. Romans 15:29, “I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ.” 1 Corinthians 10:26, “The earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof.” Galatians 4:4, “when the fullness of the time came.” The fullness of the time is that portion of time by which the longer antecedent period is completed. Ephesians 1:10, “unto a dispensation of the fullness of the times.” Ephesians 1:23, “the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.” The church is the fullness of Christ; the body of believers is filled with the presence, power, agency and riches of Christ. Ephesians 3:19, “that ye may be filled unto all the fullness of God” — that ye may be wholly filled with God and with His presence and power and grace. Ephesians 4:13, “unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.” Colossians 1:19, “In him should all the fullness dwell.” Colossians 2:9, “In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (compare Luke 2:40,52; 4:1).

3. “FULLNESS” IN EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS:

“Fullness” in Ephesians and Colossians is used to present some of the most prominent thoughts in these epistles, sometimes referring to Christ, sometimes to the church and the individual Christian. Christ is Himself to “fulfill” all things in heaven and on earth (Ephesians 4:10 King James Version margin). We cannot separate “the fullness of Christ” in this
passage (Ephesians 4:13) from the statement in Ephesians 1:23, that the Christ is being fulfilled, and finds His fullness in the church. When all the saints have come to the unity which is their destined goal, or in other words, to the full-grown man, the Christ will have been fulfilled. Thus they will have together reached “the full measure of the maturity of the fullness of the Christ” (J. Armitage Robinson, Commentary on Ephesians, 183).

The church and individual believers, have, by faith, the full possession of all that Christ has to impart — the grace and comfort and strength of Christ received by them now. Compare John 1:16; `In him ye are complete, are made full’ (Colossians 2:10); that is, the fullness of moral, intellectual and spiritual perfection is communicated by Christ to all who are united to Him. “When as the result of the Holy Spirit’s inward strengthening, Christ dwells in the heart, and His knowledge-surpassing love is known, the only limit to spiritual excellence is `to be filled unto all the fullness of God’!” (HDB, 735).

4. ITS USE BY THE FALSE TEACHERS AT COLOSSE:

In the passages from Colossians, “the fullness” in Christ is contrasted with the mediating eons or angel-powers or spiritual manifestations supposed to be intermediate between God and the world. The false teachers at Colosse seem to have used “fullness,” as a technical or semi-technical term, for the purpose of their philosophical or theosophical teaching, employing it to signify the entire series of angels or eons, which filled the space or interval between a holy God and a world of matter, which was conceived of as essentially and necessarily evil. Teaching of this sort was entirely derogatory to the person and work of Christ. In opposition, therefore, to the Colossian false teaching in regard to “the fullness,” Paul shows what the facts really are, that in Christ dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.

5. THE FULLNESS IN CHRIST:

The fullness of the Godhead is the totality of the Divine powers and attributes, all the wealth of the being and of the nature of God — eternal, infinite, unchangeable in existence, in knowledge, in wisdom, in power, in holiness, in goodness, in truth, in love. This is the fullness of the nature of God — life, light, love; and this has its permanent, its settled abode in Christ. All that is His own by right is His by His Father’s good pleasure
also. It was the Father’s good pleasure that in Christ should all the fullness dwell.

Any limitation, therefore, of the meaning of “fullness,” which would make the indwelling of the fullness of the Godhead in Christ a matter either of the future, or of the past only, is inconsistent with what is said of “the fullness” in Him, in Colossians 1:19; 2:9. The reference in both passages is to the timeless and eternal communication of the fullness of the Godhead from the Father to the Son.

It was in a sense developed along the lines of the Colossian teaching regarding “the fullness,” that the Gnostics afterward used the term.

See Gnosticism.

John Rutherfurd

FUNERAL

<fu’-ner-al>

See BURIAL.

FURLONG

<fur’-long> ([στάδιον, stadion], “stadium”; Luke 24:13; John 6:19; 11:18; Revelation 14:20; 21:16): A Greek measure of length, being 600 Greek ft., or 100 orguiai equal to 606 3/4 English ft., and thus somewhat less than a furlong, which is 660 ft.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

FURNACE

<fur’-nas>: The word is used in the Old Testament English Versions of the Bible to translate several Hebrew words:

Kibhshan, in Genesis 19:28, where the smoke of the destruction of the cities of the plain is said to have ascended “as the smoke of a furnace”; in Exodus 9:8, where Yahweh commands to take “handfuls of ashes of the furnace and .... sprinkle it toward heaven,” etc.
Kur, in Deuteronomy 4:20, where Yahweh is represented, when speaking of taking the children of Israel out of Egypt, as taking them “out of the iron furnace.”

`Alil in Psalm 12:6, where “the words of Yahweh” are said to be “pure,” “as silver tried in a furnace”; compare Proverbs 17:3, “furnace for gold.”

`Attun, in Daniel 3:6, where mention is made of “a burning fiery furnace” into which Daniel and his companions were cast. There is good reason to believe that these words all stand for either a brick-kiln or a smelting furnace.

In the New Testament a notable figurative use is made of the word in the phrase “the furnace of fire,” [ἡ κάμινος τοῦ πυρός, he kaminos tou puros]. It is found in the parable of the Tares (Matthew 13:42) as part of the remarkable imagery of that parable; while in the companion parable of the Drag-Net (Matthew 13:50) it stands as a symbol of the final destiny of the impenitent, a synonym of “hell”; compare Jeremiah 29:22; Daniel 3:6,22; Revelation 20:14-15, etc., and “eternal fire” (Matthew 25:41), “unquenchable fire” (Matthew 3:12), “the Gehenna of fire” (Matthew 5:22 margin; Matthew 18:9 parallel Mark 9:43 margin, etc.). A fact which modern travelers speak of, that furnaces for punishment have been found in Persia as elsewhere in the East, sheds some light upon this use of the expression “the furnace of fire.”

George B. Eager

FURNACES, TOWER OF THE
( Nehemiah 3:11).

See JERUSALEM.

FURNISH

fur’-nish ([ə l ə; male]; [πλήθομαι, plethomai]): To “furnish” is to supply with what is useful or necessary, to fit out, provide, equip. It is the translation of several Hebrew or Greek words: of male’, “to fill in or up,” “to complete” (Isaiah 65:11 the King James Version); nasa, “to lift up,” “to aid” (1 Kings 9:11); anaq, Hiphil, probably “to lay on the neck,” “to encircle” (with a bracelet) (Deuteronomy 15:14), of a slave set at
liberty; `arakh, “to arrange in order,” “to lay out a table” (Psalm 78:19 the King James Version; Proverbs 9:2); `asah keli, “to make a vessel for containing things” (Jeremiah 46:19, “Furnish thyself to go into captivity,” the Revised Version, margin “Hebrew, make thee vessels of captivity”); plethomai, “to be filled” (Matthew 22:10 the King James Version); stronnumi, “to strew,” “to spread” (Mark 14:15; Luke 22:12); exartizo, “to complete fully,” to equip” (2 Timothy 3:17).

In Ecclesiasticus 29:26 we have “furnish a table” (kosmeo); 44:6, “furnished with ability” (choregeo); 1 Macc 14:34 the King James Version, “He furnished them with all things” (tithe).

**W. L. Walker**

**FURNITURE**

<fur'ni-tur> ([ר ק; kar], [μυλ K κεκλιμ]; [σκευή, skeue]): In Genesis 31:34 kar is translated “furniture” in the King James Version, but “saddle” in the American Standard Revised Version. The latter is decidedly preferable. It was the “camel-basket,” or the basket-saddle of the camel, which was a sort of palanquin bound upon the saddle. Upon this saddle-basket Rachel sat with the teraphim hidden beneath, and her wily father did not suspect the presence of his gods in such a place. In other places the word kelim is used, and is generally rendered “vessels,” though sometimes “furniture.” It may have many other renderings also (see BDB). Exodus 31:7; 39:33 mention the furniture of the Tent, which is specified in other places. Moses is instructed (25:9) to make a sanctuary or tabernacle and the furniture thereof according to the pattern showed him in the Mount. The furniture of the Court consisted of the brazen altar and laver (40:29,30); that of the Holy Place, of the table of showbread, the golden lampstand and altar of incense (39:36; 40:22-26; Hebrews 9:2); that of the Holy of Holies, of the ark and mercy-seat overshadowed by the cherubim. The tribe of Levi was set apart by Yahweh to “keep all the furniture of the tent of meeting” (Numbers 3:8). When David organized the tabernacle-worship in Jerusalem and assigned the Levites their separate duties, certain men “were appointed over the furniture, and over all the vessels of the sanctuary” (1 Chronicles 9:29). In Nahum 2:9 the singular form of the word keli is used, and is rendered “furniture.” The prophet refers to the abundant, costly, luxurious furniture and raiment, largely the results of their conquests and plunder in many countries.
In Acts 27:19 the word *skeue* is translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “tackling,” with “furniture” in the Revised Version, margin. By way of information regarding the general furniture of the house little is said directly in the Scriptures. The chamber built for Elisha upon the wall contained a bed, a table, a seat, and lampstand. This was doubtless the furnishing of most bedrooms when it could be afforded. The prophet Amos had a supreme contempt for the luxurious furniture of the grandees of Samaria (3:12; 6:4). For full particulars see *HOUSE; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE*.

**FURROW**

<fur'-o> ([µl, telem]): The word is translated “furrows” in Job 39:10; 31:38; Psalm 65:10; Hosea 10:4; 12:11 (Psalm 65:10 the King James Version, “ridges”). In these passages the fields are pictured as they were in the springtime or late autumn. When the showers had softened the earth, the seed was sown and the soil turned over with the plow and left in furrows, not harrowed and pulverized as in our modern farming. The Syrian farmer today follows the custom of his ancient predecessors.

Another word, [h n[ h” ma`anah], occurs in two passages, first in the figurative sense in Psalm 129:3, and second in an obscure passage in 1 Samuel 14:14. Three other words, [h d Yd G` gedhudhah], [h gW ] `arughah], [`y[ “ ayin], translated “furrows” in the King James Version, are probably more properly rendered in the American Standard Revised Version “ridges” (Psalm 65:10), “beds” (Ezekiel 17:7,10), and “transgressions” (Hosea 10:10).

See *AGRICULTURE; PLOW*.

**FURTHER; FURTHERANCE**

<fur'-ther>, <fur'-therans> ([“ y; yacaph]; [ēti, eti], [προκοπή, prokope]); Further, adverb and adjective, is comparative of “forth,” meaning “to a greater distance,” “something more,” “moreover,” etc.; the verb “to further,” means “to help forward,” “advance,” “assist.” The verb
occurs (Ezr 8:36) as the translation of *nasa’*, “to lift up”: “They furthered the people and the house of God” (compare 1 Kings 9:11; Ezr 1:4); of *puq* “to send forth,” “carry out” (Psalm 140:8, “Further not his evil device”).

Furtherance is the translation of *prokope*, “a going forward,” “advance” (Philippians 1:12, “the furtherance of the gospel,” the Revised Version (British and American) “progress” Philippians 1:25, “for your furtherance and joy,” the Revised Version (British and American) “progress”).

Furthermore is the translation of *eita*, “then,” “so then” (Hebrews 12:9); of *loipon*, “for the rest,” or “as to the rest” (1 Thessalonians 4:1, the Revised Version (British and American) “finally then”).

Revised Version omits “further” (Acts 12:3); has “further” for “more than right” (Job 34:23), for “farther thence” (Mark 1:19, different text); “What further need have we of witnesses?” for “What need we any further witnesses?” (Mark 14:63); “your fellowship in furtherance of the gospel” (Philippians 1:5; 2:22); “to the furthest bound” for “all perfection” (Job 28:3).

W. L. Walker

**FURY**

<fu’-ri> ([ἀλάστωρ, alastor], “not to forget,” “significant of revenge”): Occurs only in 2 Macc 7:9 the King James Version, “Thou like a fury (the Revised Version (British and American) “Thou, miscreant”) takest us out of this present life.”

See also WRATH; FIERCENESS; ANGER.

**FUTURE**

<fu’-tur>, <fu’-chur>.

See ESCHATOLOGY.
GAAL

<ga’-al> ([l [ G”, ga`al], “rejection,” or “loathing”; according to Wellhausen, “beetle,” HPN, 110): A man of whose antecedents nothing is known, except that his father’s name was Ebed. He undertook to foment and lead a rebellion on the part of the inhabitants of Shechem against Abimelech, son of Gideon, and his rebellion failed (<HBM> Judges 9:26-45).

See also ABIMELECH.

GAASH

<ga’-ash> ([v [ G”, ga`-ash]): First mentioned in connection with the burial place of Joshua “in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in the hill-country of Ephraim, on the north (side) of the mountain of Gaash” (<HBM> Joshua 24:30; compare <HBM> Judges 2:9); see TIMNATH-HERES. The “brooks,” or rather the wadies or “watercourses” of Gaash are mentioned as the native place of Hiddai (<HBM> 2 Samuel 23:30), or Hurai (<HBM> 1 Chronicles 11:32), one of David’s heroes. No likely identification has been suggested.

See EPHRAIM, MOUNT.

GABA

<ga’-ba> ([[ b ” G, gabha’] (in pause)).

See GEBA.

GABAEL

<gab’-a-el> ([Γαβαηλ, Gabael]; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) “Gabelus”):

(1) An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit 1:1).
A poor Jew of Rages, a city of Media, to whom Tobit lent ten talents of silver (1:14). The money was restored to Tobit in the time of his distress through his son Tobias, whom the angel Raphael led to Gabael at Rages (1:14; 4:1,20; 5:6; 6:9; 10:2).

GABATHA

<gab’-a-tha> ([Γαβαθά, Gabatha]): A eunuch of Mardocheus (Additions to Esther 12:1).

GABBAI

<gab’-a-i> ([γαβ’αί, gabbay], “collector”): One of the chiefs of the Benjamites in Jerusalem after the return from the Babylonian captivity (Nehemiah 11:8).

GABBATHA

<gab’-a-tha>: Given (John 19:13) as the name of a special pavement ([τὸ λιθόστρωτον, to lithostroton]), and is probably a transcription in Greek of the Aramaic [גباحثא’, gabhetha’], meaning “height” or “ridge.” Tradition which now locates the Pretorium at the Antonia and associates the triple Roman arch near there with the “Ecce Homo” scene, naturally identifies an extensive area of massive Roman pavement, with blocks 4 ft. x 3 1/2 ft. and 2 ft. thick, near the “Ecce Homo Arch,” as the Gabbatha. This paved area is in places roughened for a roadway, and in other places is marked with incised designs for Roman games of chance. The site is a lofty one, the ground falling away rapidly to the East and West, and it must have been close to, or perhaps included in, the Antonia. But apart from the fact that it is quite improbable that the Pretorium was here (see PRAETORIUM), it is almost certain that the lithostroton was a mosaic pavement (compare Nehemiah 1:6), such as was very common in those days, and the site is irretrievably lost.

E. W. G. Masterman

GABBE

<gab’-e> ([Γαβή, Gabbe]; the King James Version Gabdes (1 Esdras 5:20)): Called Geba in Ezr 2:26.
**GABRIAS**

<ga’-bri-as> ([Γαβρίας, Gabrias]): Brother of GABAEL (which see). In Tobit 4:20 he is described as his father. The readings are uncertain.

**GABRIEL**

<ga’-bri-el> ([גבריאל, gabriel], “Man of God”; [Γαβριήλ, Gabriel]): The name of the angel commissioned to explain to Daniel the vision of the ram and the he-goat, and to give the prediction of the 70 weeks (Daniel 8:16; 9:21). In the New Testament he is the angel of the announcement to Zacharias of the birth of John the Baptist, and to Mary of the birth of Jesus (Luke 1:19,26). Though commonly spoken of as an archangel, he is not so called in Scripture. He appears in the Book of Enoch (chapters 9, 20, 40) as one of 4 (or 6) chief angels. He is “set over all powers,” presents, with the others, the cry of departed souls for vengeance, is “set over the serpents, and over Paradise, and over the cherubim.” He is prominent in the Jewish Targums, etc.

*See ANGEL.*

---

**GAD (1)**

([גָּד, gadh], “fortune”; [גָּד, Gad]):

1. THE NAME:

The seventh son of Jacob, whose mother was Zilpah (Genesis 30:11), and whose birth was welcomed by Leah with the cry, “Fortunate!” Some have sought to connect the name with that of the heathen deity Gad, of which traces are found in Baal-gad, Migdal-gad, etc. In the blessing of Jacob (Genesis 49:19) there is a play upon the name, as if it meant “troop,” or “marauding band.” “Gad, a troop shall press upon him; but he shall press upon their heel” (Hebrew gadh, gedhudh, yeghudhennu, wehu yaghudh `aqebh). Here there is doubtless a reference to the high spirit and valor that characterized the descendants of Gad. The enemy who attacked them exposed himself to grave peril. In the blessing of Moses again (Deuteronomy 33:20 ff) it is said that Gad “dwelleth as lioness, and teareth the arm, yea, the crown of the head.” Leonine qualities are ascribed...
to the Gadites, mighty men of valor, who joined David (1 Chronicles 12:8,14). Their “faces were like the faces of lions, and they were as swift as the roes upon the mountain.” Among their captains “he that was least was equal to a hundred, and the greatest to a thousand.”

2. THE TRIBE:

Of the patriarch Gad almost nothing is recorded. Seven sons went down with him into Egypt, when Jacob accepted Joseph’s invitation (Genesis 46:16). At the beginning of the desert march Gad numbered 45,650 “from twenty years old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war” (Numbers 1:24). In the plains of Moab the number had fallen to 40,500 (Numbers 26:18). The place of Gad was with the standard of the camp of Reuben on the South side of the tabernacle (Numbers 2:14). The prince of the tribe was Eliasaph, son of Deuel (Numbers 1:14), or Reuel (Numbers 2:14). Among the spies Gad was represented by Geuel son of Machi (Numbers 13:15).

See NUMBERS.

3. THE TRIBAL TERRITORY:

From time immemorial the dwellers East of the Jordan have followed the pastoral life. When Moses had completed the conquest of these lands, the spacious uplands, with their wide pastures, attracted the great flock-masters of Reuben and Gad. In response to their appeal Moses assigned them their tribal portions here: only on condition, however, that their men of war should go over with their brethren, and take their share alike in the hardship and in the glory of the conquest of Western Palestine (Numbers 32). When the victorious campaigns of Joshua were completed, the warriors of Reuben and Gad returned to their possessions in the East. They halted, however, in the Jordan valley to build the mighty altar of Ed. They feared lest the gorge of the Jordan should in time become all too effective a barrier between them and their brethren on the West. This altar should be for all time a “witness” to their unity in race and faith (Joshua 22). The building of the altar was at first misunderstood by the western tribes, but the explanation given entirely satisfied them.
4. BOUNDARIES:

It is impossible to indicate with any certainty the boundaries of the territory of Gad. Reuben lay on the South, and the half-tribe of Manasseh on the North. These three occupied the whole of Eastern Palestine. The South border of Gad is given as the Arnon in Numbers 32:34; but six cities to the North of the Arnon are assigned in 32:16 ff to Reuben. Again, Joshua 13:26 makes Wady Chesban the southern boundary of Gad. Mesha, however (MS), says that the men of Gad dwelt in Ataroth from old time. This is far South of Wady Chesban. The writer of Numbers 32 may have regarded the Jabbok as the northern frontier of Gad; but Joshua 13:27 extends it to the Sea of Chinnereth, making the Jordan the western boundary. It included Rabbath-ammon in the East. We have not now the information necessary to explain this apparent confusion. There can be no doubt that, as a consequence of strifes with neighboring peoples, the boundaries were often changed (1 Chronicles 5:18 f). For the Biblical writers the center of interest was in Western Palestine, and the details given regarding the eastern tribes are very meager. We may take it, however, that, roughly, the land of Gilead fell to the tribe of Gad. In Judges 5:17 Gilead appears where we should naturally expect Gad, for which it seems to stand. The city of refuge, Ramoth in Gilead, was in the territory of Gad (Joshua 20:8). For description of the country see GILEAD.

5. HISTORY:

Reuben and Gad were absent from the muster against Sisera (Judges 5:15 ff); but they united with their brethren in taking vengeance on Benjamin, Jabesh-gilead, from which no contingent was sent, being destroyed (20 f). Jephthah is probably to be reckoned to this tribe, his house, Mizpah (Judges 11:34), being apparently within its territory (Joshua 13:26). Gad furnished a refuge for some of the Hebrews during the Philistine oppression (1 Samuel 13:7). To David, while he avoided Saul at Ziklag, certain Gadites attached themselves (1 Chronicles 12:8 ff). A company of them also joined in making him king at Hebron (1 Chronicles 12:38). In Gad the adherents of the house of Saul gathered round Ish-bosheth (2 Samuel 2:8 ff). Hither David came in his flight from Absalom (2 Samuel 17:24). Gad fell to Jeroboam at the disruption of the kingdom, and Penuel, apparently within its borders, Jeroboam fortified at first (1 Kings 12:25). It appears from the Moabite Stone that part of the territory afterward passed into the hands of Moab. Under Omri
this was recovered; but Moab again asserted its supremacy. Elijah probably belonged to this district; and the brook Cherith must be sought in one of its wild secluded glens.

Gad formed the main theater of the long struggle between Israel and the Syrians. At Ramoth-gilead Ahab received his death wound (1 Kings 22). Under Jeroboam II, this country was once more an integral part of the land of Israel. In 734 BC, however, Tiglath-pileser appeared, and conquered all Eastern Palestine, carrying its inhabitants captive (<sup>2</sup> Kings 15:29; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 5:26). This seems to have furnished occasion for the children of Ammon to occupy the country (<sup>2</sup> Kings 15:29; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 5:26). This seems to have furnished occasion for the children of Ammon to occupy the country (<sup>2</sup> Kings 15:29; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 5:26). This seems to have furnished occasion for the children of Ammon to occupy the country (<sup>2</sup> Kings 15:29; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 5:26). This seems to have furnished occasion for the children of Ammon to occupy the country (<sup>2</sup> Kings 15:29; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 5:26). This seems to have furnished occasion for the children of Ammon to occupy the country (<sup>2</sup> Kings 15:29; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 5:26). This seems to have furnished occasion for the children of Ammon to occupy the country (Jeremiah 49:1). In Ezekiel’s ideal picture (Ezekiel 48:27,34), a place is found for the tribe of Gad. Obadiah seems to have forgotten the tribe, and their territory is assigned to Benjamin (1:19). Gad, however, has his place among the tribes of Israel in Revelation 7.

W. Ewing

**GAD (2)**

([d G, gadh], “fortunate”): David’s seer (chozeh, <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 21:9; 29:29; <sup>2</sup> Chronicles 29:25), or prophet (nabhi’; compare 1 Samuel 22:5; <sup>2</sup> Samuel 24:11). He appears

1. to advise David while an outlaw fleeing before Saul to return to the land of Judah (<sup>1</sup> Samuel 22:5);

2. to rebuke David and give him his choice of punishments when, in spite of the advice of Joab and the traditional objections (compare Exodus 30:11 ff), he had counted the children of Israel (<sup>2</sup> Samuel 24:11; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 21:9 ff);

3. to instruct David to erect an altar on the threshing-floor of Araunah when the plague that had descended on Israel ceased (<sup>2</sup> Samuel 24:18; <sup>1</sup> Chronicles 21:18); and

4. to assist in the arrangement of Levitical music with cymbals, psalteries and harps (compare <sup>2</sup> Chronicles 29:25). Of his writings none are known, though he is said to have written a history of a part of David’s reign (<sup>1</sup> Chronicles 29:29).

Ella Davis Isaacs
GAD (3)

([d G’, gadh], “fortune”): A god of Good Luck, possibly the Hyades. The writer in Isaiah 65:11 (margin) pronounces a curse against such as are lured away to idolatry. The warning here, according to Cheyne, is specifically against the Samaritans, whom with their religion the Jews held in especial abhorrence. The charge would, however, apply just as well to superstitious and semi-pagan Jews. “But ye that forsake Yahweh, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for Fortune, and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny; I will destine you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter.” There is a play upon words here: “Fill up mingled wine unto Destiny” ([y̱m̱] menî) and “I will destine [yt ṉ; maniṯì], i.e. portion out) you for the sword” (Isaiah 65:11,12). Gad and Meni mentioned here are two Syrian-deities (Cheyne, Book of the Prophet Isaiah, 198). Schurer (Gesch. d. jud. Volkes, II, 34 note, and bibliography) disputes the reference of the Greek (Tųχ̱η, Tuche) cult to the Semitic Gad, tracing it rather to the Syrian “Astarte” worship. The custom was quite common among heathen peoples of spreading before the gods tables laden with food (compare Herod. 1:181, 183; Smith, Rel. of Semites, Lect X).

Nothing is known of a Babylonian deity named Gad, but there are Aramean and Arabic equivalents. The origin may have been a personification of fortune and destiny, i.e. equivalent to the Fates. The Nabatean inscriptions give, in plural, form, the name of Meni. Achimenidean coins (Persian) are thought by some to bear the name of Meni. How widely spread these Syrian cults became, may be seen in a number of ways, e.g. an altar from Vaison in Southern France bearing an inscription:

“Belus Fortunae rector, Menisque Magister.”

Belus, signifying the Syrian Bel of Apamaea (Driver). Canaanitish place-names also attest the prevalence of the cult, as Baal-gad, at the foot of Hermen (Joshua 11:17; 12:7; 13:5); Migdal-gad, possibly Mejdel near Askalon (Joshua 15:37); Gadi and Gaddiel (Numbers 13:10 f). In Talmudic literature the name of Gad is frequently invoked (compare McCurdy in Jewish Encyclopedia, V, 544). Indeed the words of Leah in Genesis 30:11 may refer not to good fortune or luck but to the deity who was especially regarded as the patron god of Good Fortune (compare
Kent, Student’s Old Testament, I, 111). Similar beliefs were held among the Greeks and Romans, e.g. Hor. Sat. ii.8, 61:

“.... Fortuna, quis est crudelior in nos to deus?”
Cic. N.D. in.24, 61:

“Quo in genere vel maxime est Fortuna numeranda.”

The question has also an astronomical interest. Arabic tradition styled the planet Jupiter the greater fortune, and Venus the lesser fortune. Jewish tradition identified Gad with the planet Jupiter, and it has been conjectured that Meni is to be identified with the planet Venus.

See, however, ASTROLOGY, 10.

W. N. Stearns

GAD (4)

([ז]זא; ‘azal], “to go about”): Used once in Jeremiah 2:36, “Why gaddest thou about so much to change thy way?” of going after Egypt and Assyria.

GAD, VALLEY OF

([ג]גח”ל]גנ“, nachal ha-gadh]: the King James Version River of Gad): In 2 Samuel 24:5 we read that Joab and the captains of the host passed over Jordan and pitched in Aroer, on the right side of the city that is in the midst of the valley of Gad. If we refer to Joshua 13:25 f, this might seem to indicate a valley near Rabbath-ammon. According to a generally accepted emendation suggested by Wellhausen, however, we should read, “They began from Aroer, and from the city that is in the middle of the torrent valley, toward Gad.” See AR. The valley is evidently the Arnon.

W. Ewing

GADARA

<gard’-a-ra> ([Γάδαρα, Gadara]):
1. COUNTRY OF THE GADARENES:

This city is not named in Scripture, but the territory belonging to it is spoken of as [χώρα τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν, chora ton Gadarenon], “country of the Gadarenes” (Matthew 8:28). In the parallel passages (Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37) we read: [χώρα τῶν Γερασηνῶν, chora ton Gerasenon] “country of the Gerasenes.” There is no good reason, however, to question the accuracy of the text in either case. The city of Gadara is represented today by the ruins of Umm Qeis on the heights south of el-Chummeh — the hot springs in the Yarmuk valley — about 6 miles Southeast of the Sea of Galilee. It maybe taken as certain that the jurisdiction of Gadara, as the chief city in these regions, extended over the country East of the Sea, including the lands of the subordinate town, GERASA (which see). The figure of a ship frequently appears on its coins: conclusive proof that its territory reached the sea. The place might therefore be called with propriety, either “land of the Gerasenes,” with reference to the local center, or “land of the Gadarenes,” with reference to the superior city.

(Note. — The Textus Receptus of the New Testament reading. [τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν, ton Gergesenon], “of the Gergesenes,” must be rejected (Westcott-Hort, II. App., 11).)

2. HISTORY:

The name Gadara appears to be Semitic. It is still heard in Jedur, which attaches to the ancient rock tombs, with sarcophagi, to the East of the present ruins. They are closed by carved stone doors, and are used as storehouses for grain, and also as dwellings by the inhabitants. The place is not mentioned till later times. It was taken by Antiochus the Great when in 218 BC he first invaded Palestine (Polyb. v.71). Alexander Janneus invested the place, and reduced it after a ten months’ siege (Ant., XIII, in, 3; BJ, I, iv, 2). Pompey is said to have restored it, 63 BC (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; BJ, I, vii, 7); from which it would appear to have declined in Jewish hands. He gave it a free constitution. From this date the era of the city was reckoned. It was the seat of one of the councils instituted by Gabinius for the government of the Jews (Ant., XIV, v, 4; BJ, I, viii, 5). It was given by Augustus to Herod the Great in 30 BC (Ant., XV, vii, 3; BJ, I, xx, 3). The emperor would not listen to the accusations of the inhabitants against Herod for oppressive conduct (Ant., XV, x, 2 f). After Herod’s death it
was joined to the province of Syria, 4 BC (Ant., XVII, xi, 4; BJ, II, vi, 3). At the beginning of the Jewish revolt the country around Gadara was laid waste (BJ, II, xviii, 1). The Gadarenes captured some of the boldest of the Jews, of whom several were put to death, and others imprisoned (ibid., 5). A party in the city surrendered it to Vespasian, who placed a garrison there (BJ, IV, vii, 3). It continued to be a great and important city, and was long the seat of a bishop (Reland, Palestine, 776). With the conquest of the Moslems it passed under eclipse, and is now an utter ruin.

3. IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION:

Umm Cheis answers the description given of Gadara by ancient writers. It was a strong fortress (Ant., XIII, in, 3), near the Hieromax — i.e. Yarmuk (Pliny N H, xvi) — East of Tiberias and Scythopolis, on the top of a hill, 3 Roman miles from hot springs and baths called Amatha, on the bank of the Hieromax (Onomasticon, under the word). The narrow ridge on which the ruins lie runs out toward the Jordan from the uplands of Gilead, with the deep gorge of Wady Yarmuk — Hieromax — on the North, and Wady el `Arab on the South. The hot springs, as noted above, are in the bottom of the valley to the North. The ridge sinks gradually to the East, and falls steeply on the other three sides, so that the position was one of great strength. The ancient walls may be traced in almost their entire circuit of 2 miles. One of the great Roman roads ran eastward to Der`ah; and an aqueduct has been traced to the pool of el Khab, about 20 miles to the North of Der`ah. The ruins include those of two theaters, a basilica, a temple, and many important buildings, telling of a once great and splendid city. A paved street, with double colonnade, ran from East to West. The ruts worn in the pavement by the chariot wheels are still to be seen.

That there was a second Gadara seems certain, and it may be intended in some of the passages referred to above. It is probably represented by the modern Jedur, not far from es-Salt (Buhl, Geographic des alten Palastina, 255; Guthe). Josephus gives Pella as the northern boundary of Peraea (BJ, III, in, 3). This would exclude Gadara on the Hieromax. The southern city, therefore, should be understood as “the capital of Peraea” in BJ, IV; vii, 3.

Gadara was a member of the **DECAPOLIS** (which see).

W. Ewing
GADARENES

<gad-a-renz’>. See preceding article.

GADDI

<gad’-i> ([yāḏō’], gaddi, “my fortune”): One of the twelve spies, son of Susi, and a chief of Manasseh (Numbers 13:11).

GADDIEL

<gad’-i-el> ([lā’āḏō’], gaddi’el, “blest of God”): One of the twelve men sent by Moses from the wilderness of Paran to spy out the land of Canaan. He represented the tribe of Zebulun (Numbers 13:10).

GADDIS

<gad’-is> (A [Γάᾶδίς, Gaddis]; [Καᾶδίς, Kaddis]; the King James Version Caddis): Surname of John, the eldest brother of Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 2:2).

GADI

<ga’-di> ([yāḏi`, gadhi], “fortunate”): The father of Menahem, one of the kings of Israel who reached the throne through blood (2 Kings 15:14,17).

GADITES

<gad’-its>: Members of the tribe of Gad (Deuteronomy 3:12, etc.).

GAHAM

<ga’-ham> ([µ j gacham]): A son of Nahor, brother of Abraham, by his concubine Reumah (Genesis 22:24).

GAHAR

<ga’-har> ([r j ” G’], gachar): A family name of the Nethinim who came up with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (Ezr 2:47; Nehemiah 7:49); in 1 Esdras 5:30 called Geddur.
GAI

<ga’-i> ("a yΓ", gay’): In the Revised Version (British and American) of 1 Samuel 17:52 for the King James Version “valleys.” The Revised Version, margin notes: “The Syriac and some editions of the Septuagint have Gath” (thus also Wellhausen, Budde, Driver, etc.).

GAIN

<gan>: In the Old Testament the translation of three Hebrew substantives, [x” B, bets ξ], “unjust gain,” “any gain” (Judges 5:19; Job 22:3; Proverbs 1:19; 15:27; Isaiah 33:15; 56:11; Ezekiel 22:13,17; Micah 4:13); [r yj m] mechir], “price” for which a thing is sold (Daniel 11:39, the only place where the Hebrew word is translated “gain” in the King James Version, though it occurs in other places translated “price”); [r yj m] tebhu’ah], “produce,” “profits,” “fruit” (Proverbs 3:14). It is the translation of one Hebrew verb, [x” B; bats ξ], “to gain dishonestly” (Job 27:8); of one Aramaic verb, [b z] zebhan], “to buy,” “procure for oneself” (Daniel 2:8, here used of buying time, i.e. “seeking delay” (Gesenius)).

In the New Testament, the translation of three Greek substantives, [ἐργασία, ergasia], “gain gotten by work,” “profit” (Acts 16:16,19; 19:24 (the King James Version)); [κέρδος, kerdos], “gain,” “advantage” (Philippians 12:1; 3:7, in the former, Paul asserting that to him to die was a personal advantage, because then he would “be with Christ”; in the latter, he counts as “loss” his personal privileges in the flesh, when compared with “the excellency of the knowledge of Christ”); [πορισμός, porismos], “gain,” “a source of gain” (1 Timothy 6:5,6, where the apostle asserts, not “gain” (earthly) is godliness, but godliness is “gain” (real, abiding)). It is the translation of three Greek vbs., [κέρδαινο, kerdaino], “to gain,” “acquire,” in Matthew 16:26, where Jesus teaches that the soul, or life in its highest sense (“his own self,” Luke 9:25), is worth more than the “gaining” of the whole (material) world; Matthew 18:15, concerning the winning of a sinning brother by private interview; Matthew 25:17,22, the parable of the Talents; Acts 27:21 the King James Version, injury “gained,” sustained, by sailing from Crete; 1 Corinthians 9:19,20 bis, 21,22, all referring to Paul’s life-principle of accommodation to others to “gain,” win, them to Christ; in Jas 4:13 used in a commercial
sense; \(\tau\omicron\eta\iota\epsilon\omicron\omega, \text{poieo}\), “to make,” “make gain” (\(\text{Luke 19:18}\) the King James Version, the parable of the Pounds); \(\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\epsilon\omicron\sigma\epsilon\omicron\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\iota, \text{prosergazomai}\), “to gain by trading” (\(\text{Luke 19:16}\), commercial use, in the same parallel).

**Charles B. Williams**

**GAINSAY**

\(\text{\(<\text{gan-sa}>, \text{gan\textquotesingle-sa}\> (\text{\[\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron, \text{anteipon}\]}, \text{\[\alpha\nu\tau\iota\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega, \text{antilego}\]})\), “to say or speak against”): Occurs as \text{anteipon}, “not .... able to withstand or to gainsay” (\(\text{\langle\text{Luke 21:15}\rangle}\)); as \text{antilego}, “a disobedient and gainsaying people” (\(\text{\langle\text{Romans 10:21}\rangle}\); 2 Esdras 5:29, contradicebant; Judith 8:28, \text{anthistemi}; 12:14, \text{antero}; Additions to Esther 13:9, \text{antitasso}; 1 Macc 14:44, \text{anteipon}.

Gainsayer, \text{antilego} (\(\text{\langle\text{Titus 1:9}\rangle}\), “exhort and convince (the Revised Version (British and American) “convict”) the gainsayers”).

Gainsaying, \text{antillogia} (\(\text{\langle\text{Jude 1:11}\rangle}\), “the gain-saying of Korah”); \text{antillogia} is Septuagint for \text{meribah} (\(\text{\langle\text{Numbers 20:13}\rangle}\); \text{anantirrhetos}, “without contradiction” (\(\text{\langle\text{Acts 10:29}\rangle}\), “without gainsaying”).

The Revised Version (British and American) has “gainsaid” for “spoken against” (\(\text{\langle\text{Acts 19:36}\rangle}\); “not gainsaying” for “not answering again” (\(\text{\langle\text{Titus 2:9}\rangle}\); “gainsaying” for “contradiction” (\(\text{\langle\text{Hebrews 12:3}\rangle}\).

**W. L. Walker**

**GAIUS**

\(\text{\(<\text{ga\textquotesingle-yus}\> ([\Gamma\acute{a}\tau\omicron\varsigma, \text{Gaios}]\); Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, \text{Gaios})}\):

(1) The Gaius to whom 3 John is addressed. He is spoken of as “the beloved” (\(\text{\langle3 John 1:1,2,5,11\rangle}\), “walking in the truth” (\(\text{\langle3 John 1:3,4\rangle}\), and doing “a faithful work” “toward them that are brethren and strangers withal” (\(\text{\langle3 John 1:5,6\rangle}\). He has been identified by some with the Gaius mentioned in the Apostolical Constitutions (VII, 46), as having been appointed bishop of Pergamum by John.

(2) Gaius of Macedonia, a “companion in travel” of Paul (\(\text{\langle\text{Acts 19:29}\rangle}\). He was one of those who were seized by Demetrius and the other silversmiths in the riot at Ephesus, during Paul’s third missionary journey.
(3) Gaius of Derbe, who was among those who accompanied Paul from Greece “as far as Asia,” during his third missionary journey (Acts 20:4). In the corresponding list given in the “Contendings of Paul” (compare Budge, Contendings of the Twelve Apostles, II, 592), the name of this Gaius is given as “Gallius.”

(4) Gaius, the host of Paul when he wrote the Epistle to the Roman, and who joined in sending his salutations (Romans 16:23). As Paul wrote this epistle from Corinth, it is probable that this Gaius is identical with (5).

(5) Gaius, whom Paul baptized at Corinth (1 Corinthians 1:14).

C. M. Kerr

GALAAD

<gal’-a-ad> ([Гαλαάδ, Galaad], Greek form of Gilead (1 Macc 5:9,55; Judith 1:8)).

GALAL

<ga’-tal> ([גלל, galal]): The name of two Levites, one mentioned in 1 Chronicles 9:15, the other in 1 Chronicles 9:16 and Nehemiah 11:17.

GALATIA

<ga-la’-shi-a>, <ga-la’-sha> ([Гαλατία, Galatia]):

I. INTRODUCTORY.

1. Two Senses of Name:

“Galatia” was a name used in two different senses during the 1st century after Christ:

(1) Geographical

To designate a country in the north part of the central plateau of Asia Minor, touching Paphlagonia and Bithynia North, Phrygia West and South, Cappadocia and Pontus Southeast and East, about the headwaters of the Sangarios and the middle course of the Halys;
(2) Political

To designate a large province of the Roman empire, including not merely the country Galatia, but also Paphlagonia and parts of Pontus, Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia and Isauria. The name occurs in 1 Corinthians 16:1; Galatians 1:2; 1 Peter 1:1, and perhaps 2 Timothy 4:10. Some writers assume that Galatia is also mentioned in Acts 16:6; 18:23; but the Greek there has the phrase “Galatic region” or “territory,” though the English Versions of the Bible has “Galatia”; and it must not be assumed without proof that “Galatic region” is synonymous with “Galatia.” If e.g. a modern narrative mentioned that a traveler crossed British territory, we know that this means something quite different from crossing Britain. “Galatic region” has a different connotation from “Galatia”; and, even if we should find that geographically it was equivalent, the writer had some reason for using that special form.

2. Questions to Be Answered:

The questions that have to be answered are:

(a) In which of the two senses is “Galatia” used by Paul and Peter?

(b) What did Luke mean by Galatic region or territory? These questions have not merely geographical import; they bear most closely, and exercise determining influence, on many points in the biography, chronology, missionary work and methods of Paul.

II. ORIGIN OF THE NAME “GALATIA.”

1. The Gaulish Kingdom:

The name was introduced into Asia after 278-277 BC, when a large body of migrating Gauls (Galatai in Greek) crossed over from Europe at the invitation of Nikomedes, king of Bithynia; after ravaging a great part of Western Asia Minor they were gradually confined to a district, and boundaries were fixed for them after 232 BC. Thus, originated the independent state of Galatia, inhabited by three Gaulish tribes, Tolistobogioi, Tektosages and Trokmoi, with three city-centers, Pessinus, Ankyra and Tavia (Tavion in Strabo), who had brought their wives and families with them, and therefore continued to be a distinct Gaulish race and stock (which would have been impossible if they had come as simple warriors who took wives from the conquered inhabitants). The Gaulish
language was apparently imposed on all the old inhabitants, who remained in the country as an inferior caste. The Galatai soon adopted the country religion, alongside of their own; the latter they retained at least as late as the 2nd century after Christ, but it was politically important for them to maintain and exercise the powers of the old priesthood, as at Pessinus, where the Galatai shared the office with the old priestly families.

2. Transference to Rome:

The Galatian state of the Three Tribes lasted till 25 BC, governed first by a council and by tetrarchs, or chiefs of the twelve divisions (four to each tribe) of the people, then, after 63 BC, by three kings. Of these, Deiotaros succeeded in establishing himself as sole king, by murdering the two other tribal kings; and after his death in 40 BC his power passed to Castor and then to Amyntas, 36-25 BC. Amyntas bequeathed his kingdom to Rome; and it was made a Roman province (Dion Cass. 48, 33, 5; Strabo, 567, omits Castor). Amyntas had ruled also parts of Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia and Isauria. The new province included these parts, and to it were added Paphlagonia 6 BC, part of Pontus 2 BC (called Pontus Galaticus in distinction from Eastern Pontus, which was governed by King Polemon and styled Polemoniacus), and in 64 also Pontus Polemoniacus. Part of Lycaonia was non-Roman and was governed by King Antiochus; from 41 to 72 AD Laranda belonged to this district, which was distinguished as Antiochiana regio from the Roman region Lycaonia called Galatica.

3. The Roman Province:

This large province was divided into regiones for administrative purposes; and the regiones coincided roughly with the old national divisions Pisidia, Phrygia (including Antioch, Iconium, Apollonia), Lycaonia (including Derbe, Lystra and a district organized on the village-system), etc. See Calder in Journal of Roman Studies, 1912. This province was called by the Romans Galatia, as being the kingdom of Amyntas (just like the province Asia, which also consisted of a number of different countries as diverse and alien as those of province Galatia, and was so called because the Romans popularly and loosely spoke of the kings of that congeries of countries as kings of Asia). The extent of both names, Asia and Galatia, in Roman language, varied with the varying bounds of each province. The name “Galatia” is used to indicate the province, as it was at the moment, by Ptolemy, Pliny v.146, Tacitus Hist. ii.9; Ann. 13:35; later chroniclers,
Syncellus, Eutropius, and Hist. Aug. Max. et Balb. 7 (who derived it from earlier authorities, and used it in the old sense, not the sense customary in their own time); and in inscriptions CIL, III, 254, 272 (Ephesians Ep. v.51); VI, 1408, 1409, 332; VIII, 11028 (Mommsen rightly, not Schmidt), 18270, etc. It will be observed that these are almost all Roman sources, and (as we shall see) express a purely Roman view. If Paul used the name “Galatia” to indicate the province, this would show that he consistently and naturally took a Roman view, used names in a Roman connotation, and grouped his churches according to Roman provincial divisions; but that is characteristic of the apostle, who looked forward from Asia to Rome (Acts 19:21), aimed at imperial conquest and marched across the Empire from province to province (Macedonia, Achaia, Asia are always provinces to Paul). On the other hand, in the East and the Greco-Asiatic world, the tendency was to speak of the province either as the Galatic Eparchia (as at Iconium in 54 AD, CIG, 3991), or by enumeration of its regiones (or a selection of the regiones). The latter method is followed in a number of inscriptions found in the province (CIL, III, passim). Now let us apply these contemporary facts to the interpretation of the narrative of Luke.

III. THE NARRATIVE OF LUKE.

1. Stages of Evangelization of Province:

The evangelization of the province began in Acts 13:14. The stages are:

(1) the audience in the synagogue, Acts 13:42 f;
(2) almost the whole city, 13:44;
(3) the whole region, i.e. a large district which was affected from the capital (as the whole of Asia was affected from Ephesus 19:10);
(4) Iconium another city of this region: in 13:51 no boundary is mentioned;
(5) a new region Lycaonia with two cities and surrounding district (14:6);
(6) return journey to organize the churches in

(a) Lystra,
(b) Iconium and Antioch (the secondary reading of Westcott and Hort, ([καὶ εἰς Ἰκόνιον καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν, kai eis Ikonion kai Antiocheleian]), is right, distinguishing the two regions

(a) Lycaonia,

(b) that of Iconium and Antioch);

(7) progress across the region Pisidia, where no churches were founded (Pisidian Antioch is not in this region, which lies between Antioch and Pamphylia).

Again (in Acts 16:1-6) Paul revisited the two regiones:

(1) Derbe and Lystra, i.e. regio Lycaonia Galatica,

(2) the Phrygian and Galatic region, i.e. the region which was racially Phrygian and politically Galatic. Paul traversed both regions, making no new churches but only strengthening the existing disciples and churches. In Acts 18:23 he again revisited the two regiones, and they are briefly enumerated:

(1) the Galatic region (so called briefly by a traveler, who had just traversed Antiochiana and distinguished Galatica from it);

(2) Phrygia. On this occasion he specially appealed, not to churches as in 16:6, but to disciples; it was a final visit and intended to reach personally every individual, before Paul went away to Rome and the West. On this occasion the contribution to the poor of Jerusalem was instituted, and the proceeds later were carried by Timothy and Gaius of Derbe (Acts 20:4; 24:17; 1 Corinthians 16:1); this was a device to bind the new churches to the original center of the faith.

2. The Churches Mentioned:

These four churches are mentioned by Luke always as belonging to two regiones, Phrygia and Lycaoma; and each region is in one case described as Galatic, i.e. part of the province Galatia. Luke did not follow the Roman custom, as Paul did; he kept the custom of the Greeks and Asiatic peoples, and styled the province by enumerating its regiones, using the expression Galatic (as in Pontus Galaticus and at Iconium, CIG, 3991) to indicate the supreme unity of the province. By using this adjective about both regiones
he marked his point of view that all four churches are included in the
provincial unity.

From Paul’s references we gather that he regarded the churches of Galatia
as one group, converted together (Galatians 4:13), exposed to the same
influences and changing together (Galatians 1:6, 8; 3:1; 4:9), naturally
visited at one time by a traveler (Galatians 1:8; 4:14). He never thinks
of churches of Phrygia or of Lycaonia; only of province Galatia (as of
provinces Asia, Macedonia, Achaia). Paul did not include in one class all
the churches of one journey: he went direct from Macedonia to Athens and
Corinth, but classes the churches of Macedonia separate from those of
Achaia. Troas and Laodicea and Colosse he classed with Asia (as Luke did
Troas Acts 20:4), Philippi with Macedonia, Corinth with Achaia. These
classifications are true only of the Roman usage, not of early Greek usage.
The custom of classifying according to provinces, universal in the fully
formed church of the Christian age, was derived from the usage of the
apostles (as Theodore Mopsuestia expressly asserts in his Commentary on
First Timothy (Swete, II, 121); Harnack accepts this part of the statement
(Verbreitung, 2nd edition, I, 387; Expansion, II, 96)). His churches then
belonged to the four provinces, Asia, Galatia, Achaia, Macedonia. There
were no other Pauline churches; all united in the gift of money which was
carried to Jerusalem (Acts 20:4; 24:17).

IV. PAUL’S USE OF “GALATIANS.”

The people of the province of Galatia, consisting of many diverse races,
when summed up together, were called Galatai, by Tacitus, Ann. xv.6;
Syncellus, when he says ([Δύστος Γαλάτας φόρος έθετο, Augoustos
Galatais phorous etheto]), follows an older historian describing
the imposing of taxes on the province; and an inscription of Apollonia
Phrygiae calls the people of the city Galatae (Lebas-Waddington, 1192). If
Paul spoke to Philippi or Corinth or Antioch singly, he addressed them as
Philippians, Corinthians, Antiochians (Philippians 4:15; 2 Corinthians
6:11), not as Macedonians or Achaians; but when he had to
address a group of several churches (as Antioch, Iconium, Derbe and
Lystra) he could use only the provincial unity, Galatae.

All attempts to find in Paul’s letter to the Galatians any allusions that
specially suit the character of the Gauls or Galatae have failed. The Gauls
were an aristocracy in a land which they had conquered. They clung
stubbornly to their own Celtic religion long after the time of Paul, even though they also acknowledged the power of the old goddess of the country. They spoke their own Celtic tongue. They were proud, even boastful, and independent. They kept their native law under the Empire. The “Galatians” to whom Paul wrote had Changed very quickly to a new form of religion, not from fickleness, but from a certain proneness to a more oriental form of religion which exacted of them more sacrifice of a ritual type. They needed to be called to freedom; they were submissive rather than arrogant. They spoke Greek. They were accustomed to the Greco-Asiatic law: the law of adoption and inheritance which Paul mentions in his letter is not Roman, but Greco-Asiatic, which in these departments was similar, with some differences; on this see the writer’s Historical Commentary on Galatians.

W. M. Ramsay

**GALATIANS**

<ga-la’-shanz>. See preceding article.

**GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE**

When and to whom, precisely, this letter was written, it is difficult to say; its authorship and purpose are unmistakable. One might conceive it addressed by the apostle Paul, in its main tenor, to almost any church of his Gentilemission attracted to Judaism, at any point within the years circa 45-60 AD. Some plausibly argue that it was the earliest, others place it among the later, of the Pauline Epistles. This consideration dictates the order of our inquiry, which proceeds from the plainer to the more involved and disputable parts of the subject.

**I. THE AUTHORSHIP.**

1. *Position of the Dutch School:*

The Tubingen criticism of the last century recognized the four major epistles of Paul as fully authentic, and made them the corner-stone of its construction of New Testament history. Only Bruno Bauer (Kritik. d. paulin. Briefe, 1850-52) attacked them in this sense, while several other critics accused them of serious interpolations; but these attempts made little impression. Subsequently, a group of Dutch scholars, beginning with Loman in his Quaestiones Paulinae (1882) and represented by Van Manen
in the Encyclopedia Biblica (art. “Paul”), have denied all the canonical epistles to the genuine Paul. They postulate a gradual development in New Testament ideas covering the first century and a half after Christ, and treat the existing letters as “catholic adaptations” of fragmentary pieces from the apostle’s hand, produced by a school of “Paulinists” who carried their master’s principles far beyond his own intentions. On this theory, Galatians, with its advanced polemic against the law, approaching the position of Marcion (140 AD), was work of the early 2nd century. Edwin Johnson in England (Antiqua Mater, 1887), and Steck in Germany (Galaterbrief, 1888), are the only considerable scholars outside of Holland who have adopted this hypothesis; it is rejected by critics so radical as Scholten and Schmiedel (see the article of the latter on “Galatians” in EB). Knowling has searchingly examined the position of the Dutch school in his Witness of the Epistles (1892) — it is altogether too arbitrary and uncontrolled by historical fact to be entertained; see Julicher’s or Zahn’s Introduction to New Testament (English translation), to the same effect. Attempts to dismember this writing, and to appropriate it for other hands and later times than those of the apostle Paul, are idle in view of its vital coherence and the passionate force with which the author’s personality has stamped itself upon his work; the Paulinum pectus speaks in every line. The two contentions on which the letter turns — concerning Paul’s apostleship, and the circumcision of Gentile Christians — belonged to the apostle’s lifetime: in the fifth and sixth decades these were burning questions; by the 2nd century the church had left them far behind.

2. Early Testimony:

Early Christianity gives clear and ample testimony to this document. Marcion placed it at the head of his Apostolikon (140 AD); Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Melito, quoted it about the same time. It is echoed by Ignatius (Philad., i) and Polycarp (Philip., in and v) a generation earlier, and seems to have been used by contemporary Gnostic teachers. It stands in line with the other epistles of Paul in the oldest Latin, Syriac and Egyptian translations, and in the Muratorian (Roman) Canon of the 2nd century. It comes full into view as an integral part of the new Scripture in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian at the close of this period. No breath of suspicion as to the authorship, integrity or apostolic authority of the Ep. to the Galatians has reached us from ancient times.
II. MATTER OF THE EPISTLE.

A) Summary of Contents:

1. Outline:
   A double note of war sounds in the address and greeting (Galatians 1:1,4). Astonishment replaces the customary thanksgiving (Galatians 1:6-10): The Galatians are listening to preachers of “another gospel” (1:6,7) and traducers of the apostle (1:8,10), whom he declares “anathema.” Paul has therefore two objects in writing — to vindicate himself, and to clear and reinforce his doctrine. The first he pursues from 1:11 to 2:21; the second from 3:1 to 5:12. Appropriate: moral exhortations follow in 5:13 through 6:10. The closing paragraph (6:11-17) resumes incisively the purport of the letter. Personal, argumentative, and hortatory matter interchange with the freedom natural in a letter to old friends.

   Paul asserts himself for his gospel’s sake, by showing that his commission was God-given and complete (Galatians 1:11,12). On four decisive moments in his course he dwells for this purpose — as regards the second manifestly (Galatians 1:20), as to others probably, in correction of misstatements:

   (1) A thorough-paced Judaist and persecutor (Galatians 1:13,14), Paul was supernaturally converted to Christ (Galatians 1:15), and received at conversion his charge for the Gentiles, about which he consulted no one (Galatians 1:16,17).

   (2) Three years later he “made acquaintance with Cephas” in Jerusalem and saw James besides, but no “other of the apostles” (Galatians 1:18,19). For long he was known only by report to “the churches of Judea” (Galatians 1:21-24).

   (3) At the end of “fourteen years” he “went up to Jerusalem,” with Barnabas, to confer about the “liberty” of Gentilebelievers, which was endangered by “false brethren” (Galatians 2:1-5). Instead of supporting the demand for the circumcision of the “Greek” Titus (Galatians 2:3), the “pillars” there recognized the sufficiency and completeness of Paul’s “gospel of the uncircumcision” and the validity of his apostleship
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(4) At Antioch, however, Paul and Cephas differed (Galatians 2:11). Cephas was induced to withdraw from the common church-table, and carried “the rest of the Jews,” including Barnabas, with him (Galatians 2:12,13). “The truth of the gospel,” with Cephas’ own sincerity, was compromised by this “separation,” which in effect “compelled the Gentiles to Judaize” (Galatians 2:13,14). Paul therefore reproved Cephas publicly in the speech reproduced by Galatians 2:14-21, the report of which clearly states the evangelical position and the ruinous consequences (2:18,21) of reestablishing “the law.”

3. Doctrinal Polemic (Galatians 3:1 through 5:12):

(1) Thesis.

The doctrinal polemic was rehearsed in the autobiography (Galatians 2:3-5,11-12). In Galatians 2:16 is laid down thesis of the epistle: “A man is not justified by the works of law but through faith in Jesus Christ.” This proposition is

(a) demonstrated from experience and history in 3:1-4:7; then

(b) enforced by 4:8-5:12.

(2) Main Argument.

(a1) From his own experience (Galatians 2:19-21) Paul passes to that of the readers, who are “bewitched” to forget “Christ crucified” (Galatians 3:1)! Had their life in “the Spirit” come through “works of the law” or the “hearing of faith”? Will the flesh consummate what the Spirit began (Galatians 3:2-5)? (a2) Abraham, they are told, is the father of God’s people; but `the men of faith’ are Abraham’s true heirs (Galatians 3:6-9). “The law” curses every transgressor; Scripture promised righteousness through faith for the very reason that justification by legal “doing” is impossible (Galatians 3:10-12). “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law” in dying the death it declared “accursed” (Galatians 3:13). Thus He conveyed to the nations “the promise of the Spirit,” pledged to them through believing Abraham (Galatians 3:7,14). (a3) The “testament” God gave to “Abraham and his seed” (a single “seed”,
observe) is unalterable. The Mosaic law, enacted 430 years later, could not nullify this instrument (Galatians 3:15-17 the King James Version). Nullified it would have been, had its fulfillment turned on legal performance instead of Divine “grace” (Galatians 3:18). (a4) “Why then the law?” Sin required it, pending the accomplishment of “the promise.” Its promulgation through intermediaries marks its inferiority (Galatians 3:19,20). With no power `to give life,’ it served the part of a jailer guarding us till “faith came,” of “the paedagogus” training us `for Christ’ (Galatians 3:21-25). (a5) But now “in Christ,” Jew and Greek alike, “ye are all sons of God through faith”; being such, “you are Abraham´s seed” and `heirs in terms of the promise’ (Galatians 3:26-29). The `infant’ heirs, in tutelage, were `subject to the elements of the world,’ until “God sent forth his Son,” placed in the like condition, to “redeem” them (Galatians 4:1-5). Today the “cry” of “the Spirit of his Son” in your “hearts” proves this redemption accomplished (Galatians 4:6,7).

The demonstration is complete; Galatians 3:1-4:7 forms the core of the epistle. The growth of the Christian consciousness has been traced from its germ in Abraham to its flower in the church of all nations. The Mosaic law formed a disciplinary interlude in the process, which has been all along a life of faith. Paul concludes where he began (3:2), by claiming the Spirit as witness to the full salvation of the Gentiles; compare Romans 8:1-27; 2 Corinthians 3:4-18; Ephesians 1:13,14. From Galatians 4:8 onward to 5:12, the argument is pressed home by appeal, illustration and warning.

(3) Appeal and Warning.

(b1) After “knowing God,” would the Galatians return to the bondage in which ignorantly they served as gods “the elements” of Nature? (4:8,9). Their adoption of Jewish “seasons” points to this backsliding (4:10,11). (b2) Paul’s anxiety prompts the entreaty of 4:12-20, in which he recalls his fervent reception by his readers, decries their present alienation, and confesses his perplexity. (b3) Observe that Abraham had two sons — “after the flesh” and “through promise” (4:21-23); those who want to be under law are choosing the part of Ishmael: “Hagar” stands for `the present Jerusalem’ in her bondage; `the Jerusalem above is free — she is our mother!’ (4:24-28,31). The fate of Hagar and Ishmael pictures the issue of legal subjection (4:29,30): “Stand fast therefore” (5:1). (b4) The crucial moment comes at 5:2: the Galatians are half-persuaded (5:7,8); they will
fatally commit themselves, if they consent to `be circumcised.' This will sever them from Christ, and bind them to complete observance of Moses’ law: law or grace — by one or the other they must stand (5:3-5). “Circumcision, uncircumcision” — these “count for nothing in Christ Jesus” (5:6). Paul will not believe in the defection of those who `ran’ so “well”; “judgment” will fall on their `disturber' (5:7-10,12). Persecution marks himself as no circumcisionist (5:11)!

4. The Ethical Application (Galatians 5:13-6:10):

Law of the Spirit of Life

The ethical application is contained in the phrase of Romans 8:2, “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.”

(1) Love guards Christian liberty from license; it `fulfills the whole law in a single word’ (Galatians 5:13-15).

(2) The Spirit, who imparts freedom, guides the free man’s “walk.” Flesh and spirit are, opposing principles: deliverance from “the flesh” and its “works” is found in possession by “the Spirit,” who bears in those He rules His proper “fruit.” `Crucified with Christ’ and `living in the Spirit,’ the Christian man keeps God’s law without bondage under it (Galatians 5:16-26).

(3) In cases of unwary fall, `men of the Spirit’ will know how to “restore” the lapsed, `fulfilling Christ’s law’ and mindful of their own weakness (Galatians 6:1-5).

(4) Teachers have a peculiar claim on the taught; to ignore this is to `mock God.’ Men will “reap corruption” or “eternal life,” as in such matters they `sow to the flesh’ or `to the Spirit.’ Be patient till the harvest! (Galatians 6:6-10).

5. The Epilogue (Galatians 6:11-18):

The autograph conclusion (Galatians 6:11) exposes the sinister motive of the circumcisionists, who are ashamed of the cross, the Christian’s only boast (Galatians 6:12-15). Such men are none of “the Israel of God!” (Galatians 6:16). “The brand of Jesus” is now on Paul’s body; at their peril “henceforth” will men trouble him! (Galatians 6:17). The benediction follows (Galatians 6:18).
1. The Principles at Stake:

The postscript reveals the inwardness of the legalists’ agitation. They advocated circumcision from policy more than from conviction, hoping to conciliate Judaism and atone for accepting the Nazarene — to hide the shame of the cross — by capturing for the Law the Gentile churches. They attack Paul because he stands in the way of this attempt. Their policy is treason; it surrenders to the world that cross of Christ, to which the world for its salvation must unconditionally submit. The grace of God the one source of salvation Galatians (1:3; 2:21; 5:4), the cross of Christ its sole ground (1:4; 2:19-21; 3:13; 6:14), faith in the Good News its all-sufficient means (2:16,20; 3:2,5-9,23-26; 5:5), the Spirit its effectuating power (3:2-5; 4:6,7; 5:5,16-25; 6:8) — hence, emancipation from the Jewish law, and the full status of sons of God open to the Gentiles (2:4,5,15-19; 3:10-14; 3:28-4:9,26-31; 5:18; 6:15): these connected principles are at stake in the contention; they make up the doctrine of the epistle.

2. Present Stage of the Controversy:

Circumcision is now proposed by the Judaists as a supplement to faith in Christ, as the qualification for sonship to Abraham and communion with the apostolic church (Galatians 3:7,29). After the Council at Jerusalem, they no longer say outright, “Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved” (Acts 15:1). Paul’s Galatian converts, they admit, “have begun in the Spirit”; they bid them “be perfected” and attain the full Christian status by conforming to Moses — “Christ will profit” them much more, if they add to their faith circumcision (Galatians 3:3; 5:2; compare Romans 3:1). This insidious proposal might seem to be in keeping with the findings of the Council; Peter’s action at Antioch lent color to it. Such a grading of the Circumcision and Uncircumcision within the church offered a tempting solution of the legalist controversy; for it appeared to reconcile the universal destination of the gospel with the inalienable prerogatives of the sons of Abraham. Paul’s reply is, that believing Gentiles are already Abraham’s “seed” — nay, sons and heirs of God; instead of adding anything, circumcision would rob them of everything they have won in Christ; instead of going on to perfection by its aid, they would draw back unto perdition.
3. Paul’s Depreciation of the Law:

Paul carries the war into the enemies’ camp, when he argues,

(a) that the law of Moses brought condemnation, not blessing, on its subjects (Galatians 3:10-24); and

(b) that instead of completing the work of faith, its part in the Divine economy was subordinate (Galatians 3:19-25). It was a temporary provision, due to man’s sinful unripeness for the original covenant (Galatians 3:19,24; 4:4). The Spirit of sonship, now manifested in the Gentiles, is the infallible sign that the promise made to mankind in Abraham has been fulfilled. The whole position of the legalists is undermined by the use the apostle makes of the Abrahamic covenant.

4. The Personal Question:

The religious and the personal questions of the epistle are bound up together; this Galatians 5:2 clearly indicates. The latter naturally emerges first (1:1,11 ff). Paul’s authority must be overthrown, if his disciples are to be Judaized. Hence, the campaign of detraction against him (compare 2 Corinthians 10 through 12). The line of defense indicates the nature of the attack. Paul was said to be a second-hand, second-rate apostle, whose knowledge of Christ and title to preach Him came from Cephas and the mother church. In proof of this, an account was given of his career, which he corrects in Galatians 1:13 through 2:21. “Cephas” was held up (compare 1 Corinthians 1:12) as the chief of the apostles, whose primacy Paul had repeatedly acknowledged; and “the pillars” at Jerusalem were quoted as maintainers of Mosaic rule and authorities for the additions to be made to Paul’s imperfect gospel. Paul himself, it was insinuated, “preaches circumcision” where it suits him; he is a plausible time-server (Galatians 1:10; 5:11; compare Acts 16:3; 1 Corinthians 9:19-21). The apostle’s object in his self-defense is not to sketch his own life, nor in particular to recount his visits to Jerusalem, but to prove his independent apostleship and his consistent maintenance of Gentilerights. He states, therefore, what really happened on the critical occasions of his contact with Peter and the Jerusalem church. To begin with, he received his gospel and apostolic office from Jesus Christ directly, and apart from Peter (Galatians 1:13-20); he was subsequently recognized by “the pillars” as apostle, on equality with Peter (Galatians 2:6-9); he had finally vindicated his doctrine when it was assailed, in spite
of Peter (Galatians 2:11-12). The adjustment of Paul’s recollections with Luke’s narrative is a matter of dispute, in regard both to the conference of Galatians 2:1-10 and the encounter of 2:11-21; to these points we shall return, iv.3 (4), (5).

C) Characteristics:

1. Idiosyncrasy of the Epistle:

This is a letter of expostulation. Passion and argument are blended in it. Hot indignation and righteous scorn (Galatians 1:7-9; 4:17; 5:10,12; 6:12,13), tender, wounded affection (Galatians 4:11-20), deep sincerity and manly integrity united with the loftiest consciousness of spiritual authority (Galatians 1:10-12,20; 2:4-6,14; 5:2; 6:17), above all a consuming devotion to the person and cross of the Redeemer, fill these few pages with an incomparable wealth and glow of Christian emotion. The power of mind the epistle exhibits matches its largeness of heart. Roman indeed carries out the argument with greater breadth and theoretic completeness; but Galatians excels in pungency, incisiveness, and debating force. The style is that of Paul at the summit of his powers. Its spiritual elevation, its vigor and resource, its subtlety and irony, poignancy and pathos, the vis vivida that animates the whole, have made this letter a classic of religious controversy. The blemishes of Paul’s composition, which contribute to his mastery of effect, are conspicuous here — his abrupt turns and apostrophes, and sometimes difficult ellipses (Galatians 2:4-10,20; 4:16-20; 5:13), awkward parentheses and entangled periods (Galatians 2:1-10,18; 3:16,20; 4:25), and outburst of excessive vehemence (Galatians 1:8,9; 5:12).

2. Jewish Coloring:

The and-legalist polemic gives a special Old Testament coloring to the epistle; the apostle meets his adversaries on their own ground. In Galatians 3:16,19-20; 4:21-31, we have examples of the rabbinical exegesis Paul had learned from his Jewish masters. These texts should be read in part as argumenta ad hominem; however peculiar in form such Pauline passages may be, they always contain sound reasoning.
III. RELATIONS TO OTHER EPISTLES.

(1) The connection of Galatians with Romans is patent; it is not sufficiently understood how pervasive that connection is and into what manifold detail it extends. The similarity of doctrine and doctrinal vocabulary manifest in Galatians 2:13-6:16 and Romans 1:16-8:39 is accounted for by the Judaistic controversy on which Paul was engaged for so long, and by the fact that this discussion touched the heart of his gospel and raised questions in regard to which his mind was made up from the beginning (1:15,16), on which he would therefore always express himself in much the same way. Broadly speaking, the difference is that Romans is didactic and abstract, where Galatians is personal and polemical; that the former presents, a measured and rounded development of conceptions projected rapidly in the latter under the stress of controversy. The emphasis lies in Romans on justification by faith; in Galatians on the freedom of the Christian man. The contrast of tone is symptomatic of a calmer mood in the writer — the lull which follows the storm; it suits the different address of the two epistles.

1. Galatians and Romans:

Besides the correspondence of purport, there is a verbal resemblance to Romans pervading the tissue of Galatians, and traceable in its mannerisms and incidental expressions. Outside of the identical quotations, we find more than 40 Greek locutions, some of them rare in the language, common to these two and occurring in these only of Paul’s epistles — including the words rendered “bear” (Romans 11:18 and Galatians 5:10, etc.); “blessing” or “gratulation” (makarismos), “divisions” (Romans 16:17; Galatians 5:20); “fail” or “fall from” (ekpipto); “labor on” or “upon” (of persons), “passions” (pathemata, in this sense); “set free” or “deliver” (eleutheroo); “shut up” or “conclude,” and “shut out” or “exclude”; “travail (together),” and such phrases as “die to” (with dative), “hearing of faith,” “if possible,” “put on (the Lord Jesus) Christ,” “those who do such things,” “what saith the Scripture?” “where then?” (rhetorical), “why any longer?” The list would be greatly extended by adding expressions distinctive of this pair of letters that occur sporadically elsewhere in Paul. The kinship of Galatians-Romans in vocabulary and vein of expression resembles that existing between Colossians-Ephesians or 1 and 2 Thessalonians; it is twice as strong proportionately as that of 1 and 2 Corinthians. Not only the same current of thought, but with it, much the
same stream of language was running through Paul’s mind in writing these two epistles.

The association of Galatians with the two Corinthian letters, though less intimate than that of Galatians-Romans, is unmistakable.

2. Links with 1 and 2 Corinthians:

We count 23 distinct locations shared by 2 Corinthians alone (in its 13 chapters) with Galatians, and 20 such shared with 1 Corinthians (16 chapters) — a larger proportion for the former. Among the Galatians-1 Corinthians peculiarities are the sayings, “A little leaven,” etc., “circumcision is nothing,” etc., and the phrases, “be not deceived,” “it is manifest” (delon as predicate to a sentence), “known by God,” “profit nothing” and “to be something,” “scandal of the cross,” “the spiritual” (of persons), “they that are Christ’s (of Christ Jesus).” Peculiar to Galatians through 2 Corinthians are “another gospel” and “false brethren,” “brings into bondage,” “devour” and “zealously seek” or “am jealous over” (of persons); “a new creation,” “confirm” or “ratify” (kuroo); “I am perplexed,” the antithesis of “sowing” and “reaping” (figuratively); the phrase “on the contrary” or “contrariwise” (t’ounantion), etc. The conception of the “two covenants” (or “testaments”) is conspicuous in both epistles (Galatians 3:17-21; 4:21-31; 2 Corinthians 3:8-18), and does not recur in Paul; in each case the ideas of “law” (or “letter”), “bondage,” “death,” are associated with the one, diatheke, of “spirit,” “freedom,” “life,” with the other. Galatians 3:13 (“Christ .... made a curse for us”) is matched by 2 Corinthians 5:21 (“made sin for us”); in Galatians 2:19 and 6:14 we find Paul “crucified to the world” in the cross of his Master and “Christ” alone “living in” him; in 2 Corinthians 5:14,15 this experience becomes a universal law for Christians; and where in Galatians 6:17 the apostle appears as `from hence-forth .... bearing in’ his `body the brand of Jesus,’ in 2 Corinthians 4:10 he is “always bearing about in” his “body the dying of Jesus.”

These identical or closely congruous trains of thought and turns of phrase, varied and dominant as they are, speak for some near connection between the two writings. By its list of vices in Galatians 5:19,20 Galatians curiously, and somewhat intricately, links itself at once with 2 Corinthians and Roman (see 2 Corinthians 12:20; Romans 13:13; 16:17). Galatians is allied by argument and doctrine with Romans, and by temper
and sentiment with 2 Corinthians. The storm of feeling agitating our epistle
downs from the same quarter, reaches the same height, and engages the
same emotions with those which animate 2 Corinthians 10 through 13.

3. With the Corinthians-Romans Group:

If we add to the 43 locutions confined in the Pauline Epistles to Galatians-
Romans the 23 such of Galatians-2 Corinthians, the 20 of Galatians-1
Corinthians, the 14 that range over Galatians-Romans-2 Corinthians, the
15 of Galatians-Romans-1 Corinthians, the 7 of Galatians-1-2 Corinthians,
and the 11 running through all four, we get a total of 133 words or phrases
(apart from Old Testament quotations) specific to Galatians in common
with one or more of the Corinthians-Romans group — an average, that is,
of close upon 3 for each chapter of those other epistles.

With the other groups of Pauline letters Galatians is associated by ties less
numerous and strong, yet marked enough to suggest, in conjunction with
the general style, a common authorship.

4. With Other Groups of Epistles:

The proportion of locutions peculiar to Galatians and the 3rd group
(Colossians-Philemon-Ephesians-Philippians) is 1 to each of their 15
chapters. The more noticeable of these are in Galatians-Colossians:
“elements of the world,” and the maxim, “There is no Jew nor Greek,” etc.,
associated with the “putting on of Christ” (“the new man”); “fullness of the
time” (or “seasons”) and “householders of faith (of God),” also “Christ
loved me (the church) and gave up himself for me (her),” in Galatians-
Ephesians; “he that supplieth (your supplying of, epichoregia) the Spirit,”
and “vain-glory” (kenodoxia), in Galatians-Philippians; “redeem”
(exagorazo) and “inheritance” are peculiar to Galatians with Colossians-
Ephesians together; the association of the believer’s “inheritance” with “the
Spirit” in Galatians-Ephesians is a significant point of doctrinal identity.

The Thessalonians and Timothy-Titus (1st and 4th) groups are outliers in
relation to Galatians, judged by vocabulary. There is little to associate our
epistle with either of these combinations, apart from pervasive Corinthians-
Romans phrases and the Pauline complexion. There are 5 such expressions
registered for the 8 chapters of 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 7 for the 13 of 1 and
2 Timothy and Titus — just over one to two chapters for each group.
While the verbal coincidences in these two cases are, proportionately, but
one-half so many as those connecting Galatians with the 3rd group of epistles and one-fifth or one-sixth of those linking it to the 2nd group, they are also less characteristic; the most striking is the contrast of “well-doing” (*kalopoieo*) with “fainting” or “wearying” (*egkakeo*) in Galatians 6:9 and 2 Thessalonians 3:13.

5. General Comparison:

No other writing of Paul reflects the whole man so fully as this — his spiritual, emotional, intellectual, practical, and even physical, idiosyncrasy. We see less of the apostle’s tenderness, but more of his strength than in Philippians; less of his inner, mystic experiences, more of the critical turns of his career; less of his “fears,” more of his “fightings,” than in 2 Corinthians. While the 2nd letter to Timothy lifts the curtain from the closing stage of the apostle’s ministry, Galatians throws a powerful light upon its beginning. The Pauline theology opens to us its heart in this document. The apostle’s message of deliverance from sin through faith in the crucified Redeemer, and of the new life in the Spirit growing from this root, lives and speaks; we see it in Galatians as a working and fighting theology, while in Romans it peacefully expands into an ordered system. The immediately saving truth of Christianity, the gospel of the Gospel, finds its most trenchant utterance in this epistle; here we learn “the word of the cross” as Paul received it from the living Savior, and defended it at the crisis of his work.

IV. THE DESTINATION AND DATE.

1. Place and Time Interdependent:

The question of the people to whom, is bound up with that of the time at which, the Epistle to the Galatians was written. Each goes to determine the other. The expression “the first time” (*to proteron*) of Galatians 4:13 presumes Paul to have been twice with the readers previously — for the first occasion, see 4:13-15; for the second, 1:9; 5:3. The explanation of Round (Date of the Epistle to Galatians, 1906), that the apostle intended to distinguish his first arrival at the several (South) Galatian cities from his return in the course of the same journey (*Acts* 14:21-23), cannot be accepted: Derbe, the limit of the expedition, received Paul and Barnabas but once on that round, and in retracing their steps the missionaries were completing an interrupted work, whereas Galatians 4:13 implies a second, distinct visitation of the churches concerned as a whole; in *Acts*
15:36 Paul looks back to the journey of Acts 13:14-14:26 as one event. Now the apostle revisited the South Galatian churches in starting on the 2nd missionary tour (Acts 16:1-5). Consequently, if his “Galatians” were Christians of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe (the South Galatian hypothesis), the letter was written in the further course of the 2nd tour — from Macedonia or Corinth about the time of 1 and 2 Thessalonians (so Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, I, English translation), or from Antioch in the interval between the 2nd and 3rd journeys (so Ramsay); for on this latter journey (Acts 18:23) Paul (ex hyp.) traversed “the (South) Galatian country” a third time. On the other hand, if they were people of Galatia proper, i.e. of North (Old) Galatia, the epistle cannot be earlier than the occasion of Acts 18:23, when Paul touched a second time “the Galatian country,” which, on this supposition, he had evangelized in traveling from South Galatia to Troas during the previous tour (Acts 16:6-8). On the North Galatian hypothesis, the letter was dispatched from Ephesus during Paul’s long residence there (Acts 19; so most interpreters, ancient and modern), in which case it heads the 2nd group of the epistles; or later, from Macedonia or Corinth, and shortly before the writing of the Epistle to the Romans (thus Lightfoot, Salmon, A. L. Williams and others).

Per contra, the earlier date, if proved independently, carries with it the South Galatian, the later date the North Galatian theory. The subscription of the Textus Receptus of the New Testament “written from Rome,” rests on inferior manuscript authority and late Patristic tradition. Clemen, with no suggestion as to place of origin, assigns to the writing a date subsequent to the termination of the 3rd missionary tour (55 or 57 AD), inasmuch as the epistle reflects the controversy about the Law, which in Romans is comparatively mild, at an acute, and, therefore (he supposes), an advanced stage.

2. Internal Evidence:

Lightfoot (chapter in of Introduction to Commentary) placed Galatians in the 2nd group of the epistles between 2 Corinthians and Romans, upon considerations drawn from “the style and character” of the epistle. His argument might be strengthened by a detailed linguistic analysis (see III, 1-3, above). The more minutely one compares Galatians with Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, the more these four are seen to form a continuous web, the product of the same experience in the writer’s mind and the same
situation in the church. This presumption, based on internal evidence, must be tested by examination of the topographical and chronological data.

3. External Data:

(1) **Galatia and the Galatians.**

The double sense of these terms obtaining in current use has been shown in the article on GALATIA; Steinmann sets out the evidence at large in his essay on Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes, 61-76 (1908); see also A. L. Williams’ Introduction to Galatians in Cambr. Greek Test. (1910). Roman authors of the period in using these expressions commonly thought of provincial Galatia (NOTE: Schurer seems to be right, however, in maintaining that “Galatia” was only the abbreviated designation for the province, named a parte potiori, and that in more formal description it was styled “Galatia, Pisidia, Phrygia,” etc.) which then embraced in addition to Galatia proper a large tract of Southern Phrygia and Lycaonia, reaching from Pisidian Antioch in the west to Derbe in the east; but writers of Asia Minor leaned to the older local and national usage, according to which “Galatia” signified the north-central highlands of the peninsula, on both sides of the river Halys, in which the invading Galatae had settled long before this time. (On their history see the previous article) It is asserted that Paul strictly followed the official, as against the popular, usus loquendi in these matters — a questionable dictum (see A. L. Williams, op. cit., xix, xx, or Steinmann’s Leserkreis, 78-104), in view of Galatians 1:21,22 (note the Greek double article), to go no farther. There was nothing in Paul’s Roman citizenship to make him a precisian in a point like this. Ramsay has proved that all four cities of Acts 13:14-14:23 were by this time included in provincial Galatia. Their inhabitants might therefore, officially, be styled “Galatians” (Galatae); it does not follow that this was a fit or likely compilation for Paul to use. Julicher says this would have been a piece of “bad taste” on his part. The attachment of the southern districts (Phrygian, Pisidian, Lycaonian) to Galatia was recent — Derbe had been annexed so late as the year 41 — and artificial. Supposing that their Roman “colonial” rank made the designation “Galatians” agreeable to citizens of Antioch or Lystra, there was little in it to appeal to Iconians or Derbeans (compare Schmiedel, in EB, col. 1604).

(2) **Prima Facie Sense of Acts 16:6.**

The “Galatian country” (Galatike chora) is mentioned by Luke, with
careful repetition, in Acts 16:6 and 18:23. Luke at any rate was not tied to imperial usage; he distinguishes “Phrygia” from “Asia” in Acts 2:9,10, although Phrygia was administratively parcelled out between Asia and Galatia. When therefore “Asia” is opposed in 16:6 to “the Phrygian and Galatian country” (or “Phrygia and Galatian country,” Zahn), we presume that the three terms of locality bear alike a non-official sense, so that the “Galatian country” means Old Galatia (or some part of it) lying to the Northeast, as “Asia” means the narrower Asia west of “Phrygia.” On this presumption we understand that Paul and Silas, after completing their visitation of “the cities” of the former tour (Acts 16:4,5; compare 15:36, in conjunction with 13:14 through 14:23), since they were forbidden to proceed westward and “speak the word in Asia,” turned their faces to the region — first Phrygian, then Galatian — that stretched northward into new territory, through which they traveled toward “Mysia” and “Bithynia” (Acts 16:7). Thus Acts 16:6 fills in the space between the South Galatia covered by 16:4 and 5, and the Mysian-Bithynian border where we find the travelers in 16:7. Upon this, the ordinary construction of Luke’s somewhat involved sentence, North Galatia was entered by Paul on his 2nd tour; he retraversed, more completely, “the Galatian region” at the commencement of the 3rd tour, when he found “disciples” there (Acts 18:23) whom he had gathered on the previous visit.


In the interpretation of the Lukan passages proposed by Ramsay, Acts 16:16a, detached from 16b, is read as the completion of 16:1-5 (And they went through the Phrygian ... region. They were forbidden by the Holy Ghost ... in Asia, and came over against Mysia,’ etc.); and “the Phrygian and Galatian region” means the southwestern division of Provincia Galatia, a district at once Phrygian (ethnically) and Galatian (politically). The combination of two local adjectives, under a common article, to denote the same country in different respects, if exceptional in Greek idiom (15:41 and 27:5 illustrate the usual force of this collocation), is clearly possible — the one strictly parallel geographical expression, “the Iturean and Trachonite country” in Luke 3:1, unfortunately, is also ambiguous. But the other difficulty of grammar involved in the new rendering of Acts 16:6 is insuperable: the severance of the participle, “having been forbidden” (koluthentes), from the introductory verb, “they went through” (diel-thon), wrenches the sentence to dislocation; the aorist participle in such connection “must contain, if not something antecedent to `they went,’
at least something synchronous with it, in no case a thing subsequent to it, if all the rules of grammar and all sure understanding of language are not to be given up” (Schmiedel, EB, col. 1599; endorsed in Moulton’s Prolegomena to the Grammar of New Testament Greek, 134; see also Chase in The Expositor, IV, viii, 404-11, and ix, 339-42). Acts 10:29 (“I came .... when I was sent for”) affords a grammatical parallel to 16:6 (‘They went through .... since they were hindered’). Zahn’s position is peculiar (Intro to New Testament, I, 164-202). Rejecting Ramsay’s explanation of Acts 16:6, and of 18:23 (where Ramsay sees Paul a third time crossing South Galatia), and maintaining that Luke credits the apostle with successful work in North Galatia, he holds, notwithstanding, the South Galatian view of the epistle. This involves the paradox that Paul in writing to “the churches of Galatia” ignored those of North Galatia to whom the title properly belonged — an incongruence which Ramsay escapes by denying that Paul had set foot in Old Galatia. In the 1st edition of the Einleitung Zahn had supposed North and South Galatia together included in the address; this supposition is contrary to the fact that the readers form a homogeneous body, the fruit of a single mission (4:13), and are affected simultaneously by the same disturbance (1:6; 5:7-9). Associating the letter in 2nd edition with South Galatians alone, Zahn suggests that while Paul had labored in North Galatia and found “disciples” there on his return, these were too few and scattered to form “churches” — an estimate scarcely in keeping with Luke’s phrase Acts 5:7-9 “all the disciples” (18:23), and raising a distinction between “disciples” and “churches” foreign to the historian’s usage (see Acts 6:2; 9:19; 14:20). We must choose between North and South Galatia; and if churches existed among the people of the north at the time of writing, then the northerners claim this title by right of use and wont — and the epistle with it. The reversal of “Galatian and Phrygia(n)” in Acts 18:23, as compared with 16:6, implies that the apostle on the 3rd tour struck “the Galatian country” first, traveling this time directly North from Syrian Antioch, and turned westward toward Phrygia when he had reached Old Galatia; whereas his previous route had brought him westward along the highroad traversing South Galatia, until he turned northward at a point not far distant from Pisidian Antioch, to reach North Galatia through Phrygia from the southwest. See the Map of Asia Minor.
(4) Notes of Time in the Epistle.

The “3 years” of Galatians 1:18 and the “14 years” of 2:1 are both seemingly counted from Paul’s conversion.

(a) The synchronism of the conversion with the murder of Stephen and the free action of the high priest against the Nazarenes (Acts 9:2, etc.), and of Saul’s visit to Jerusalem in the 3rd year thereafter with Aretas’ rule in Damascus (2 Corinthians 11:32,33), forbid our placing these two events further back than 36 and 38 — at furthest, 35 and 37 AD (see Turner on “Chronology of the NT” in HDB, as against the earlier dating).

(b) This calculation brings us to 48-49 as the year of the conference of Galatians 2:1-10 — a date precluding the association of that meeting with the errand to Jerusalem related in Acts 11:30 and 12:25, while it suits the identification of the former with the council of Acts 15. Other indications converge on this as the critical epoch of Paul’s apostleship. The expedition to Cyprus and South Galatia (Acts 13; 14) had revealed in Paul `signs of the apostle’ which the chiefs of the Judean church now recognized (Galatians 2:7-9; compare Acts 15:12), and gave him the ascendancy which he exercised at this crisis; up to the time of Acts 13:1 “Saul” was known but as an old persecutor turned preacher (Galatians 1:23), one of the band of “prophets and teachers” gathered round Barnabas at Antioch. The previous visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem (Acts 11; 12) had no ostensible object beyond that of famine-relief. From Acts 12 we learn that the mother church just then was suffering deadly persecution; Peter certainly was out of the way. There was no opportunity for the negotiation described in Galatians 2:1-10, and it would have been premature for Paul to raise the question of his apostleship at this stage. In all likelihood, he saw few Judean Christians then beyond “the elders,” who received the Antiochene charity (Acts 11:30). Nothing transpired in connection with this remittance, important as it was from Luke’s standpoint, to affect the question of Galatians 1; 2; it would have been idle for Paul to refer to it. On the other hand, no real contradiction exists between Acts 15 and Galatians 2 “The two accounts admirably complete each other” (Pfleiderer; compare Cambr. Greek Test., 145, 146; Steinmann, Die Abfassungszeit d. Gal.-Briefes, section 7); in matters of complicated dispute involving personal considerations, attempts at a private understanding naturally precede the public settlement. It would be
strange indeed if the same question of the circumcision of Gentilebelievers had twice within a few years been raised at Antioch, to be twice carried to Jerusalem and twice over decided there by the same parties — Barnabas and Paul, Peter and James — and with no reference made in the second discussion (that of Acts, ex hyp.) to the previous compact (Galatians 2). Granting the epistle written after the council, as both Ramsay and Zahn suppose, we infer that Paul has given his more intimate account of the crisis, about which the readers were already informed in the sense of Acts 15, with a view to bring out its essential bearing on the situation.

(c) The encounter of Paul and Cephas at Antioch (Galatians 2:11-21) is undated. The time of its occurrence bears on the date of the epistle. As hitherto, the order of narration presumably follows the order of events, the “but” of Galatians 2:11 appears to contrast Cephas’ present attitude with his action in Jerusalem just described. Two possible opportunities present themselves for a meeting of Paul and Cephas in Antioch subsequently to the council — the time of Paul’s and Barnabas’ sojourn there on their return from Jerusalem (Acts 15:35,36), or the occasion of Paul’s later visit, occupying “some time,” between the 2nd and 3rd tours (Acts 18:22,23), when for aught we know Barnabas and Peter may both have been in the Syrian capital. The former dating assumes that Peter yielded to the Judaizers on the morrow of the council, that “Barnabas too was carried away” while still in colleagueship with Paul and when the cause of Gentilefreedom, which he had championed, was in the flush of victory. It assumes that the legalists had no sooner been defeated than they opened a new attack on the same ground, and presented themselves as “from James” when James only the other day had repudiated their agitation (Acts 15:19,24). All this is very unlikely. We must allow the legalists time to recover from their discomfiture and to lay new plans (see II 2, (2), (3), (4)). Moreover, Luke’s detailed narrative in Acts 15:30-36, which makes much of the visit of Judas and Silas, gives no hint of any coming of Peter to Antioch at that time, and leaves little room for this; he gives an impression of settled peace and satisfaction following on the Jerusalem concordat, with which the strife of Galatians 2:11 ff would ill accord. Through the course of the 2nd missionary tour, so far as the Thessalonian epistles indicate, Paul’s mind remained undisturbed by legalistic troubles. “The apostle had quitted Jerusalem (after his understanding with the pillars) and proceeded to his 2nd missionary journey full of satisfaction at the victory he had gained and free from anxiety for the future .... The decisive moment of the crisis
necessarily falls between the Thessalonian and Galatian epistles .... A new situation suddenly presents itself to him on his return” to Antioch (A. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, English translation, 10, 11, also 124-36).

(5) Paul’s Renewed Struggle with Legalism.

The new situation arose through the vacillation of Peter; and the “certain from James” who made mischief at Antioch, were the forerunners of “troublers” who agitated the churches far and wide, appearing simultaneously in Corinth and North Galatia. The attempt to set up a separate church-table for the circumcised at Antioch was the first movement in a crafty and persistent campaign against Gentile liberties engineered from Jerusalem. The Epistle to the Romans signalized Paul’s conclusive victory in this struggle, which covered the period of the 3rd missionary tour. On his revisitation of the Galatians (1:9; 5:3 parallel <441823>Acts 18:23), fresh from the contention with Cephas and aware of the wide conspiracy on foot, Paul gave warning of the coming of “another gospel”; it had arrived, fulfilling his worst fears. Upon this view of the course of affairs (see Neander, Planting and Training of the Christian Church, III, vii; Godet’s Introduction to the New Testament, Epistles of Paul, 200-201; Sabatier, as above), the mistake of Peter at Antioch was the proximate antecedent of the trouble in Galatia; hence, <480211>Galatians 2:11-24 leads up to 3:1 and the main argument. Now, if the Antiochene collision befell so late as this, then the epistle is subsequent to the date of <441822>Acts 18:22,23; from which it follows, once more, that Galatians belongs to the 3rd missionary tour and the Corinthians-Romans group of letters.

(6) Ephesus or Corinth?

Chiefly because of the words, “you are removing so quickly,” in <480106>Galatians 1:6, the epistle is by many referred to the earlier part of the above period, the time of Paul’s protracted sojourn in Ephesus (<441908>Acts 19:8,10:54-56 AD); “so quickly,” however, signifies not “so soon after my leaving you,” but “so suddenly” and “with such slight persuasion” (<480507>Galatians 5:7,8). From Ephesus, had the apostle been there when the trouble arose, he might as easily have visited Galatia as he did Corinth under like circumstances (so much is implied in <471301>2 Corinthians 13:1): he is longing to go to Galatia, but cannot (<480419>Galatians 4:19,20). A more distant situation, such as Macedonia or Corinth (<442001>Acts 20:1-3), where Paul found himself in the last months of this tour (56-57 AD), and where, in churches of some standing, he was surrounded by a body of sympathetic
“brethren” (Galatians 1:1) whose support gave weight to his remonstrance with the Galatians, suits the epistle better on every account.

(7) Paul’s First Coming to Galatia.

In Galatians 4:13-15 the apostle recalls, in words surcharged with emotion, his introduction to the readers. His “preaching the good news” to them was due to “weakness of the flesh” — to some sickness, it seems, which arrested his steps and led him to minister in a locality that otherwise he would have “passed over,” as he did Mysia a little later (Acts 16:8). So we understand the obscure language of Galatians 4:13. The South Galatian theorists, in default of any reference to illness as affecting the apostle’s movements in Acts 13:13,14, favor Ramsay’s conjecture that Paul fell a victim to malaria on the Pamphylian coast, and that he and Barnabas made for Pisidian Antioch by way of seeking the cooler uplands. The former explanation lies nearer to the apostle’s language: he says “I preached to you,” not “I came to you, because of illness.” The journey of a hundred miles from Perga to Antioch was one of the least likely to be undertaken by a fever-stricken patient (see the description in Conybeare and Howson’s Life of Paul, or in Ramsay’s Paul the Traveler). Besides, if this motive had brought Paul to Antioch, quite different reasons are stated by Luke for his proceeding to the other South Galatian towns (see Acts 13:50,51; 14:6,19,20). Reading Galatians 4:13-15, one imagines the missionary hastening forward to some further goal (perhaps the important cities of Bithynia, Acts 16:7), when he is prostrated by a malady the physical effects of which were such as to excite extreme aversion. As strength returns, he begins to offer his gospel in the neighborhood where the unwilling halt has been made. There was much to prejudice the hearers against a preacher addressing them under these conditions; but the Galatians welcomed him as a heaven-sent messenger. Their faith was prompt and eager, their gratitude boundless.

The deification of Barnabas and Paul by the Lycaonians (Acts 14:11-18) is the one incident of Luke’s narrative of which the apostle’s description reminds us. To this the latter is thought to be alluding when he writes, “You received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus!” But could he speak thus of his reception — hateful at the time — in the character of a heathen god, and of a reception that ended in his stoning? The “welcome” of the messenger implies faith in his message (compare Galatians 4:14; 2 Corinthians 6:1; 1 Thessalonians 1:6; Matthew 10:40,41, where the same Greek verb is used).
Paul’s mishandling at Lystra (Acts 14:19,20) has suggested a correspondence in the opposite sense between the epistle and the story of the South Galatian mission. The Lystran stones left their print on Paul’s body; in these disfiguring scars one might see “the marks of Jesus” to which he points in Galatians 6:17, were it not for the note of time, “from henceforth,” which distinguishes these stigmata as a fresh infliction, identifying the servant now more than ever with his Master. The true parallel to Galatians 6:17 is 2 Corinthians 4:10 (see the context in 4:7 through 5:4, also 18), which we quoted above (III, 2). When he wrote 2 Cor, the apostle was emerging from an experience of crucial anguish, which gave him an aspect imaging the dying Savior whom he preached; to this new consecration the appeal of our epistle seems to refer.

(8) Barnabas and the Galatians.

The references to Barnabas in Galatians 2:1,9,13, at first sight suggest the South Galatian destination of the letter. For Barnabas and Paul were companions on the first only of the three tours, and Barnabas is named thrice here and but twice in the rest of the epistles. Yet these very references awaken misgiving. Barnabas was Paul’s full partner in the South Galatian mission; he was senior in service, and had introduced Saul to the apostles at Jerusalem; he was the leader at the outset of this journey (Acts 9:27; 11:22-26; 13:1-3; 15:25) — Barnabas was taken for “Zeus” by the heathen of Lystra, while the eloquent Paul was identified with “Hermes” (Acts 14:12). The churches of South Galatia had two founders, and owed allegiance to Barnabas along with Paul. Yet Paul deals with the readers as though he alone were their father in Christ. Referring to Barnabas conspicuously in the letter and as differing from himself on a point affecting the question at issue (Galatians 2:13), Paul was the more bound to give his old comrade his due and to justify his assumption of sole authority, if he were in truth addressing communities which owed their Christianity to the two men in conjunction. On the South Galatian hypothesis, the apostle appears ungenerously to have elbowed his colleague out of the partnership. The apostle Paul, it is to be noted, was particularly sensitive on matters of this kind (see 1 Corinthians 4:15; 2 Corinthians 10:13-16). The name of Barnabas was known through the whole church (see 1 Corinthians 9:6; Colossians 4:10); there is no more difficulty in supposing the North Galatians to be familiar with it than with the names of James and John (Galatians 2:9). Possibly Paul, as his responsibilities extended, had left the care of South Galatia to Barnabas,
who could readily superintend this district from Antioch in Syria; Paul refers to him in 1 Corinthians 9:6, long after the separation of Acts 15:39, as a fellow-worker. This would account for his making direct for North Galatia on the 3rd tour; see IV, 3 (3).

(9) The Two Antiochs.

In Galatians 2:11 Paul refers to “Antioch,” the famous city on the Orontes. To South Galatians “Antioch” meant, as in 2 Timothy 3:11, the Pisidian city of that name. Had Paul been addressing South Galatians, and Antiochenes imprimis, he could not without singular inadvertence have failed to make the distinction. The gaucherie would have been as marked as if, in writing to a circle of West-of-England towns including Bradford-on-Avon, one should mention “Bradford” without qualification, meaning the Yorkshire Bradford.

The arguments drawn from local difference in legal usage — in the matters of adoption, testament, etc. — in favor of the South Galatian destination (see Schmiedel’s examination of Ramsay’s views in EB, coll. 1608-9), and from the temperament of Paul’s “Galatians” in favor of North Galatia (Lightfoot), are too precarious to build upon.

(10) Wider Bearings of the Problem.

On a broad view of the scope of Paul’s missionary work and of the relation of his letters to Acts, there is much to commend the South Galatian theory. It simplifies the situation by connecting this cardinal writing of Paul with churches of cardinal importance in Luke’s narrative. The South Galatian cities lay along the main route of the apostle’s travels, and in the mid-stream of the church’s life. The epistle, when associated with the Christian communities of this region, gains a definite setting and a firm point of attachment in New Testament history; whereas the founding of North Galatian Christianity is indicated by Luke, if at all, in the most cursory fashion, and it held an obscure place in the early church. How, it is asked, could Paul’s intimate friend have been (on the North Galatian theory) so uninterested in churches by which Paul himself set such store? And how can Paul have ignored, apart from the allusion of 2 Timothy 3:11, the South Galatians who formed the first-fruits of his wider labors and supplied a vital link in his chain of churches? In reply, we must point out:

(1) that for anything we know Paul wrote many letters to South Galatia; we possess but a selection from his correspondence; the choice
of the canonical epistles was not governed by the importance of the parties addressed in them — witness Colossians and Philemon; nor were Paul’s concern for his churches, and the empressemnt with which he wrote, determined by their magnitude and position, but by their needs and their hold on his affections (see Galatians 1:6, etc.; 4:12-20).

(2) The North Galatian mission lay off the central line of Paul’s journeyings and of the advance of Gentile Christianity; this is probably the reason why Luke, who was compelled to a strict economy of space, just ignores this field, though he shows himself aware of its existence. The apostle’s confession that he preached to the readers, in the first instance, not from choice but necessity (Galatians 4:13), accords with the neglect of North Galatia in Acts; the evangelizing of the North Galatians was an aside in Paul’s work — an incident beyond the scope of his plans, from which at this period he was compelled again and again to deviate (Acts 16:6-10).

After all, though less important during the 1st century than South Galatia, North Galatia was not an unimportant or inaccessible region. It was traversed by the ancient “Royal Road” from the East to the Hellespont, which the apostle probably followed as far as Phrygia in the journey of Acts 18:22,23. Planted by Paul in Old Galatia, the gospel would spread to Bithynia and Pontus farther north, as it certainly had done by the time Peter wrote to the churches of Asia Minor (1 Peter 1:1). It is observable that “Galatia” stands between “Pontus and Cappadocia” in Peter’s enumeration of the provinces — an order indicating that Christians of North Galatia were particularly in the writer’s mind. Had Paul never set foot in North Galatia, had he not worked along the Royal Road and put his message in the Way of reaching the northern provinces of Asia Minor, the claim of Romans 15:19 is difficult to sustain, that “from Jerusalem, and in a circle as far as Illyricum, he had fulfilled the gospel of Christ.” On the whole, we find the external evidence in accord with the testimony given by the internal character and affinities of the epistle: we judge that this epistle was written circa the autumn or winter of 56-57 AD, from Macedonia or Corinth, toward the end of Paul’s third missionary tour; that it was addressed to a circle of churches situated in Galatia proper or North Galatia, probably in the western part of this country contiguous to (or overlapping) Phrygia (Acts 16:6); and that its place lies between the two Corinthian and the Roman letters among the epistles of the second
The South Galatian destination was proposed by the Danish Mynster (Einltg. in d. Brief an d. Gal, 1825; M. however included North Galatia), and adopted by the French Perrot (De Galatia Provincia Romana, 1867) and Renan (S. Paul); by the German Clemen (Chronologie d. paulin. Briefe, 1893; Die Adressaten d. Gal.-Briefes; Paulus: sein Leben u. Wirken, 1904), Hausrath (NT Zeitgeschichte, 1873, English Translation), Pfleiderer (Paulinismus, 1873, English translation; Paulinismus2, much altered; Urchristenthum, 1902), Steck (as above), Weizsacker (Das apost. Zeitalter3, 1902, English Translation); after Ramsay (see under GALATIA), by Belser (Beitrage z. Erklarung d. AG, etc.), O. Holtzmann (Zeitschrift f. KG, 1894), von Soden (Hist of Early Christian Lit., ET; he includes South with North Galatia), Weber (Die Adressaten d. Gal.-Briefes), J. Weiss (RE3, article “Kleinasien”), in Germany; by Askwith (Ep. to Gal: An Essay on Its Destination and Date), Bacon (Expos, V, vii, 123-36; x, 351-67), Bartlet (Expos, V, x, 263-80), Gifford (Expos, IV, x, 1-20), Maclean (1-vol HDB), Rendall (Expos, IV, ix, 254-64; EGT, Introduction to “Galatians”), Round (as above), Sanday (with hesitation, The Expositor, IV, vii, 491-95), Woodhouse (EB, article “Galatia”). The N. Galatian destination, held by earlier scholars up to Lightfoot and Salmon (DB2, an illuminating discussion), is reasserted, in view of Ramsay’s findings, by Chase (Expos, IV, viii, 401-19; ix, 331-42), Cheetham (Class. Review, 1894), Dods (HDB, article “Galatians”), Williams (Cambr. Greek Testament., 1910), in this country; by Sabatier (L’Apotre Paul2, English translation, 1891); by Gheorghiu (Adressatii epistle c. Galateni, Cernauti, 1904, praised by Steinmann); and by the German critics Blass (Acta Apost.), you Dobschutz (Die urchr. Gemeinden, 1902, and Probleme d. apost. Zeitalters), Harnack (Apostelgeschichte, 1908, 87-90), H. Holtzmann (Handcomm. z. New Testament, “AG”), Julicher (NT Intro, English Translation), Lipsius (Handcomm. z. New Testament, “Galater”) Lietzmann (doubtfully, Handbuch z. N T, III, i, “Galaterbrief”), Mommsen (ZNTW, 1901, 81-96), Schmiedel (Encyclopedia Biblica), Schurer (Jahrbuch f. prot. Theologie, XVIII, 460-74), Sieffert (Meyer’s Kommentar), Steinmann (as above), Zockler (a full and masterly discussion: Studien u. Kritiken, 1895, 51-102). Mommsen’s verdict is thus expressed: “To apprehend `the Galatians’ of Paul otherwise than in the strict and narrower sense of the term, is unallowable. The Provinces
associated with Galatia under the rule of a single legate, as e.g. Lycaonia
certainly was as early as the time of Claudius, were in no way incorporated
in that region; the official inscriptions simply set Galatia at the head of the
combined regions. Still less could the inhabitants of Iconium and Lystra be
named ‘Galatians’ in common speech.”

Apart from the aforesaid controversy, besides the standard Commentary on
Paul’s Epistles, Luther’s Ad Galatas is of unique historical interest; the
interpretations of Usteri (1833), Hilgenfeld (1852), Winer (18594),
Holsten (Das Evangel. d. Paulus, 1880), Philippi (1884), in German; Baljon
(1889), in Dutch; and of B. Jowett, Ellicott, Beet, are specially serviceable,
from different points of view; see also CGT and EB.

George G. Findlay

GALBANUM

<gal’-ba-num> ([h nB] , chelbenah]; [ xaβaνη, chalbdne]): A gum-
resin which occurs in small, round, semitranslucent tears or in brownish
yellow masses; has a pleasant aromatic odor and a bitter taste; and is today,
at any rate, imported from Persia. It is derived from certain umbelliferous
plants, Ferula galbaniflua and F. rubricaulis. It is mentioned in
Exodus 30:34 as an ingredient of the holy incense, and also in Sirach 24:15: “a
pleasant odor .... as galbanum.”

GALEED

<gal’e-ed> ([d [ e śl , gal`edh]): Derived from the Hebrew gal, “a heap
of stones,” and ´edh, “witness.” The meaning therefore is “cairn” or “heap
of witness,” corresponding to yeghar-sahddhutha’ in Aramaic (Genesis
31:47). It is applied to the cairn raised by Jacob and Laban, beside which
they sealed their covenant in a common meal, the memory of which they
appealed to the silent cairn to preserve. The ancient custom of associating
events with inanimate objects as witnesses is often illustrated in Hebrew
history (Joshua 4:4 ff, etc.). There may be in this narrative a suggestion
of how the name “Gilead” came to be applied to that country.

W. Ewing
GALGALA

<gal’-gal-a> ([Γάλγαλα, Gallgala]): Greek equivalent for Gilgal. The word occurs in 1 Macc 9:2 in connection with Arbela, in Galilee — “The way to Galgala” — but it is doubtful which Gilgal is meant. Compare Josephus, Ant, XII, xi, 1; and see GILGAL.

GALILEAN

<gal-i-le’-an>.

See GALILEE.

GALILEE

<gal’-i-le> ([יַלְיָה, חַיָל, ha-galil, hagelilah], literally, “the circuit” or “district”; [η Γαλιλαία, he Galilaia]):

1. GALILEE OF THE NATIONS:

Kedesh, the city of refuge, is described as lying in Galilee, in Matthew Naphtali (Joshua 20:7; compare 21:32). The name seems originally to have referred to the territory of Naphtali. Joshua’s victorious campaign in the north (Joshua 11), and, subsequently, the triumph of the northern tribes under Deborah and Barak (Judges 4 f) gave Israel supremacy; yet the tribe of Naphtali was not able to drive out all the former inhabitants of the land (Judges 1:33). In the time of Solomon the name applied to a much wider region, including the territory of Asher. In this land lay the cities given by Solomon to Hiram (1 Kings 9:11). Cabul here named must be identical with that of Joshua 19:27. The Asherites also failed to possess certain cities in their allotted portion, so that the heathen continued to dwell among them. To this state of things, probably, is due the name given in Isaiah 9:1 to this region, “Galilee of the nations,” i.e. a district occupied by a mixed population of Jews and heathen. It may also be referred to in Joshua 12:23, where possibly we should read “king of the nations of Galilee” (legalil), instead of “Gilgal” (begilgal). Yet it was within this territory that, according to 2 Samuel 20:18 (Septuagint) lay the two cities noted for their preservation of ancient Israelite religious customs in their purity — Abel-bethmaacah and Dan.
2. ANCIENT BOUNDARIES:

There is nothing to guide us as to the northern boundary of Galilee in the earliest times. On the East it was bounded by the upper Jordan and the Sea of Galilee, and on the South by the plain of *el-BaTTauf*. That all within these limits belonged to Galilee we may be sure. Possibly, however, it included Zebulun, which seems to be reckoned to it in *Isaiah 9:1*. In this territory also there were unconquered Canaanite cities (Judges 1,30).

3. BEFORE THE EXILE:

At the instigation of Asa, king of Judah, Benhadad, son of Tabrimmon of Damascus, moved against Israel, and the cities which he smote all lay within the circle of Galilee (2 Kings 15:20). Galilee must have been the arena of conflict between Jehoahaz and Hazael, king of Syria. The cities which the latter captured were recovered from his son Benhadad by Joash, who defeated him three times (2 Kings 10:32; 13:22 ff). The affliction of Israel nevertheless continued “very bitter,” and God saved them by the hand of Jeroboam son of Joash, the great warrior monarch of the Northern Kingdom, under whom Galilee passed completely into the hands of Israel (2 Kings 14:25 ff). But the days of Israel’s supremacy in Northern Palestine were nearly over. The beginning of the end came with the invasion of Tiglath-pileser III, who took the chief cities in Galilee, and sent their inhabitants captive to Assyria (2 Kings 14:29). Probably, as in the case of the Southern Kingdom, the poorest of the land were left as husbandmen. At any rate there still remained Israelites in the district (2 Chronicles 30:10 f); but the measures taken by the conqueror must have made for the rapid increase of the heathen element.

4. AFTER THE EXILE:

In post-exilie times Galilee is the name given to the most northerly of the three divisions of Western Palestine. The boundaries are indicated by Josephus (BJ, III, in, 1). It was divided into Lower and Upper Galilee, and was encompassed by Phoenicia and Syria. It marched with Ptolemais and Matthew Carmel on the West. The mountain, formerly Galliean, now belonged to the Syrians. On the South it adjoined Samaria and Scythopolis (Beisan) as far as the river Jordan. It was bounded on the East by Hippene, Gadara, Gaulonitis and the borders of the kingdom of Agrippa, while the northern frontier was marked by Tyre and the country of the Tyrians. The
northern limit of Samaria was Ginea, the modern Jenin, on the south border of Esdraelon. Lower Galilee, therefore, included the great plain, and stretched northward to the plain of er-Rameh — Ramah of Joshua 19:36. Josephus mentions Bersabe, the modern Abu-Sheba, and the Talmud, Kephar Chananyah, the modern Kefr `Anan, as the northern border; the former being about a mile North of the latter. The plain reaches to the foot of the mountain chain, which, running East and West, forms a natural line of division. Upper Galilee may have included the land as far as the gorge of the Litany, which, again, would have formed a natural boundary to the N. Josephus, however, speaks of Kedesh as belonging to the Syrians (BJ, II, xviii, 1), situated “between the land of the Tyrians and Galilee” (Ant., XIII, v, 6). This gives a point on the northern frontier in his time; but the rest is left indefinite. Guthe, Sunday and others, followed by Cheyne (EB, under the word), on quite inadequate grounds conclude that certain localities on the East of the Sea of Galilee were reckoned as Galilean.

5. CHARACTER OF THE GALILEANS:

In the mixed population after the exile the purely Jewish element must have been relatively small. In 165 BC Simon Maccabeus was able to rescue them from their threatening neighbors by carrying the whole community away to Judea (1 Macc 5:14 ff). Josephus tells of the conquest by Aristobulus I of Ituraea (Ant., XIII, xi, 3). He compelled many of them to adopt Jewish religious customs, and to obey the Jewish law. There can be little doubt that Galilee and its people were treated in the same way. While Jewish in their religion, and in their patriotism too, as subsequent history showed, the population of Galilee was composed of strangely mingled elements — Aramaean, Iturean, Phoenician and Greek In the circumstances they could not be expected to prove such sticklers for high orthodoxy as the Judeans. Their mixed origin explains the differences in speech which distinguished them from their brethren in the South, who regarded Galilee and the Galileans with a certain proud contempt (John 1:46; 7:52). But a fine type of manhood was developed among the peasant farmers of the two Galilees which, according to Josephus (BJ, III, in, 2), were “always able to make a strong resistance on all occasions of war; for the Galileans are inured to war from their infancy .... nor hath the country ever been destitute of men of courage.” Josephus, himself a Galilean, knew his countrymen well, and on them he mainly relied in the war with Rome.
In Galilee also the Messianic hope was cherished with the deepest intensity. When the Messiah appeared, with His own Galilean upbringing, it was from the north-countrymen that He received the warmest welcome, and among them His appeal elicited the most gratifying response.

6. LATER HISTORY:

In 47 BC, Herod the Great, then a youth of 25, was made military commander of Galilee, and won great applause by the fashion in which he suppressed a band of robbers who had long vexed the country (Ant., XIV, ix, 2). When Herod came to the throne, 37 BC, a period of peace and prosperity for Galilee began, which lasted till the banishment of his son Antipas in 40 AD. The tetrarchy of Galilee was given to the latter at his father’s death, 4 BC. His reign, therefore, covered the whole life of Jesus, with the exception of His infancy. After the banishment of Antipas, Galilee was added to the dominions of Agrippa I, who ruled it till his death in 44 AD. Then followed a period of Roman administration, after which it was given to Agrippa II, who sided with the Romans in the subsequent wars, and held his position till 100 AD. The patriotic people, however, by no means submitted to his guidance. In their heroic struggle for independence, the command of the two Galilees, with Gamala, was entrusted to Josephus, who has left a vivid narrative, well illustrating the splendid courage of his freedom-loving countrymen. But against such an adversary as Rome even their wild bravery could not prevail; and the country soon lay at the feet of the victorious Vespasian, 67 AD. There is no certain knowledge of the part played by Galilee in the rebellion under Hadrian, 132-35 AD.

At the beginning of the Roman period Sepphoris (Cafuriyeh), about 3 miles North of Nazareth, took the leading place. Herod Antipas, however, built a new city on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, which, in honor of the reigning emperor, he called Tiberias. Here he reared his “golden house,” and made the city the capital of his tetrarchy. See TIBERIAS. After the fall of Jerusalem, Galilee, which had formerly been held in contempt, became the home of Jewish learning, and its chief seat was found in Tiberias where the Mishna was committed to writing, and the Jerusalem Talmud was composed. Thus a city into which at first no pious Jew would enter, in a province which had long been despised by the leaders of the nation, became the main center of their national and religious life.
7. CITIES OF GALILEE:

Among the more notable cities in Galilee were Kedesh Naphtali, the city of refuge, the ruins of which lie on the heights West of el-Chuleh; Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum, North of the Sea of Galilee; Nazareth, the city of the Savior’s youth and young manhood; Jotapata, the scene of Josephus’ heroic defense against the Romans, which stood at Tell Jefat, North of the plain of Asochis (BJ, III, vii, viii); Cana of Galilee; and Nain, on the northern slope of the mountain now called Little Hermon.

8. GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

In physical features Galilee is the most richly diversified and picturesque district in Western Palestine; while in beauty and fertility it is strongly contrasted with the barren uplands of Judah. Cut off from Matthew Lebanon in the North by the tremendous gorge of the Litany, it forms a broad and high plateau, sinking gradually southward until it approaches Cafed, when again it rises, culminating in Jebel Jermuk, the highest summit on the West of the Jordan. From Cafed there is a rapid descent by stony slope and rocky precipice to the shore of the Sea of Galilee. The mountains of which Jebel Jermuk is the Northeast outrunner stretch westward across the country, and drop upon the plain of er-Rameh to the South. Irregular hills and valleys, with breadths of shady woodlands, lie between this plain and that of Asochis (el-Battauf). The latter is split from the East by the range of Jebel Tor’an. South of Asochis rise lower hills, in a cup-like hollow among which lies the town of Nazareth. South of the town they sink steeply into the plain of Esdraelon. The isolated form of Tabor stands out on the East, while Carmel bounds the view on the West. The high plateau in the North terminates abruptly at the lip of the upper Jordan valley. As the Jordan runs close to the base of the eastern hills, practically all this valley, with its fine rolling downs, is included in Galilee. The plain of Gennesaret runs along the northwestern shore of the Sea of Galilee. From the uplands to the West, stretching from Qurun Chattin (the traditional Mount of Beatitudes) to the neighborhood of Tabor, the land lets itself down in a series of broad and fertile terraces, falling at last almost precipitously on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. The descent toward the Mediterranean is much more gradual; and the soil gathered in the longer valleys is deep and rich.
The district may be described as comparatively well watered. The Jordan with its mighty springs is, of course, too low for purposes of irrigation. But there are many perennial streams fed by fountains among the hills. The springs at Jenin are the main sources of the river Kishon, but for the greater part of its course through the plain the bed of that river is far below the surface of the adjoining land. The dews that descend from Lebanon and Hermon are also a perpetual source of moisture and refreshment.

9. PRODUCTS:
Galilee was famous in ancient times for its rich and fruitful soil, “full of the plantations of trees of all sorts, insomuch that it invites the most slothful to pains in its cultivation by its fruitfulness; accordingly it is all cultivated by its inhabitants, and no part of it lies idle” (BJ, III, in, 2). See also Gennesaret, Land Of. The grapes grown in Naphtali were in high repute, as were the pomegranates of Shikmona — the Sykaminos of Josephus — which stood on the shore near Matthew Carmel. The silver sheen of the olive meets the eye in almost every valley; and the olive oil produced in Galilee has always been esteemed of the highest excellence. Its wheat fields also yielded an abundant supply, the wheat of Chorazin being proverbial. The great plain of Esdraelon must also have furnished rich provision. It cannot be doubted that Galilee was largely drawn upon for the gifts in kind which Solomon bestowed upon the king of Tyre (2 Chronicles 2:10). At a much later day the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon depended upon the produce of Galilee (Acts 12:20).
Galilee was in easy touch with the outside world by means of the roads that traversed her valleys, crossed her ridges and ran out eastward, westward and southward. Thus she was connected with the harbors on the Phoenician seaboard, with Egypt on the South, with Damascus on the Northeast, and with the markets of the East by the great caravan routes (see “Roads” under Palestine).

10. CONTACT WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD:
In the days of Christ the coming and going of the merchantmen, the passing of armies and the movements of the representatives of the Empire, must have made these highways a scene of perpetual activity, touching the dwellers in Galilee with the widening influences of the great world’s life.
11. POPULATION:

The peasant farmers of Galilee, we have seen, were a bold and enterprising race. Encouraged by the fruitfulness of their country, they were industrious cultivators of the soil. Josephus estimates the population at 3,000,000. This may be an exaggeration; but here we have all the conditions necessary for the support of a numerous and prosperous people. This helps us to understand the crowds that gathered round and followed Jesus in this district, where the greater part of His public life was spent. The cities, towns and villages in Galilee are frequently referred to in the Gospels. That the Jewish population in the centuries immediately after Christ was numerous and wealthy is sufficiently proved by the remains from those times, especially the ruins of synagogues, e.g. those at Tell Chum, Kerazeh, Irbid, el-Jish, Kefr Bir`im, Meiron, etc. Near the last named is shown the tomb of the great Jewish teacher Hillel.

Galilee was not without her own heroic memories. The great battlefields of Megiddo, Gilboa, and the waters of Merom lay within her borders; and among the famous men of the past she could claim Barak, Ibzan, Elon and Tola of the judges; of the prophets, Jonah and Elisha at least; possibly also Hosea who, according to a Jewish tradition, died in Babylon, but was brought to Galilee and buried in Cafed (Neubauer, Geog. der Talmud, 227). When the chief priests and Pharisees said, “Search, and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet,” it argued strange and inexcusable ignorance on their part (John 7:52). Perhaps, however, in this place we should read [ὁ προφήτης, he prophetes], “the prophet,” i.e. the Messiah. It is significant that 11 out of the 12 apostles were Galileans.

For detailed description of the country, see ISSACHAR; ASHER; ZEBULUN AND NAPHTALI; see also GALILEE, SEA OF.

W. Ewing

GALILEE, MOUNTAIN IN

After the resurrection the disciples “went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them” (Matthew 28:16). Here Jesus came to them, declared that all authority in heaven and earth had been given to Him, commanded them to go and make disciples of all nations, concluding with the memorable promise: “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” Probably it was some well-known height not far from the
scenes most frequented during the Galilean ministry. Looking from the western shore at the uplands North of the lake, it is not easy to imagine a more appropriate spot for this never-to-be-forgotten interview than Jebel Qan`-an, a bold headland not far to the East of Cafed, overlooking the land of Gennesaret and the sea, and commanding from its lofty summit a view of about 80 miles in every direction. Of course, there is no certainty.

W. Ewing

GALILEE, SEA OF

([ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας, he thalassa tes Galilaias]):

1. THE NAME:

This is the name 5 times given in the New Testament (Matthew 4:18; 15:29; Mark 1:16; 7:31; John 6:1) to the sheet of water which is elsewhere called “the sea of Tiberias” (John 21:1; compare 6:1); “the lake of Gennesaret” (Luke 5:1); “the sea” (John 6:16, etc.), and “the lake” (Luke 5:1, etc.). The Old Testament names were “sea of Chinnereth” ([ԠNCtμי”, yam-kinnereth]: Numbers 34:11; Deuteronomy 3:17; Joshua 13:27; 19:35), and “sea of Chinneroth” ([wNԠNCtμy”, yam-kineroth]: Joshua 12:3; compare 11:2; 1 Kings 15:20). In 1 Macc 11:67 the sea is called “the water of Gennesar” (the Revised Version (British and American) “Gennesareth”). It had begun to be named from the city so recently built on its western shore even in New Testament times (John 21:1; 6:1); and by this name, slightly modified, it is known to this day — Bachr Tabariyeh.

2. GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The sea lies in the deep trough of the Jordan valley, almost due East of the Bay of Acre. The surface is 680 ft. below the level of the Mediterranean. It varies in depth from 130 ft. to 148 ft., being deepest along the course of the Jordan (Barrois, PEFS, 1894, 211-20). From the point where the Jordan enters in the North to its exit in the South is about 13 miles. The greatest breadth is in the North, from el-Mejdel to the mouth of Wady Semak being rather over 7 miles. It gradually narrows toward the South, taking the shape of a gigantic pear, with a decided bulge to the West. The water of the lake is clear and sweet. The natives use it for all purposes, esteeming it light and pleasant. They refuse to drink from the Jordan,
alleging that “who drinks Jordan drinks fever.” Seen from the mountains
the broad sheet appears a beautiful blue; so that, in the season of greenery,
it is no exaggeration to describe it as a sapphire in a setting of emerald. It
lights up the landscape as the eye does the human face; and it is often
spoken of as “the eye of Galilee.” To one descending from Matthew Tabor
and approaching the edge of the great hollow, on a bright spring day, when
the land has already assumed its fairest garments, the view of the sea, as it
breaks upon the vision in almost its whole extent, is one never to be
forgotten. The mountains on the East and on the West rise to about 2,000
ft. The heights of Naphtali, piled up in the North, seem to culminate only in
the snowy summit of Great Hermon. If the waters are still, the shining
splendors of the mountain may be seen mirrored in the blue depths. Round
the greater part of the lake there is a broad pebbly beach, with a sprinkling
of small shells. On the sands along the shore from el-Mejdel to `Ain et-
Tineh these shells are so numerous as to cause a white glister in the
sunlight.

The main formation of the surrounding district is limestone. It is overlaid
with lava; and here and there around the lake there are outcrops of basalt
through the limestone. At eT-Tabgha in the North, at `Ain el Fuliyeh,
South of el-Mejdel, and on the shore, about 2 miles South of modern
Tiberias, there are strong hot springs. These things, together with the
frequent, and sometimes terribly destructive, earthquakes, sufficiently attest
the volcanic character of the region. The soil on the level parts around the
sea is exceedingly fertile. See GENNESARET, LAND OF. Naturally the
temperature in the valley is higher than that of the uplands; and here wheat
and barley are harvested about a month earlier. Frost is not quite unknown;
but no one now alive remembers it to have done more than lay the most
delicate fringe of ice around some of the stones on the shore. The fig and
the vine are still cultivated with success. Where vegetable gardens are
planted they yield plentifully. A few palms are still to be seen. The indigo
plant is grown in the plain of Gennesaret. In their season the wild flowers
lavish a wealth of lovely colors upon the surrounding slopes; while bright-
blossoming oleanders fringe the shore.

Coming westward from the point where the Jordan enters the lake, the
mountains approach within a short distance of the sea. On the shore, fully 2
miles from the Jordan, are the ruins of Tell Chum. See CAPERNAUM.
About 2 miles farther West are the hot springs of eT-Tabgha. Here a
shallow vale breaks northward, bounded on the West by Tell `Areimeh.
This tell is crowned by an ancient Canaanite settlement. It throws out a rocky promontory into the sea, and beyond this are the ruins of Khan Minyeh, with `Ain et-Tineh close under the cliff. Important Roman remains have recently been discovered here. From this point the plain of Gennesaret (el-Ghuweir) sweeps round to el-Mejdel, a distance of about 4 miles. West of this village opens the tremendous gorge, Wady el Chamam, with the famous robbers’ fastnesses in its precipitous sides, and the ruins of Arbela on its southern lip. From the northern parts of the lake the Horns of ChatTTin, the traditional Mount of Beatitudes, may be seen through the rocky jaws of the gorge. South of el-Mejdel the mountains advance to the shore, and the path is cut in the face of the slope, bringing us to the hot spring, `Ain el-Fuliyeh, where is a little valley, with gardens and orange grove. The road then crosses a second promontory, and proceeds along the base of the mountain to Tiberias. Here the mountains recede from the shore, leaving a crescent-shaped plain, largely covered with the ruins of the ancient city. The modern town stands at the northern corner of the plain; while at the southern end are the famous hot baths, the ancient Hammath. A narrow ribbon of plain between the mountain and the shore runs to the South end of the lake. There the Jordan, issuing from the sea, almost surrounds the mound on which are the ruins of Kerak, the Tarichea of Josephus Crossing the floor of the valley, past Semakh, which is now a station on the Haifa-Damascus railway, we find a similar strip of plain along the eastern shore. Nearly opposite Tiberias is the stronghold of Chal`-at el Chocn, possibly the ancient Hippos, with the village of Fik, the ancient Aphek, on the height to the East. To the North of this the waters of the sea almost touch the foot of the steep slope. A herd of swine running headlong down the mountain would here inevitably perish in the lake (\textsuperscript{400832}Matthew 8:32, etc.). Next, we reach the mouth of Wady Semak, in which lie the ruins of Kurseh, probably representing the ancient Gerasa. Northward the plain widens into the marshy breadths of el-BaTeichah, and once more we reach the Jordan, flowing smoothly through the fiat lands to the sea.

3. STORMS:

The position of the lake makes it liable to sudden storms, the cool air from the uplands rushing down the gorges with great violence and tossing the waters in tumultuous billows. Such storms are fairly frequent, and as they are attended with danger to small craft, the boatmen are constantly on the
alert. Save in very settled conditions they will not venture far from the shore. Occasionally, however, tempests break over the lake, in which a boat could hardly live. Only twice in over 5 years the present writer witnessed such a hurricane. Once it burst from the South. In a few moments the air was thick with mist, through which one could hear the roar of the tortured waters. In about ten minutes the wind fell as suddenly as it had risen. The air cleared, and the wide welter of foam-crested waves attested the fury of the blast. On the second occasion the wind blew from the East, and the phenomena described above were practically repeated.

4. FISH:

The sea contains many varieties of fish in great numbers. The fishing industry was evidently pursued to profit in the days of Christ. Zebedee was able to hire men to assist him (Mark 1:20). In recent years there has been a considerable revival of this industry. See FISHING. Four of the apostles, and these the chief, had been brought up as fishermen on the Sea of Galilee. Peter and Andrew, James and John.

The towns around the lake named in Scripture are treated in separate articles. Some of these it is impossible to identify. Many are the ruins of great and splendid cities on slope and height of which almost nothing is known today. But from their mute testimony we gather that the lake in the valley which is now so quiet was once the center of a busy and prosperous population. We may assume that the cities named in the Gospels were mainly Jewish. Jesus would naturally avoid those in which Greek influences were strong. In most cases they have gone, leaving not even their names with any certainty behind; but His memory abides forever. The lake and mountains are, in main outline, such as His eyes beheld. This it is that lends its highest charm to “the eye of Galilee.”

The advent of the railway has stirred afresh the pulses of life in the valley. A steamer plies on the sea between the station at Semakh and Tiberias. Superior buildings are rising outside the ancient walls. Gardens and orchards are being planted. Modern methods of agriculture are being employed in the Jewish colonies, which are rapidly increasing in number. Slowly, perhaps, but surely, the old order is giving place to the new. If freedom and security be enjoyed in reasonable measure, the region will again display its long-hidden treasures of fertility and beauty.

W. Ewing
GALL

<gol>:

(1) [vərɔˈʃh], or [wɔˈʃ], rosh (Deuteronomy 32:32 only, “grapes of gall”): Some very bitter plant, the bitterness as in (2) being associated with the idea of poison. Deuteronomy 29:18 margin “rosh, a poisonous herb”; Lamentations 3:5,19; Jeremiah 8:14; 9:15; 23:15, “water of gall,” margin “poison”; Hosea 10:4, translated “hemlock”; Amos 6:12, “Ye have turned justice into gall”; Job 20:16, the “poison of asps”: here rosh clearly refers to a different substance from the other references, the points in common being bitterness and poisonous properties. Hemlock (Conium maculatum), colocynthis (Citrullus colocynthis) and the poppy (Papaver somniferum) have all been suggested as the original rosh, the last having most support, but in most references the word may represent any bitter poisonous substance. Rosh is associated with la`anah, “wormwood” (Deuteronomy 29:18; Lamentations 3:19; Amos 6:12).

(2) [jɜˈrɔn] mererah] (Job 16:13), and [hɔˈrɔn] merorah] (Job 20:14,25), both derived from a root meaning “to be bitter,” are applied to the human gall or “bile,” but like (1), merorah is once applied to the venom of serpents (Job 20:14). The poison of these animals was supposed to reside in their bile.

(3) [χολῆ, chole] (Matthew 27:34), “They gave him wine to drink mingled with gall”; this is clearly a reference to the Septuagint version of Psalm 69:21: “They gave me also gall (chole, Hebrew rosh) for my food; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.” In Mark 15:23, it says, “wine mingled with myrrh.” It is well known that the Romans gave wine with frankincense to criminals before their execution to alleviate their sufferings; here the chole or bitter substance used was myrrh (Pliny Ep. xx.18; Sen. Ep. 83).

E. W. G. Masterman

GALLANT

<gal’-ant>: The translation of [r yĐ âm] , ‘addir], “bright,” “splendid,” “mighty” (Isaiah 33:21, “Neither shall gallant (‘addir) ship pass thereby”); the word is translated “mighty” in Exodus 15:10;
Samuel 4:8; Isaiah 10:34; Zec 11:2 the King James Version. In Isaiah 33:21, above, it is applied to Yahweh. “glorious (‘addir) Lord” the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “Yahweh .... in .... majesty”; compare also Psalm 16:3, “the excellent.” As a noun it is used in the margin of Nahum 2:5 as alternative for “worthies,” the Revised Version (British and American) “nobles” in Zec 11:2, for “the might “Revised Version” “goodly ones” margin, “glorious”; it is translated “nobles” in Judges 5:13; 2 Chronicles 23:20, etc.

See also SHIPS AND BOATS.

**GALLERY**

<gal’-er-i>:

(1) ([q ו"נ ר” , ‘attuaq], Kethibh; [q yו ר” , ‘attik], used only in Ezekiel 41:16; 42:3,1; etymology and meaning uncertain; among the more probable suggestions are “pillar,” “column,” “walk with pillars,” “colonnades,” “passageway,” “porches,” “galleries” of “terraces.” Cornhill suggests the substitution of kiroth, “walls,” to suit the context; others, e.g. Rothstein, would omit it as a dittography or other corruption): A long narrow balcony formed either by pillars or by the receding upper stories of a building. Both kinds are described in Ezekiel’s vision of the Temple restored. They surround the three stories of side chambers around the Temple proper, and also the “building before the separate place which was at the back thereof,” and the three-story structure containing rows of chambers in the outer court opposite the side-chambers of the Temple. Those around the Temple proper were apparently supported by pillars, and hence, they did not take away from the width of the 2nd-story and 3rd-story rooms (compare 41:7). On the other hand, the galleries of the outer buildings which were not supported by pillars and therefore not on top of each other, but in terraces, did take away from the upper stories more than from the lowest and middlemost: the upper chambers were shortened or “straitened more than the lowest and the middlemost from the ground.”

The lower porches of the outer court were cut off from the view of those of the inner court by a low wall, but in the 3rd story, gallery looked out to gallery across the twenty cubits which belonged to the inner court and the pavement which belonged to the outer court.” These “galleries,” or ‘attiqim, are one of the few features that distinguish the temple of Ezekiel’s
vision from Solomon’s temple. The idea and perhaps the word seem to have been borrowed from the more elaborate architecture of the countries of the Exile, which must have impressed the Jews of Ezekiel’s time very strongly. The building Ezekiel would place in the outer court with its terraces is a perfect Babylonian ziggurat or stage-tower temple (compare Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition, II, 374, c-d).

(2) ([f h” r’ ”, rahaT], probably “lock of hair,” Song of Solomon 7:5; [f yh r ; rahiT] Qere, [f yj r ; rachiT], Kethibh, probably “rafters,” Song of Solomon 11:7; both words and also the similar word (rehaTim, Genesis 30:38; Exodus 2:16), translated “troughs,” are probably connected with the Aramaic rehaT “to flow,” “to run”): Although the King James Version uses “galleries” in Song of Solomon 7:5 and 1:17 margin, the context in each place clearly points to another meaning. In the former of these passages, “the king is held captive in the tresses thereof,” there follows a description of the head. In the latter passage the word in question is in parallelism with qoroth batenu, “the beams of our house,” and “rafters” the King James Version, or possibly “boards,” is suggested.

Nathan Isaacs

GALLEY

See SUITS AND BOATS, II, 2, (2).

GALLIM

([μ yl Γ′ , gallim]), “ heaps”): Probably two distinct places:

(1) A town mentioned among the 11 additional cities of Judah which are in the Septuagint appended to Joshua 15:59, and have altogether disappeared from the Hebrew text. It occurs between Karem (’Ain Kairem) and Baither (Bettir); it is probably the large and flourishing village of Beit Jala, near Bethlehem.

(2) Gallim is mentioned in Isaiah 10:30; not far from Laishah and Anathoth and certainly North of Jerusalem. It was the home of Palti the son of Laish (1 Samuel 25:44), and it is by many authorities identified with the Gilgal on the North border of Judah (Joshua 15:7), the
Geliloth of the parallel passage (Joshua 18:17), and the Beth-gilgal of Nehemiah 12:29.

E. W. G. Masterman

GALLIO

<gal'-i-o> ([Γαλλίων, Gallion]): The Roman deputy or proconsul of Achaia, before whom Paul was haled by his Jewish accusers on the apostle’s first visit to Corinth, during his second missionary journey (Acts 18:12-17). The trial was not of long duration. Although Gallio extended his protection to the Jewish religion as one of the religions recognized by the state, he contemptuously rejected the claim of the Jews that their law was binding upon all. In the eyes of the proconsul, the only law universally applicable was that of the Roman code and social morality: under neither was the prisoner chargeable; therefore, without even waiting to hear Paul’s speech in his own defense, he summarily ordered his lictors to clear the court. Even the subsequent treatment meted out to Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, was to him a matter of indifference. The beating of Sosthenes is ascribed by different readings to “Jews” and to “Greeks,” but the incident is referred to by the writer of Acts to show that the sympathies of the populace lay with Paul, and that Gallio made no attempt to suppress them. Gallio has often been instanced as typical of one who is careless or indifferent to religion, yet in the account given of him in Acts, he merely displayed an attitude characteristic of the manner in which Roman governors regarded the religious disputes of the time (compare also LYSIAS; FELIX; FESTUS). Trained by his administrative duties to practical thinking and precision of language, he refused to adjudicate the squabbles of what he regarded as an obscure religious sect, whose law was to him a subtle quibbling with “words and names.”

According to extra-canonical references, the original name of Gallio was Marcus Annaeus Novatus, but this was changed on his being adopted by the rhetorician, Lucius Junius Gallio. He was born at Cordova, but came to Rome in the reign of Tiberius. He was the brother of the philosopher Seneca, by whom, as also by Statius, reference is made to the affable nature of his character. As Achaia was reconstituted a proconsular province by Claudius in 44 AD, the accession of Gallio to office must have been subsequent to that date, and has been variously placed at 51-53 AD (compare also Knowling in The Expositor’s Greek Testament, II, 389-92).

C. M. Kerr
GALLOWS
<gal’-oz>.

See HANGING; PUNISHMENTS.

GAMAEL
<gam’-a-el> ([Gαλαήλ, Gamael]): Chief of the family of Ithamar who went up from Babylon with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:29); called Daniel in Ezr 8:2.

GAMALIEL
<ga-ma’-li-el> ([I a άλη, gamli’el], “reward or recompense of God”; [Gαμαλιήλ, Gamaliel]):

(1) The son of Pedahzur, and “prince of the children of Manasseh,” chosen to aid in taking the census in the Wilderness (Numbers 1:10; 2:20; 7:54,59; 10:23).

(2) A Pharisee who at the meeting of the “council” succeeded in persuading its members to adopt a more reasonable course when they were incensed at the doctrine of Peter and the rest of the apostles and sought to slay them (Acts 5:33-40). That he was well qualified for this task is attested by the fact that he was himself a member of the Sanhedrin, a teacher of the law, and held in high honor among all the people. In his speech he pointed out to his fellow-councilors the dire consequences that might ensue upon any precipitous action on their part. While quoting instances, familiar to his hearers, of past insurrections or seditions that had failed, he reminded them at the same time that if this last under Peter “is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God.” As a result of his arguments, the apostles, after being beaten and admonished to speak no longer in the name of Jesus, were released. In the speech which he was permitted by Lysias to deliver from the stairs of the palace after the riot in Jerusalem, Paul referred to Gamaliel as the teacher of his youth, who instructed him rigidly in the Mosaic law (Acts 22:3).

The toleration and liberality displayed by Gamaliel upon the occasion of his speech before the Sanhedrin were all the more remarkable because of their rarity among the Pharisees of the period. Although the strict observance by the Christians of temple worship, and their belief in immortality, a point in
dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees, may have had influence over him (Knowling), no credence is to be attached to the view that he definitely favored the apostles or to the tradition that he afterward became a Christian. The high place accorded him in Jewish tradition, and the fact that the title of Rabban, higher even than Rabbi or Master, was first bestowed upon him, testify that he remained a Pharisee to the end. His speech is rather indicative of one who knew the deeper truth in the Old Testament of the universal fatherhood of God, and who recognized that the presence of His power was the deciding factor in all human enterprise. His social enactments were permeated by the same broad-minded spirit. Thus his legislation on behalf of the poor was formulated so as to include Gentiles as well as Jews. The authenticity of his speech has been questioned by Wendt and others, chiefly on account of the alleged anachronism in regard to Theudas (see THEUDAS); but the internal evidence is against this view (compare Knowling in The Expositor Greek Test., II, 161). It has also been objected by Baur and the Tubingen school that the liberal, peace-loving Gamaliel could not have been the teacher of the fanatical Saul. To this, reply has been made, firstly, that the charges against Stephen of destroying the temple and subverting the laws of Moses were not brought against Peter and the other apostles, and, secondly, that the doctrines of any teacher, however moderate he himself may be, are liable to be carried to extremes by an over-zealous pupil.
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C. M. Kerr

GAMES

<gamz>:

About the amusements of the ancient Israelites we know but little, partly on account of the nature of our literary sources, which are almost exclusively religious, partly because the antiquities thus far discovered yield very little information on this topic as compared with those of some other countries, and partly because of the relatively serious character of the people. Games evidently took a less prominent place in Hebrew life than in that of the Greeks, the Romans and the Egyptians. Still the need for
recreation was felt and to a certain extent supplied in ways according with
the national temperament. Mere athletics (apart from Greek and Roman
influence) were but little cultivated. Simple and natural amusements and
exercises, and trials of wit and wisdom, were more to the Hebrew taste.
What is known or probably conjectured may be summed up under the
following heads: Games of Children; Sports; Games of Chance and Skill;
Story-telling; Dancing; Proverbs; Riddles. The amusements of Greece and
Rome, which to some extent influenced later Jewish society and especially
those which are directly or indirectly referred to in the New Testament, will
be theme of the latter part of the article.

I. ISRAELITE GAMES

1. Children’s Games:

There are two general references to the playing of children: Zec 8:5: “And
the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets
thereof”; and Genesis 21:9 margin, where we read of Ishmael “playing”
(metscheq). The rendering of our Bibles, “mocking,” is open to question.
Of specific games and pets there is hardly a mention in the Old Testament.
Playing with ball is alluded to in Isaiah 22:18: “He will .... toss thee like
a ball into a large country,” but children need not be thought of as the only
players. If the balls used in Palestine were like those used by the Egyptians,
they were sometimes made of leather or skin stuffed with bran or husks of
corn, or of string and rushes covered with leather (compare Wilkinson,
Popular Account, I, 198-201; British Museum Guide to the Egyptian
Collections, 78). The question of Yahweh to Job (41:5): “Wilt thou play
with him (the crocodile) as with a bird? or wilt thou bind him for thy
maidens?” suggests that tame birds were petted by Hebrew children,
especially by girls. The New Testament has one reference to children’s
play, namely, the half-parable about the children in the market-place who
would neither dance to the flute as if at a marriage feast nor wail as if at a

Mimicry

There are interesting accounts in Les enfants de Nazareth, by the Abbe Le
Camus (60-66; 101-10), of the way in which the children of the modern
Nazareth mimic scenes connected with weddings and funerals. That
Israelite children had toys (dolls, models of animals, etc.) cannot be
doubted in view of the finds in Egypt and elsewhere, but no positive evidence seems to be as yet forthcoming.

2. Sports:

Running was no doubt often practiced, especially in the time of the early monarchy. Saul and Jonathan (<100123>2 Samuel 1:23), Asahel (<100218>2 Samuel 2:18), Ahimaaz (18:23,27) and some of the Gadites in David’s service (<131208>1 Chronicles 12:8) were renowned for their speed, which can only have been the result of training and exercise. The same may be said of the feats of those who ran before a king or a prince (<100123>1 Samuel 8:11; <101501>2 Samuel 15:1; <110105>1 Kings 1:5; 18:46). The Psalmist must have watched great runners before he pictured the sun as rejoicing like a strong man to run his course (<191905>Psalm 19:5b; compare also <210911>Ecclesiastes 9:11; <240806>Jeremiah 8:6; 23:10). For running in the Greek games, see the latter part of this article.

Archery practice is implied in the story of Jonathan’s touching interview with David (<100123>1 Samuel 20:20,35-38) and in Job’s complaint: “He hath also set me up for his mark. His archers compass me round about” (<110105>Job 16:12 f). Only by long practice could the 700 left-handed Benjamite slingers, every one of whom could sling stones at a hair-breadth and not miss (<072016>Judges 20:16), and the young David (<091749>1 Samuel 17:49), have attained to the precision of aim for which they are famous.

In Zec 12:3, “I will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone,” literally, “a stone of burden,” Jerome found an allusion to a custom which prevailed widely in Palestine in his day, and has been noticed by a recent traveler, of stone-lifting, i.e. of testing the strength of young men by means of heavy round stones. Some, he says, could raise one of these stones to the knees, others to the waist, others to the shoulders and the head, and a few could lift it above the head. This interpretation is not quite certain (Wright, Comm., 364), but the form of sport described was probably in vogue in Palestine in Biblical times.

High leaping or jumping was probably also practiced (<190829>Psalm 18:29). The “play” referred to in <100214>2 Samuel 2:14 ff of 12 Benjamites and 12 servants of David was not a sport but a combat like that of the Horatii and the Curiatii.
3. Games of Chance and Skill:

Dice were known to the ancient Egyptians, and Assyrian dice have been found, made of bronze with points of gold, but there is no trace of them in the Old Testament. Recent research at Ta`-annek has brought to light many bones which seem to have been used in somewhat the same way as in a game played by the modern Arabs, who call it ka`ab, the very word they apply to dice. These bones were “the oldest and most primitive form of dice” (Konig after Sellin, RE3, XVIII, 634). The use of dice among the later Jews is attested by the condemnation of dice-players in the Mishna (Sanh., in. 3). The Syrian soldiers who cast lots for the raiment of Jesus at the cross (Matthew 27:35 parallel Mark 15:24; Luke 23:34; John 19:24) may have used dice, but that can neither be proved nor disproved.

It has been suggested that the mockery of Jesus before the Sanhedrin described in Matthew 26:67 f parallel Mark 14:65; Luke 22:63 f may have been connected with a Greek game in which one of the players held the eyes of another while a third gave him a box on the ear. The last was then asked with what hand he had been struck. A somewhat similar game is represented in an Egyptian tomb picture (Wilkinson, Popular Account, I, 192). This reference, however, though not quite inadmissible, is scarcely probable. Games with boards and men bearing some resemblance to our draughts were in great favor in Egypt (ibid., 190-95), but cannot be proved for the Jews even in New Testament times.

4. Story-Telling:

Listening to stories or recitations has long been a favorite amusement of Orientals (compare Lane, Modern Egyptians, 359-91: “The Thousand and One Nights”), but there seems to be no reference to it in the Bible. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that the Hebrews, like their neighbors, had story-tellers or reciters, axed heard them with delight. Egyptian tales of great antiquity are well known from the two volumes edited by Professor Petrie in 1895; and there are several non-canonical Jewish tales which combine romance and moral teaching: the Books of Tobit and Judith and perhaps the Story of Ahikar, the last of which, with the help of the Aramaic papyri discovered at Elephantine, can be traced back (in some form) to about 400 BC (Schurer, GJ V4, III, 255). There
are also many short stories in the Haggadic portions of the Talmud and the Midrash.

5. Dancing:

Dancing, that is, the expression of joy by rhythmical movements of the limbs to musical accompaniment, is scarcely ever mentioned in the Bible as a social amusement, except in a general way (Judges 16:25,27(?); Job 21:11; Psalm 30:11; Ecclesiastes 3:4; Jeremiah 31:4,13; Lamentations 5:15; Matthew 11:17; Luke 15:25). There is one exception, the dancing of Salome, the daughter of Herodias, before Herod Antipas and his court (Matthew 14:6 parallel Mark 6:22), which was a solo dance, probably of a pantomimic character affected by Roman influence. The other Biblical references to dancing can be grouped under two heads: the dance of public rejoicing, and the dance which was more or less an act of worship. Of the former we have two striking examples in the Old Testament: the dance accompanied by the tambourine with which the maidens of Israel, led by Jephthah’s daughter, met that leader after his victory (Judges 11:34), and the dances of the Israelite women in honor of Saul and David to celebrate the triumph over the Philistines (1 Samuel 18:6; 21:11; 29:5).

It was probably usual to welcome a king or general with music and dancing. There is a good illustration in a fine Assyrian sculpture in the British Museum which represents a band of 11 instrumentalists taking part in doing homage to a new ruler. Three men at the head of the procession are distinctly dancing (SBOT, “Psalms,” English, 226).

The distinctly religious dance is more frequently mentioned. The clear instances of it in the Bible are the dance of the women of Israel at the Red Sea, headed by Miriam with her tambourine (Exodus 15:20); the dance of the Israelites round the golden calf (Exodus 32:19); the dance of the maidens of Shiloh at an annual feast (Judges 21:19 ff); the leaping or limping of the prophets of Baal round their altar on Carmel (1 Kings 18:26), and the dancing of David in front of the ark (2 Samuel 6:14,16 parallel 1 Chronicles 15:29). There are general references in Psalm 149:3: “Let them praise his name in the dance”; 150:4: “Praise him with timbrel and dance”; and perhaps in 68:25. The allusions in Song of Solomon 6:13, “the dance of Mahanaim,” and in the proper name Abel-meholah, “the meadow of the dance” (1 Kings 19:16, etc.), are too
uncertain to be utilized. The ritual dance was probably widespread in the ancient East. David’s performance has Egyptian parallels. Seti I, the father of Rameses II, and three other Pharaohs are said to have danced before a deity (Budge, The Book of the Dead, I, xxxv), and Asiatic monuments attest the custom elsewhere. About the methods of dancing practiced by the ancient Hebrews but little is known. Probably the dancers in some cases joined hands and formed a ring, or part of a ring, as in some heathen representations. The description of David’s dance: he “danced before Yahweh with all his might .... leaping and dancing before Yahweh” (2 Samuel 6:14-16) suggests three features of that particular display and the mode of dancing which it represented: violent exertion, leaping (mephazzez), and whirling round (mekharker). Perhaps the whirling dance of Islam is a modern parallel to the last. Women seem generally to have danced by themselves, one often leading the rest, both in dancing and antiphonal song; so Miriam and the women of Israel, Jephthah’s daughter and her comrades, the women who greeted Saul and David, and, in the Apocrypha, Judith and her sisters after the death of Holofernes (Judith 15:12 f). Once the separation of the sexes is perhaps distinctly referred to (Jeremiah 31:13). In public religious dances they may have occasionally united, as was the case sometimes in the heathen world, but there is no clear evidence to that effect (compare, however, 2 Samuel 6:20 and Psalm 68:25). Of the social dancing of couples in the modern fashion there is no trace. There seems to be some proof that the religious dance lingered among the Jews until the time of Christ and later.

If the Mishna can be trusted (Cukkah, v.4), there was a torch-light dance in the temple in the illuminated court of the women at the Feast of Tabernacles in which men of advanced years and high standing took part. The Gemara to the Jerusalem Talmud adds that a famous dancer on these occasions was Rabbi Simeon or Simon, the son of Gamaliel, who lived in the apostolic age (Josephus, BJ, IV, in, 9). According to another passage (Ta’anith 4 8) the daughters of Jerusalem used to dance dressed in white in the vineyards on Tishri the 10th and Abib the 15th. Religious dancing in the modern East is illustrated not only by the dances of the dervishes mentioned above, but also by occasional dances led by the sheikh in honor of a saint (Curtiss, Primitive Semitic Religion Today, 169). Among the later Jews dancing was not unusual at wedding feasts. More than one eminent rabbi is said to have danced before the bride (Kethubboth 17a).
Singing and dancing, with lighted torches, are said to be wedding customs of the modern Arabs.
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6. Proverbs:

Proverbs ([לווי; mashal]; [παροιμία, paroimia]) : Proverbs and proverbial expressions seem to have been, to some extent, a means of amusement as well as instruction for the ancient Oriental who delighted in the short, pointed statement of a moral or religious truth, or a prudential maxim, whether of literary or popular origin. Most of these sayings in the Bible belong to the former class, and are couched in poetic form (see PROVERBS; ECCLESIASTES; ECCLESIASTICUS). The others which are shorter and simpler, together with a number of picturesque proverbial phrases, must have recurred continually in daily speech and have added greatly to its vivacity.

The Old Testament supplies the following 10 examples of the popular proverb:

(1) “Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before Yahweh” (Genesis 10:9);

(2) “As the man is, so is his strength” (Judges 8:21), only two words in the Hebrew;

(3) “Is Saul also among the prophets?” (1 Samuel 10:11 f; 19:24);

(4) “Out of the wicked (wicked men) cometh forth wickedness” (1 Samuel 24:13);

(5) “There are the blind and the lame; he cannot come into the house” (2 Samuel 5:8);

(6) “Let not him that girdeth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off” (1 Kings 20:11);

(7) “Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life” (Job 2:4);
“The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth” (Ezekiel 12:22), a scoffing jest rather than a proverb;

“As is the mother, so is her daughter” (Ezekiel 16:44), two words in the Hebrew;

“The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge” (Jeremiah 31:29; Ezekiel 18:2).

In the New Testament we find 10 others:

(1) “Physician, heal thyself” (Luke 4:23); in the Midrash Rabbah on Gen: “Physician heal thine own wound”;

(2) “Can the blind guide the blind? shall they not both fall into a pit?” (Luke 6:39);

(3) “With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you” (Matthew 7:2 parallel Mark 4:24; Luke 6:38), almost identical with a Jewish proverb, “measure for measure” cited several times in the ancient Midrash, the Mekhila’t;

(4) “One soweth, and another reapeth” (John 4:37);

(5) “A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country” (Matthew 13:57; Luke 4:24; John 4:44; Logion of Oxyrhynchus);

(6) “There are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest” (John 4:35), possibly a kind of proverb;

(7) “Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles (m “vultures”) be gathered together” (Matthew 24:28 parallel Luke 17:37); perhaps a proverb of which there is a trace also in the reference to the vulture: “Where the slain are, there is she” (Job 39:30);

(8) “It is hard for thee to kick against the goad” (Acts 26:14), a Greek proverb: for proof compare Wetstein’s note;

(9) “The dog turning to his own vomit again, and the sow that had washed to wallowing in the mire” (2 Peter 2:22); Wetstein gives rabbinic parallels for the former half, and Greek for the latter;

(10) “Ye .... strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel” (Matthew 23:24).
There are also many proverbial phrases which added piquancy to conversation. Exceeding smallness was likened to the eye of a needle (Matthew 19:24 parallel Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25), or to a grain of mustard (Matthew 13:31 parallel Mark 4:31; Matthew 17:20 parallel Luke 17:6), comparisons both found also in the Talmud, the Koran, and modern Arabic sayings. Relative greatness was likened to a camel (Matthew 19:24, etc.), in the Talmud to a camel or an elephant. Great number was illustrated by reference to “the sand which is upon the sea-shore” (Genesis 22:17 and many other passages); “the dust of the earth” (Genesis 13:16, etc.; also an Arabian figure); “the grass of the earth” (Job 5:25; Psalm 72:16; compare 92:7), an early Babylonian figure; a swarm of locusts (Nahum 3:15 and 4 other passages), a similitude used also by Sennacherib (RP, n.s. VI, 97), and the stars of heaven (Genesis 15:5 and 10 other passages). When complete security was promised or described it was said that not a hair of the head was or should be injured or perish (1 Samuel 14:45; 2 Samuel 14:11; 1 Kings 1:52; Daniel 3:27; Luke 21:18; Acts 27:34). Overcoming of difficulties was referred to as the removal of mountains (Matthew 17:20; 21:21 parallel Mark 11:23; 1 Corinthians 13:2), an expression which has rabbinic parallels. Other proverbial phrases may perhaps be found in the saying about the mote and the beam (Matthew 7:3-5), jot or tittle (Matthew 5:18 parallel Luke 16:17), and the foolish words of Rehoboam and his young advisers (1 Kings 12:10 f). Many old proverbs have no doubt perished. Dukes in his Rabbinische Blumenlese gives 665 proverbs and proverbial expressions from the Talmud and related literature, and modern collections show that proverbial lore is still in great favor in the Biblical Orient.

See also PROVERBS.
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7. Riddles:

Riddles ([ḥ d y] i chidhah]; [ἀἰνigma, ainigma]): Riddle-making and riddle-guessing were in favor in the ancient East, both in educated circles and in comparatively common life. There is a tablet in the British Museum
(K 4347: Guide to Assyrian and Babylonian Antiquities2, 53) from the library of Ashur-bani-pal which attests the use of riddles not only by the Assyrians of the 7th century BC, but also in a far earlier age, for it contains a Sumer as well as a Semitic text. So it is not surprising that we find a remarkable example in early Israelite history in Samson’s famous riddle: “Out of the eater came forth food, and out of the strong came forth sweetness” (Judges 14:14). The riddle is couched in poetic form, as is also the solution: “What is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion?” (Judges 14:18), and the comment: “If ye had not plowed with my heifer, ye had not found out my riddle” (same place). The stipulation of a prize or penalty according to the success or failure of the persons challenged to solve the riddle was a custom met with also among the ancient Greeks and in a later age among the Arabs. In 1 Kings 10:1 parallel 2 Chronicles 9:1 the word used of Samson’s riddle (chidhah) is employed of the “hard questions” put to Solomon by the queen of Sheba. The Septuagint seems to have understood the word as “riddle” here also, for it renders “enigmas,” and some of the later Jews not only adopted this interpretation, but actually gave riddles said to have been propounded. Of these riddles which, of course, have no direct historic value, but are interesting specimens of riddle lore, one of the best is the following: “Without movement while living, it moves when its head is cut off”; the answer to which is: “a tree” (Jewish Encyclopedia, article “Riddle”; see also for these riddles Wunsche, Die Rathselweisheit bei den Hebraern, 15-23). If Josephus can be trusted, historians of Phoenicia recorded a riddle-contest between Solomon and the Phoenician Hiram in which the latter finally won with the help of a Tyrian named Abdemon (Ant., VIII, v, 3; CAp, 1, 18). In this case, too, defeat involved penalty. The testing of ability by riddles has a striking parallel in the Persian epic, the Shah Nameh, in the trial of the hero Sal by the mobeds or wise men (Wunsche, op. cit., 43-47). Solomon’s fame as an author of riddles and riddle-like sayings is referred to in Sirach 47:15,17 (Hebrew): “With song, and proverbs, dark sayings (chidhah) and figures, thou didst greatly move the nations.” Chidhah occurs only once in Proverbs (1:6): “the words of the wise, and their dark sayings,” but the collection contains several examples of what Konig calls “the numerical riddle”: Proverbs 6:16-19; 30:7 ff,15 f,18 f,21 ff,24-28,29 ff. In each case the riddle is stated first and then the solution. The saying in Proverbs 26:10: “As an archer that woundeth all, so is he that hireth the fool and he that hireth them that pass by,” has been cited as a riddle, and it is certainly obscure enough, but the obscurity
may be due to textual corruption. There are several passages in the Old Testament in which the word *chidhah* seems to be used in the general sense of “mysterious utterance”: Numbers 12:8; Psalm 49:4; 78:2; Daniel 5:12 (the Aramaic equivalent of *chidhah*); 8:23; Habakkuk 2:6. In Ezekiel 17:1 it describes the parable or allegory of the Two Eagles and the Cedar and the Vine. Sirach has several numerical riddles: 23:16; 25:1 f, 7 f; 26:5 f; 50:25 f; and there are similar sayings in Ab 5:1-11, 16-21 (Taylor’s edition). In the Book of Jeremiah (25:26; 51:41; 51:1) are two examples of a cryptic or cipher mode of writing which comes very near the riddle. SHE SHaKH, in the first two passages, represented by the three letters shin, shin, kaph, answering to our sh, sh, k, is meant to be read with the substitution for each letter of the letter as near the beginning of the alphabet as it is near the end, the result being sh = b, sh = b, k = l, that is, B-b-l or Babel/Babylon. In the same way in the last passage the consonants composing the word *Lebkamai* l, b, k, margin, y, suggest k, s, d, y, margin, that is, Kasdim or Chaldees. This cipher or riddle-writing was called by the Jews ‘At-bash (compare Buxtorf, Lexicon Chaldaicum, etc., I, 131, 137 f, edited by Fischer; and modern commentaries on Jer). The New Testament contains no riddle except the numerical puzzle, Revelation 13:18 (compare NUMBER; GEMATRIA), and has the Greek equivalent of *chidhah* only in 1 Corinthians 13:12, “for now we see .... darkly,” the Revised Version, margin “in a riddle” (Greek *en ainigmati*). There can be little doubt that riddles enlivened marriage festivals, such as that of Cana. Wunsche (op. cit.) gives some interesting specimens of later Jewish riddles, subsequent indeed to our Lord’s time, but such as might have been in circulation then.
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II. THE GAMES OF GREECE AND ROME.

1. Historical Introduction:

This is not the place to give a detailed account of the Greek gymnasium and the elaborate contests for which candidates were prepared in them, or to describe the special forms of sport introduced by the Romans, but these exercises and amusements were so well known in Palestine and throughout the Roman Empire in the time of Christ and the apostles that they cannot be passed over in silence. Some acquaintance with them is absolutely necessary for the interpretation of many passages in the New Testament, especially in the Epistles. Hellenic athletics found their way into Jewish society through the influence of the Greek kingdom ruled over by the Seleucids. Early in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 176 BC) a gymnasion, “place of exercise,” was built in Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:14; 2 Macc 4:9,12) and frequented by priests (1 Macc 1:14 f), who are spoken of as “making of no account the honors of their fathers, and thinking the glories of the Greeks best of all.” After the success of the Maccabean rising Greek games fell into disrepute among the Jewish population of Palestine, and were thenceforth regarded with suspicion by all strict religionists, even the worldly Josephus sharing the general feeling (Ant., XV, viii, 1).

Nevertheless Gentile games must have been familiar to most in Jerusalem and elsewhere during the Herodian rule and the Roman occupation. Herod the Great built a theater and amphitheater in the neighborhood of the city (Josephus, ibid.; for probable sites, see G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 493), and instituted in the name of Caesar games which included Roman as well as Hellenic sports, celebrated every 5 years. There was also a hippodrome or race-course for horses and chariots, bearing considerable resemblance to the Roman circus (Josephus, Ant, XVII, x, 2; BJ, II, in, 1). Jericho, too, was provided with a theater, an amphitheater and a hippodrome. There was a hippodrome also at Tarichea. In addition there were scattered over Syria many Hellenic and partially Hellenic cities — Schurer (GJV4, II, 108-221) gives the history of 33 — Caesarea Stratonis, Caesarea Philippi, the cities of the Decapolis, Tiberias, etc., which would all have had gymnasium and games. In Tarsus, which must have had a large Greek element in its population, Paul must have heard, and perhaps seen, in his childhood, much of the athletic exercises which were constantly in progress, and in later life he must often have been reminded of them, especially at Corinth, near which were celebrated biennially the Isthmia or Isthmian Games which drew visitors from all parts of the Empire, at Caesarea which possessed a
theater, an amphitheater and a stadium, and at Ephesus. The custom, indeed, seems to have been almost universal. No provincial city of any importance was without it (Schurer, op. cit., 48), especially after the introduction of games in honor of the Caesars. The early Christians, therefore, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin, were able to understand, and the latter at any rate to appreciate, references either to the games in general, or to details of their celebration.

2. General References:

The word which described the assembly gathered together at one of the great Grecian games (agon) was also applied to the contests themselves, and then came to be used of any intense effort or conflict. The corresponding verb (agonizomai) had a similar history. Both these words are used figuratively in the Pauline Epistles: the noun in Philippians 1:30; Colossians 2:1; 1 Thessalonians 2:2; 1 Timothy 6:12; 2 Timothy 4:7, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (except in the second passage), “conflict” or “fight”; the verb in Colossians 1:29; 4:12; 1 Timothy 4:10; 6:12; 2 Timothy 4:7, translated “strive,” “fight.” In Corinthians 9:25; 2 Timothy 2:5 (where another word is used) there are literal references. The former passage English Revised Version: “Every man that striveth in the games (agonizomenos) is temperate in all things,” also alludes to the rigid self-control enforced by long training which the athlete must practice. The training itself is glanced at in the exhortation: “Exercise thyself (gumnaze) unto godliness” (1 Timothy 4:7), and in the remark which follows: “Bodily exercise (gumnasia) is profitable for a little.” It is remarkable that the word gymnasium, or “place of training,” which occurs in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 4:9,12) is not met with in the New Testament. The necessity for the observance of rules and regulations is referred to in the words: “And if also a man contend in the games, he is not crowned, except he have contended lawfully” (2 Timothy 2:5). In all these passages the games will have been more or less in the apostle’s thought (for other possible New Testament references compare Hebrews 5:14; 10:32; 12:1; 2 Peter 2:14).
3. Specific References to Greek Athletics:

In addition to these general references there are many allusions to details, again found mainly in the Pauline Epistles. These may most conveniently be grouped in alphabetical order.

(a) Beast-fight.

The combats of wild animals with one another and with men, which were so popular at Rome toward the close of the Republic and under the Empire, were not unknown in Palestine. Condemned criminals were thrown to wild beasts by Herod the Great in his amphitheater at Jerusalem, “to afford delight to spectators,” a proceeding which Josephus (Ant., XV, viii, 1) characterizes as impious. After the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD many Jewish captives were slain in fighting with wild beasts (BJ, VII, ii). This horrible form of sport must have been in the apostle’s mind when he wrote: “I fought with beasts (etheriomachesa) at Ephesus” (<461532>1 Corinthians 15:32). The reference is best understood as figurative, as in Ignatius on <450501>Romans 5:1, where the same word (theriomacheo) is used, and the soldiers are compared to leopards.

(b) Boxing.

This form of sport is directly referred to in <460926>1 Corinthians 9:26: “So box I (Revised Version margin, Greek pukteuo), as not beating the air.” The allusion is probably continued in 9:27a: “but I buffet (the Revised Version, margin “bruise,” Greek hupopiaz) my body.”

(c) The Course.

Foot-races and other contests took place in an enclosure 606 feet 9 inches in length, called a stadium. This is once referred to in a passage in the context of that just mentioned, which almost seems based on observation: “They that run in a race-course (RVm, Greek stadion) run all” (<461532>1 Corinthians 9:24).

(d) Discus Throwing.

The throwing of the discus, a round plate of stone or metal 10 or 12 inches in diameter, which was a prominent feature of Greek athletics and is the subject of a famous statue, a copy of which is in the British Museum, is not mentioned in the New Testament, but is alluded to in 2 Macc 4:14 as one
of the amusements indulged in by Hellenizing priests in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.

(e) The Foot-race.

The words for “run” and “race” (Greek *trecho* and *dromos*) sometimes clearly, and in other cases probably, allude to foot-races at the games. For obvious references compare *1 Corinthians* 9:24; *Hebrews* 12:1; *2 Timothy* 4:7; for possible references see *Acts* 13:25; 20:24; *Romans* 9:16; *Galatians* 2:2; 5:7; *Philippians* 2:16; *2 Thessalonians* 3:1. The second of these passages (*Hebrews* 12:1) alludes to the necessity for the greatest possible reduction of weight, and for steady concentration of effort. All the passages would remind the first readers of the single-course and double-course foot-races of the games.

(f) The Goal.

The goal of the foot-race, a square pillar at the end of the stadium opposite the entrance, which the athlete as far as possible kept in view and the sight of which encouraged him to redouble his exertions, is alluded to once: “I press on toward the goal” (*Philippians* 3:14, Greek *skopos*).

(g) The Herald.

The name and country of each competitor were announced by a herald and also the name, country and father of a victor. There may be an allusion to this custom in *1 Corinthians* 9:27: “after that I have been a herald (Revised Version margins, Greek *kerusso*) to others”; compare also *1 Timothy* 2:7; *2 Timothy* 1:11, where the Greek for “preacher” is *kerux*, “herald.”

(h) The Prize.

Successful athletes were rewarded at the great games by a wreath consisting in the apostolic age of wild olive (Olympian), parsley (Nemean), laurel (Pythian), or pine (Isthmian). This is referred to in a general way in *Philippians* 3:14, and in *1 Corinthians* 9:24: “One receiveth the prize” (Greek in both cases *brabeion*; compare also *Colossians* 3:15: “Let the peace of Christ arbitrate (Revised Version margin) in your hearts,” where the verb is *brabeuo*). The wreath (*stephanos*) is directly alluded to in *1 Corinthians* 9:25: “They (the athletes) do it to receive a corruptible crown”; *2 Timothy* 2:5: “A man .... is not crowned, except he have contended lawfully”; and *1 Peter* 5:4: “Ye shall receive the crown of
glory that fadeth not away.” There may be allusions also in Philippians 4:1; 1 Thessalonians 2:19; Hebrews 2:7,9; Jas 1:12; Revelation 2:10; 3:11. In the palm-bearing multitude of the Apocalypse (Revelation 7:9) there is possibly a reference to the carrying of palm-branches by victors at the games. The judges who sat near the goal and who, at Olympia at any rate, had been carefully prepared for their task, may be glanced at in 2 Timothy 4:8: “The crown .... which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day.”

(i) Wrestling.

This form of sport, which was in great favor in Greek society from the age of Homer onward, is alluded to once in the New Testament: “Our wrestling (Greek pale) is not against flesh and blood,” etc. (Ephesians 6:12). The exercise made great demands on strength, perseverance and dexterity. There is an indirect allusion in the term palaestra, which first meant “place for wrestling,” and then “place for athletic exercises in general” (2 Macc 4:14).

4. References to the Theater and the Drama:

Although there is no direct reference in the New Testament to the intellectual contests in which the Greeks delighted as much as in athletics, the former cannot be entirely ignored. The word “theater” (Greek theatron) occurs 3 times: twice in the sense of “public hall” (Acts 19:29,31); and once with a clear reference to its use as a place of amusement: “We are made a spectacle” (1 Corinthians 4:9). “The drama was strongly discountenanced by the strict Jews of Palestine, but was probably encouraged to some extent by some of the Jews of the Diaspora, especially in Asia Minor and Alexandria. Philo is known to have witnessed the representation of a play of Euripides, and the Jewish colony to which he belonged produced a dramatic poet named Ezekiel, who wrote inter alia a play on the Exodus, some fragments of which have been preserved (Schurer, GJV4, II, 60; III, 500 ff). An inscription found not long ago at Miletus shows that part of theater of that city was reserved for Jews (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 446 ff). The readers of the Pauline Epistles, Jews as well as Gentiles, would be generally more or less familiar with theater and the drama. It has been suggested that there is a glimpse of a degraded form of the drama, the mime or mimic play, which was exceedingly popular in the 1st century and afterward, in the mockery
of Jesus by the soldiers (Matthew 27:27-30 parallel Mark 15:16-19). The “king” seems to have been a favorite character with the comic mime. The mockery of the Jewish king, Agrippa I, by the populace of Alexandria, a few years later, which furnishes a very striking parallel to the incident recorded in the Gospels (Schurer, GJV4, I, 497), is directly connected by Philo with the mimes. The subject is very ably discussed by a German scholar, Hermann Reich, in a learned monograph, Der König mit der Dornenkrone (1905). Certainty is, of course, unattainable, but it seems at least fairly probable that the rude Syrian soldiers, who were no doubt in the habit of attending theater, may have been echoing some mimic play in their mock homage to “the king of the Jews.”

LITERATURE.

In addition to works already mentioned see for the whole subject: articles “Games” in Smith, DB2; HDB, large and small; EB; Jewish Encyclopedia; arts. “Spiele” in Winer, RWB, and Riehm2, and especially König, “Spiele bei den Hebraern,” RE3. On the games of Greece and Rome See articles in Smith’s Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, “Amphitheatrum,” “Circus,” “Olympia,” “Stadium,” etc.

William Taylor Smith

GAMMADIM

<gam’-a-dim> ([μ yd MG’, gammadhim]): The word occurs only in Ezekiel 27:11, in the King James Version in form “Gammadims,” in the English Revised Version “Gammadim.” In the American Standard Revised Version, as also in the English Revised Version, margin, it is rendered “valorous men.” Some think a proper name is required, but identification is not possible, and the meaning remains doubtful.

GAMUL

<ga’-mul> ([l Wng; gamul], “weaned”): The head of the 22nd of the 24 courses of priests inaugurated by David (1 Chronicles 24:17).

GANGRENE

<gan’-gren> ([γάγραγνα, gaggraina], pronounced gan-graina; the King James Version canker): The name was used by the old Greek physicians for an eating ulcer which corrodes the soft parts and, according to Galen,
often ends in mortification. Paul compares the corrupting influence of profane babbling or levity, in connection with subjects which ought to be treated with reverence to this disease (2 Timothy 2:17). The old English word “canker” is used by 16th-and 17th-century authors as the name of a caterpillar which eats into a bud. In this sense it occurs 18 times in Shakespeare (e.g. Midsummer Night’s Dream, II, ii, 3). The canker-worm mentioned 6 times by Joel and Nahum is probably the young stage of Acridium peregrinum, a species of locust. Cankered in Jas 5:3 the King James Version means “rusted” (Greek katiotai), and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). In Susanna verse 52 Coverdale uses the phrase, “O thou old cankered carle,” in Daniel’s address to the elder, where English Versions of the Bible has “waxen old in wickedness.” The word is still used in the Scottish dialect and applied to persons who are cross-grained and disagreeable.

**Alexander Macalister**

GAP

The translation of [םֶר פִּ, perets], “a breach” (Ezekiel 13:5, “Ye have not gone up into the gaps,” the Revised Version, margin “breaches”; 22:30, “I sought for a man among them, that should build up the wall, and stand in the gap before me for the land”). Said of prophets who failed to stand up for the right and to strengthen and preserve the people.

**GAR**

<gar>: the King James Version for GAS (which see).

**GARDEN**

<gar’-d’-n> ([^G’, gan], [ֻנ, gannah], [גנ, gannah]; [κῆπος, kepos]): The Arabic jannah (diminutive, jannainah), like the Hebrew gannah, literally, “a covered or hidden place,” denotes in the mind of the dweller in the East something more than the ordinary garden. Gardens in Biblical times, such as are frequently referred to in Semitic literature, were usually walled enclosures, as the name indicates (Lamentations 2:6 the American Revised Version, margin), in which there were paths winding in and out among shade and fruit trees, canals of running water, fountains, sweet-smelling herbs, aromatic blossoms and convenient arbors in which to sit and enjoy the effect. These gardens are mentioned in Genesis 2 and 3;
13:10; Song of Solomon 4:12-16; Ecclesiastes 2:5,6; Ezekiel 28:13; 31:8,9; 36:35; Joel 2:3. Ancient Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian records show the fondness of the rulers of these countries for gardens laid out on a grand scale and planted with the rarest trees and plants. The drawings made by the ancients of their gardens leave no doubt about their general features and their correspondence with Biblical gardens. The Persian word *pardec* ([παράδεισος, paradeisos]) appears in the later Hebrew writings to denote more extensive gardens or parks. It is translated “orchards” in Ecclesiastes 2:5 the King James Version; Song of Solomon 4:13.

*See PARADISE.*

Such gardens are still common throughout the Levant. They are usually situated on the outskirts of a city (compare John 18:1,26; 19:41), except in the case of the more pretentious estates of rich pashas or of the government seats (compare 2 Kings 21:18; Nehemiah 1:5; 7:7,8; Nehemiah 3:15; 2 Kings 25:4; Jeremiah 39:4; 52:7). They are enclosed with walls of mud blocks, as in Damascus, or stone walls capped with thorns, or with hedges of thorny bushes (compare Lamentations 2:6 the American Revised Version, margin), or prickly pear. In nearly treeless countries, where there is no rain during 4 or 5 months, at least, of the year, the gardens are often the only spots where trees and other vegetation can flourish, and here the existence of vegetation depends upon the water supply, brought in canals from streams, or raised from wells by more or less crude lifting machines (compare Numbers 24:7). Such references as Genesis 2:10; Numbers 24:6; Deuteronomy 11:10; Isaiah 1:30; 58:11; Song of Solomon 4:15 indicate that in ancient times they were as dependent upon irrigation in Biblical lands as at present. The planning of their gardens so as to utilize the water supplies has become instinctive with the inhabitants of Palestine and Syria. The writer has seen a group of young Arab boys modeling a garden out of mud and conducting water to irrigate it by channels from a nearby canal, in a manner that a modern engineer would admire. Gardens are cultivated, not only for their fruits and herbs (compare Song of Solomon 6:11; Isaiah 1:8; 1 Kings 21:2) and shade (compare Song of Solomon 6:11; Luke 13:19), but they are planned to serve as dwelling-places during the summer time when the houses are hot and stuffy. That this was an ancient practice is indicated by Song of Solomon 5:2; 6:2; 8:13. A shaded garden, the air laden with the ethereal perfumes of fruits and flowers, accompanied by
the music of running water, a couch on which to sit or recline, suggest a condition of bliss dear to the Oriental. Only one who has traveled for days in a dry, glaring desert country and has come upon a spot like the gardens of such a city as Damascus, can realize how near like paradise these gardens can appear. Mohammed pictured such a place as the future abode of his followers.

No doubt the remembrances of his visit to Damascus were fresh in his mind when he wrote. El-Jannah is used by the Moslems to signify the “paradise of the faithful.”

Gardens were used as places of sacrifice, especially in heathen worship (Isaiah 1:29; 65:3; 66:17). They sometimes contained burial places (2 Kings 21:18,26; John 19:41).

Figurative: The destruction of gardens typified desolation (Amos 4:9); on the other hand, fruitful gardens figured prosperity (Numbers 24:6; Job 8:16; Isaiah 51:3; 58:11; 61:11; Jeremiah 29:5,28; 31:12; Amos 9:14).

James A. Patch

GARDEN, THE KING’S

Mention is made of “the king’s garden” in 2 Kings 25:4; Jeremiah 39:4; 52:7 (fundamentally the same passage), in connection with the flight of Zedekiah from Jerusalem; and again in Nehemiah 3:15. The last passage shows that the “garden” was at the pool of Siloah (the Revised Version (British and American) “Shelah”), at the mouth of Tyropeon, near the “fountain gate.” This would seem to be “the gate between the two walls which was by the king’s garden” of the passages in 2 Kings and Jeremiah (compare 2 Chronicles 32:5). On the topography, see JERUSALEM; also Robinson, Palestine, II, 142. Arnold (in Herzog) thinks the garden is probably identical with “the garden of Uzza” of 2 Kings 21:18,26.

James Orr

GARDENER

<gar’-d’n-er> ([κῆπουρος, kepouros]): “Gardener” occurs once in the English Versions of the Bible (John 20:15), the translation of kepos and ouros, “warden” or “keeper.” It is likely that the man referred to was the
watchman or keeper (Arabic natur; Hebrew notser), corresponding to those mentioned in 2 Kings 17:9; 18:8; Job 27:18, etc., and not one who did the manual labor. It is the common practice in Palestine today to set a watchman over a garden during its productive season.

See WATCHMAN.

GARDEN-HOUSE

([‘Gh “ t yBeth ha-gan]): A place mentioned in describing the flight of Ahaziah, king of Judah, from Jehu (2 Kings 9:27). Probably we ought not to translate the Hebrew, but take it as a proper name, Beth-Haggan (which see). If he fled southward, the town might possibly be Jenin, ENGANNIM, which see.

GAREB

<ga’-reb> ([b r garebh]): One of David’s “mighty men of the armies” (2 Samuel 23:38; 1 Chronicles 11:40), an “Ithrite,” i.e. a member of one of the families of Kiriath-jea-rim (1 Chronicles 2:53). Some, however, read ha-yattiri for ha-yithri, thus making him a native of Jattir.

See IRA.

GAREB, THE HILL OF

<ga’-reb>, ([b r garebh]): A hill in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, which was one of the landmarks to which the prophet Jeremiah (31:39) foresaw that the city should extend. The site is unknown. Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica) would connect this with the “mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward” (Joshua 15:8), but this is too far South; it is inconceivable that the prophet could have imagined the city extending so far in this direction; most probably the hill was to the North — the one natural direction for the city’s extension — and is now incorporated in the modern suburbs.

E. W. G. Masterman

GARIZIM

<gar’-i-zim>.
See GERIZIM.

GARLAND

\(<\text{gar'-land}>\) ([στέμμα, stemma], “wreath”): Mentioned only in Acts 14:13, where it is said that the priest of Jupiter brought oxen and garlands unto the gates with which to offer sacrifices unto Barnabas and Paul. The rendering “oxen and garlands,” instead of “oxen garlanded,” seems to imply that the garlands were for the priests and altar and worshippers themselves, as well as for the victims sacrificed. Only occasionally did the Hebrews use such ornaments for themselves, and that almost altogether in their later history.

See CROWN.

GARLIC

\(<\text{gar'-lik}>\) ([ח, shum], used only in plural [חים, shumim]; compare Arabic thum): One of the delights of Egypt for which the Israelites in the Wilderness longed (Numbers 11:5); we know from other sources that, though originally a product of Central Asia, garlic was known to the ancient Egyptians. It is the bulb of Allium sativum, Natural Order Liliaceae, and is cultivated all over the Orient. It is eaten cooked in stews; its disagreeable penetrating odor is in evidence in the houses and on the breath of most Orientals. A bulb of garlic, hung over a bed or over the door of a house, is a powerful charm against the evil eye and other malign influences.

E. W. G. Masterman

GARMENT

\(<\text{gar'-ment}>\).

See DRESS.

GARMITE

\(<\text{gar'-mit}>\) ([גarmi]): A gentilic name applied to Keilah in Chronicles 4:19. The reason for this is not known.
GARNER


GARNISH

<gar'-nish> ([תִּסְפָּה, tsippah], [שִׁפְרָה, shiprah]; [κοσμέω, kosmeo]): The word is used twice in the Old Testament. In 2 Chronicles 3:6, tsippah means “to overlay,” or “to plate.” Thus, he “garnished” the house or “overlaid” it, “studded” it, with precious stones, and thus adorned and beautified it. In Job 26:13, shiprah is a feminine noun meaning “fairness,” “beauty,” “brilliancy.” “By his Spirit the heavens are garnished,” i.e. the clouds are driven off by the wind or breath of Yahweh, and the sky made bright and clear.

In the New Testament (Matthew 12:44; 23:29) the word kosmeo means “set in order,” “make ready,” “adorn,” etc. In Matthew 25:7 it is translated “trimmed,” and in Revelation 21:19 “adorned.”

J. J. Reeve

GARRISON

<gar'-i-s'-n>.

See WAR.

GAS

<gas> ([גָּז, Gas]): Named among the “sons of the servants of Solomon” (1 Esdras 5:34); not mentioned in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

GASHMU

<gash'-mu>, <gash'-moo> ([גָּשָׁמ, gashmu]): A form of the name GESHEM (which see), found in Nehemiah 6:6 (compare 6:1), “And Gashmu saith it.” According to BDB the same termination -u is found in Nabatean proper names.
GATAM

\(<ga\text{-}tam>\) ([µΤ [ ḡ , ga\text{`}tam]): An Edomite chief, grandson of Esau (\text{Genesis} 36:11,16; \text{1 Chronicles} 1:36).

GATE

\(<\text{gat}>\) (Hebrew normally (over 300 times) [ר [ ṣ ] , sha\text{`}ar]; occasionally [ת [ ד , deleth], properly, “gateway” (but compare \text{Deuteronomy} 3:5); elsewhere the gateway is [ג [ ת , pethach] (compare especially \text{Genesis} 19:6); Aramaic [ר [ ת , tera\text{`}] ; Greek [πυλών , pulon], [πύλη, pule]; the English Revised Version and the King James Version add [ץ [ , caph], “threshold,” in \text{1 Chronicles} 9:19,22; and the King James Version adds [מ [ ד , delathayim], “double-door,” in \text{Isaiah} 45:1; [θύρα , thura], “door,” \text{Acts} 3:2):

(1) The usual gateway was provided with double doors, swung on projections that fitted into sockets in the sill and lintel. Ordinarily the material was wood (\text{Nehemiah} 2:3,17), but greater strength and protection against fire was given by plating with metal (\text{Psalm} 107:16; \text{Isaiah} 45:2). Josephus (BJ, V, v, 3) speaks of the solid metal doors of the Beautiful Gate (\text{Acts} 3:2) as a very exceptional thing. Some doors were solid slabs of stone, from which the imagery of single jewels (\text{Isaiah} 54:12; \text{Revelation} 21:21) was derived. When closed, the doors were secured with a bar (usually of wood, \text{Nahum} 3:13, but sometimes of metal, \text{1 Kings} 4:13; \text{Psalm} 107:16; \text{Isaiah} 45:2), which fitted into clamps on the doors and sockets in the post, uniting the whole firmly (\text{Judges} 16:3). Sometimes, perhaps, a portcullis was used, but \text{Psalm} 24:7 refers to the enlargement or enrichment of the gates. As the gate was especially subject to attack (\text{Ezekiel} 21:15,22), and as to “possess the gate” was to possess the city (\text{Genesis} 22:17; 24:60), it was protected by a tower (\text{2 Samuel} 18:24,33; \text{2 Chronicles} 14:7; 26:9), often, doubtless, overhanging and with flanking projections. Sometimes an inner gate was added (\text{2 Samuel} 18:24). Unfortunately, Palestine gives us little monumental detail.

(2) As even farm laborers slept in the cities, most of the men passed through the gate every day, and the gate was the place for meeting others (\text{Ruth} 4:1; \text{2 Samuel} 15:2) and for assemblages. For the latter
purpose “broad” or open places (distinguished from the “streets” in Proverbs 7:12) were provided (1 Kings 22:10; Nehemiah 8:1), and these were the centers of the public life. Here the markets were held (2 Kings 7:1), and the special commodities in these gave names to the gates (Nehemiah 3:1,3,18). In particular, the “gate” was the place of the legal tribunals (Deuteronomy 16:18; 21:19; 25:7, etc.), so that a seat among the elders in the gates” (Proverbs 31:23) was a high honor, while “oppression in the gates” was a synonym for judicial corruption (Job 31:21; Proverbs 22:22; Isaiah 29:21; Amos 5:10). The king, in especial, held public audiences in the gate (2 Samuel 19:8; 1 Kings 22:10; Jeremiah 38:7; compare Jeremiah 39:3), and even yet “Sublime Porte” (the French translation of the Turkish for “high gate”) is the title of the Court of Constantinople. To the gates, as the place of throngs, prophets and teachers went with their message (1 Kings 22:10; Jeremiah 17:19; Proverbs 1:21; 8:3; 31:31), while on the other hand the gates were the resort of the town good-for-nothings (Psalm 69:12).

(3) “Gates” can be used figuratively for the glory of a city (Isaiah 3:26; 14:31; Jeremiah 14:2; Lamentations 1:4; contrast Psalm 87:2), but whether the military force, the rulers or the people is in mind cannot be determined. In Matthew 16:18 “gates of Hades” (not “hell”) may refer to the hosts (or princes) of Satan, but a more likely translation is `the gates of the grave (which keep the dead from returning) shall not be stronger than it.’ The meaning in Judges 5:8,11 is very uncertain, and the text may be corrupt.

See CITY; JERUSALEM; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

Burton Scott Easton

GATE, CORNER, FOUNTAIN, HORSE, SUR

See JERUSALEM.

GATE, EAST

The expressions are found in Ezekiel: “Even the gate that looketh toward the east” (43:1); “The gate whose prospect is toward the east” (43:4); but the idea of a gate on the eastern side as the principal entrance to the court of the sanctuary goes back to the days of the tabernacle (Exodus 27:13-16). In addition to its use as admitting to the sanctuary enclosure, it may be
presumed, in analogy with the general mode of the administration of justice, to have been the place where in earlier times cases were tried which were referred to the jurisdiction of the sanctuary (compare \textsuperscript{\textit{Exodus} 18:19-22; \textit{Deuteronomy} 17:8; 19:16,18; \textit{Numbers} 27:2,3, etc.).

1. **THE TABERNACLE:**

In \textit{Exodus} 27:13-16 the “gate” by which the congregation entered the tabernacle is carefully described. An embroidered screen of the three sacred colors (blue, purple and scarlet), 20 cubits in width, hung from 4 pillars (really 5 pillars, 5 cubits apart; on the reckoning see \textit{TABERNACLE}), in the center of the East side of the tabernacle court. This is further alluded to in \textit{Numbers} 4:26, “the screen for the door of the gate of the court.”

2. **SOLOMON’S TEMPLE:**

Nothing is said of the position of gates in connection with Solomon’s temple, but there was an “inner” (\textit{1 Kings} 6:36), and also an “outer” or “great” court (\textit{2 Chronicles} 4:9), the latter with doors overlaid with brass, and analogy makes it certain that here also the chief gate (inner or outer court? see \textit{COURT}) was on the East side. Provision was made by Solomon in his adjoining palace for the administration of justice in a hall or “porch of judgment” (\textit{1 Kings} 7:7), but graver cases were still, apparently, referred for decision to the sanctuary (\textit{Jeremiah} 26:10). The trial in Jeremiah’s case, however, took place, not at the East gate, but at “the entry of the new gate of Yahweh’s house” (\textit{Jeremiah} 26:10; compare 36:10), probably Jotham’s “upper gate” (\textit{2 Kings} 15:35).

3. **EZEKIEL’S TEMPLE:**

In Ezekiel’s ideal temple, “the gate whose prospect was toward the east” was that by which the glory of Yahweh went up from the city (\textit{Ezekiel} 11:23), and by which the prophet in vision saw it return (\textit{Ezekiel} 43:4).

4. **SECOND TEMPLE:**

Nothing is told of an East gate in the temple of Zerubbabel, but it may be assumed that there was one as in the other cases.
5. HEROD’S TEMPLE:

The great East gate of the Herodian temple, which followed those above mentioned, was that “Beautiful Gate of the temple” where the miracle of the healing of the lame man was performed (Acts 3:1-10).

See GATE, THE BEAUTIFUL; HARSITH; SHECANIAH.

W. Shaw Caldecott

GATE, THE BEAUTIFUL

<bu’-ti-fool> ([ἡ ὑφαίνα πύλη τοῦ ἱεροῦ, he horaia pule tou hierou]):
This gate of Herod’s temple is mentioned in the narrative of the healing of the lame man by Peter and John in Acts 3:2,10. Little dispute exists as to the identification of the Beautiful Gate with the splendid “gate of Nicanor” of the Mishna (Mid., i.4), and “Corinthian Gate” of Josephus (BJ, V, v, 3), but authorities are divided as to whether this gate was situated at the entrance to the women’s court on the East, or was the gate reached by 15 steps, dividing that court from the court of the men. The balance of recent opinion inclines strongly to the former view (compare Kennedy, “Problems of Herod’s Temple,” The Expositor Times, XX, 170); others take the opposite view (Waterhouse, in Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 110), or leave the question open (thus G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 212). See TEMPLE, HEROD’S. The gate itself was of unusual size and splendor. It received the name “Nicanor” from its being the work, or having been constructed at the expense, of an Alexandrian Jew of this name. Lately an ossuary was discovered on Matthew Olivet bearing the Greek inscription: “The bones of Nicanor the Alexandrian, who made the doors.” Its other name, “Corinthian,” refers to the costly material of which it was constructed — Corinthian bronze. Josephus gives many interesting particulars about this gate, which, he tells us, greatly excelled in workmanship and value all the others (BJ, V, v, 3). These were plated with gold and silver, but this still more richly and thickly. It was larger than the other gates; was 50 cubits in height (the others 40); its weight was so great that it took 20 men to move it (BJ, VI, vi, 3). Its massiveness and magnificence, therefore, well earned for it the name “Beautiful.”

W. Shaw Caldecott
GATE, VALLEY

In Nehemiah 2:13 the King James Version, “gate of the valley.”

See JERUSALEM.

GATH

<gath> ([t G’ , gath]; Septuagint [Γεθθ, Geth], “winepress”): One of the five chief cities of the Philistines (Joshua 13:3; 1 Samuel 6:17). It was a walled town (2 Chronicles 26:6) and was not taken by Joshua, and, although many conflicts took place between the Israelites and its people, it does not seem to have been captured until the time of David (1 Chronicles 18:1). It was rendered famous as the abode of the giant Goliath whom David slew (1 Samuel 17:4), and other giants of the same race (2 Samuel 21:18-22). It was to Gath that the Ashdodites conveyed the ark when smitten with the plague, and Gath was also smitten (1 Samuel 5:8,9). It was Gath where David took refuge twice when persecuted by Saul (21:10; 27:2-4). It seems to have been destroyed after being taken by David, for we find Rehoboam restoring it (2 Chronicles 11:8). It was after this reoccupied by the Philistines, for we read that Uzziah took it and razed its walls (2 Chronicles 26:6), but it must have been restored again, for we find Hazael of Damascus capturing it (2 Kings 12:17). It seems to have been destroyed before the time of Amos (Amos 6:2), and is not further mentioned in the Old Testament or Macc, except in Micah 1:10, where it is referred to in the proverb, “Tell it not in Gath” (compare 2 Samuel 1:20). Since its destruction occurred, probably, in the middle of the 8th century BC, it is easy to understand why the site has been lost so that it can be fixed only conjecturally. Several sites have been suggested by different explorers and writers, such as: Tell es Safi, Beit Jibrin, Khurbet Jeladiyeh, Khurbet Abu Geith, Jennata and Yebna (see PEFS, 1871, 91; 1875, 42, 144, 194; 1880, 170-71, 211-23; 1886, 200-202). Tradition in the early centuries AD fixed it at 5 Roman miles North of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin, toward Lydda, which would indicate Tell es Safi as the site, but the Crusaders thought it was at Jamnia (Yebna), where they erected the castle of Ibelin, but the consensus of opinion in modern times fixes upon Tell es Safi as the site, as is to be gathered from the references cited in PEFS above. The Biblical notices of Gath would indicate a place in the Philistine plain or the Shephelah, which was fortified, presumably in a strong position on the
border of the Philistine country toward the territory of Judah or Daniel Tell es Safi fits into these conditions fairly well, but without other proof this is not decisive. It is described in SWP, II, 240, as a position of strength on a narrow ridge, with precipitous cliffs on the North and West, connected with the hills by a narrow neck, so that it is thrust out like a bastion, a position easily fortified. In 1144 Fulke of Anjou erected here a castle called Blanchegarde (Alba Specula). The writer on “Gath and Its Worthies” in PEFS, 1886, 200-204, connects the name Safi with that of the giant Saph (2 Samuel 21:18), regarding him as a native of Gath, but the most direct evidence from early tradition connecting Tell es Safi with Gath is found in a manuscript said to be in the library of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which informs us that Catherocastrum was situated on a mountain called Telesaphion or Telesaphy, which is clearly Tell es Safi. Catherocastrum must be the Latin for “camp of Gath” (PEFS, 1906, 305).

H. Porter

GATHER

<gath’-er> ([5”a; ‘acaph], [6b”q; qabhats]; [συλλέγω, sullego], [συνάγω, sunago]): “Gather,” transitive “to bring together,” “collect,” etc., and intransitive “to come together,” “assemble,” etc., occurs frequently and represents many Hebrew and Greek words. It is the translation of ‘acaph, “to bring together,” in Joshua 6:9, the King James Version margin “gathering host”; Psalm 27:10, the King James Version margin “The Lord will gather me”; compare Numbers 12:14,15, Isaiah 52:12 King James Version margin. The phrases “gather thee unto thy fathers,” “gathered unto his fathers,” “gathered into the grave,” etc., are frequently used for “to die” and “death” (Genesis 25:8,17; 49:29,33; Deuteronomy 32:50; 2 Kings 22:20; 2 Chronicles 34:28; Job 27:19; compare Jeremiah 8:2), etc.; qabhats, “to take or grasp with the hand,” is frequently used of the Divine “gathering” or restoration of Israel (Deuteronomy 30:3,1; Nehemiah 1:9; Psalm 106:47; Isaiah 43:5, etc.; Ezekiel 20:34, etc.; Hosea 8:10; Micah 2:12; Zephaniah 3:19,20; Zec 10:8,10); figuratively, Isaiah 40:11, “He shall gather the lambs with (the Revised Version (British and American) “in”) his arm” (compare Psalm 27:10 King James Version margin); sometimes it denotes bringing together for punishment or destruction (Micah 4:12), “He hath gathered them as the sheaves to the threshing-floor.”
In the New Testament we have *sullego*, “to lay together,” “to collect” (Matthew 13:28, 29, 30, 40, 41, 48); *sunago* “to lead or bring together,” “to gather,” “to collect” (Matthew 25:26, “seek returns”; John 4:36, “fruit unto life eternal”); *episunago*, “to lead or bring together” (Matthew 23:37, “even as a hen gathereth her chickens”); *anakephalaioomai*, “to sum up under one head,” “to recapitulate” (Ephesians 1:10, “that he might gather together in one all things in Christ,” the Revised Version (British and American) “to sum up all things in Christ”; compare Ephesians 2:14; in Romans 13:9 the passive is translated “be briefly comprehended,” the Revised Version (British and American) “summed up”).


Gatherer occurs in Amos 7:14 as the translation of *bolec*, from *balac*, to cultivate figs or sycamores, “a gatherer of sycamore fruit,” the Revised Version (British and American) “a dresser of sycomore-trees” (“a nipper of sycomore figs, i.e. helping to cultivate a sort of figs or mulberries produced by the real sycamore tree” (used only by the poorest), which requires nipping in the cultivation, perhaps an occupation of shepherds; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390–405 A.D.) vellicans sycamia).

Gathering is the translation of *episunagoge*, “leading together unto” (2 Thessalonians 2:1), “our gathering together unto him”; in 1 Corinthians 16:2 we have “gathering” (logia from lego) in the sense of a collection of many, the Revised Version (British and American) “collection,” as the King James Version in 1 Corinthians 16:1.

“Gather,” etc., occurs frequently in Apocrypha, e.g. “will gather us out of all the nations,” *sunago* (Tobit 13:5); “gather them together” (1 Macc 9:7; 10:8); “Gather together our dispersion,” *episunagage ten diasporan hemon* (2 Macc 1:27); “gathered to his fathers” *prosetethe pros ton laon autou*, the Revised Version (British and American) “people” (Judith 16:22; Bel and the Dragon verse 1, *tous pateras*; 1 Macc 2:69); “gathering up briefly,” the Revised Version (British and American) “gather,” *suntemno* (2 Macc 10:10); “gathering” in the sense of a collection of money (2 Macc 12:43), the Revised Version (British and American) “collection.”
Among the changes in the Revised Version (British and American) we have “hold firm” for “gather” (Jeremiah 51:11); “Gather thee together” for “Go one way or other” (Ezekiel 21:16 margin, “Make thyself one”); for “gather blackness” (Nahum 2:10), “are waxed pale “; for “or gather together” (Job 11:10), “and call unto judgment,” margin Hebrew “call an assembly”; for “even as a hen doth gather her brood” (Luke 13:34) “gathereth her own brood”; for “as the partridge sitteth on eggs and hatcheth them not,” the American Standard Revised Version has “that sitteth on eggs which she hath not laid,” margin “gathereth young which she hath not brought forth,” text of the English Revised Version and the King James Version margin (Jeremiah 17:11).

W. L. Walker

GATH-HEPFER

<gath-he’-fer> ([^p j b t G], gath ha-chepher], “winepress of the pit”): A town on the boundary of Zebulun (Joshua 19:13; the King James Version in error, “Gittah-hapher”), the birthplace of the prophet Jonah (2 Kings 14:25). Jerome (Commentary on Jonah) speaks of Geth as an inconsiderable village, about 2 miles from Sepphoris on the Tiberias road, where the tomb of Jonah was shown. Benjamin of Tudela says that Jonah the son of Amittai the prophet was buried “in the mountain” near Sepphoris (Bohn, Early Travels in Palestine, 88). These indications agree with the local tradition which identifies Gath-hepher with el-Meshhed, a village with ancient ruins on a height North of the road as one goes to Tiberias, about 2 miles from Nazareth, and half a mile from Kefr Kennah.

W. Ewing

GATH-RIMMON

<gath-rim’-un> ([^w t G], gath rimmon], “winepress of Rimmon”):

(1) A city in the territory of Daniel named with Bene-berak and Me-jarkon, in the plain not far from Joppa (Joshua 19:45), assigned to the Kohathite Levites (Joshua 21:24), reckoned to Ephraim in 1 Chronicles 6:69. Eusebius, Onomasticon locates it 12 miles from Eleutheropolis on the way to Diospolis. This, however, is too far to the South. More probably it is identical with the “Gath” which Eusebius, Onomasticon places between Antipatris and Jamnia. It is not identified.
A town in the territory of Manasseh, West of Jordan, given to the Levites (Joshua 21:25). There is nothing to indicate the position of the place, and there is much confusion in the writing of the name: Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus, “Baithsa”; Codex Vaticanus, “Jebatha.” In 1 Chronicles 6:70 it is replaced by “Bileam,” i.e. IBLEAM (which see).

W. Ewing

GAULONITIS
@gol-on-i’tis>. See GOLAN.

GAULS
@golz> ([Γαλάται, Galatai]): Galatia in Asia Minor is literally the Gallia of the East; its inhabitants are called Galli by Roman writers, just as the inhabitants of ancient France are called Galatai by Greek writers. In some manuscripts in 2 Timothy 4:10, eis Gallian is read for eis Galatian. The emigration of the Gauls from Europe and their settlement in the central region of the peninsula of Asia Minor are somewhat obscure subjects, but the ancient authorities leave no doubt of the main facts. In 1 Macc 8:2 it is difficult to say whether Judas Maccabeus is referring to the Gauls of Europe or the Gauls of Asia Minor. Both became finally subject to the Romans, and about the same time. It was in 191 BC that Gallia Cisalpina was reduced to the form of a Roman province, and in 189 BC occurred the defeat of Antiochus, king of Asia. Mommsen argues that the reference is to the Gauls in the North of Italy, from the circumstance that they are mentioned as being under tribute to the Romans, and also from their mention in connection with Spain. Not much, however, can be argued from this, as the notice of them is in a manner rhetorical, and the defeat of Antiochus is mentioned practically in the same connection. In 2 Macc 8:20 the reference is without doubt to the Asiatic Gauls or Galatians, as they are more commonly called. In the Maccabean period they were restless and fond of war, and often hired themselves out as auxiliaries to the Asiatic kings.

J. Hutchison
GAZA

<ga’-za> ([ḥ Ἰ Ἥ ‘azzah], “strong”; Septuagint [Γαζα, Gaza]; Arabic Ghazzeh): One of the five chief towns of Philistia and probably the oldest, situated near the coast in lat. 31 degrees 30’ and about 40 miles South of Jaffa. It is on a hill rising 60 to 200 ft. above the plain, with sand dunes between it and the sea, which is about 2 1/2 miles distant. The plain around is fertile and wells abound, and, being on the border of the desert between Syria and Egypt and lying in the track of caravans and armies passing from one to the other, it was in ancient times a place of importance. The earliest notices of it are found in the records of Egypt. Thothmes III refers to it in the account of his expedition to Syria in 1479 BC, and it occurs again in the records of the expedition of Seti I in 1313 BC (Breasted, History of Egypt, 285, 409). It occurs also in the early catalogue of cities and tribes inhabiting Canaan in the earliest times (Genesis 10:19). Joshua reached it in his conquests but did not take it (Joshua 10:41; 11:22). Judah captured it (Judges 1:18) but did not hold it long, for we find it in the hands of the Philistines in the days of Samson, whose exploits have rendered it noteworthy (16:1-3,11,30). The hill to which he carried off the gate of the city was probably the one now called el-Muntar (“watchtower”), which lies Southeast of the city and may be referred to in 2 Kings 18:8, “from the tower of the watchmen to the fortified city,” Gaza, with the other chief towns, sent a trespass offering to Yahweh when the ark was returned (1 Samuel 6:17). Hezekiah defeated and pursued the Philistines to Gaza, but does not seem to have captured it. It was taken by Sargon in 720 BC, in his war with Egypt, since Khanun, the king of Gaza, joined the Egyptians and was captured at the battle of Raphia (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, II, 142). It was probably destroyed (see Amos 1:7). It was certainly dismantled by Alexander the Great in 332, when it dared to resist him. It was then exceedingly strong, verifying its name, and was most bravely defended, so that it took Alexander two months to reduce it. He put to death all the men and sold the women and children as slaves (Grote, History of Greece, XI, 467 ff). It was restored, however, and we learn that Jonathan forced it to submit to him (Josephus, Ant, XIII, v, 5; 1 Macc 11:62), and Alexander Janneus took it and massacred the inhabitants who escaped the horrors of the siege (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xiii, 3). Pompey restored the freedom of Gaza (ibid., XIV, iv, 4), and Gabinius rebuilt it in 57 BC (ibid., XIV, v, 3). Gaza is mentioned only once in the New Testament (Acts 8:26), in the account of Philip and the eunuch. In the
2nd and 3rd centuries AD, it became a center of Greek commerce and culture, and pagan influence was strong, while the church rounded there was struggling for existence. Many martyrs there testified to the faith, until finally, under Theodosius, Christianity gained the supremacy (HGHL, 12th edition, 188). It fell into the hands of the Arabs in 634 AD, and became and has remained a Moslem city since the days of Saladin, who recovered it from the Crusaders in 1187, after the battle of Hattin. It is now a city of some 20,000 inhabitants, among whom are a few hundred Christians.

See also AZZAH.

H. Porter

GAZARA

<ga-za’-ra> ([Гαζάρα, Gazara], [Гαζηρά, Gazera]): A fortress of great strength in Judea, which figures often in the Maccabean wars. To this place Judas pursued Gorgias (1 Macc 4:15). It was fortified by the Greek general Bacchides (1 Macc 9:52; Ant, XIII, i, 3). It was captured by Simon Maccabeus, who turned out the inhabitants and purified the city. He built here a palace for himself, and appointed his son John commander of his army (1 Macc 13:43 ff). A different account of this occurrence is given in 2 Macc 10:32 ff, where the capture is attributed to Judas. The narrative here, however, is inspired by antagonism to Simon because he had assumed the high-priesthood.

The fortress is identical with Tell Jezer, the ancient GEZER (which see). It is interesting to note that recent excavations have uncovered the ruins of Simon’s palace (PEFS, 1905, 26).

W. Ewing

GAZATHITES

<ga’-zath-its> ([μυτ ΖΙ, “azzathim]): The inhabitants of GAZA (which see) (Joshua 13:3 the King James Version), rendered “Gazites” (Judges 16:2).

GAZELLE

<ga-zel’> ([ъбк], tsebhi], and feminine [ъbhк] tsebhiyah]; compare [Тαβειθα, Tabetha] (Acts 9:36), and Arabic zabi; also Arabic ghazal; [Доркаς, Dorkas] (Acts 9:36); modern Greek [ζαρκάδι, zarkadi]):
The word “gazelle” does not occur in the King James Version, where 
tsebhi and tsebhiyah, in the 16 passages where they occur, are uniformly 
translated “roe” or “roebuck.” In the Revised Version (British and 
American) the treatment is not uniform. We find “gazelle” without 
comment in Deuteronomy 12:15,22; 14:5; 15:22; 1 Kings 4:23. We 
find “roe,” with marginal note “or gazelle,” in Proverbs 6:5; Song of 
Solomon 2:7,9,17; 4:5; 8:14; Isaiah 13:14. We find “roe” without 
comment in 2 Samuel 2:18; 1 Chronicles 12:8; Song of Solomon 
3:5; 7:3. In the last passage cited, Song of Solomon 7:3, while the 
American Standard Revised Version has no note, the English Revised 
Version refers to Song of Solomon 4:5, where “gazelle” is graven in the 
margin. In the opinion of the writer, the rendering should be “gazelle” in all 
of these passages. It must be acknowledged, however, that the gazelle and 
and the roe-deer are of about the same size, and are sometimes confused with 
each other. The Greek dorkas may refer to either, and in Syria the roe-deer 
is sometimes called ghazal or even wa’l, which is the proper name of the 
Persian wild goat.
The gazelle is an antelope belonging to the bovine family of the even-toed 
ruminants. There are more than twenty species of gazelle, all belonging to 
Asia and Africa. The species found in Syria and Palestine is the Dorcas 
gazelle (Gazella dorcas). It is 2 ft. high at the shoulders. Both sexes have 
unbranched, lyrate, ringed horns, which may be a foot long. The general 
coloration is tawny, but it is creamy white below and on the rump, and has 
a narrow white line from above the eye to the nostril. Several varieties have 
been distinguished, but they will not bear elevation to the rank of species, 
except perhaps Gazelle merilli a form of which a few specimens have been 
obtained from the Judean hills, having distinctly different horns from those 
of the common gazelle. The gazelle is found singly or in small groups on 
the interior plains and the uplands, but not in the high mountains. It is a 
marvel of lightness and grace, and a herd, when alarmed, makes off with 
great rapidity over the roughest country (2 Samuel 2:18; 1 Chronicles 12:8; 
Proverbs 6:5; Song of Solomon 8:14). The beauty 
of the eyes is proverbial. The skin is used for floor coverings, pouches or 
shoes, and the flesh is eaten, though not highly esteemed.

*See DEER; GOAT; ZOOLOGY.*

*Alfred Ely Day*
GAZER

<ga’-zer> ([גָּזֶר, gazer] (in pause)).

See GEZER.

GAZERA

<ga-ze’-ra> ([Γαζερά, Gazera]):

(1) A fortress of Judea (1 Macc 4:15; 7:45); in the Revised Version (British and American) always GAZARA (which see).


GAZEZ

<ga’-zez> ([זֶז, gazez], “shearer”):

(1) A son of Ephah, Caleb’s concubine (1 Chronicles 2:46).

(2) A second Gazez is mentioned in the same verse as a son of Haran, another son of Ephah.

GAZING-STOCK

<gaz’-ing-stok>: This obsolete word occurs twice:

(1) in Nahum 3:6, as the translation of [יָהָר ‚יָרוֹי], “a sight” or “spectacle” (from רָה, “to look,” “see,” also “to look down upon,” “despise,”); “I will .... make thee vile, and will set thee as a gazing-stock,” as one set up to be gazed at, mocked and despised — a form of punishment in olden times; compare “mocking stock” (2 Macc 7:7), and “laughing-stock” still in use. The Hebrew word occurs only here and in Genesis 16:13; 1 Samuel 16:12; Job 7:8; 33:21, in which places it does not have the same bad meaning; for a similar threatening compare Isaiah 14:16; Jeremiah 51:37.

(2) In Hebrews 10:33, it is the translation of theatrizo, “to bring upon the theater,” “to be made a spectacle of,” “made a gazing stock both by reproaches and afflictions”; compare 1 Corinthians 4:9, theatron ginomai, where Paul says the apostles were “made a spectacle
unto the world,” the King James Version margin “(Greek) theater.” The reference in both instances is to the custom of exhibiting criminals, and especially gladiators, men doomed to death, in theaters. “In the morning men are exposed to lions and bears; at mid-day to their spectators; those that kill are exposed to one another; the victor is detained for another slaughter; the conclusion of the fight is death” (Seneca, Ep. vii, quoted by Dr. A. Clarke on 1 Corinthians 4:9). We are apt to forget what the first preachers and professors of Christianity had to endure.

W. L. Walker

GAZITES

<gaz’-its>: Inhabitants of Gaza, who were Philistines when the Israelites came into contact with them (Joshua 13:3; Judges 16:2), but there was an older stratum of population which occupied the place before the invasion of the Philistines, probably of Amorite stock.

GAZZAM

<gaz’-am> ([µΖ‘ , gazzam], “devouring”): Head of a family of Nethinim who returned from exile (Ezr 2:48; Nehemiah 7:51; 1 Esdras 5:31, “Gazera”).

GEBA

<ge’-ba> ([ b” G, gebha`], “hill”):

(1) A town on the Northeast boundary of the territory of Benjamin (Joshua 18:24), given to the Levites (Joshua 21:17; 1 Chronicles 6:60). It stood on the northern frontier of the kingdom of Judah, Geba and Beersheba marking respectively the northern and southern limits (2 Kings 23:8). In 2 Samuel 5:25 “Geba” should be altered to “Gibeon,” which stands in the corresponding passage, 1 Chronicles 14:16. In Judges 20:10,33, 1 Samuel 13:3,16, the Hebrew reads “Geba,” the translation “Gibeah” being due to confusion of the two names. From 1 Samuel 14:5 we gather that Geba stood to the South of the great gorge, Wady Suweinit, commanding the pass at Michmash. This was the scene of Jonathan’s daring enterprise against the Philistines, when, accompanied by his armor-bearer, he accomplished an apparently impossible feat, climbing
the rocky steeps of the gorge to the North and putting the enemy to flight. There can be no doubt that the modern village of Jeba` occupies the ancient site. It stands to the South of Wady Suweinit, looking toward Michmash — modern Mukhmas — with Seneh, the crag on the southern lip of the gorge, in front of it. The distance from Jerusalem is about 6 miles. It was fortified by Asa with materials that his enemy Baasha had used to fortify Ramah against him (1 Kings 15:22). It is named by Isaiah in his description of the terrifying march of the Assyrians upon Jerusalem from the North (10:28 ff). It appears among the cities which were reoccupied by Israel after the Exile (Ezr 2:26, etc.; Nehemiah 11:31).

(2) ([Γαϊβαϊ, Gaibai]): Between a fortress so named and Scythopolis (Beisan), Holofernes pitched his camp (Judith 3:10). On the high road that runs through Jenin, and down the Vale of Jezreel to Beisan, about 2 miles to the South of Sanur, stands the village of Jeba`, with which this fortress may be identified.

W. Ewing

**GEBAL**

<ge’-bal> ([| b ” G] gebhal], “border”; [Bǔβλος, Bublos], and [Bǐβλος, Biblos]; Byblus, modern Jebeil):

(1) An ancient Phoenician city, situated on a bluff of the foothills of Lebanon, overlooking the Mediterranean. It was one of the principal seaports of Phoenicia, and had a small but good harbor for small ships. It lies in lat. 34 degrees 8’, nearly, and about 4 miles North of the river Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim). It was regarded as a holy city by the ancients. Philo mentions the tradition that it was founded by Kronos, and was sacred to the worship of Beltis and, later, of Adonis, whose rites were celebrated yearly at the river of the same name and at its source in the mountain, at Aphheca (see TAMMUZ). Gebal was the center of quite an extensive district, extending from the Eleutherus on the North to the Tamyras on the South, a distance of 60 or 70 miles along the coast. It is mentioned by Joshua (13:5) as the land of the Gebalites (which see) (the King James Version “Giblites”), and the Gebalites are also mentioned in 1 Kings 5:18 (Hebrew 32) as aiding in the construction of Solomon’s temple. The “elders” and the “wise men” of Gebal are among the workmen employed on Tyrian ships (Ezekiel 27:9 the American Revised Version, margin). The earliest mention of Gebal found in history is in the Tell el-Amarna
Letters, which were composed in the first half of the 14th century BC. It had become, in connection with all Phoenicia, a dependency of Egypt in the days of Thothmes III and was under Egyptian governors, but, in the reign of Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton), the Hittites and Amorites from the North and Khabiri from the South attacked the territory of Gebal, and its governor wrote letters to Amenhotep, calling for help. There are over 60 of these, describing the desperate condition of the city and of its governor, Ribaddi, who was expelled and took refuge in Beirut, but afterward regained his capital only to be besieged and lose all his dependencies, and finally to fall into the hands of the enemy. Gebal afterward became independent, as is shown by the records of Ramses IX (1442-1423 BC) and of Ramses XII, for its king retained the emissaries of the former 17 years in captivity, and treated a trusted agent of the latter with scant civility. Its king at this time was Zakkar-Baal, and kings of Gebal are mentioned in the Assyrian records, one paying tribute to Ashurnazir-pal (circa 887 BC) and another to Sennacherib (705-680). The latter king was Uru-melek, and kings of Gebal are mentioned in connection with other Phoenician cities under Persian rule. The city submitted to Alexander the Great without opposition, and furnished a fleet to aid him in the siege of Tyre (332). Strabo refers to it as a town of note in the days of Pompey (xvi.2,17), and it is frequently mentioned in Phoenician (CIS, 1) and Assyrian inscriptions in the forms Gubal and Gubli (COT, I, 174).

(2) ([Ґ b][Gb][b] gebhal; [Γοβολίτις, Gobolitis]): A district Southeast of the Dead Sea, which is referred to in Psalm 83:7 (Hebrew 8) in connection with Moab, Ammon, Amalek and others, as making a covenant together against Israel (compare 1 Macc 5). Robinson (BR, II, 154) found the name Jebal still applied to this region, and Josephus (Ant., II, i, 2) speaks of a Gebalitis as forming part of Idumaea. It is a hilly region, as the modern name signifies, and includes the towns of Shobek and Tolfieh.

H. Porter

GEBALITES

<ge’-bal-its> ([µ yl b ŧ” , ha-gibhlím]): Inhabitants of GEBAL (which see). According to the present text of Joshua 13:5, “the land of the Gebalites” was given to Israel as part of its future territory. But it was never occupied by the Israelites. Septuagint, however, has a very different
reading, indicating an early corruption of the text. Perhaps with many modern scholars it is better to read “to the borders of the Gebalites.”

In 1 Kings 5:18 the King James Version translates this word “stone-squerers,” the King James Version margin gives “Giblites,” and the Revised Version (British and American) “Gebalites,” as workmen who, with the men of Solomon and of Hiram, fashioned the stones for the temple. Here also the text is doubtful, and some by a slight change would read: “and made a border for them” (i.e. for the stones). In Ezekiel 27:9 the men of Gebal are described as the “calkers” of the ships of Tyre and Sidon.

George Rice Hovey

GEBER

<ge’-ber> ([ר ג, gebher], “man,” “strong one”):

(1) According to 1 Kings 4:13 the King James Version the father of one of the 12 officers who provided food for Solomon and his household (but here the Revised Version (British and American) “Ben-geber”). His district lay to the Northeast of Jordan.

(2) Another, and the last in the list of Solomon’s commissariat officers (1 Kings 4:19). His district was also East of the Jordan, but probably to the South of that named in connection with the official of 4:13 (the Revised Version (British and American) “Ben-geber”). According to the rendering of English Versions of the Bible, he is said to have been “the only officer that was in the land.” Unless the text, which presents some difficulties, is corrupt, as some suppose, it probably means that this large region was assigned to one official because less able than the others to furnish the required supplies.

Benjamin Reno Downer

GEBIM

<ge’-bim> ([ם ג, gebhim], “trenches”): A place named only in Isaiah 10:31. Some would place it at Jebia, identifying it with the Geba of Eusebius, 5 Roman miles from Gophna (modern Jifneh), on the way to Shechem. Its place, however, in the order of names, after Anathoth, seems
to point to some position South of that village, to the Northeast of Jerusalem.

**GECKO**

<gek’-o> (the Revised Version (British and American) for [הַקַּנָּה] ‘anaqah], only in Leviticus11:30; Septuagint [μυγάλη, mugale], “shrew mouse” or “field mouse”; the King James Version ferret): Probably a shrew or a field mouse.

*See FERRET; LIZARD; SPIDER.*

**GEDALIAH**

<ged-a-li’-a> ([יהֵלַג] gedalyah]; except in 1 Chronicles 25:3,9 and Jeremiah 38:1, where it is [יהֵלַג] gedhalyahu], “Yah(u) is great”):

1. HIS APPOINTMENT AS GOVERNOR IN JUDAH:

After the destruction of Jerusalem and the carrying away captive of the Jews to Babylon (586 BC), Gedaliah was appointed by Nebuchadnezzar governor over the poor Jews who had been left in the land to be vinedressers and husbandmen (2 Kings 25:12,22). To his charge were committed also some royal princesses (Jeremiah 43:6) and courtiers (Jeremiah 41:16) who had been allowed to remain as unlikely to cause any trouble. Gedaliah fixed his residence at Mizpah, a few miles Northwest of Jerusalem. Here he was joined by Jeremiah (40:6).

2. HIS CONCILIATORY SPIRIT AND WISE RULE:

The Jewish soldiers who had escaped capture, having heard that the Chaldeans had departed, and that Gedaliah, one of their own nation, had been appointed governor in Judah, came with Ishmael, Johanan and other officers at their head, to Gedaliah at Mizpah (2 Kings 25:23,14; Jeremiah 40:7-10). The governor assured them that they need have no fear of vengeance from their conquerors, and promised them on oath
protection and security, if they would remain and cultivate the land and become the peaceful subjects of the king of Babylon. This assurance led to a general gathering around Gedaliah of refugees from all the neighboring countries (Jeremiah 40:11,12). For two months (some think longer) Gedaliah’s beneficent and wise rule did much to consolidate affairs in Judah and to inspire the feeble remnant of his countrymen with heart and hope.

3. HIS TREACHEROUS ASSASSINATION:

But evil spirits were at work against him. Baalis, king of Ammon, had determined upon his life (Jeremiah 40:13-16). The peaceful and popular rule which was being established by the good governor stood in the way of the accomplishment of any plan of conquest he entertained. Baalis found a ready instrument for his murderous design in Ishmael who, as one of royal birth and in the counsels of the king (Jeremiah 41:1), was doubtless jealous of the man who had been chosen governor in preference to himself. Gedaliah was informed by Johanan and the other captains of the plot to assassinate him, and Johanan at a private interview expressed to him a strong desire to go himself and slay Ishmael secretly, declaring that the safety of the Jews depended upon the life of the governor. But Gedaliah refused to allow Johanan to anticipate his enemy, believing, in the generosity of his heart, that Ishmael was not capable of such an act of treachery. He soon found, however, that his confidence had been sadly misplaced. Ishmael, with ten of his companions, came on a visit to him to Mizpah, and after they had been hospitably entertained they fell upon their good host and murdered him, along with all the Jewish and the Chaldean soldiers whom he had with him for order and protection (2 Kings 25:25; Jeremiah 41:1-3). They then cast the bodies of their victims into the cistern which Asa had made (Jeremiah 41:9). Ishmael was pursued and overtaken by Johanan, but he succeeded in effecting his escape to the Ammonites (Jeremiah 41:11-15). Then Johanan and the other captains, afraid lest the Chaldeans should avenge upon them the murder of the governor (Jeremiah 41:16-18), and against the earnest entreaties of Jeremiah (chapter 42), fled to Egypt, taking the prophet and the Jewish remnant with them (43:5-7). In memory of the date of Gedaliah’s assassination the Jews kept a fast (which is still retained in the Jewish calendar) on the 3rd day of the 7th month, Tishri (Zec 7:5; 8:19).
4. HIS NOBLE CHARACTER:
The narratives reveal Gedaliah in a very attractive light, as one who possessed the confidence alike of his own people and their conquerors; a man of rare wisdom and tact, and of upright, transparent character, whose kindly nature and generous disposition would not allow him to think evil of a brother; a man altogether worthy of the esteem in which he was held by succeeding generations of his fellow-countrymen.

(2) (gedhalyahu): Son of Jeduthun, and instrumental leader of the 2nd of the 24 choirs in the Levitical orchestra (1 Chronicles 25:3,1).

(3) A priest of the “sons of Jeshua,” in the time of Ezra, who had married a foreign woman (Ezr 10:18).

(4) (gedhalyahu): Son of Pashhur (who beat Jeremiah and put him in the stocks, Jeremiah 20:1-6), and one of the chiefs of Jerusalem who, with the sanction of the king, Zedekiah, took Jeremiah and let him down with cords into a cistern where he sank in the mud (38:1,4-6).

(5) Grandfather of Zephaniah the prophet, and grandson of Hezekiah, probably the king (Zephaniah 1:1).

James Crichton

GEDDUR

<ged’-ur> ([Gεδόυρ, Geddour]): Head of a family of temple-servants (1 Esdras 5:30), corresponding to Gahar of Ezr 2:47 and Nehemiah 7:49.

GEDEON

<ged’-e-on> ([Hebrews 11:32 the King James Version]).

See GIDEON.

GEDER

<ge’-der> ([גדר, gedher]): A royal city of the Canaanites taken by Joshua along with Lachish, Eglon, Gezer, Debir and Hormah (Joshua 12:13 f). It may be the city called “Beth-gader” in 1 Chronicles 2:51, and the birthplace of Baal-hanan, who had charge of David’s olives and sycamores (27:28); unidentified.
GEDERAH; GEDERATHITE

<ge-de’-ra>, <ge-de’-ra-thit> ([ḥ r d ḫ ” , ha-gedherah], “the enclosed place”): A town in the Shephelah of Judah, named with Socoh, Azekah, Shaaraim and Adithaim (Joshua 15:36). In 1 Chronicles 4:23 the Revised Version (British and American) reads, “the inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah,” for the King James Version, “those that dwelt among plants and hedges.” It is probably represented by Khirbet Jadireh, about 3 miles Southwest of Gezer. “Gederathite,” applied to Jozabad (1 Chronicles 12:4), probably meant an inhabitant of this place.

GEDERITE

<ge’-der-it>, <ge-de’-rit> ([yr ḫ gedheri]): Inhabitant of GEDER, which see (1 Chronicles 27:28).

GEDEROTH

<ged’-e-roth>, <ge-de’-roth> ([t ṣ ḫ gedheroth]): A town in the Shephelah of Judah, named with Kithlish, Beth-dagon, Naamah and Makkedah (Joshua 15:41). It is mentioned along with Bethshemesh and Aijalon as taken by the Philistines in the reign of Ahaz (2 Chronicles 28:18). It possibly corresponds with the “Kidron” of 1 Macc 15:39,41; 16:9. Eusebius, Onomasticon places a very large village named Gedrom 10 Roman miles from Lydda on the road to Eleutheropolis. This points to Katrah, Southeast of Yebnah.

GEDEROTHAIM

<ged-e-ro-tha’-im> ([μ y t ” r ḫ gedherathayim], “place of enclosures”): Stands as the 15th in a list which professes to give only the names of 14 cities in the Judean Shephelah (Joshua 15:36). the King James Version margin suggests that we might read “or” for “and” after Gederah, but this is impossible. Septuagint reads, “and its cattle shelters.” Probably, however, the name has arisen by dittography from the preceding GEDERAH (which see).
GEDOR

<ge’-dor> ([ג’ יד’] gedhor; Codex Vaticanus, [Γέδδωρ, Geddoor], Codex Alexandrinus, [Γέδδωρ, Gedor]):

(1) A town in the mountains of Judah, named with Halhul and Beth-zur (Joshua 15:58). It seems to be referred to by Eusebius as Gadeira (Onomasticon, under the word), which he identifies with Gaidora (Jerome calls it Gadora), a village in the borders of Jerusalem, near the terebinth. It is probably represented today by Khirbet Jedur, about 7 miles North of Hebron (PEF, III, 313, Sh XXI).

(2) Among the Benjamites who joined David at Ziklag were the sons of Jeroham of Gedor (1 Chronicles 12:7). No trace of this name is found in the territory of Benjamin. It may be identical with (1).

(3) The Simeonites are said to have gone to the entering in of Gedor in search of pasture for their flocks. They smote and expelled the Meunim, “and dwelt in their stead” (1 Chronicles 4:39 ff). Here the Septuagint reads Gerar, and this is probably correct.

(4) A family in Judah (1 Chronicles 4:4).

(5) An ancestor of Saul (1 Chronicles 8:31).

W. Ewing

GE-HARASHIM

<ge-ha-ra’-shim> ([עפר]a Ge’charashim): In 1 Chronicles 4:14, the King James Version renders “valley of Charashim.” In Nehemiah 11:35, English Versions of the Bible renders “valley of craftsmen”; here it is named with Lod and Ono. Something of the name perhaps survives in Khirbet Hirsa, East of Lydda.

GEHAZI

<ge-ha’-zi> ([ג’ יזג] gechazi, except in 2 Kings 4:31; 5:25; 8:4,5, where it is [ג’ יזג] gechazi], perhaps “valley of vision”): The confidential servant of Elisha. Various words are used to denote his relation to his master. He is generally called Elisha’s “boy” ([ר [ ח’] , na’ar]), servant or personal attendant; he calls himself (5:25) his master’s servant or slave.
([d b [ , `ebhedh]), and if the reference be to him in 4:43 the Revised Version, margin, he receives the designation “minister” ([t r `em] meshareth]), or chief servant of Elisha.

1. HIS READY SERVICE:

Mention is made of him on three different occasions. He is first brought under notice in the story of the wealthy Shunammite (2 Kings 4:8-37) who provided in her house special accommodation for Elisha, which suited his simple tastes, and of which he availed himself as often as he passed that way. By command of his master, Gehazi called the Shunammite, that she might be rewarded by the prophet for her liberal hospitality. Failing to elicit from the lady a desire for any particular favor, and being himself at a loss to know how to repay her kindness, Elisha consulted with his servant, whose quick perception enabled him to indicate to his master the gift that would satisfy the great woman’s heart. When on the death of her child the Shunammite sought out the man of God at Carmel, and in the intensity of her grief laid hold of the prophet’s feet, “Gehazi came near to thrust her away” (2 Kings 4:27) — perhaps not so much from want of sympathy with the woman as from a desire to protect his master from what he considered a rude importunity. Then Elisha, who had discovered of himself (2 Kings 4:27), from what the woman had said (2 Kings 4:28), the cause of her sorrow, directed Gehazi, as a preliminary measure, to go at once to Shunem and lay his staff upon the face of the dead child. Gehazi did so, but the child was “not awaked.”

In this narrative Gehazi appears in a favorable light, as a willing, efficient servant, jealous of his master’s honor; a man of quick observation, whose advice was worth asking in practical affairs.

2. HIS GRIEVIOUS SIN:

Gehazi, however, reveals himself in a different character in connection with the healing of Naaman (2 Kings 5:20-27). As soon as the Syrian general had taken his departure with his retinue from the house of Elisha, the covetous spirit of Gehazi, which had been awakened by the sight of the costly presents the prophet had refused, was no longer able to restrain itself. Running after Naaman, Gehazi begged in the prophet’s name a talent of silver (400 pounds = $2,000) and two changes of raiment, alleging, as a specious reason for Elisha’s change of mind, the arrival at his master’s
house of two poor scholars of the prophet, who would require help and maintenance. Naaman, glad to have the opportunity he desired of showing his gratitude to Elisha, urged Gehazi to take two talents and sent two servants with him to carry the money and the garments. When they came to the hill in the neighborhood of the prophet’s house, Gehazi dismissed the men and concealed the treasure. Thereafter, with a bold front, as if he had been attending to his ordinary duties, he appeared before his master who at once inquired, “Whence, Gehazi?” (Hebrew). On receiving the ready answer that he had not been anywhere, Elisha, who felt sure that the suspicion he entertained regarding his beloved servant, his very “heart” (2 Kings 5:26), was well grounded, sternly rebuked him for the dishonor he had brought upon God’s cause, and called down upon him and his family forever the loathsome disease of the man whose treasures he had obtained by his shameful lie. “And he went out from his presence a leper as white as snow.”

By this narrative confidence in Gehazi is somewhat unexpectedly and rudely shaken. The active, zealous servant stands confessed a liar and a thief. Gehazi’s sin branched out in different directions. By his falsehood he deceived Naaman and misrepresented Elisha; he not only told a lie, but told a lie about another man, and that man his master and friend. Further, he brought true religion into disrepute; for it was not a time (2 Kings 5:26) for a servant of God to allow any commercial idea to be associated with the prophet’s work in the mind of the Syrian general to whom God’s power had been so strikingly manifested and when many for worldly gain pretended to be prophets. But while Gehazi’s sin had ats various ramifications, its one root was covetousness, “the love of money (which) is a root of all kinds of evil” (1 Timothy 6:10).

3. HIS PROBABLE REPENTANCE:

Once more Gehazi is mentioned (2 Kings 8:1-6) as having been summoned, leper though he was, by King Jehoram to give him an account of all the great things Elisha had done. And when he came to the story of the restoration of the Shunammite’s child to life, the woman herself appeared before the king along with her son, craving to be reinstated in her house and land of which she had been dispossessed during her seven years’ absence from her native country in a time of famine. Gehazi testified to the identity of both mother and son, with the result that the king at once
ordered the restoration not only of all her former possessions, but also of all the profits her land had yielded during her sojourn in Philistia.

The appearance and conduct of Gehazi on this occasion give some ground for the hope that he had repented of his sin and could now be trusted to speak the truth; and the pleasure he seemed to take in rehearsing the wonderful deeds of a master who, though kind and indulgent to a stranger, was hard upon him, may even warrant the belief that in his earlier days there was some good thing in him toward his master’s God. If also, as has been indicated above, the word used in 2 Kings 4:43 ([meshareth]) applies to him — the same as is applied to Elisha (1 Kings 19:21) — we may be the more readily inclined to see in the history of Gehazi how one besetting sin may prevent a man from taking his natural place in the succession of God’s prophets. Let us hope, however, that though Gehazi became a “lost leader,” “just for a handful of silver,” he was yet saved by a true repentance from becoming a lost soul.

James Crichton

GEHENNA

<ga-hen’-a> ([γεήννα, geenna] (see Grimm-Thayer, under the word)): Gehenna is a transliteration from the Aramaic form of the Hebrew ge-hinnom, “valley of Hinnom.” This latter form, however, is rare in the Old Testament, the prevailing name being “the valley of the son of Hinnom.” Septuagint usually translates; where it transliterates the form is different from Gehenna and varies. In the New Testament the correct form is Gee’nna with the accent on the penult, not Ge’enna. There is no reason to assume that Hinnom is other than a plain patronymic, although it has been proposed to find in it the corruption of the name of an idol (EB, II, 2071). In the New Testament (King James Version margin) Gehenna occurs in Matthew 5:22,29,30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15,33; Mark 9:43,15,47; Luke 12:5; Jas 3:6. In all of these it designates the place of eternal punishment of the wicked, generally in connection with the final judgment. It is associated with fire as the source of torment. Both body and soul are cast into it. This is not to be explained on the principle that the New Testament speaks metaphorically of the state after death in terms of the body; it presupposes the resurrection. In the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Gehenna is rendered by “hell” (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT). That “the valley of Hinnom” became the technical designation for the place of final punishment
was due to two causes. In the first place the valley had been the seat of the idolatrous worship of Molech, to whom children were immolated by fire (2 Chronicles 28:3; 33:6). Secondly, on account of these practices the place was defiled by King Josiah (2 Kings 23:10), and became in consequence associated in prophecy with the judgment to be visited upon the people (Jeremiah 7:32). The fact, also, that the city’s offal was collected there may have helped to render the name synonymous with extreme defilement. Topographically the identification of the valley of Hinnom is still uncertain. It has been in turn identified with the depression on the western and southern side of Jerusalem, with the middle valley, and with the valley to the E. Compare EB, II, 2071; DCG, I, 636; RE3, VI.

**Geerhardus Vos**

**GELILOTH**

<ge-li’-loth> ([t wOyl geliloth]): This word is used for “districts” or “circuits” perhaps indicating the different parts subject to the several lords of the Philistines (Joshua 13:2, the King James Version “borders,” the Revised Version (British and American) “regions”); for the quarter of the Jordan valley where the eastern tribes built the altar of Ed (Joshua 22:10 f; the King James Version “border of,” the Revised Version (British and American) “region about,” Jordan); and apparently, for the whole of Philistia (Joel 3:4, the King James Version “coasts of Palestine,” the Revised Version (British and American) “regions of Philistia”). But in Joshua 18:17, it is clearly used as a place-name. Geliloth lay on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin which passed En-shemesh (probably `Ain el-Chod, about 2 miles East of Jerusalem), “and went out to Geliloth, which is over against the ascent of Adummim.” From this point it “went down” toward the plain. The place cannot therefore be identified with Gilgal in the Jordan valley. Some point on the road leading from Jericho to Tal`at ed-Dumm, about 6 miles from Jerusalem, was probably intended, but no identification is possible.

**W. Ewing**

**GEM**

<jem> (Proverbs 26:8, the English Revised Version “a bag of gems,”). See STONES, PRECIOUS.
GEMALLI

<ge-mal’-i> ([yL in” ג gemalli], “camel owner”): Father of the spy Ammiel from the tribe of Daniel (<sup>5</sup>Numbers 13:12), who was one of those sent by Moses to spy out the land of Canaan.

GEMARA

<ge-ma’-ra>.

See TALMUD.

GEMARIAH

<gem-a-ri’-a> ([ו יר מ” ג gemaryahu], [ה יר מ” ג gemaryah], “Yahweh hath accomplished”):

(1) Son of Shaphan the scribe, one of the princes, from whose chamber Baruch read Jeremiah’s prophecies to the people. He, with others, sought to stay Jehoiakim from burning the roll (<sup>8</sup>Jeremiah 36:10,11,12,25).

(2) Son of Hilkiah, one of Zedekiah’s ambassadors to Babylon, by whom Jeremiah sent his letter to the captives (<sup>5</sup>Jeremiah 29:3).

GEMATRIA

<ge-ma’-tri-a>.

See NUMBERS; GAMES.

GENDER

<jen’-der> ([ד l " y, yaladh], [ר b “ [ ; `abhar]; [γεννάω, gennao]): “Gender” is an abbreviation of “engender.” In <sup>9</sup>Job 38:29 yaladh (common for “to bear,” “to bring forth”) is translated “gender” (after Wycliff), the Revised Version (British and American) “The hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it?” margin “given it birth.” In 21:10 we have `abhar (either the Piel of `abhar, “to pass over,” etc., or of a separate word meaning “to bear,” “to be fruitful”), translated “gendereth,” “Their bull gendereth, and faileth not”; in Leviticus19:19, rabha’, “to lie down with,” is used of cattle gendering. In <sup>9</sup>Galatians 4:24 the King James Version we have “Mount Sinai, which gendereth (gennoa, “to beget”) to
bondage,” the Revised Version (British and American) “bearing children unto bondage” (like Hagar, Abraham’s bondwoman), and in 2 Timothy 2:23, which “gender strifes,” i.e. beget them.

W. L. Walker

GENEALOGY

<je-na-al’-o-ji>, <jén-a-al’-o-ji>:

The Old Testament translates (once, Nehemiah 7:5) the noun [כָּלַי, yachas; [כָּלַי הַר שֵּׁכֶר, cepher ha-yachas], “book of the genealogy”; also translates a denominate verb in Hithpael, [כָּלַי, yachas], “sprout” “grow” (compare family “tree”); [כָּלַי הַר הָיתִית, hithyaches], “genealogy”; the idea is conveyed in other phrases, as [תֵּפֶל הַר שֵּׁכֶר, toledhoth], “book of the generations,” or simply [תֵּפֶל הַר, toledhoth], “generations.” In the New Testament it transliterates [γενεαλογία, genealogia], “account of descent,” 1 Timothy 1:4; Titus 3:9. In Matthew 1:1, [βιβλος γενέσεως, biblos geneseos], “book of the generation” of Jesus Christ, is rendered in the American Revised Version, margin “the genealogy of Jesus Christ”; a family register, or register of families, as 1 Chronicles 4:33, etc.; the tracing backward or forward of the line of ancestry of individual, family, tribe, or nation; pedigree. In Timothy and Titus refers probably to the Gnostic (or similar) lists of successive emanations from Deity in the development of created existence.

2. BIBLICAL REFERENCES:

According to the Old Testament, the genealogical interest dates back to the beginnings of sacred history. It appears in the early genealogical tables of Genesis 5; 10; 46, etc.; in Exodus 6:14-27, where the sons of Reuben, Simeon and especially Levi, are given; in Numbers 1:2; 26:2-51, where the poll of fighting men is made on genealogical principles; in Numbers 2:2, where the positions on the march and in camp are determined by tribes and families; in David’s division of priests and Levites into courses and companies (1 Chronicles 6-9); is referred to in the account of Jeroboam’s reign (2 Chronicles 12:15 margin, “the words of Iddo, after the manner of genealogies”); is made prominent in Hezekiah’s reforms when he reckoned the whole nation by genealogies (1 Chronicles 4:41; 2
Chronicles 31:16-19); is seen in Jotham’s reign when the Reubenites and Gadites are reckoned genealogically (<130517>1 Chronicles 5:17). Zerubbabel took a census, and settled the returning exiles according to their genealogies (<130319>1 Chronicles 3:19-24; 1 Chronicles 9; Ezr 2; Nehemiah 7; 11; 12). With the rigid exclusion of all foreign intermixtures by the leaders of the Restoration (Ezr 10; Nehemiah 10:30; 13:23-31), the genealogical interest naturally deepened until it reached its climax, perhaps in the time of Christ and up to the destruction of Jerusalem. Josephus, in the opening of his Life, states that his own pedigree was registered in the public records. Many families in Christ’s time clearly possessed such lists (Luke 1:5, etc.). The affirmed, reiterated and unquestioned Davidic descent of Christ in the New Testament, with His explicit genealogies (Matthew 1:1-17; Luke 3:23-38); Paul’s statement of his own descent; Barnabas’ Levitical descent, are cases in point. Davididae, descendants of David, are found as late as the Roman period. There is a tradition that Herod I destroyed the genealogical lists at Jerusalem to strengthen his own seat, but more probably they persisted until the destruction of Jerusalem.

3. IMPORTANCE OF GENEALOGIES:

Genealogical accuracy, always of interest both to primitive and more highly civilized peoples, was made especially important by the facts that the land was promised to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, that the priesthood was exclusively hereditary, that the royal succession of Judah lay in the Davidic house, that the division and occupation of the land was according to tribes, families and fathers’ houses; and for the Davididae, at least, that the Messiah was to be of the house of David. The exile and return, which fixed indelibly in the Jewish mind the ideas of monotheism, and of the selection and sacred mission of Israel, also fixed and deepened the genealogical idea, prominently so in the various assignments by families, and in the rejection in various ways of those who could not prove their genealogies. But it seems extreme to date, as with many modern critics, its real cultivation from this time. In the importance attached to genealogies the Hebrew resembles many other ancient literatures, notably the Egyptian Greek, and Arabic, but also including Romans, Kelts, Saxons, the earliest history naturally being drawn upon genealogical as well as on annaline lines. A modern tendency to overestimate the likeness and underestimate the unlikeness of the Scripture to its undoubtedly cognate
literatures finds in the voluminous artificial genealogical material, which
grew up in Arabia after the time of the caliph Omar, an almost exact
analogue to the genealogical interest at the time of the return. This,
however, is on the assumption of the late date of most of the genealogical
material in the older New Testament books, and rests in turn on the
assumption that the progress of religious thought and life in Israel was
essentially the same as in all other countries; an evolutionary development,
practically, if not theoretically, purely naturalistic in its genesis and
progress.

4. THEIR HISTORICAL VALUE:
The direct historical value of the Scripture genealogies is variously
estimated. The critically reconstructive school finds them chiefly in the late
(priestly) strata of the early books, and dates Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah
(our fullest sources) about 300 BC, holding it to be a priestly
reconstruction of the national history wrought with great freedom by the
“Chronicler.” Upon this hypothesis the chief value of the genealogies is as
a mirror of the mind and ideas of their authors or recorders, a treasury of
reflections on the geographical, ethnological and genealogical status as
believed in at their time, and a study of the effect of naive and exaggerated
patriotism dealing with the supposed facts of national life, or else, in the
extreme instance, a highly interesting example of bold and inventive
juggling with facts by men with a theory, in this particular case a priestly
one, as with the “Chronicler.” To more conservative scholars who accept
the Old Testament at its face value, the genealogies are a rich mine of
historical, personal and ethnographic, as well as religious, information,
whose working, however, is much hindered by the inevitable corruption of
the text, and by our lack of correlative explanatory information. Much
interesting illustrative matter may be looked for from such archaeological
explorations as those at Gezer and elsewhere under the Palestine
Exploration Society, the names on the pottery throwing light on the name-
lists in Chronicles, and the similar discoveries on the supposed site of
Ahab’s palace in Samaria, which also illustrate the conflict between Baal
and Yahweh worship by the proportion of the proper names compounded
by “Baal” or “Jah” (see Macalister, Bible Sidelights from Gezer, 150 ff;
PEF, 1905, 243, 328; Harvard Theological Review, 1911). In spite of all
such illustrative data, however, the genealogies must necessarily continue
to present many insoluble problems. A great desideratum is a careful and
systematic study of the whole question by some modern conservative scholar endowed with the patience and insight of the late Lord A.C. Hervey, and equipped with the fruits of the latest discoveries. While much curious and suggestive information may be derived from an intensive study of the names and relationships in the genealogies (although here the student needs to watch his theories), their greatest present value lies in the picture they present of the large-hearted cosmopolitanism, or international brotherliness, in the older ones, notably Genesis 10, recognizing so clearly that God hath made of one all nations to dwell on the earth; and, as they progress, in the successive selection and narrowing as their lines converge upon the Messiah.

5. PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION:

In the evaluation and interpretation of the genealogies, certain facts and principles must be held in mind.

(1) Lists of names necessarily suffer more in transmission than other literature, since there is almost no connectional suggestion as to their real form. Divergences in different versions, or in different stages, of the same genealogy are therefore to be looked for, with many tangles hard to unravel, and it is precisely at this point that analytic and constructive criticism needs to proceed most modestly and restrain any possible tendency unduly to theorize.

(2) Frequently in the Scriptural lists names of nations, countries, cities, districts or clans are found mingled with the names of individuals. This is natural, either as the personification of the clan or nation under the name of its chief, or chief progenitor, or as the designation of the individual clan, family or nation, from its location, so common among many nations. Many of the cases where this occurs are so obvious that the rule may not be unsafe to consider all names as probably standing for individuals where the larger geographical or other reference is not unmistakably clear. This is undoubtedly the intent and understanding of those who transmitted and received them.

(3) It is not necessary to assume that the ancestors of various tribes or families are eponymous, even though otherwise unknown. The Scriptural explanation of the formation of tribes by the expansion and division of families is not improbable, and is entitled to a certain presumption of correctness. Furthermore, it is extremely difficult to
establish a stopping-point for the application of the eponymous theory; under its spell the sons of Jacob disappear, and Jacob, Isaac and even Abraham become questionable.

(4) The present quite popular similar assumption that personal details in the genealogy stand for details of tribal history, as, for instance, the taking of a concubine means rather an alliance with, or absorption of, an inferior tribe or clan, is a fascinating and far-reaching generalization, but it lacks confirmation, and would make of the Scripture an allegorical enigma in which historical personages and events, personified peoples or countries, and imaginary ancestors are mingled in inextricable confusion.

(5) Scriptural genealogies are often given a regular number of generations by omitting various intermediate steps. The genealogies of Jesus, for instance, cover 42 generations, in 3 subdivisions of 14 each. Other instances are found in the Old Testament, where the regularity or symmetry is clearly intentional. Instance Jacob’s 70 descendants, and the 70 nations of Genesis 10. This has in modern eyes an artificial look, but by no means necessarily involves violence done to the facts under the genealogist’s purview, and is readily and creditably accounted for by his conceptions and purposes. The theory that in some cases the requisite number has been built up by the insertion of imaginary names (see Curtis, ICC, “Chronicles,” 135) has another aspect, and does not seem necessary to account for the facts, or to have sufficient facts to sustain it. See 21:5,

(6) below. It involves a view of the mental and moral equipment and point of view of the Chronicler in particular, which would not seem to leave him many shreds of either historical, or “religious” value, and which a sounder criticism will surely very materially modify.

(6) Much perplexity and confusion is avoided by remembering that other modes of entrance into the family, clan, tribe or nation obtained than that by birth: capture, adoption, the substitution of one clan for another just become extinct, marriage. Hence, “son of,” “father of,” “begat,” have broader technical meanings, indicating adoptive or official connection or “descent,” as well as actual consanguinity, nearer or remote, “son” also meaning “grandson,” “great-grandson,” etc. Instance Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, of the tribe of Judah, styled
(1 Chronicles 2:18) a descendant of Hezron and son of Hur, but also, in token of his original descent, called the Kenizzite or “son of Kenaz” (Joshua 15:17), etc. Similarly, where in an earlier genealogy a clan or individual is assigned to a certain tribe, and in a later to another, it has been “grafted in.” But while these methods of accretion clearly obtained, the nations freely absorbing neighboring or surrounding peoples, families, or persons, families likewise absorbing individuals, as in American Indian, and many other tribes; yet, as in them, the descent and connection by birth constituted the main line, and in any given case has the presumption unless clear facts to the contrary exist.

(7) The repetition of the same name in the same genealogy, as in that of the high priests (1 Chronicles 6:1-15), rouses “suspicion” in some minds, but unnecessarily. It is very natural, and not uncommon, to find grandfathers and grandsons, especially among the Hebrews, receiving the same name (Luke 1:59). This would be especially to be expected in a hereditary caste or office like the priesthood.

(8) The existence of the same name in different genealogies is not uncommon, and neither implies nor should cause confusion.

(9) The omission of one or many links in the succession, often clearly caused by the desire for symmetry, is frequent where the cause is unknown, the writers being careful only to indicate the connection more or less generally, without feeling bound to follow every step. Tribes were divided into families, and families into fathers’ houses; tribe, family and fathers’ house regularly constituting links in a formal genealogy, while between them and the person to be identified any or all links may be omitted. In similar fashion, there is an absence of any care to keep the successive generations absolutely distinct in a formal fashion, son and grandson being designated as alike “son” of the same ancestor. Genesis 46:21, for instance, contains grandsons as well as sons of Benjamin, Bela, Becher, Ashbel, Gera, Nanman, Ehi, etc. This would be especially true where the son as well as the father became founder of a house. Some confusion is occasionally caused by the lack of rigid attention to precise terminology, a characteristic of the Hebrew mind. Strictly the tribe, [f b y ʃ eʃbheT] (in the Priestly Code (P), [h F m” , maTTeh]), is the larger subdivision, then the clan, [h j P v jš mi mishpachah], “family,” and then the “house” or “fathers’ house,”
But sometimes a “fathers’ house” is a tribe (Numbers 17:6), or a clan (1 Chronicles 24:6). In this connection it is to be remembered again that sequence of generations often has to do with families rather than with individuals, and represents the succession to the inheritance or headship, rather than the actual relationship of father and son.

(10) Genealogies are of two forms, the descending, as Genesis 10: “The sons of Japheth: Gomer,” etc.; “The sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz,” etc.; and the ascending, Ezr 7:1 ff: “Ezra, the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah, the son of Hilkiah,” etc. The descending are the usual.

(11) Feminine names are occasionally found, where there is anything remarkable about them, as Sarai and Milcah (Genesis 11:29), Rebekah (Genesis 22:23), etc.; or where any right or property is transmitted through them, as the daughters of Zelophehad, who claimed and were accorded “a possession among the brethren of (their) father” (Numbers 26:33; 27:1-11), etc. In such cases as Azubah and Ephrath, successive wives of Caleb (1 Chronicles 2:18-20), many modern critics find tribal history enshrined in this case, “Caleb” or “dog” tribe having removed from Azubah, “deserted” to Ephrathah, Bethlehem, in Northern Judah. But the principle is not, and cannot be, carried Out consistently.

(12) The state of the text is such, especially in Chronicles, that it is not easy, or rather not possible, to construct a complete genealogical table after the modern form. Names and words have dropped out, and other names have been changed, so that the connection is often difficult and sometimes impossible to trace. The different genealogies also represent different stages in the history and, at many places, cannot with any knowledge now at our command be completely adjusted to each other, just as geographical notices at different periods must necessarily be inconsistent.

(13) In the present state of our knowledge, and of the text, and also considering the large and vague chronological methods of the Hebrews, the genealogies can give us comparatively little chronological assistance. The uncertainty as to the actual length of a generation, and the custom of frequently omitting links in the descent, increases the difficulty; so that unless they possess special marks of completeness, or
have outstanding historical relationships which determine or corroborate them, or several parallel genealogies confirm each other, they must be used with great caution. Their interest is historical, biographical, successional or hereditary, rather than chronological.

6. PRINCIPLES OF COMPILATION:

The principal genealogical material of the Old Testament is found in Genesis 5; 10; 11; 22; 25; 29; 30; 35; 36; 46; Exodus 6; Numbers 1; 2; 7; 10; 13; 26; 34; scattered notices in Josh, Ruth, 1 Sam; 2 Samuel 3; 5; 23; 1 Kings 4; 1 Chronicles 1 through 9; 11; 12; 15; 23 through 27; 2 Chronicles 23; 29; Ezr 2; 7; 10; Nehemiah 3; 7; 10; 11; 12. The genealogies of our Lord (Matthew 1:1-17; Luke 3:23-38) are the only New Testament material. The Old Testament and New Testament genealogies bring the record down from the creation to the birth of Christ. After tracing the descent from Adam to Jacob, incidentally (Genesis 10) giving the pedigree of the various nations within their purview, the Hebrew genealogists give the pedigree of the twelve tribes. As was to be expected, those tribes, which in the developing history assumed greater prominence, received the chief attention. Daniel is carried down but 1 generation, and credited with but 1 descendant; Zebulun 1 generation, 3 sons; Naphtali 1 generation, 4 sons; Issachar 4 generations, 15 descendants; Manasseh 4 generations, 39 descendants; Asher 7 generations, 40 descendants; Reuben 8 (?) generations, 22 descendants; Gad 10 generations, 28 descendants; Ephraim 14 (?) generations, 25 descendants. Levi, perhaps first as the priestly tribe, Judah next as the royal, Benjamin as most closely associated with the others, and all three as the survivors of the exile (although representatives of other tribes shared in the return) are treated with the greatest fullness.

7. SOURCES:

Chronicles furnishes us the largest amount of genealogical information, where coincident with the older genealogies, clearly deriving its data from them. Its extra-canonical sources are a matter of considerable difference among critics, many holding that the books cited by the Chronicler as his sources (“The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah,” “The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel,” “The History of Samuel the Seer,” “The History of Nathan the Prophet,” etc., to the number of perhaps 16) are our canonical books, with the addition of a “Midrashic History of Israel,” from which he quotes the most freely. But the citations are made with such
fullness, vividness, and particularity of reference, that it is hard to believe that he did not have before him extensive extra-canonical documents. This is the impression he clearly seeks to convey. Torrey (AJSI, XXV, 195) considers that he cites this array of authority purely “out of his head,” for impressiveness’ sake, a theory which leaves the Chronicler no historical value whatever. It is extremely likely that he had before him also oral and written sources that he has not cited, records, private or public lists, pedigrees, etc., freely using them for his later lists and descents. For the post-exilic names and lists, Ezra-Nehemiah also furnish us much material. In this article no attempt is made at an exhaustive treatment, the aim being rather by a number of characteristic examples to give an idea of the quality, methods and problems of the Bible genealogies.

8. PRINCIPAL GENEALOgies AND LISTS:

In the early genealogies the particular strata to which each has been assigned by reconstructive critics is here indicated by J, the Priestly Code (P), etc. The signs “=“ or “:” following individual names indicate sonship.

Seven generations to Jabal, Jubal and Tubal-cain, explaining the hereditary origin of certain occupations (supposed by many to be a shorter version of chapter 5).

(2) Genesis 4:25,26. — The Sethites (Assigned to J).

Brings the genealogy down to Noah, and gives the chronology to the Flood. The numbers in the Hebrew Massoretic Text, the Samaritan Hebrew, and the Septuagint differ, Massoretic Text aggregating 1,656 years, Samaritan 1,307 years, and Septuagint 2,242 years. Some scholars hold this list to be framed upon that of the ten Babylonian kings given in Berosus, ending with Xisuthrus, the Babylonian Noah. An original primitive tradition, from which both lists are derived, the Hebrew being the nearer, is not impossible. Both the “Cainite” list in Genesis 4 and this “Sethite” list end with three brothers.

“The Table of Nations” (assigned to the Priestly Code (P), 10:1-7; J, 10:8-19; the Priestly Code (P), 10:20; J, 10:21; the Priestly Code (P), 10:22; J,

I. Japheth = Gomer, Magog, Badai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, Tiras.
   1. Gomer = Ashkenaz, Riphath (Chronicles 1:6, Diphath), Togarmah.
   2. Javan = Elisha, Tarshish, Kittim, Dodanim (Rodanim, 1 Chronicles 17, is probably correct, a “d”, having been substituted by a copyist for “r”).

II. Ham = Cush, Mizraim, Put, Canaan.
   3. Canaan = Zidon (Chronicles, Sidon), Heth; the Jebusite, Amorite, Gergashite, Hivite, Arkite, Sinite, Arvadite, Zemarite, Hittite.
   4. Raamah (son of Cush ) = Sheba, Dedan.

III. Elam = Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, Aramaic
   1. Aram = Uz, Hul, Gether, Mash (Chronicles, Meshech).

Nearly all these names are of peoples, cities or districts. That Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth, Nahor, Terah, Abraham, Nimrod, and probably Peleg, Reu, Serug, represent actual persons the general tenor of the narrative and the general teaching of Scripture clearly indicate, although many critics consider these also as purely eponymous. The others can mostly be more or less clearly identified ethnographically or geographically. This table represents the nations known to the writer, and in general, although not in all particulars, expresses the ethnographical relationships as far as they are now known to modern research. It follows a partly ethnological, partly
geographical scheme, the descendants of Japheth in general representing the Aryan stock settled in Asia Minor, Media, Armenia, Greece, and the islands of the Mediterranean; those of Ham representing the Hamitic races in Ethiopia, Egypt, in Southwest Arabia, and Southern Babylonia. Many modern writers hold that in making “Nimrod” the son of “Cush,” the Scripture writer has confused “Cush,” the son of Ham, with another “Gush,” the Cassei, living near Elam, since the later Babylonians and Assyrians were clearly Semitic in language and racial characteristics. Nevertheless the Scripture statement is accordant with early traditions of a Hamitic settlement of the country (Oannes the fish-god coming out of the Red Sea, etc.), and perhaps also with the fact that the earliest language of Babylonia was non-Sem. The sons of Canaan represent the nations and peoples found by the Hebrews in Palestine, the Phoenicians and the Canaanites. Heth is the great Hittite nation, by language and racial type strikingly non-Sem. Among the sons of Shem, Eber is by many considered eponymous or imaginary, but the hypothesis is not necessary. Most Assyriologists deny the connection of Elam with Shem, the later Elamites being non-Sem; the inscriptions, however, show that the earlier inhabitants up to 2300 BC were Semitic Lud must be the Lydians of Asia Minor, whose manners and older names resemble the Semitic Asia Minor presents a mixture of races as manifold as does Palestine. The sons of Joktan are tribes in Western and Southern Arabia. Havilah is given both as a son of Cush, Hamite, and of Joktan, Semite, perhaps because the district was occupied by a mixed race. It would seem, however, that “begat” or “son of” often represents geographical as well as ethnological relations. And where the classification of the Scripture writer does not accord with the present deliverances of archaeology, it must be remembered that at this distance conclusions drawn from ethnology, philology and archaeology, considering the present incomplete state of these sciences, the kaleidoscopic shifting of races, dynasties and tongues through long periods, and our scanty information, are liable to so many sources of error that dogmatism is precarious. The ancient world possessed a much larger amount of international knowledge than was, until recently, supposed. A writer of 300 BC had a closer range and could have had sources of information much more complete than we possess. On the assumption of the Mosaic authorship, that broad, statesmanlike mind, learned in all the knowledge of the Egyptians, and, clearly, profoundly influenced by Babylonian law and literature, may be credited with considerable breadth of vision and many sources of information. Aside from the question of
inspiration, this Table of Nations; for breadth of scope, for inclusiveness (though not touching peoples outside of the life of its writer), for genial broadmindedness, is one of the most remarkable documents in any literature.

(5) Genesis 11:10-27. — The Generations of Shem (assigned to P). From Shem to Abraham. The list is also chronological, but the versions differ, Massoretic Text making 290 years, from Shem to Abraham, Samaritan Hebrew, 940, and Septuagint 1,070. Septuagint inserts Cainan, 130 years, otherwise agreeing with the Samaritan to the birth of Abraham. Arpachshad may be rendered “the territory of Chesed,” i.e. of the Chasdim, Chaldeans. Eber therefore is descended from Arpachshad, Abraham, his descendant, coming from Ur-Chasdim.

(6) Genesis 11:23-26; 22:20-24. — The Children of Nahor (11:23-26 P; 22:20-24 J). Uz, Buz, Kemuel, etc. These descendants of Abraham’s brother probably represent Aramean tribes chiefly East or Northeast of Canaan. Aram may be the ancestor of the Syrians of Damascus. Uz and Buz probably belong to Arabia Petrea, mentioned in Jeremiah 25:23 with the Arabian tribes Dedan and Thama. Chesed in this list probably stands, not for the Chaldeans of Babylonia, but for a related tribe of Northern Syria. In Genesis 10:23 (assigned to P) Uz is the son of Aram, and in 10:22 Aram is a son of Shem. On the purely tribal hypothesis, this is either a contradiction, or the later statements represent other tribal relationships or subdivisions. Probably other individuals or tribes are indicated. Chronicles does not have this list, it being a side stream.


The descendants of Abraham through Hagar and Ishmael represent the Ishmaelite tribes of Arabia living North and Northwest of the Joktanidae, who chiefly peopled Arabia. Twelve princes are named, possibly all sons of Ishmael, perhaps some of them grandsons. The number has seemed “suspicious” as balancing too exactly the twelve tribes of Israel. But twelve is an approved Semitic number, determining not necessarily the sons born, but the “sons” mentioned. The Arabians generally were frequently given
the name Ishmaelites, perhaps because of the greater prominence and
closer contact of these northern tribes with the Hebrews. The sons of
Keturah seem to have been chiefly Arabian tribes, whose locations are
unknown. Midian, of the sons of Keturah, is the well-known and powerful
tribe in the Arabian desert near the Aelanic Gulf, bordered by Edom on
the Northwest Sheba and Dedan are also mentioned as Cushites
\(^{(011007)}\) Genesis 10:7). Very likely the tribes extensively intermarried, and
could claim descent from both; or were adopted into one or the other
family. Sheba was in Southwestern Arabia. Dedan lived near Edom, where
the caravan routes to various parts of Arabia converged. Asshurim are of
course not Assyrians, but an Arabian tribe, mentioned by the side of Egypt
in Minaean inscriptions. While the two sons of Isaac are to be accepted as
real persons, their typical character is also unmistakable, the history of the
two nations, Israel and Edom, being prefigured in their relations.

\(^{(012931)}\) Genesis 29:31 through 30:24; 35:16-26. The Children of Jacob
JE; 35:23-26 P).
The account of the parentage, birth and naming of the founders of the
twelve tribes; by Leah: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun
(daughter Dinah); by Bilhah: Dan, Naphtali; by Zilpah: Gad, Asher; by
Rachel: Joseph, Benjamin. Much modern criticism agrees that these names
are purely those of tribes, some of them perhaps derived from persons or
places impossible now to trace, but mostly eponymous. Accordingly, these
chapters are to be translated as follows. An Arab tribe, Jacob, wanders in
Canaan, quarrels with Edom, migrates to Haran, forms alliances with the
Aramean clans Rachel, Bilhah, Leah, Zilpah. Rachel and Jacob constitute a
new tribe, Joseph. The federation takes the name Jacob. The other allied
clans divide into sub-clans, or new clans join them, until Leah has six
“sons,” Reuben, Simeon, etc.; Zilpah, two; Bilhah, two. Zilpah and Bilhah
are “concubines” because inferior members of the federation, or else have a
left-handed connection with it. The formation of the new tribe Benjamin
broke up the old tribe Rachel, which (who) accordingly “died.” Although
such are the original facts imbedded in the documents, they are now set in
a framework of personal narrative, and were understood as narrative by the
first hearers and readers. The history thus constituted is necessarily “an
enigma which it is very hard to solve” (Bennett, Genesis, 284), and with
almost as many answers as students. For critical purposes it presents a rich
field for exploration, analysis and conjecture, but its edificatory value is
chiefly found in reading the narratives as personal: a serious and reverent religious romance rounded on facts or legends, whose real value lies in the sidelights it throws on national character and ethical principles, expressed in a naive, vivid, lifelike story, full of suggestion and teaching. This present article, however, proceeds on the Scripture representation of these details and incidents as personal.

The explanations of the names illustrate the Hebrew fondness for assonances, paronomasias, coming from a time when much importance was attached to words and sounds, but need not be considered mere popular etymologies, the Hebrew individual mother being fully capable of them. Neither do they necessarily represent the original etymology, or reason for the name, but may give the pregnant suggestion occurring to the maternal or other imagination.

Leah, “wild cow,” is supposed by many to be so called from the “totem” of the “Leah” tribe. Reuben (re’ubhen), original meaning unknown, unless Leah’s emotional explanation explains the name, rather than is explained by it: ra’ah be’onyi, “hath looked upon my affliction.” Superficially it might be re’u ben, “See, a son,” as in the American Revised Version, margin. Others see in the second statement: “My husband will love me,” still another etymology, ye’ehdbhani, “will love me.” The lover of assonances can find more than one. The tribe is not prominent after Deborah’s time. Simeon, considered by some an animal (totem) name, the Arabic sim’u, cross between hyena and wolf, suggests to the mother (or is suggested by that) its likeness to shama’, “hear”: “Yahweh hath heard.” It is not much known after the Conquest. Levi, “adhesion, associate”: thought by many a gentilic adjective from Leah, the Leah tribe paragraph excellence; the name is adjectival in form. Leah connects it with yillaweh, “He will join,” “Now will my husband be joined unto me.” A similar allusion is found in Numbers 18:2,4, there applied to the “joining” of the tribe to Aaron. Judah is associated with the verb hadhah, “praise”: “Now will I praise Yahweh.” Jacob makes the same suggestion in Genesis 49:8; no other plausible suggestion of the origin of the name can be made. The etymology and origin of Bilhah are unknown. Daniel is associated with danah, “judge”: “God hath judged”; no other etymology can be found. Naphtali is derived from niphtal, “wrestle”: “I have wrestled,” the only discoverable etymology. Zilpah, zilpah, perhaps is “dropping,” “drop.” Gad, gadh, “fortunate,” according to Leah. Gad was the well-known Syrian god of “fortune”; but there is no necessary connection here. Asher, from ‘ashar,
“happy,” ‘ashsher, “call happy”; so Leah; no connection with Asshur, Assyrian god. Issachar, from sakhar, “hire,” “man of hire”: “God hath given me mine hire,” also because Leah had “hired” Jacob with her son’s mandrakes; a similar allusion in Genesis 49, “a servant under taskwork.” Wellhausen would read ‘ish-sakhar, “man of (some deity, unknown).” Zebulun, from zebhul, “habitation, dwelling”: Leah gives two explanations, the first assigned by critics to Elohist (E) (probably), connecting the name with a root found in Zebediah, Zabdi, etc., “endow”: “God hath endowed me with a good dowry”; the second with zabhal, “dwell”: “Now will my husband dwell with me.” Dinah, like Dan, is from dan, “judge.” Supposed by some to be an old tribe of Israel, in some way associated with Dan, possibly a twin division. Rachel is “ewe,” hence identified with a “ewe” tribe. Joseph has a twofold suggestion: the first (assigned to E) from acaph, “take away”: “God hath taken away my reproach”; the second (assigned to J) from yacaph, “add”: “Yahweh will add to me another son.” None of these three cases of double explanation would so far exhaust Hebrew maternal imagination as to require the hypothesis of two documents, even though in the last “God” is used in the first suggestion and “Yahweh” in the second. Benjamin is called by Rachel Benoni, “the son of my sorrow,” which is supposed to be an old tribal name, perhaps related to Onan, a clan of Judah, or the Benjamite city, Ono, and possibly to the Egyptian On. Benjamin, Jacob’s name for him, “son of the right hand,” i.e. of happiness, is understood as “son of the south,” because originally the southern section of the Joseph tribe. The attempts to trace these names to tribal origins, local allusions, cognate languages, customs and religions have engaged much research and ingenuity, with results exceedingly diverse.


I. The Descent of the Edomite Chiefs and Clans from Esau through His Three Wives, the Hittite or Canaanite Adah, the Ishmaelite Basemath, and the Horite Oholibamah (Genesis 36:1-19).

The wives’ names here differ from the other statements: In Genesis 26:34 and 28:9:

1. Judith, daughter of Beeri the Hittite.

2. Bashemath, daughter of Elan, the Hittite.
3. Mahalath, daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebaioth.

In Genesis 36:

1. Oholibamah, daughter of Anah, daughter of Zibeon, the Hivite.
2. Adah, daughter of Elon the Hittite.
3. Bashemath, daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebaioth.

It is not necessary to resort to the hypothesis of different traditions. Bashemath and Adah are clearly identical, Esau perhaps having changed the name; as are Mahalath and the Ishmaelite Basemath, a transcriber’s error being probably responsible for the change. As to Judith and Oholibamah, Anah is probably a man, identical with Beeri (Genesis 36:24), the son of Zibeon. Both “Hivite” and “Hittite” are apparently errors for “Horite,” the difference being in only one consonant. Or “Hittite” may be used as the larger term embracing “Horite.” “Edom” (Genesis 36:1,8,19) is a personal name; in Genesis 36:9,43 (Hebrew the American Revised Version, margin) it is national, indicating that to the writer Esau was a person, not an eponym. Nowhere are personal characteristics more vividly and unmistakably portrayed than in the accounts of Jacob and Esau. In these Esauite names are but two compounds of “El” (‘el), none of “Jah” (yah).

II. The Aboriginal Leaders or Clans in Edom, Partly Subdued by, Partly Allied with, the Esauites (Genesis 36:20-30).

These are descendants of “Seir the Horite” in seven branches, and in sub-clans. “Seir” looks like an eponym or a personification of the country, as no personal details have been preserved. Among these names are no “El” (‘el) or “Jah” (yah) compounds, although they are clearly cognate with the Hebrew. Several close similarities to names in Judah are found, especially the Hezronite. Many animal names, “Aiah,” “bird of prey,” “Aran,” “wild goat,” etc.

III. Eight Edomite “Kings” before the Hebrew Monarchy (Genesis 36:31-39).

One ‘el compound, “Mehitabel,” one ba’al compound. It is to be noted that the “crown” was not hereditary and that the “capital” shifted; the office was elective, or fell into the hands of the local chief who could win it.

Apparently arranged territorially rather than tribally. The names seem used here as either clans or places and should perhaps be read: “the chief of Teman,” etc. The original ancestor may have given his name to the clan or district, or obtained it from the district or town.

In general this genealogy of Esau shows the same symmetry and balance which rouses suspicion in some minds: excluding Amalek, the son of the concubine, the tribes number twelve. Amalek and his descendants clearly separated from the other Edomites early and are found historically about Kadesh-barnea, and later roaming from the border of Egypt to North Central Arabia.

(10) Genesis 46:8-27.

(In different form, Numbers 26:1-51, and much expanded in parts of 1 Chronicles 2 through 8; compare Exodus 6:14-16). Jacob’s posterity at the descent into Egypt (considered a late addition to P).

A Characteristic Genealogy.

It includes the ideal number of 70 persons, obtained by adding to the 66 mentioned in Genesis 46:26, Jacob, Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, the two latter born in Egypt. Septuagint, followed by Stephen (Acts 7:14), reckons 75, adding to Genesis 46:20 the names of three grandsons and two great-grandsons of Joseph, obtained from Numbers 26:29,35 ff. Some may have been omitted to secure the ideal number so fascinating to the Hebrew mind. It is to be noted that Leah’s male descendants are double those of Zilpah, and Rachel’s double those of Bilhah, showing the ideal (but not the fictitious) character of the list. The design, also, seems to be to include those descendants of Jacob from whom permanent divisions sprang, even though, like Manasseh and Ephraim and probably Hezron and Hamul, born after the migration, but before Jacob’s death. A comparison with the partial parallels also illustrates the corruption of the text, and the difficulty of uniformity in lists of names. The full list follows:

1. Jacob.

2. Leah’s descendants.
A. Reuben = Hanoch, Pallu, Hezron, Carmi.

B. Simeon = Jemuel, Jamin, Ohad, Jachin, Zohar, Shaul.

C. Levi = Gershon, Kohath, Merari.

D. Judah = Er, Onan, Shelah, Perez, Zerah; Perez, Hezron, Hamul.

E. Issachar = Tolah, Puvah, Iob, Shimron.

F. Zebulun = Sered, Elon, Jahleel.

G. Dinah, daughter.

3. Zilpah’s descendants, 16.

A. Gad = Ziphion, Haggi, Shuni, Ezbon, Eri, Arodi, Areli.

B. Asher = Imnah, Ishvah, Ishvi, Beriah, Serah (daughter); Beriah = Heber, Malchiel.

4. Rachel’s descendants, 14.

A. Joseph = Manasseh, Ephraim.

B. Benjamin = Bela, Becher, Ashbel, Gera, Naaman, Ehi, Rash, Muppim, Huppin, Ard.

5. Bilhah’s descendants, 7.

A. Daniel = Hushim.

B. Naphtali = Jahzeel, Guni, Jezer, Shillem.

The list differs in many respects from those in Numbers and Chronicles, and presents some chronological and other problems. Without entering upon an exhaustive study, a number of names may be touched on.

Carmi, (2A), like the other names in i, might be a gentilic, “the Carmite,” like “the Amorite,” etc., especially if these names are those of clans, as they are in Numbers, instead of persons, as the Genesis narrative states. A town, “Bethhaccherem,” is mentioned in Jeremiah 6:1. But “the vine-dresser” is also a good rendering.
Hezron (2A). Another Hezron is given as a descendant of Judah. This duplication of names is possible in clans; see instances below, but more likely in persons.

Jemuel (2B). Nemuel in <042612>Numbers 26:12; <130424>1 Chronicles 4:24, an easy error in transcription, [y, yodh], and [n, nun], being easily confused. In Numbers, Nemuel is also a Reubenite name.

Jamin (or Jachin) (2B) is Jarib in Chronicles.

Ohad (2B). Not in Numbers or Chronicles.

Zohar (2B) is Zerah in Numbers and Chronicles.

Gershon (2C). In <130616>1 Chronicles 6:16 Gershom; identified by some with Gershom, son of Moses, on theory that the priestly family of Gershom originally traced its descent to Moses, but its later members were reckoned, not as priests, but as Levites, thus becoming identified with Levi; precarious; its principal foundation being similarity of name and tribe.

Hezron and Hamul (2D) rouse chronological or exegetical difficulties. Pharez (Genesis 33) could not have been old enough at the migration to have two sons; but very possibly Genesis 38 is introduced episodically, not chronologically, and therefore its events may have occurred before those of Genesis 37. Jacob was 130 years old at the descent, making Judah not 42 but 62, and Pharez old enough for sons. And, as suggested above, the writer may have done with Hezron and Hamul as with Ephraim and Manasseh — included them constructively, they having been born in Egypt, but before Jacob’s death, belonging therefore to the generation of the migration and so reckoned, especially as they rounded permanent tribal divisions.

Puvah (2E). Puah in <130701>1 Chronicles 7:1. In <071001>Judges 10:1, centuries later, Puah is father of Tola, an illustration of the descent of fathers’ names.

Iob (2E) is Jashub (Numbers, Chronicles), the latter probably correct. Septuagint has it here. A copyist, no doubt, omitted the “[shin],” “sh.”

Dinah (2G) is thought by some to be a later insertion, on account of the “awkward Hebrew,” “with Dinah.” Dinah and Serah as unmarried, and no doubt because of other distinguishing facts, now unknown, are the only women descendants mentioned; married women would not be. On the clan
theory of the names, the “Dinah” clan must have disappeared in Egypt, not being found in Number.

**Ziphion** (3A). Zephon in Numbers, perhaps giving its name to the Gadite city of Zaphon (Joshua 13:27).


**Arodi** (3A). In Numbers 26:17 Arod.

**Ishvah** (3B). Omitted in Numbers; perhaps died childless, or his descendants did not constitute a tribal family.

**Beriah** (3B). Also an Ephraimite (1 Chronicles 7:23); a Benjaminite (8:13,16); a Levite (23:10,11). The repetition of the name indicates individuals rather than clans; but both the Asherite and Benjamite were heads of families.

**Serah** (3B), “abundance,” not the same name as that of Abraham’s wife, “princess.”

**Heber** (3B), in 1 Chronicles 4:18, a clan of Judah; 8:17, of Benjamin. Not the same name as Eber, (5:13; 8:22; and Genesis 10:21).

**The Sons of Benjamin.**

The three lists, Genesis, Numbers, Chronicles, represent marked divergences, illustrating the corruption of perhaps all three texts. This list illustrates the genealogical method of counting all descendants as sons, though of different generations. It gives Benjamin ten “sons.” Numbers 26:38-40 gives five sons, Naaman and Ard being sons of Bela. The Septuagint of our passage gives only three sons, Bela, Becher, Ashbel. 1 Chronicles 7:6 gives three sons, Bela, Becher, Jedediael (Ashbel), and Shuppim and Huppim are Bela’s grandsons. Becher is omitted in 8:1, probably through a copyist’s error, who took [r k B l B e h w bekher we’ashbel], for “Becher and Ashbel,” [l B e h w k B bekhorot ‘ashbel], “his first-born, Ashbel.” Jedediael, both by older and newer scholars, is usually, but not with absolute certainty, identified with Ashbel. He may be
a later chief. Another explanation is that 7:6 is part of a Zebulunite genealogy which has been transformed into a Benjamite list, Jediael being a remaining Zebulunite “pebble.”

**Naaman** (4B) perhaps appears, by a transcriber’s error in 1 Chronicles 8:2, as *Nochach*, j j  for  m[ n. If Nohah is not Naaman, and not (Keil) Shephupham, or a chief who succeeded him, he may have been one who was born after the migration and not needed to make up the seventy.

**Gera** (4B) in similar fashion may appear in 1 Chronicles 8:2 as Rapha. If not, Rapha also may be one born after the migration, and did not found a family.

**Ehi** (4B) is Ahiram (Numbers 26:38); Aharah (1 Chronicles 8:1). Ehi probably arises from some copyist omitting the “ram.”

**Rosh** (4B) is not in Numbers or Chronicles. He rounded no family.

**Muppim** (4B) troubled the scribes greatly. In Numbers 26:39 he is Shephupham, though as compounded in his family name it is Shupham. In 1 Chronicles 7:12 he is Shuppim, and it is not made clear whether he is a son, or other descendant, of Benjamin. He is apparently called, with Huppim, a son of Ir (Iri), son of Bela. In 8:8 he is catalogued as a son of Bela, as Shephuphan. In old Hebrew mem in (“m”) and shin (“sh”) closely resemble each other. As the “sh” also appears in the gentilic names, it is probably the correct form. The corrupt state of the Chronicler’s text especially is apparent, and also the fact that “son” may refer to any male descendant.

**Huppim** (4B) in Numbers 26:39 is Hupham; in 1 Chronicles 8:5 is Huram.

**Ard** (4B) in 1 Chronicles 8:3 is a son of Bela, Addar, the copyist having transposed d, d, and r, r, or mistaken one for the other. In Septuagint at Genesis 46:21 Ard is son of Gera, son of Bela.

**Hushim** (5A), the same in 1 Chronicles 7:12, is Shuham (Numbers 26:42), by transposition of consonants. Another Hushim is a Benjaminite, son of Aher, but Aher may possibly be a corruption of the numeral “one,” it being the Chronicler’s frequent habit to add numerals. But see under Daniel 21:6, (3), p. 1194.
Jahzeel (5B) is Jahziel in 1 Chronicles 7:13.

Guni (5B) in 1 Chronicles 5:15 is also a Gadite name.

Shillem (5B), in 1 Chronicles 7:13, Shallum, the commoner form.


Reuben and Simeon are as in Genesis. Levi follows:


2. Kohath.
   
   A. Amram married Jochebed = Aaron, Moses; Aaron married Elisheba, daughter of Amminadab, sister of Nahshon = Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, Ithamar; Eleazar married daughter of Putiel = Phinehas.
   
   B. Izhar = Korah, Nepheg, Zichri; Korah, Assir, Elkanah, Abiasaph.
   
   C. Hebron.
   
   D. Uzziel = Mishael, Elzaphan, Sithri.


The interest of the list is partly chronological, but chiefly to illustrate the genealogical place of Aaron and Moses. It probably exhibits the genealogical practice of omitting links, Amram the father of Moses apparently being several links from Amram the son of Kohath. By Moses’ time the Amramites numbered some 2,000 males (Numbers 3:27, etc.). Jochebed (2A) is an instance of [Yah] in compounds before the Exodus. Putiel (2A) has been considered a partly Egyptian name, Puti or Poti, “devoted to” -El (‘el); but probably Hebrew, “afflicted by God.” Hebron is often identified with the city. It is also found in 1 Chronicles 2:42,43, as Judahite.

I. Reuben: Elizur, Son of Shedeur.

II. Simeon: Shelumiel, Son of Zurishaddai.

Shelumiel found in Judith.
III. Judah: Nahshon, Son of Amminadab.


IV. Issachar: Nethanel, Son of Zuar.

Nethanel, name of nine persons in Chronicles, Nehemiah, Ezra, same as Nathaniel.

V. Zebulun: Eliab, Son of Helon.

Other Eliabs, Numbers 16:1 (Reubenite); 1 Samuel 16:6 (Jesse’s son, Judah).

VI. Joseph: Ephraim: Elishama, Son of Ammihud.


VIII. Benjamin: Abidan, Son of Gideoni.

IX. Dan: Ahiezer, Son of Ammishaddai.

Another, 1 Chronicles 12:3 (Benjamite).

X. Asher: Pagiel, Son of Ochran.

XI. Gad: Eliasaph, Son of Deuel.

Another, Numbers 3:24 (Levite).

XII. Naphtali: Ahira, Son of Enan.

Seven of these names, Amminadab, Ammihud, Abidan, AHIRAH, Ahiezer, Eliab, Elishama, are concededly early. The 5 compounded in Shaddai or Zur are said to be of a type found only in P; 9 of the 24 are compounded in ‘el, said to be a characteristic of late names. The ‘El is postfixed more times, 5, than it is prefixed, 4; also a characteristic of late names. The proportion of compound names is also greater than in the older names; for these and similar reasons (Gray, ICC, “Nu,” 6; HPN, 191-211; The Expositor T, September, 1897, 173-90) it is concluded that though several
of the names are, and more may be, early, the list is late. But see Ancient Hebrew Tradition, 74, 83 ff, 85 ff, 320. The contention rests largely on the late date of the Priestly Code (P) and of Chronicles. But while fashions in names changed in Hebrew life as elsewhere, in view of the persistence of things oriental, the dating of any particular names is somewhat precarious. They may be anticipations or late survivals of classes of names principally prevalent at the later or earlier date. Two of the names, otherwise unknown, have come to us through Ruth, and indicate a source now unknown to us, from which all the names could have been drawn. The fondness for names in ‘el very likely indicates not a late date but an early one. ‘El is the Divine name appearing in personal names previous to Moses, succeeded by Jab from Moses and Joshua on. The recurrence of ‘el in the time of Ezra and later probably indicates the renewed interest in antiquity as well as the at once wider and narrower outlook brought about by the exile and return. Numerous South Arabian compounds both with the “ilu,” “ili” (‘el), affixed and prefixed, occur in monuments about 1000 BC (AHT, 81 ff).

(13) Numbers 3:1-37. — The Family of Aaron, with the “Princes” of Levi.

Adds nothing to list in Exodus 16:16-25 except the Levite “princes.”

I. Gershonites: Eliasaph, Son of Lael.

Also a Benjaminite Eliasaph (Numbers 1:14).

II. Kohathites: Elizaphan, Son of Uzziel.

A Zebulunite Elizaphan (Numbers 34:25). Five other Uzzies, Benjamite, Levite, Simeonite.

III. Merarites: Zuriel, Son of Abihail.

A Gadire Abihail (1 Chronicles 5:14); also father of Queen Esther; also two women: wife of Abishur (1 Chronicles 2:29); wife of Rehoboam (2 Chronicles 11:18). Four [‘el] suffixes, two prefixes.
Numbers 13:4-16. — The Twelve Spies (P).

I. Reuben: Shammua, Son of Jaccur.

Other Shammuas (2 Samuel 5:14; 1 Chronicles 14:4 (David’s son); Nehemiah 11:17, Levite; 12:18, priest). Seven other Zaccurs, Simeonites and Levites.

II. Simeon: Shaphat, Son of Hori.

Four other Shaphats, one Gadite, one Judahite; Elisha’s father. Hori looks like the national name of the Horites; perhaps Hori or an ancestor had been adopted, through marriage or otherwise.

III. Judah: Caleb, Son of Jephunneh, the Kenizzite (Numbers 32:12; Joshua 14:6,14).

Another Caleb, Chelubai, son of Hezron, brother of Jerahmeel (1 Chronicles 2:9). Either as an individual, or as a clan, Caleb seems to be originally of the pre-Israelitish stock in Canaan, absorbed into the tribe of Judah. Perhaps Jephunneh the Kenizzite married a woman of Caleb’s (brother of Jerahmeel) household, and to their firstborn was given the name of Caleb, he becoming head of the house and prince of Judah. Another Jephunneh, an Asherite (1 Chronicles 7:38).

IV. Issachar: Igal, Son of Joseph.

Other Igals: 2 Samuel 23:36 (one of David’s heroes); 1 Chronicles 3:22. Note the name of another tribe given to a man of Issachar — Joseph (Numbers 13:7).

V. Ephraim: Hoshea, Son of Nun;


VI. Benjamin: Palti, Son of Raphu. See 16 IV.

VII. Zebulun: Gaddiel, Son of Sodi.

VIII. Joseph-Manasseh: Gaddi, Son of Susi.

A Gaddi is in 1 Macc 2:2.
IX. Dan: Ammiel, Son of Gemali.

Another Ammiel (2 Samuel 9:4).

X. Asher: Sethur, Son of Michael.

Nine other Michaels, Gadite, Levite, Issacharite, Benjamite, Manassite, Judahite.

XI. Naphtali: Nahbi, Son of Vophsi.

XII. Gad: Geuel, Son of Machi.

Four names in ‘el. Nine ending with i; unusual number. The antiquity of the list cannot be readily questioned.


Related to Numbers 1 and 2, and closely follows Genesis 46. The divergences in individual names have been noted under (10). This list adds to

I. Reuben:

1. Eliab, son of Pallu (also Numbers 16:1,12).
2. Dathan, Abiram, Nemuel, sons of Eliab.

II. Manasseh:

1. Machir; also Genesis 50:23.
2. Gilead, son of Machir.
3. Iezer (abbreviation for Abiezer), Helek (not in Chronicles), Asriel, Shechem, Shemida, sons of Gilead.
5. Mahlah, Noah, Hoglah, Milcah, Tirzah, daughters of Zelophehad.

III. Ephraim:

1. Shuthelah; also 1 Chronicles 7:21.
2. Becher.
3. Tahan (Tahath, 1 Chronicles 7:20).
4. Eran (Elead, 1 Chronicles 7:21).

The names of Manasseh’s grandsons and great-grandsons are puzzling. Gilead is the district except in Judges 11:1,2, where it is the father of Jephthah. Shechem sounds like the Ephraimite town. Hepher reminds of Gath-Hepher. In Joshua 17:1,2 the six sons of Gilead are described as sons of Manasseh; loosely, it is probable; they are to be understood as descendants. Perhaps the references may be summarized: The family of Machir, the son of Manasseh, conquered Gilead, and took its name therefrom, either as a family or in the person of a son, Gilead, whose six sons founded clans named from or giving names to certain towns or districts.

The daughters of Zelophehad are noted for the interesting case at law they presented, claiming and receiving the inheritance of their father, which by Gray, ICC, “Nu,” is considered not historical but a fictitious instance, for the purpose of raising the question, these daughters being clans, and not persons.

Among the sons of Ephraim, Becher has perhaps been misplaced from verse 38, and possibly displaces Bered (1 Chronicles 7:20) between Shuthelah and Tahath. It is not found here in the Septuagint. It is possible that an alliance between the Becherites and the Ephraimites caused one portion of the former to be counted with Ephraim and another with Benjamin; or that at different times the clan was allied with the two different tribes. An error in transcription is more probable. Another Shuthelah is found later in the line (1 Chronicles 7:21).

(16) Numbers 34:16-28. — Tribal Representatives in the Allotment. Reuben, Gad, half-Manasseh, omitted because their allotments had already been assigned East of Jordan; Levi, because receiving none. Changing to the order in (10):

I. Reuben: None.

II. Simeon: Shemuel, Son of Ammihud.

Shemuel is Hebrew of Samuel. Another Shemuel is of Issachar, 1 Chronicles 7:2. Samuel the prophet, a Levite.
III. Judah: Caleb, Son of Jephunneh.

IV. Issachar: Paltiel, Son of Azzan.

Another Paltiel, otherwise Palti, David’s wife Michal’s temporary husband (2 Samuel 3:15). Another Benjamite spy (Numbers 13:9).

V. Zebulun: Elizaphan, Son of Parnach.

Another Elizaphan, Kohathite Levite (Exodus 6:18,22).

VI. Gad: None.

VII. Asher: Ahihud, Son of Shelomi.

Another Ahihud, Benjamite (1 Chronicles 8:7).

VIII. Joseph-Ephraim: Kemuel, Son of Shiftan.

Another Kemuel, son of Nahor, an Aramean chief (Genesis 22:21); also Levite of David’s time (1 Chronicles 27:17).

IX. Joseph-Manasseh: Hanniel, Son of Ephod.

Hanniel, also an Asherite (1 Chronicles 7:39).

X. Benjamin: Elidad, Son of Chislon.

XI. Dan: Bukki, Son of Jogli.

Bukki, abbreviation of Bukkiah; another, in high-priestly line of Phinehas (1 Chronicles 6:5,51).

XII. Naphtali: Pedahel, Son of Ammihud.

A Simeonite Ammihud above.

Seven “El” names, only one “Jah.”


Contained unchanged in 1 Chronicles 2:9-15; also Matthew 1:1-6; also Luke 3:32. Some links have been omitted between Obed and Jesse. Salmon might be traced to the ancestor of the Bethlehemite (1 Chronicles 2:51,54), who is, however, of Caleb’s line, not Ram’s; but the lines may mingle.
I. Born in Hebron: Amnon, Chileab, Absalom, Adonijah, Shephatiah, Ithream.


Four names in ‘el, all prefixed. Two in “Jah.” Chileab is Daniel in 1 Chronicles 3:1; uncertain which is right, but probably Daniel is a corruption. Chronicles adds Nogah to the Jerusalem sons, probably developed in transcription. 1 Chronicles 3:6-8 has two Eliphelets; 14:6 has Elpalet in place of the first; more probable. This gives David 6 sons in Hebron, and, if both Nogah and Elpalet be correct, 12 in Jerusalem. Eliada is Beeliada in 14:7, perhaps the original form, a relic of the time before the Hebrews turned against the use of Baal, “lord,” as applied to Yahweh; in which case Baaliada, “Lord knows,” was changed to Eliada, “God knows.” 3:6 reads Elishama for Elishua. Japhia is also the name of a king of Lachish in Joshua’s time (Joshua 10:3-7).

(19) 2 Samuel 23 (also 1 Chronicals 11:11-41). — David’s Knights.

1. Josheb-bashebeth, the Tahchemonite.

In Chronicles it is Jashobeam, and should read Ishbaal, the writer’s religious horror of Baal leading him to substitute the consonants of bosheth, “shame,” as in Mephibosheth, Ishbosheth. Septuagint has [Ἰσσεβαδά, Iesebada] (Codex Vaticanus), [Ἰσσεβαδάλ Ἰσβοάμ, Jessebadal, Isbaam] (Codex Alexandrinus), in Chronicles, and [Ἰβοσθε, Iebosthe] (Codex Vaticanus), [Ἰβοσθαί, Iebosthai] (Codex Alexandrinus) here. In Chronicles he is a Hachmonite, probably correct. “Adino the Heznite” is probably a corruption for “He wielded his spear” (Chronicles).

2. Eleazar, Son of Dodai, the Ahohite.

Dodo in Chronicles; 8 other Eleazars in the Old Testament. Another Dodo is father of Elhanan.
3. Shammah, Son of Agee, a Hararite.
Omitted by Chronicles. Three other Shammahs, one of them a knight of David. “Harari” may be “mountaineer,” or “inhabitant of the village Harar.”

4. Abishai, Son of Zeruiah, Brother of Joab.
Abshai (1 Chronicles 18:12 margin). Zeruiah perhaps David’s half-sister (2 Samuel 17:25). Father never mentioned.

5. Benaiah, Son of Jehoiada of Kabzeel.
Eleven other Old Testament Benaiahs, one of them also a knight. This Benaiah succeeded Joab as commander-in-chief, 4 other Jehoiadas, one Benaiah’s grandson, high in David’s counsel, unless a scribe has inverted the order in 1 Chronicles 27:34, which should then read Benaiah, son of Jehoiada.

6. Asahel, Brother of Joab.
Three other Asahels.

7. Elhanan, Son of Dodo of Bethlehem.
Another Elhanan, slayer of the brother of Goliath (2 Samuel 21:19; 1 Chronicles 20:5). Perhaps the same.

8. Shammah the Harodite.
Chronicals, Shammoth. From Harod, near Gideon’s well (Judges 7:1).

9. Elika the Harodite.

10. Helez the Paltite.
Paltite perhaps local or family name from Pelet, or Palti.

11. Ira, Son of Ikkesh the Tekoite.
Two others, one a knight. Tekoah, Judaite town, home of Amos, etc.

12. Abiezer the Anathothite.
One other, a Manassite (Joshua 17:2). Anathoth an hour Northeast of Jerusalem, Jeremiah’s town.
13. Mebunnai the Hushathite.
Should read, with Chronicles, Sibbecai.

14. Zalmon the Ahohite.
Zalmon, also name of mountain (Judges 9:48). Descendant of Ahoah, Benjamite of Bela’s line. See 1 Chronicles 8:14.

15. Maharai the Netophathite.
From Netophah, town.

16. Heleb, Son of Baanah.
1 Chronicles 11:30, Heled. Three other Bannabs.

17. Ittai, Son of Ribai of Gibeah of the Children of Benjamin.
1 Chronicles 11:31, Ithai. An Ittai of Gath also followed David.

18. Benaiah a Pirathonite.
Pirathon, Amalekite town in Ephraimite territory.

Chronicles, Hurai (d for r). Ga’ash, a Wady in Ephraim.

20. Abi-albon the Arbathite.
Chronicles, Abiel, perhaps corrupted from Abi-Baal; from Beth-arabah, Judah or Benjamin.

21. Azmaveth the Barhumite.
Three others, and a Judaite town, of the same name. Baharumite; Chronicles, Barhumite, a Benjamite town.

22. Eliahba the Shaalbonite.
Shaalbon, a Danite town.

23. The Sons of Jashen (better, Hashem).
Chronicles, “the sons of Hashem the Gizonite.” “Sons of” looks like a scribal error, or interpolation, perhaps a repetition of “bni” in “Shaalboni” above.
24. Jonathan, Son of Shammah the Hararite.
 Chronicles adds, “the son of Shagee the Hararite.” Shagee should perhaps be Agee (2 Samuel 23:11); but Septuagint indicates Shammah here; both Samuel and Chronicles should read “J., son of Shammah the Ararite.”

25. Ahiam, Son of Sharar the Ararite.
 Chronicles, Sacar the Hararite. Sacar is supported by Septuagint.

26. Eliphelet, Son of Ahasvai, the Son of the Maacathite.
 Chronicles has “Eliphal, son of Ur,” and adds “Hepher the Mecherathite.” Both texts are corrupt. Chronicles should perhaps read, “Eliphelet the son of....., the Maacathite, Eliam,” etc.

27. Eliham, Son of Ahithophel the Gilonite.

27a. Ahijah the Pelonite (in Chronicals but Not Samuel).
 Seven other Ahijahs. Pelonite uncertain, probably a corruption; perhaps inserted by a scribe who could not decipher his “copy,” and means “such and such a one,” as in 1 Samuel 21:2.

28. Hezro (Hezrai) the Carmelite.
 A scribe confused the Hebrew letters, w and y. Carmel, near Hebron.

29. Paarai the Arbite.

30. Igal, Son of Nathan of Zobah.
 Chronicles, Joel, brother of Nathan. Igal less common than Joel, hence, more likely to be corrupted; 2 other Igals; 12 other Joels; 5 other Nathans.

30a. Mibhar, Son of Hagri (Chronicles, not Samuel).
 Text uncertain as between this and 31.

31. Bani the Gadite (Omitted in Chronicles).
 Possibly the Gerarite.
32. Zelek the Ammonite.

Ammon East of Jordan and upper Jabbok.

33. Naharai the Beerothite, Armor-bearer to Joab, Son of Zeruiah.

Beeroth, Benjamite town.

34. Ira the Ithrite.

Ithrites, a family of Kiriath-jearim, Judah.

35. Gareb the Ithrite.

Gareb also a hill West of Jerusalem.

36. Uriah the Hittite.

Bathsheba’s husband; 3 others. From some Hittite town surrounded by Israel at the Conquest.

37. Zabad, Son of Ahlai (Perhaps Dropped out of Samuel), Chronicles.

Chronicles adds 13 others. The filling of vacancies makes the number 37 instead of 30. Two names, perhaps, in ba’al, 5 in yah, 7 in ‘el. As far as guessable, 5 from Judah, 3 from Benjamin, 2 from Ephraim, 1 from Dan, 1 from Issachar, 1 Ammonite, 1 Hittite, 2 (or 4) Hararites, 2 Harodites, 2 Ithrites.

(20) 1 Kings 4:1-19. — Solomon’s “Princes” and Commissaries.

Eleven princes, 12 officers. No mention of their tribal connections; assigned only partly by tribal bounds. 7 yah names, 1 ‘el; 5 of the officers are prefixed ben as if their own names had dropped out.

(21) 1 Chronicals 1-9. — Genealogies, with Geographical and Historical Notices.

By far the largest body of genealogical material, illustrating most fully the problems and difficulties. The estimate of its value depends on the estimate of the Chronicler’s date, purpose, equipment, ethical and mental qualities. He uses freely all previous Old Testament matter, and must have had in hand family or tribal songs, traditions; genealogical registers, as mentioned in Ezr 2:61-69; Nehemiah 7:63-65; local traditions; official genealogies,
such as “the genealogies reckoned in the days of Jotham king of Judah, and .... Jeroboam king of Israel” (1 Chronicles 5:17); prophetic, historical and other matter now lost, “the words of Shemaiah .... after the manner of genealogies” (2 Chronicles 12:15), and elsewhere. The results of David’s census seem to have been in his hands (1 Chronicles 27:24).

Curtis (ICC, “Chronicles,” 528) suggests that his purpose was partly to provide genealogies for contemporary families, implying an accommodating insertion of names “after the manner of genealogies” today. Two main purposes, however, seem clear: the first historical, to give the historical and personal basis and setting to elucidate the Chronicler’s main thesis, that national prosperity depended upon, and national character was measured by, fidelity to the law of God, especially as it centered upon the worship and services of Yahweh’s house. To do this it was necessary to trace the descent of the prominent characters, families, tribes. Hence, the space given to Judah, Levi, Benjamin, the main line of fidelity, the survival of the fittest. The other purpose was to conserve purity of blood in the restored nation, to include all who were entitled and to exclude all who were not. We may also credit him with such regard for his material that he preserved it all (with certain comprehensible exceptions), even though extremely fragmentary here and there. His materials are of many degrees of age. It is thought by some that the antiquity is indicated by the last stage in the descent, the genealogy of Sheshun, e.g. ending with Hezekiah’s time; Heman’s and Asaph’s (1 Chronicles 6,33) in David’s. Name-study and historico-literary criticism seeks still other marks of relative age. The text has suffered much, as lists of names will, from scribal errors. Details of his method will be pointed out in the following analysis. As in this whole article, space forbids exhaustive treatment of the endless textual, critical, historical questions arising. A few illustrative cases only are given.

I. Primeval Genealogies (1 Chronicals 1:1-54).

To show Israel’s place among the nations; follows Genesis closely, omitting only the Cainites; boldly, skillfully compressed, as if the omitted facts were well known.

(1) The ten antediluvian Patriarchs, and Noah’s three sons (1 Chronicles 1:1-4).

Follows Genesis 4:5, giving only the names.
(2) Japheth’s descendants (1 Chronicles 1:5-7) (Genesis 10:2-4 unchanged).

(3) The Hamites (1 Chronicles 1:8-16) (Genesis 10:6-8, 13-18a unchanged).

(4) The Semites (1 Chronicles 1:17-23) (Genesis 10:22-29; only scribing changes).

(5) Abram’s descent (1 Chronicles 1:24-27) (Genesis 11:10-26 abridged, giving only the Patriarchs).

(6) The sons of Abraham, Keturah, Isaac (1 Chronicles 1:28-34).

(7) Sons of Esau (1 Chronicles 1:35-52) (Genesis 36:4-10).

(8) Kings and sheikhs of Edom (1 Chronicles 1:43, 14) (Genesis 36:31-43). Scribing changes.

II. Descendants of Jacob (1 Chronicles 2 through 9).

The tribes arranged chiefly geographically. Judah, as the royal line, is given 100 verses, Levi, as the priestly, 81 verses, Benjamin 50, the other ten 56, Daniel and Zebulun neglected. His purpose practically confines him to the first three; and these were also the best preserved.

(1) Sons of Israel.

Follows substantially the order in Genesis 35. Daniel is placed before Rachel’s sons. 17 different orders of the tribes in Bible lists.

(2) Genealogies of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:3 through 4:23).

(a) Descent of Jesse’s sons from Judah (1 Chronicles 2:3-17).

Largely gleaned from the historical books. The sons of Zerah (1 Chronicles 2:6-8) are not found elsewhere. Chelubai is Caleb. Only 7 sons of Jesse are mentioned. Abishai, Joab, Asahel are always designated by their mother’s name, Zeruiah.

(b) Genealogy of Bezalel (1 Chronicles 2:18-20).

The artificer of the tabernacle, hence, greatly interests the Chronicler.
(c) Other descendants of Hezron (1 Chronicles 2:21-24).

(d) The Jerahmeelites (1 Chronicles 2:25-41).

Concededly a very old list of this important clan not found elsewhere. Sheshan (1 Chronicles 2:35), who married his daughter to Jarha, an Egyptian servant, illustrates the introduction of a foreigner into the nation and tribe.

(e) The Calebites (1 Chronicles 2:41-55).

Not elsewhere. The names are largely geographical. A subdivision of the Hezronites. Not Caleb the son of Jephunneh.

(f) David’s descendants (1 Chronicles 3:1-24).

Gives first the sons and their birthplaces, then the kings to Jeconiah and Zedekiah, then the Davidic line from Jeconiah to Zerubbabel, then the grandsons of Zerubbabel and the descendants of Shecaniah. Two other lists of David’s sons (2 Samuel 5:14-16; 1 Chronicles 14:4-17). Eliphelet and Nogah here are thought to have developed in transcription, with some other changes. Johanan’s name (s. of Josiaih) is given among the kings, though he never reigned. Zedekiah is called son (instead of brother) of Jehoiachin, perhaps a scribal error. “Jah” names extremely numerous. Names of Zerubbabel’s sons are highly symbolic: Meshullam, “Recompensed”; Hananiah, “Jah is gracious”; Shelomith, “Peace”; Hashubah, “Consideration”; Ohel, “Tent,” i.e. “Dwelling of Yahweh”; Berechiah, “Jah blesses”; Hasadiah, “Jah is kind”; Jushab-hesed, “Loving-kindness returns”; characteristic of the Exile.

1 Chronicles 3:19-24, beginning with Zerubbabel’s descendants, are obscure, and a battleground of criticism on account of their bearing on the date of Chronicles. There are three possible interpretations:

(1) Following the Hebrew, Zerubbabel’s descendants stop with Pelatiah and Jeshiaiah, his grandsons. Then follow three unclassified sets of “sons.” No connection is shown between Jeshiaiah and these. Then follows Shecaniah’s line with four generations. There are several other instances of unrelated names thus being thrown in. This gives two generations after Zerubbabel.

(2) Still following the Hebrew, assume that Shecaniah after Obadiah is in Zerubbabel’s line. This gives six generations after Zerubbabel.
(3) Following Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (but the two latter are of very small critical weight), read in verse 21, “Rephaiah his son, Arnan his son,” etc. — a very possible change: eleven generations after Zerubbabel. According to (3), Chronicles was written at least 253 years (allowing 23 years to a generation; more probable than 30 or 40) after Zerubbabel (515), hence, after 262 BC; (2) makes it after 373; (1) makes it 459, during Ezra’s life. The book’s last recorded event is Cyrus’ decree (538), which indicates the earliest date. The New Testament casts no light here, none of these names appearing in the genealogies in Matthew or Luke. If Septuagint is correct, Keil suggests that it is a later insertion, a critical device too frequently used to nullify inconvenient facts. The passage itself justifies the statement that “there is no shadow of proof that the families enumerated in 1 Chronicles 3:21, latter part, were descendants of Hananiah the son of Zerubbabel.” Against this, and the other indications, the admittedly faulty Septuagint furnishes an insufficient basis for so far-reaching a conclusion.

(g) Fragmentary genealogies of families of Judah (1 Chronicles 4:1-23).

Contains

(1) “sons” of Judah, four or five successive generations;
(2) sons of Shobal and Hur;
(3) sons of Chelub;
(4) sons of Caleb, son of Jephunneh;
(5) sons of Jehaleel;
(6) sons of Ezra (of course, not the priest-scribe of the return);
(7) sons of “Bethiah the daughter of Pharaoh whom Mered took”;
(8) sons of Shimon;
(9) sons of Ishi;
(10) sons of Shelah. It is hard to trace the law of association here; which fact has its bearing on the discussion under (f) above. Chelub may be another Caleb. 1 Chronicles 4:9-11 give an interesting
name-study, where Jabez by prayer transforms into prosperity the omen of his sorrowful name: “Because I bare him with sorrow,” a characteristic note. 1 Chronicles 4:21-23 speak of the linenworkers and potters. Similar, even identical, names have been found on pot-handles-in Southern Palestine.

(3) Genealogy of Simeon (4:24-43).


(c) Princes and conquests (1 Chronicles 4:34-43).

Source unknown, but considered old. Gray, however, thinks the names of late formation. Meshobab, Jamlech, Josiah, Amaziah, Joel, Jehu, Josibiah, Seraiah, Asiel, Elioenai, Jaakobah, Jeshohaiah, Asaiah, Adiel, Jesimiel, Benaijah, Ziza, Shiphi, Allon, Jedaiah, Shimri, Shemaiah, Ishi, Pelatiah, Neariah, Rephaiah, Uzziel; many undoubtedly old ones; 11 in [yah], 5 in [‘el]. Eliothal sounds post-exilic. The section mentions several exploits of Simeon.


As in Simeon above, the usual order, deviated from in instances, is

(1) Introductory: Sons and immediate descendants;

(2) Territory;

(3) Princes or Chiefs;

(4) Incidents.

(a) Reuben (1 Chronicles 5:1-10).

Partly follows Gen, Nu; but only as to first generation. Very fragmentary and connections obscure.

(b) Gad (1 Chronicles 5:11-17).

First generation omitted. Chronicler draws from genealogies “in the days of” Jotham and Jeroboam.
(c) Half-Manasseh (1 Chronicles 5:23,14).

The whole tribe is treated of (1 Chronicles 7:14 ff). Here only the seats and heads of houses.


Illustrates more fully the Chronicler’s attitude and methods.

(a) High priests from Levi to Jehozadak (the Exile) (1 Chronicles 6:1-15).

(i) Levi’s sons: Gershon, Kohath, Merari (Genesis 46:11; Exodus 6:16).

(ii) Kohath’s sons: Amram, Izhar, Hebron, Uzziel (Exodus 6:18).

(iii) Amram’s “sons”: Aaron, Moses, Miriam (Exodus 6:20,23 (except Miriam); Numbers 26:59 f).

(iv) High priests from Eleazar. Also (partly) Ezra (7:1-5):

1. Eleazar
2. Phinehas
3. Abishua
4. Bukki
5. Uzzi
6. Zerahiah
7. Meraioth
8. Amariah
9. Ahitub
10. Zadok
11. Ahimaaz
12. Azariah
13. Johnnan
14. Azariah
15. Amariah
16. Ahitub
17. Zadok
18. Shallum
19. Hilkiah
20. Azariah
21. Seraiah
22. Jehozadak

Noteworthy omissions: Eli’s house, Eli, Phinehas, Ahitub, Ahimelech, Abiathar, because set aside for Zadok’s in Solomon’s time; Bukki to Zadok being their contemporaries; but the list also omits Amariah in the reign of Jehoshaphat (perhaps), Jehoiada, Joash’s “power behind the throne,” Urijah in Ahaz’ day, Azariah in Hezekiah’s. It has been thought that this was done in the interests of a chronological scheme of the Chronicler, making 23 generations of 40 years from the Exodus to the Captivity, or 920 years. The Hebrew generation, however, was as likely to be 30 as 40 years, and as a matter of fact was nearer 20. The apparent number of generations from Aaron to the Captivity, adding the data from the historical books, is 29, making a generation about 24 years. The reasons for the omission here, as for many others, are not apparent.

Outside of Chronicles and Ezra we know nothing of Abishua, Bukki, Uzzi, Zerahiah, Merioth, the first Amaziah, Johanan, Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok 2, Shallum, Azariah 3. The list touches historical notices in Aaron, Eleazar, Phinehas, Zadok, Ahimaaz, Azariah 2, contemporary of Solomon, perhaps Amariah, contemporary of Jehoshaphat, Azariah, contemporary of Uzziah, Hilkiah, contemporary of Joshua, Seraiah slain by the Chaldeans, and Jehozadak. The recurrence of similar names in close succession is characteristically Jewish (but compare names of popes and kings). It is seen in the list beginning with Jehozadak: Joshua, Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Jonathan, Jaddua, Onias, Simon, Eleazar, Manasseh, Onias, Simon, Onias, Joshua. Also about Christ’s time: Eleazar, Jesus, Annas, Ismael, Eleazar, Simon, Joseph, Jonathan, Theophilus, Simon, although these latter do not succeed in a genealogical line.


(c) Lineal descendants of Gershom: seven, <130620>1 Chronicles 6:20,21; thirteen, <130639>1 Chronicles 6:39-43. See also <132307>1 Chronicles 23:7.

The two lists (<130620>1 Chronicles 6:20,21 and 6:39-43) are clearly the same:

Gershom Gershom
Libni Jahath
Zimmah Zimmah
Joah Ethan
Iddo Adaiah
Zerah Zerah
Jeatherai Ethni
Malchiah
Baaseiah
Michael
Shimea
Berachiah
Asaph

Jahath, Zimmah, Zerah are in both. By slight changes Joah, h a wy, is Ethan, t ya ; Iddo, wd [ , is h yd [ , Adaiah; Jeatherai, y t a y, is Ethni, ynt a . Shimei may have dropped from one and Libni from the other. Jahath and Shimei have been transposed. In 1 Chronicles 23:7 Libni is Ladan.

(d) Pedigrees of Samuel (1 Chronicles 6:27,28; 33-35). See also 1 Samuel 1:1; 8:2.

We have three pedigrees of Samuel, all suffering in transcription:

(1) 1 Chronicles 6:22-24,28
(2) 1 Chronicles 6:33-38
(3) 1 Samuel 1:1; 8:2

Kohath Kohath
Amminadab Izhar
Korah Korah
Assir, Elkanah,
Ebiasaph Ebiasaph
Assir Assir
Tahath Tahath
Uriel Zephaniah
Uzziah Azariah
Shaual Joel
Elkanah Elkanah
Amasai Amasai
Ahimoth Mahath
Elkanah Elkanah
Zophai Zuph Zuph
Nahath Thoah Thohu
Eliab Eliel Elihu
Jeroham Jeroham Jeroham
Elkanah Elkanah Elkanah
Samuel Samuel Samuel
Joel (Vashni) and Joel Joel
Abijah
Heman

The text is obscure. Septuagint reads (1 Chronicles 6:26), “Elkanah his (Ahimoth’s) son, Zophai his son.” It has Izhar in (1) for Amminadab, as has Hebrew in Exodus 6:18,21. Uriel for Zephaniah is unexplainable. Uzziah and Azariah are exchangeable. The other variations are transcriptional. Joel has dropped out of the first list, and the following words, now in 1 Samuel 8:2, and the Syriac here: “and the second,” v-sh-n, have been read “Vashni.” 1 Samuel 1:1 calls Zuph an Ephraimite. The Chronicler’s claiming him (and Samuel) seems to some another instance of Levitical bias and acquisitiveness. The genealogy is also found “clearly artificial,” Zuph being a territory, and Toah, Tohu, Nahath, a family. But “Ephraimite” is either merely local, the family having been assigned residence there (Joshua 21:5; 1 Chronicles 6:66), or (Hengstenberg, Ewald) because, being thus assigned, it has been incorporated into the tribe. Hannah’s vow to devote him to Yahweh is said (Curtis, Moore, ICC in the place cited.) to show that he was no Levite, in which case no vow was necessary. But Elkanah’s Ephraimite citizenship may have obscured in Hannah’s mind the Levitical descent. In the disorganized times of the Judges an Ephraimite woman may well have been ignorant of, or indifferent to, the Levitical regulation, She, or the author of 1 Samuel 1:1, must also have forgotten that every male that openeth the womb from any tribe is equally God’s property A mother’s vow to devote her firstborn son to Yahweh, beyond recall or redemption, and to seal his consecration by the significant symbol of the unshaved head, is not hard to imagine in either a Levite or an Ephrahimate, and equally “unnecessary” in either case. Heman, ending the pedigree (2), was David’s contemporary.

(e) Pedigree of Asaiah the Merarite (1 Chronicles 6:29,30).
Merari: Mahli: Libni; Shimei: Uzzah: Shimea: Haggiah: Asaiah. Hard to adjust or place. Libni and Shimei are elsewhere Gershonites, but the same
name is frequently found in different tribes or clans. Information below Mahli is entirely wanting.

(f) Descent of David’s three singers, Heman, Asaph, Ethan (1 Chronicles 6:33-47).

(i) Heman has been given under (d) ; 20 links.


Hardly anywhere is the Chronicler’s good faith more questioned than in these lists. Finding in his day the three guilds of singers claiming descent from David’s three, and through these from Levi, he fits them out with pedigrees, borrowing names from 1 Chronicles 6:16-20, and filling out with his favorite names, or those of his own invention, or from current lists. To make Asaph contemporary with David, he adds Malchijah, Maaseiah, Michael, Shimei, Berechiah. He helps out Ethan with Bani, Amzi, Hilkiah, Amaziah, Hashabiah, Malluch, Abdi, Kishi. The names added are very frequent in Chronicles and Ezra, not frequent in older writings. Aside from the general objection to this thoroughgoing discredit of Chronicles, and theory of religious development in Israel on which it is based, it may be said:

1) The Chronicler’s failure to give his three families nearly the same number of links is suspicious, but if he took an old list, as it came to him, it is natural.

2) The fact that these added names occur many more times in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah indicates simply that Levitical names occur frequently in a writer and among a people whose interests are Levitical. No one would look among the Roundheads for either classical or aristocratic names.

3) In no tribe would such names be more likely to recur, naturally or purposely, than in the Levitical.
The Chronicler has inserted among his new names 6 in $yah$ and only 1 in ‘$el$, and that far down the list.

Of the “added” names Malchijah occurs in Jeremiah 21:1; Masseiah, in 29:21,25; 35:4, in every case priestly or Levitical. Michael occurs in Numbers 13:13. Berechiah is the name of the prophet Zechariah’s father. Hilkiah is the name of Joshua’s high priest. Amaziah reigned 800 BC. Bani is mentioned in 2 Samuel 23:36 (though this is thought to be copied from Chronicles). Shimea is concededly early. Of the 13 “added names” 8 are found elsewhere. Of the others, Amzi, Abdi, Kishi (Kish, Kushaiah) have an early look. Malluch might be late. If Hashabiah is late the author has scattered it well through the history, 1 several generations before David, 3 in David’s time, 1 in Josiah’s, 1 in Ezra’s, 3 in Nehemiah’s, in every case a Levite.

While these “added” names occur more times in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, than elsewhere, and 5 of the 13 occur nowhere else, it is also true that more than 500 other names also occur only in these three books, and that the total names in these, to say nothing of the “P” portions elsewhere, outnumber the names in the other books about three to one. Other things being equal, three mentions of any common name ought to be found in these books to one in the others. Of all names applied to more than four persons the usual proportion in these books by count is four, to one elsewhere.


Dwelling-places of Levi.

The six remaining tribes.

Issachar (1 Chronicles 7:1-5).


Benjamin (1 Chronicles 7:6-13).

A very difficult section. It is considered a Zebulunite genealogy which has been Benjaminized, because
(1) there is a Benjamite list elsewhere;

(2) Benjamin is out of place here, while in 13 out of 17 tribal lists Zebulun comes at this point, and in this list has no other place;

(3) the numbers of Benjamin’s sons differ from other Benjamite genealogies;

(4) the names of Be’ala’s and Becher’s sons are different here;

(5) many names are not Benjamite;

(6) Tarshish, in this list, is a sea-coast name appropriate to Zebulun, but not Benjamin. But

(1) it is called Benjamite;

(2) doublets are not unknown in Chronicles;

(3) Daniel is also neglected;

(4) many Benjamite names are found;

(5) both the Zebulunite material and the Benjamite material elsewhere is too scanty for safe conclusions.

(c) Dan, 1 Chronicles 7:12, from Genesis 46:23.

Aher (“another”) is a copyist’s error or substitute for Dan.

(d) Naphtali, 1 Chronicles 7:13, from Genesis 46:24

(transcriptional changes).

(e) Manasseh, East and West (1 Chronicles 7:14-19).

The text of 1 Chronicles 7:14,15 very corrupt. No other notice is found of the sons in 1 Chronicles 7:16,17: Peresh, Sheresh, Ulam, Rakere, Bedan.

(f) Ephraim to Joshua (1 Chronicles 7:20-29).

Contains an interesting personal note in the mourning of Ephraim over his sons Ezer and Elead, and the subsequent birth of Beriah. Interpreted to mean that the clans Ezer and Elead met with disaster, on which the clan Beriah became prominent.
The seats of Joseph’s sons (1 Chronicles 7:28,29).

Hard to say why this has been placed here.

Asher (1 Chronicles 7:30-40).
The earliest names derived from Genesis 46:17. Gray considers the others ancient.

Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:1-40).

Sons of Benjamin. After Genesis 46:21, with variations. See (6) (b).

Descendants of Ehud (1 Chronicles 8:6-28). Text very corrupt, obscure.

The house of Saul (1 Chronicles 8:29-38); repeated (1 Chronicles 9:35-44).

In this passage two exceptions to the usual treatment of Baal compounds. Ishbaal and Meribbaal here are Ishbosheth and Mephibosheth in S.

The inhabitants of Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 9:1-34).

With variations in Nehemiah 11:1-13. This passage has been thought an interpolation, but it is the Chronicler’s custom to give dwelling-places. Perhaps this and Nehemiah are two independent abridgments of the same document. This probably describes post-exilic conditions. 1 Chronicles 9:1 and 2 here, and Nehemiah 11 seem conclusive on this point. Four classes of returning exiles:

The children of Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, Manasseh.

“the laity,” “Israel.”

The priests.

Agreeing with Nehemiah, but abridged.

The Levites. Paralleling Nehemiah, but not exactly.

Nethinim or porters. Fuller than Nehemiah, and different.

(22) David’s Knights (1 Chronicals 11:10-47).

Discussed under (19). Adds to the list, Adina, son of Shiza, Reubenite; Hanan, son of Maacah, Joshaphat the Mithnite, Uzziah the Ashterathite, Shama and Jeiel the sons of Hotham the Aroerite, Jedael the son of Shimi, and Joah his brother, the Tizite, Elieel the Mahavite, and Jeribai and Joshuaiah, the sons of Elnaam, and Ithmah the Moabite, Elieel, and Obed, and Jaasieh the Mezobaite.

(23) David’s Recruits at Ziklag (1 Chronicals 12 through 22).

Found only here. Contains 23 names from Benjamin (some may be Judahite); 11 from Gad; 8 from Manasseh; nothing to show that the names are not old.


Also 1 Chronicles 16:5,6,37-43. Each division of the Levites represented by a chief musician.

(25) David’s Organization of the Kingdom (1 Chronicals 23 through 27).

I. The Levites (1 Chronicals 23).

(1) The family of Gershon (1 Chronicles 23:7-11); 9 houses.

(2) The family of Kohath (1 Chronicles 23:12-20); 11 houses.

(3) The family of Merari (1 Chronicles 23:21-23); 4 houses.

II. The Priests (1 Chronicals 24).

24 divisions; 16 divided among descendants of Eleazar, headed by Zadok; 8 among those of Ithamar, headed by Ahimelech (perhaps an error for Abiathar); but perhaps Ahimelech’s. Abiathar, son of Ahimelech, was acting for his father.

(1) Eleazar’s courses: Jehoiarib, Harim, Malchijah, Hakkoz, Joshua, Eliashib, Huppah, Bilgah, Hezer, Aphses, Pethahiah, Jehezekel, Jachin, Gamul, Delaiah, Maaziah.

(2) Ithamar: Jedaiah, Seorim, Mijamin, Abijah, Shecaniah, Jachim, Joshebeab, Immer.
Josephus gives the same names of courses (Ant., VII, xiv, 7; Vita, 1). Several are mentioned in Apocrypha, Talmud, and the New Testament. Jehoiarib, Jedaiah, Harim, Malchijah, Mijarain, Abijah, Shecaniah, Bilgah, Maaziah, are found in one or both of Nehemiah’s lists.

(3) Supplementary list of Levites (1 Chronicles 20 through 31). Repeats the Levitical families in 1 Chronicles 23:6-23, omitting the Gershonites, adding to the Kohathites and Merarites.

III. The Singers (1 Chronicals 25).

(1) Their families, classified under the three great groups, descendants of Asaph, Jeduthun (Ethan), Heman. A curious problem is suggested by the fact that the names in verse 4, beginning with Hanani, with a few very slight changes, read: “Hanan (‘Have mercy’) -iah (‘O Yahweh’); Hanani (‘Have mercy’); Eli-athah (‘Thou art my God’); Giddalti (‘I have magnified’) (and) Romamti (‘exalted’) (thy) Ezer (‘help’); Josh-bekashah (‘In the seat of hardness’); Mallothi (‘I spake of it’); Hothir (‘Gave still’); Mahazioth (‘Visions’).” How, or why, this came among these names, cannot be said.

(2) The 24 courses of 12 singers each, of which courses numbers 1, 3, 5, 7 fell to Asaph; numbers 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, 14 fell to Jeduthun; numbers 6, 9, 11, 13, 15-24 fell to Heman.

IV. Gatekeepers and Other Officers (1 Chronicals 26).

(1) Genealogies and stations of the gatekeepers (1 Chronicles 26:1-19).

(2) Those in charge of the temple treasury (1 Chronicles 26:20-28).

(3) Those in charge of the “outward business.” Subordinate magistrates, tax-collectors, etc.

V. The Army, and David’s Officers (1 Chronicals 27).

(1) The army (1 Chronicles 27:1-15). 12 officers, each commanding 24,000 men, and in charge for one month; chosen from David’s knights.

(2) The tribal princes (1 Chronicles 27:16-24).
After the fashion of Numbers 12 through 15. Gad and Asher are omitted. The 12 are made up by including the Levites and the Aaronites.

(3) The king’s twelve stewards (<132725>1 Chronicles 27:25-31).

(4) The king’s court officers (<132732>1 Chronicles 27:32-34).

Counselor and scribe: Jonathan, the king’s uncle, otherwise unknown; tutor: Jehiel; counselor: Ahithophel; “the king’s friend” (closest confidant?): Hushai. Possibly two priests are next included: Jehoiada the son of Benaiah, and Abiathar, high priest of the Ithamar branch. But perhaps it should read, “Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada.” If two priests are intended, it seems strange that Zadok is not one. The list ends with the commander-in-chief, Joab.

This elaborate organization in every part and branch of the kingdom is looked upon as the Chronicler’s glowing Utopian dream of what must have been, underrating the organizing power of the great soldier and statesman.


(1) The Leaders (<150202>Ezra 2:2).

(2) Numbers, according to Families (<150203>Ezra 2:3-19).

18 of Ezra’s numbers differ from Nehemiah’s.

(3) Numbers according to Localities (<150220>Ezra 2:20-35).

10 towns probably Judahite, 7 Benjamite.

(4) The Priests (<150239>Ezra 2:39,42).

Only 4 families, representing 3 Davidic courses.


Among the singers, only Asaphites.

(6) The Porters (<150245>Ezra 2:45).

3 old names, 3 new ones.
(7) The “Nethinim” (Temple-Slaves) (Ezra 2:46-56).

(8) The Children of Solomon’s Servants (Slaves) (Ezra 2:57-59).

(9) Those Who Could Not Prove Their Descent.

(a) General population.

Three families, children of Delaiah, Tobiah, Nekoda.

(b) Priestly families.

Hobaiah, Hakkoz, Barzillai. Hakkoz, the seventh of the Davidic courses, perhaps succeeded later in establishing their right (Nehemiah 3:21).


An ascending genealogy: Ezra, son of Seraiah, son of Azariah, son of Hilkiah, son of Shallum, son of Zadok, son of Ahitub, son of Amariah, son of Azariah, son of Meraioth, son of Zerahiah, son of Uzzi, son of Bukki, son of Abishua, son of Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron; 16 links. Follows 1 Chronicles 6:7-10 down to Zadok, then omits 7 to Shallum, besides the 7 omitted in Chronicles.


Numbers much smaller than in Zerubbabel’s list (Ezr 2:1-14). Perhaps 3 new families, Shecaniah, Shelomith, Joah; 7 more leaders. A much smaller proportion of Levites; among them a “man of discretion,” perhaps a name, “Ishsecel,” of the sons of Mahli, therefore a Merarite, with other Merarites, 39 in all.


Seventeen in all; members of the high priest’s family, and of the Davidic courses of Immer and Harim, besides the family of Pashhur.
(2) The Levites (Ezra 10:23); 6 in All.

(3) Singers and Porters (Ezra 10:24); 4 in All.

(4) “Israel,” “the Laity” (Ezra 10:25-43).

Sixteen families represented; 86 persons. Out of a total of 163 names, 39 yah compounds, 19 ‘el compounds, 8 prefixed.


Thirty-eight leaders; in 30 instances the father’s name also given. As far as mentioned, all from Judah and Jerusalem.


Follows Ezr 2:1-63, with transcriptional variations in names and numbers.


Twenty-two priests, 17 Levites, 20 heads of families already mentioned, 24 individuals.

(34) Nehemiah 11:3-36. — Chief Dwellers in Jerusalem and Vicinity.

Parallels in 1 Chronicles 9:9-22. Some omissions and variations; 5 priestly courses given, Joiarib, course number 1; Jedaiah, number 2; Jachin, number 23; Malchijah, number 5; Immer, number 6. 24 “Jah,” 6 “El” names out of 82.


Compare with priests’ lists in Nehemiah 10:2-8 (33), and with priests under Joiakim (Nehemiah 12:12-21 (36)). They are names of families. See Nehemiah 12:12.
Nehemiah 12:10,11. — High Priests from Jeshua to Jaddua.

(1) Jeshua, 538 to 520 BC.

(2) Joiakim.

(3) Eliashib, 446 till after 433.

(4) Joiada, about 420.

(5) Jonathan, Johanan, 405 to 362.

(6) Jaddua, to 323.

This list bears upon the date of Ezra-Nehemiah. Jaddua was high priest when Alexander visited Jerusalem, 335 BC. If the Darius of verse 22 is Darius Nothus (425 to 405 BC), and Jaddua, a young boy, is mentioned as the heir to the high-priesthood, this passage was written before 400. If Jaddua’s actual high-priesthood is meant, and Darius Codomannus (336 to 330 BC) is the Darius here, the date may be about 330. The enumeration of families here is assigned to the time of Joiakim, before 405, and the latest recorded events to the time of the high priest before Jaddua (Nehemiah 12:23; 13:28), hence, before 362. The hypothesis of an addition by some scribe after 350 is possible, but not necessary.


(39) Nehemiah 12:31-42. — Princes and Priests at Dedication of the Wall.

(40) Matthew 1:1-17. — The Genealogy of Jesus Christ.

(See separate article).


(See separate article).
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Philip Wendell Crannell

GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST, THE
I. INTRODUCTION.

1. The Problems Involved:

The genealogy of Jesus as contained in the First and Third Gospels presents three special problems which lie somewhat part from general questions of New Testament criticism:

(1) the construction and purpose of each list taken separately;

(2) the relation of the two lists, in their coincidences and variations, to each other;

(3) the relationship of both lists to the statement concerning the virgin birth of our Lord with which they are directly connected. These questions necessarily involve the conclusion to be arrived at concerning the trustworthiness of the list of names as forming an actual historical connection between Jesus and His ancestors according to the flesh.

2. Nature and Importance of the Issue:

Before these problems are dealt with, it would be well to consider the kind and degree of importance to be attached to the question at issue. As we see it, the only vital point at stake is the balance, sanity and good judgment of the evangelists.

(1) That Jesus had a line of ancestors by His human birth may be taken for granted. The tradition, universal from the earliest times among believers and granted even by the bitterest opponents, that He was connected with the line of David, may also readily be accepted. The exact line through which that connection is traced is, on general principles, of secondary importance. The fact is that, while natural sonship to David on the part of the Messiah was of vital importance to many Jewish inquirers, it failed of any very enthusiastic endorsement on the part of Jesus Himself (see the truly remarkable interview recorded in Mark 12:35-37). The expressions of Paul in this connection will be referred to later; at this point it is sufficient to say that physical kinship to David cannot be insisted upon as the only justification for his words.

(2) If, then, the purpose of the evangelists in having recourse to these lists is worth while, the question of their correctness need not even be raised. Unless some vital issue is involved, the supposition of a special inspiration to go behind lists currently accepted is gratuitous. No such issue seems to
be presented here. The Davidic kinship of Jesus, in any sense essential to His Messiahship, is independent of the lists which are used to justify it. This is preliminary to the actual discussion and need not prevent us from giving all due credit to lists which could not have been carelessly compiled nor lightly used.

II. THE GENEALOGIES SEPARATELY.

1. Peculiarities of Matthew’s Genealogy:

(1) The construction and incorporation of Joseph’s genealogical tree is, in the light of all the facts, the primary consideration.

(2) The artificial division into three groups of fourteen generations each. The apparent defect in this arrangement as it actually stands (the third group lacks one member) is probably traceable to a defect of the Septuagint version of 1 Chronicles 3:11, which is reproduced in the Greek gospel (see Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, English translation, 564, note 4). This arrangement into groups is the more striking because it makes 14 generations from the captivity to Joseph, where Luke makes 20 or 21, and because the first group of 14 is formed by the omission of three names. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that this artificial grouping is essential to the purpose of the evangelist.

(3) The insertion of the names of brothers, thus following the historical lists and broadening the genealogy by including collateral lines.

(4) The insertion of the names of women — a practice not only foreign but abhorrent to ordinary usage. This peculiarity is the more marked when we notice that these names introduce what would be considered serious blots in the family history of the Davidic house (see Matthew 1:5,7).

(5) The principle upon which the division into periods is constructed:

(a) from Abraham to David,

(b) from David to the Captivity,

(c) from the Captivity to Jesus. Attention has repeatedly been called to the fact that this gives a definite historical movement to the genealogy. It involves the origin, the rise to power, the decay and downfall of the
house of David (see Allen, ICC, “Matthew,” 2; compare Zahn, N T, English translation, I, 535).

2. Explanation of the Foregoing:

Of the many theories which have been constructed to explain the foregoing six peculiarities of the genealogy of Matthew, altogether the most satisfactory is that of Professor Zahn. His contention is that the list was framed not to prove the natural connection of Jesus with the house of David — a fact which no one doubted — but to defend the one vital point where attack had been made, namely, the legitimacy of Jesus’ connection with David. No one seems to have questioned that Jesus was born of Mary and was closely connected with the royal house. The question was whether He was of legitimate birth. It was charged — and the slander which was very early in origin and circumstantial in character obtained an extraordinary hold upon the hostile Jewish mind — that Jesus was the illegitimate offspring of Mary. The Gospel of Matthew meets that slander by giving a bird’s-eye view of the movement of the history from Abraham to the Messiah in the form of a genealogy of Joseph, who in the light of all the facts concerning the origin of Jesus marries Mary and gives her the protection of his stainless name and royal lineage. The extraordinary boldness and brilliancy of this apologetic method ought not to be overlooked. The formal charge that Jesus is son of Mary, not of Joseph, is admitted — the slander involved is refuted by bringing Joseph forward as a witness for Mary. Nothing could have been more natural for a man fearless in the confidence of truth; nothing could have been more impossible for one insecure in his hold upon the facts. So far as the genealogy is concerned, just the moment we realize that the purpose is not to prove the natural sonship of Jesus to David, but to epitomize the history, all hesitancy and apprehension concerning the historicity of the successive names disappear. The continuity of blood relationship through these successive generations becomes of no essential importance. Zahn’s explanation (the argument in full should be read by every student), simple in itself, explains all the facts, as a key fits a complicated lock. It explains the choice of a genealogy as a method of epitomizing history and that genealogy Joseph’s, the artificial grouping at the expense of changing the traditional lists, the inclusion of the names of brothers and of women.
3. Peculiarities of Luke’s Genealogy:

(1) The choice of Joseph’s genealogical tree on the part of one who is so deeply interested in Mary.

(2) The reversal of order in going back from Joseph to his ancestors. Godet emphasizes the fact that, in the nature of the case, a genealogy follows the order of succession, each new individual being added to the roll of his family. Luke’s method indicates that his genealogy has been constructed for a special purpose.

(3) The carrying of the line back of the history of the covenant, which begins with Abraham, to Adam, who represents the race in general. This fact, together with another, that the line of Joseph is traced to David through Nathan who was not David’s heir, proves that Luke was not concerned with establishing the Davidic standing of Jesus.

(4) The placing of the genealogy, not at the beginning of the Gospel, but at the beginning of the ministry, between the baptism and the temptation.

(5) The omission of the article before the name of Joseph.

4. Explanation of the Foregoing:

(1) In his comment upon the fourth peculiarity enumerated above, namely, the placing of the genealogy at the beginning of the ministry, Godet (Gospel of Luke, American edition, 126) has this to say: “In crossing the threshold of this new era, the sacred historian casts a general glance over the period which thus reaches its close, and sums it up in this document, which might be called the mortuary register of the earlier humanity.” In other words, in connecting the genealogy directly with the ministry, Luke exhibits the fact that his interest in it is historical rather than antiquarian or, so to say, genealogical. As Matthew summarizes the history of the covenant people from the days of Abraham by means of the genealogical register, modified so as to make it graphic by its uniformity, so Luke has written the story of the humanity Jesus, as the Second Adam, came to save, by the register of names summarizing its entire course in the world.

It has recently been commented upon that genealogical lists such as those of Genesis and the New Testament are not infrequently used to convey ideas not strictly germane to the matter of descent or the cognate notion of chronology. For example, the statements as to the longevity of the
patriarchs are of historical interest only — they are not and could never have been of value for chronological purposes (see Warfield, “Antiquity and Unity of Human Race,” Princeton Review, February, 1911).

(2) In commenting upon the order which Luke adopts, Godet (who has thrown more light upon this portion of the Gospel than anyone else) says: “The ascending form of genealogy can only be that of a private instrument, drawn up from the public document with a view to the particular individual whose name serves as the starting-point of the whole list” (127).

(3) From the fact that the name of Joseph is introduced without an article Godet draws three conclusions:

(a) that this name belongs rather to the sentence introduced by Luke;

(b) that the genealogical document which he consulted began with the name of Heli;

(c) and consequently, that this piece was not originally the genealogy of Jesus or of Joseph, but of Heli (ibid., 128).

(4)

(a) The importance of these considerations is twofold. In the first place it indicates that Luke is bringing together two separate documents, one of which contained a statement of the foster-fatherhood of Joseph, while the other contained the genealogy of Heli, between whom and Joseph there existed a relationship which made Luke desirous of connecting them.

(b) In addition, the absence of the article serves to call attention to something exceptional in the relationship of Joseph to the rest of this ancestral line which is brought into connection with his name. To this point we shall recur later. We have an explanation for all the suggested problems except one, and that one, in a sense, the most difficult of all, namely, the choice of Joseph’s genealogy.
III. THE GENEALOGIES COMPARED.

1. Divergences:

In order, however, to discuss this question intelligently, we must enter upon the second stage of our inquiry — as to the relationship between the two lists.

(1) The most notable fact here is of course the wideness of the divergence together with the contrasted and unintelligible fact of minute correspondence. Between Abraham and David the two lists agree. Between David and Joseph there is evident correspondence in two (see Matthew 1:12; Luke 3:27), and possible correspondence in four names (that is, if Abiud (Matthew 1:13) and Judah (Luke 3:30) are the same). This initial and greatest difficulty is of material assistance to us because it makes one conclusion certain beyond peradventure. The two lists are not divergent attempts to perform the same task. Whatever difficulties may remain, this difficulty is eliminated at the outset. It is impossible that among a people given to genealogies two lists purporting to give the ancestry of a man in the same line could diverge so widely. There is, therefore, a difference between these lists which includes the purpose for which they were compiled and the meaning which they were intended to convey.

2. Correspondence:

(2) Two of the most striking points in the lists as they stand may be brought into connection and made to explain each other. The two lists coincide in the names of Zerubbabel and Shealtiel — they differ as to the name of Joseph’s father, who is Jacob according to Matthew and Heli according to Luke. As to the second of these two important items this much is clear. Either these two lists are in violent contradiction, or else Joseph was in some sense son of both Jacob and Heli. Now, in connection with this seeming impossibility, turn to the other item. The names of Shealtiel and Zerubbabel belong to the captivity. Their being common to both lists is easily explained by the fact that during that troubled period a number of collateral family branches might be narrowed down to one or two common representatives (see Zahn, op. cit., 535). In the New Testament genealogies Zerubbabel is the son of Shealtiel — according to 1 Chronicles 3:19 he is the nephew of Shealtiel and the son of Pedaiah.
He is, therefore, at one and the same time heir and, legally, son of two men and would appear as such on two collateral lists.

Shealtiel himself appears in Matthew (1:12) as the son of Jechoniah and in Luke (3:27) as the son of Neri. In 1 Chronicles 3:17 he appears as son of Jechoniah. The name of Neri is peculiar to Lk, so that we cannot check his use of it and discover the actual parentage of Shealtiel. His appearance in two lists with a double reference of parentage is not surprising in view of what we have already seen. Besides this, a reasonable explanation at once appears. In Jeremiah 36:30 it is asserted that Jehoiakim should have “none to sit upon the throne of David,” and of his son (Jehoiachin, Jechoniah, Coniah) it is said (Jeremiah 22:30), “Write ye this man childless,” etc. It has been rightly pointed out (see HDB, II 557) that this means simply legal proscription, not actual childlessness. It suggests, however, that it might be thought necessary to provide in the genealogy an heir not of their blood for the two disgraced and proscribed members of the royal house, In view of these facts the contradictory references as to Joseph’s parentage present no difficulty.

Joseph may easily have been and undoubtedly was, legally, son and heir of both Jacob and Heli. Godet’s objection to this is based upon the supposition that Heli and Jacob were brothers, which leaves the divergence beyond these two names unexplained. It is evident, however, that the kinship between Jacob and Heli might have been more distant than this supposition calls for.

(3) When we come to explain how it happened that Joseph was connected with both these lines and that Matthew chose one list and Luke the other we are necessarily shut up to conjecture. There is one supposition, however, which is worthy of very careful consideration because it solves so many and such difficult problems. The authorities have been divided as to whether Luke’s genealogy is Joseph’s, as appears, or Mary’s. Godet makes a strong showing for the latter, and, after all has been said per contra, some of his representations remain unshaken (compare Godet and Plummer sub loc.). Most of the difficulties are removed at one stroke, and the known facts harmonized, by the simple supposition that Luke has given us the meeting-point of the lineage both of Joseph and Mary who are akin. This explains the apparent choice of Joseph’s list; the peculiar position of his name in that list; the reversal of the order; the coincidences and discrepancies with reference to Matthew’s; the early tradition of Mary’s
Davidic origin; the strange reference in the Talmud (Chaghigha’ 77 4) to Mary as the daughter of Heli; the visit of Mary with Joseph to Bethlehem at the time of the registration; the traditional discrepancy of ages between Joseph and Mary, such that (apparently) Joseph disappears from the scene before Jesus reaches maturity. Against this nothing of real weight can be urged (the kinship with Elisabeth is not such: see Edersheim, LTJM, I, 149) except that it is too simple and too felicitous. Its simplicity and felicitous adjustment to the whole complex situation is precisely its recommendation. And there we may let the matter rest.

**IV. THE GENEALOGIES AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH.**

We have now to deal with the relationship of the genealogies to the virgin-birth statement which forms the vital center of the infancy narratives and to the general question of the Davidic origin of Jesus.

*See VIRGIN BIRTH.*

**1. Text of Matthew 1:16:**

The first part of this question may be most directly approached by a brief consideration of the text of Matthew 1:16. The text upon which the Revised Version (British and American) is based reads: “And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.” Beside this there are two readings, one contained in the so-called Ferrar group of manuscripts, and the other in the Sinaitic which, differing among themselves, unite in ascribing the parentage of Jesus to Joseph. This has been seized upon by negative critics (see for list and discussion Machen, Princeton Review, January, 1906, 63; compare Bacon, HDB, article “Genealogy of Jesus Christ,” Am. Jour. Theol., January, 1911, who long ago gave in his advocacy to the supposition that the evangelists could easily reconcile the supernatural birth with the actual paternity of Joseph) to support the idea of a primitive Christian tradition that Joseph was the father of Jesus. Of this contention Zahn leaves nothing, and concludes his argument with this statement: “The hope of finding indications in old manuscripts and versions that the authors of lost Gospels or brief writings which may have been worked over in our Matthew and Luke regarded Joseph as the physical father of Jesus, should at last be dismissed. An author who knew how to make even the dry material of a genealogy to its least detail contribute to the purpose of his thought concerning the slandered miracle of the Messiah’s birth, cannot at the same time have
taken over statements from a genealogy of Joseph or Jesus used by him which directly contradicted his conception of this fact. Any text of Matthew which contained such statements would be condemned in advance as one altered against the author’s interest” (op. cit., 567). It is interesting to note that Allen (ICC, “Matthew,” 8), starting from the extreme position that the Sinaitic form of statement, of all extant texts, most nearly represents the original, reaches the same conclusion as Zahn, that Matthew’s Gospel from the beginning taught the virgin birth.

2. General Conclusions:

(1) It is clear, therefore, from the general trend as well as from specific statements of both Gospels, that the genealogies and the birth-narratives were not floating traditions which accidentally touched and coalesced in mid-stream, but that they were intended to weld inseparably the two beliefs that Jesus was miraculousity conceived and that He was the heir of David. This could be done only on the basis of Joseph’s genealogy, for whatever the lineage of Mary, Joseph was the head of the family, and the Davidic connection of Jesus could only be established by acknowledgment of Him as legal son by Joseph. Upon this basis rests the common belief of the apostolic age (see Zahn, ibid., 567, note references), and in accordance with it all statements (such as those of Paul, Romans 1:3; 2 Timothy 2:8) must be interpreted.

(2) For it must be remembered that, back of the problem of reconciling the virgin birth and the Davidic origin of Jesus, lay the far deeper problem — to harmonize the incarnation and the Davidic origin. This problem had been presented in shadow and intimation by Jesus Himself in the question: “David himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he his Son?” It is further to be noticed that in the annunciation (Luke 1:32) the promised One is called at once Son of God and Son of David, and that He is the Son of God by virtue of His conception by the Spirit — leaving it evident that He is Son of David by virtue of His birth of Mary. With this should be compared the statement of Paul (Romans 1:3,1): He who was God’s Son was “born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.” This is at least most suggestive (see Orr, Virgin Birth of Christ, 119, with note, p. 121), for it indicates that as Paul and Luke were in very close sympathy as to the person of our Lord, so they are in equally close sympathy as to the mystery of His origin. The
unanimity of conviction on the part of the early church as to the Davidic origin of Jesus is closely paralleled by its equally firm conviction as to His supernatural derivation. The meeting-point of these two beliefs and the resolution of the mystery of their relationship is in the genealogies in which two widely diverging lines of human ancestry, representing the whole process of history, converge at the point where the new creation from heaven is introduced.

LITERATURE.

The literature on this subject is very copious. The works referred to in the text will serve to introduce the reader to more extensive investigations. The whole situation is well summarized by Plummer (ICC, “Luke,” sub loc.).

Louis Matthews Sweet

GENERAL; GENERALLY

<jen’-er-al>, <jen’-er-al-i> ([h L K ύkullah]; [πανήγυρις, paneguris]):

(1) General is the translation of sar, “master,” “head,” “chief”; used once in the King James Version in the sense of commander-in-chief, “the general of the king’s army” (1 Chronicles 27:34), usually in this connection translated “captain,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the captain of the king’s host.”

(2) As an adjective “general assembly” is the translation of paneguris (whence we have panegyric), “an assembly or convocation of the whole people to celebrate any public festival or solemnity, as the public games or sacrifices, hence, a high festival, public convocation, joyful assembly” (Robinson); the word occurs in the New Testament only in Hebrews 12:23, “to the general assembly and church of the firstborn; paneguris is Septuagint for μο`εdh (Ezekiel 46:11; Hosea 2:11), “solemn assembly” and for `atsarah (Amos 5:21), with the same meaning. The Greek words translated “and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn” (the King James Version) have been variously arranged and translated; Robinson gives “and to countless throngs (even) the joyful assembly of angels, i.e. as hymning the praises of God around His throne”; compare Revelation 5:11 f; Psalm 148:2; Daniel 7:10). From both Hebrew and Greek analogies,
this is probably correct; similarly, Alford, Delitzsch and others have “festival assembly”; Weymouth translated “to countless hosts of angels, to the great festal gathering and church of the first-born.”

(3) Generally, adverb, occurs in Jeremiah 48:38 the King James Version as the translation of kullah (Pual of kalah), “the whole of it,” “There shall be lamentation generally (universally) upon all the housetops of Moab,” the Revised Version (British and American) “everywhere”; in 2 Samuel 17:11, `acaph, “to be gathered,” is translated “to be generally gathered,” the Revised Version (British and American) “gathered together.”

In Apocrypha we have “general” in the sense of “common,” “universal” (Additions to Esther 15:10 margin, koinos; 2 Macc 3:18, pandemon); “in general” (2 Esdras 8:15, “man in general”; Ecclesiasticus 18:1, “all things in general,” koinos, the Revised Version (British and American) “in common”).

W. L. Walker

GENERATION

<jen-er-a’-shun> (Latin generatio, from genero, “beget”):

(1) The translation

(a) of [נְדָר, dor], “circle,” “generation,” hence, “age,” “period,” “cycle”: “many generations” (Deuteronomy 32:7);

(b) the people of any particular period or those born about the same time: “Righteous before me in this generation” (Genesis 7:1); “four generations” (Job 42:16);

(c) the people of a particular class or sort, with some implied reference to hereditary quality; the wicked (Deuteronomy 32:5; Proverbs 30:11); the righteous (Psalm 14:5; 112:2).

(2) [תּוֹלְדוֹת, toledhoth], “births,” hence

(a) an account of a man and his descendants: “The book of the generations of Adam” (Genesis 5:1);

(b) successive families: “The families of the sons of Noah, after their generations” (Genesis 10:32);
(c) genealogical divisions: “The children of Reuben .... their generations, by their families” (Numbers 1:20);

(d) figurative, of the origin and early history of created things: “The generations of the heavens and of the earth” (Genesis 2:4).

(3) [γενεά, genea], “a begetting,” “birth,” “nativity,” therefore

(a) the successive members of a genealogy: “All the generations from Abraham unto David” (Matthew 1:17);

(b) a race, or class, distinguished by common characteristics, always (in the New Testament) bad: “Faithless and perverse generation” (Matthew 17:17);

(c) the people of a period: “This generation shall not pass away” (Luke 21:32);

(d) an age (the average lifetime, 33 years): “Hid for (Greek “from the”) ages and (from the) generations” (Colossians 1:26). The term is also by a figurative transference of thought applied to duration in eternity: “Unto all generations for ever and ever” (Ephesians 3:21) (Greek “all the generations of the age of the ages”).

(4) [γενεσίς, genesis], “source,” “origin”: “The book of the generation of Jesus Christ” (Matthew 1:1; the American Revised Version, margin “The genealogy of Jesus Christ”).

(5) [γεννήμα, gennema], “offspring,” “progeny”; figurative: “O generation of vipers” (Luke 3:7 the King James Version).

(6) [γένος, genos], “stock,” “race,” in this case spiritual: “But ye are a chosen generation” (1 Peter 2:9; the American Standard Revised Version “an elect race”).

Philip Wendell Crannell

GENESIS

<jen’-e-sis>:
I. GENERAL DATA.

1. The Name:

The first book of Moses is named by the Jews from the first word, namely, [t yv r 8] bere’shith, i.e. “in the beginning” (compare the [Brhsiq, Bresith] of Origen). In the Septuagint it is called [Genesiv, Genesis], because it recounts the beginnings of the world and of mankind. This name has passed over into the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (Liber Genesis). As a matter of fact the name is based only on the beginning of the book.

2. Survey of Contents:

The book reports to us the story of the creation of the world and of the first human beings (Genesis 1); of paradise and the fall (Genesis 2 f); of mankind down to the Deluge (Genesis 4 f; compare Genesis 4, Cain and Abel); of the Deluge itself (Genesis 6 through 9); of mankind down to the age of the Patriarchs (Genesis 10:1 through 11:26; compare 11:1 ff, the building of the tower of Babel); of Abraham and his house (Genesis 11:27 through 25:18); of Isaac and his house (Genesis 25:19 through 37:2); of Jacob and of Joseph (Genesis 37:2-50:26). In other words, the Book of Genesis treats of the history of the kingdom of God on earth from the time of the creation of the world down to the beginning of Israel’s sojourn in Egypt and to the death of Joseph; and it treats of these subjects in such a way that it narrates in the 1st part (Genesis 1:1 through 11:26) the history of mankind; and in the 2nd part (Genesis 11:27 through 50:26) the history of families; and this latter part is at the same time the beginning of the history of the chosen people, which history itself begins with Exodus 1. Though the introduction, Genesis 1-11, with its universal character, includes all mankind in the promise given at the beginning of the history of Abraham (12:1-3), it is from the outset distinctly declared that God, even if He did originally set apart one man and his family (Genesis 12 through 50), and after that a single nation (Exodus 1 ff), nevertheless intends that this particularistic development of the plan of salvation is eventually to include all mankind. The manner in which salvation is developed historically is particularistic, but its purposes are universal.
3. Connection with Succeeding Books:

By the statements just made it has already been indicated in what close connection Genesis stands with the subsequent books of the sacred Scriptures. The history of the chosen people, which begins with Exodus 1 ff, at the very outset and with a clear purpose, refers back to the history as found in Genesis (compare Exodus 1:1-6,8 with Genesis 46:27; 50:24 ff; and see EXODUS, I, 3), although hundreds of years had clasped between these events; which years are ignored, because they were in their details of no importance for the religious history of the people of God. But to Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3 the promise had been given, not only that he was to be the father of a mighty nation that would recognize him as their founder, and the earliest history of which is reported in Exodus and the following books of the Pentateuch, but also that the Holy Land had been promised him. In this respect, the Book of Joshua, which gives the story of the capture of this land, is also a continuation of the historical development begun in Genesis. The blessing of God pronounced over Abraham, however, continued to be efficacious also in the later times among the people who had descended from him. In this way Genesis is an introduction to all of the books of the Old Testament that follow it, which in any way have to do with the fate of this people, and originated in its midst as the result of the special relation between God and this people. But in so far as this blessing of God was to extend to all the nations of the earth (Genesis 12:3), the promises given can be entirely fulfilled only in Christ, and can expand only in the work and success of Christian missions and in the blessings that are found within Christianity. Accordingly, this book treats first of beginnings and origins, in which, as in a kernel, the entire development of the kingdom of God down to its consummation is contained (compare VI below).

II. COMPOSITION OF GENESIS IN GENERAL.

1. Unity of the Biblical Text:

(1) The Toledoth.

The fact that Genesis is characterized by a far-reaching and uniform scheme has, at least in outline, been already indicated (see I, 2 and 3). This impression is confirmed when we examine matters a little more closely and study the plan and structure of the book. After the grand introitus, which reports the creation of the world (1:1-2:3) there follows in the form of 10
pericopes the historical unfolding of that which God has created, which pericopes properly in each case bear the name *toledhoth*, or “generations.” For this word never signifies creation or generation as an act, but always the history of what has already been created or begotten, the history of generations; so that for this reason, 2:4a, where mention is made of the *toledhoth* of heaven and of earth, cannot possibly be a superscription that has found its way here from 1:1. It is here, as it is in all cases, the superscription to what follows, and it admirably leads over from the history of creation of the heavens and the earth in Genesis 1 to the continuation of this subject in the next chapter. The claim of the critics, that the redactor had at this place taken only the superscription from his source P (the priestly narrator, to whom 1 through 2:3 is ascribed), but that the section of P to which this superscription originally belonged had been suppressed, is all the more monstrous a supposition as 2:4a throughout suits what follows.

Only on the ground of this correct explanation of the term *toledhoth* can the fact be finally and fully explained, that the *toledhoth* of Terah contain also the history of Abraham and of Lot; the *toledhoth* of Isaac contain the history of Jacob and Esau; the *toledhoth* of Jacob contain the history of Joseph and his brethren. The ten *toledhoth* are the following: I, Genesis 2:4-4:26, the *toledhoth* of the heavens and the earth; II, 5:1 through 6:8, the *toledhoth* of Adam; III, 6:9 through 9:29, the *toledhoth* of Noah; IV, 10:1 through 11:9, the *toledhoth* of the sons of Noah; V, 11:10-26, the *toledhoth* of the sons of Shem; VI, 11:27 through 25:11, the *toledhoth* of Terah; VII, 25:12-18, the *toledhoth* of Ishmael; VIII, 25:19 through 35:29, the *toledhoth* of Isaac; IX, 36:1 through 37:1, the *toledhoth* of Esau (the fact that 36:9, in addition to the instance in verse 1, contains the word *toledhoth* a second time, is of no importance whatever for our discussion at this stage, as the entire chapter under any circumstances treats in some way of the history of the generations of Esau; see III, 2:9); X, 37:2 through 50:26, the *toledhoth* of Jacob. In each instance this superscription covers everything that follows down to the next superscription.

The number 10 is here evidently not an accidental matter. In the articles *Exodus, Leviticus, Day of Atonement*, also in *Ezekiel*, it has been shown what role the typical numbers 4, 7, 10 and 12 play in the structure of the whole books and of the individual pericopes. (In the New Testament we meet with the same phenomenon, particularly in the Apocalypse of John; but compare also in Matthew’s Gospel the 3 X 14
generations in Matthew 1:1 ff, the 7 parables in 13:1 ff, the 7 woes in 23:13 ff.) In the same way the entire Book of Leviticus naturally falls into 10 pericopes (compare Leviticus, II, 2, 1), and Leviticus 19 contains 10 groups, each of 4 (possibly also of 5) commandments; compare possibly also 18:6-18; 20:9-18; see Leviticus, II, 2, 21, VI. Further, the number 10, with a greater or less degree of certainty, can be regarded as the basis for the construction of the pericopes: Exodus 1:8-7:7; 7:8-13:16 (10 plagues); 13:17-18:27 (see Exodus, II, 2:1-3); the Decalogue (20:1 ff); the first Book of the Covenant (21:1 through 23:13; 23:14-19), and the whole pericope 19:1 through 24:18a, as also 32:1 through 35:3 (see Exodus, II, 2, 4, 6). In the Book of Genesis itself compare further the 10 members from Shem to Abraham (11:11-26), as also the pericopes 25:19 through 35:29; 37:2 through 50:26 (see III, 2, 8, 10 below), and the 10 nations in Genesis 15:19 ff. And just as in the cases cited, in almost every instance, there is to be found a further division into 5 X 2 or 2 X 5 (compare, e.g. the two tables of the Decalogue); thus, too, in the Book of Genesis in each case, 5 of the 10 pericopes are more closely combined, since I-V (toledhoth of Shem inclusive) stand in a more distant, and VI-X (treating of the toledhoth of Terah, or the history of Abraham) in a closer connection with the kingdom of God; and in so far, too, as the first series of toledhoth bring into the foreground more facts and events, but the second series more individuals and persons. Possibly in this case, we can further unite 2 toledhoth; at any rate I and II (the primitive age), III and IV (Noah and his sons), VII and VIII (Ishmael and Isaac), IX and X (Esau and Jacob) can be thus grouped.

(2) Further Indication of Unity.

In addition to the systematic scheme so transparent in the entire Biblical text of the Book of Genesis, irrespective of any division into literary sources, it is to be noticed further, that in exactly the same way the history of those generations that were rejected from any connection with the kingdom of God is narrated before the history of those that remained in the kingdom of God and continued its development. Cain’s history (4:17 ff) in Jahwist (Jahwist) stands before the history of Seth (4:25 f J; 5:3 ff P); Japheth’s and Ham’s genealogy (10:1 ff P; 10:8 ff P and J) before that of Shem (10:21 ff J and P), although Ham was the youngest of the three sons of Noah (9:24); the further history of Lot (19:29 ff P and J) and of Ishmael’s genealogy (25:12 ff P and J) before that of Isaac (25:19 ff P and
In favor of the unity of the Biblical text we can also mention the fact that the Book of Genesis as a whole, irrespective of all sources, and in view of the history that begins with Exodus 1 ff, has a unique character, so that e.g. the intimate communion with God, of the kind which is reported in the beginning of this Book of Genesis (compare, e.g. 3:8; 7:16; 11:5 J; 17:1,22; 35:9,13 P; 18:1 ff; 32:31 J), afterward ceases; and that in Ex, on the other hand, many more miracles are reported than in the Book of Genesis (see Exodus, III, 2); that Genesis contains rather the history of mankind and of families, while Exodus contains that of the nation (see I, 2 above); that it is only in Exodus that the law is given, while in the history of the period of the patriarchs we find only promises of the Divine grace; that all the different sources ignore the time that elapses between the close of Genesis and the beginning of Exodus; and further, that nowhere else is found anything like the number of references to the names of persons or things as are contained in Genesis (compare, e.g. 2:23; 3:20; 4:1,25, etc., in J; 17:5,15,17-20, etc., in P; 21:9,17,31, etc., in E; 21:6; 27:36, etc., in J and E; 28:19, etc., in R; 49:8,16,19, etc., in the blessing of Jacob); that the changing of the names of Abram and Sarai to Abraham and Sarah from Genesis 17:5,15 goes on through all the sources, while before this it is not found in any source. Finally, we would draw attention to the psychologically finely drawn portraits of Biblical persons in Genesis. The fact that the personal pronoun hu’ and the noun na`ar are used of both masculine and feminine genders is characteristic of Genesis in common with all the books of the Pentateuch, without any difference in this regard being found in the different documents, which fact, as all those cited by us in number 1 above, militates against the division of this book into different sources. Let us now examine more closely the reason assigned for the division into different sources.

2. Rejection of the Documentary Theory:

(1) In General.

(a) Statement of Theory:

Old Testament scholars of the most divergent tendencies are almost unanimous in dividing the Biblical text of Genesis into the sources the Priestly Code (P), Jahwist and Elohist, namely Priestly Codex, Jahwist, and
Elohist. To P are attributed the following greater and connected parts: 1:1-2:4a; 5; a part of the story of the Deluge in chapters 6-9; 11:10 ff; 17; 23; 25:12 ff; 35:22b ff; the most of 36. As examples of the parts assigned to J we mention 2:4b-4:26; the rest of the story of the Deluge in chapters 6-9; 11:1 ff; 12 f; 16; 18 f, with the exception of a few verses, which are ascribed to P; chapter 24 and others. Connected parts belonging to the Elohist (E) are claimed to begin with chapters 20 and 21 (with the exception of a number of verses which are attributed to P or J or R), and it is thought that, beginning with chapter 22, E is frequently found in the history of Jacob and of Joseph (25:19-50:26), in part, however, interwoven with J (details will be found under III, in each case under 2). This documentary theory has hitherto been antagonized only by a few individuals, such as Klostermann, Lepsius, Eerdmans, Orr, Wiener, and the author of the present article.

(b) Reasons Assigned for Divisions:

As is well known, theory of separation of certain books of the Old Testament into different sources began originally with the Book of Genesis. The use made of the two names of God, namely Yahweh (Yahweh) and Elohim, caused Astruc to conclude that two principal sources had been used in the composition of the book, although other data were also used in vindication of theory; and since the days of Ilgen the conviction gained ground that there was a second Elohist (now called E), in contradistinction to the first (now called the Priestly Code (P), to whom, e.g., Genesis 1 is ascribed). This second Elohist, it was claimed, also made use of the name Elohim, as did the first, but in other respects he shows greater similarity to the Jahwist. These sources were eventually traced through the entire Pentateuch and into later books, and for this reason are discussed in detail in the article **PENTATEUCH**. In this article we must confine ourselves to the Book of Genesis, and limit the discussion to some leading points. In addition to the names for God (see under 2), it is claimed that certain contradictions and duplicate accounts of the same matters compel us to accept different sources. Among these duplicates are found, e.g., Genesis 1:1 through 2:4a the Priestly Code (P), and 2:4b ff J, containing two stories of creation; Genesis 12:9 ff J; 20:1 ff E; 26:1 ff J; with the narrative of how Sarah and Rebekah, the wives of the two patriarchs, were endangered; chapters 15 J and 17 the Priestly Code (P), with a double account of how God concluded His covenant with Abraham;
21:22 ff E and 26:12 ff J, the stories of Abimelech; chapters 16 J and 21 E, the Hagar episodes; 28:10 ff J and E and 35:1 ff E and the Priestly Code (P), the narratives concerning Bethel, and in the history of Joseph the mention made of the Midianites E, and of the Ishmaelites J, who took Joseph to Egypt (37:25 ff; 39:1); the intervention of Reuben E, or Judah J, for Joseph, etc. In addition a peculiar style, as also distinct theological views, is claimed for each of these sources. Thus there found in P a great deal of statistical and systematic material, as in 5:1 ff; 11:10 ff; 25:12 ff; 36:6 ff (the genealogies of Adam, Shem, Ishmael, Esau); P is said to show a certain preference for fixed schemes and for repetitions in his narratives. He rejects all sacrifices earlier than the Mosaic period, because according to this source the Lord did not reveal himself as Yahweh previous to Exodus 6:1 ff. Again, it is claimed that the Elohist (E) describes God as speaking to men from heaven, or through a dream, and through an angel, while according to J Yahweh is said to have conversed with mankind personally. In regard to the peculiarities of language used by the different sources, it is impossible in this place to enumerate the different expressions, and we must refer for this subject to the different Introductions to the Old Testament, and to the commentaries and other literature. A few examples are to be found under (c) below, in connection with the discussion of the critical hypothesis. Finally, as another reason for the division of Genesis into different sources, it is claimed that the different parts of the sources, when taken together, can be united into a smooth and connected story. The documents, it is said, have in many cases been taken over word for word and have been united and interwoven in an entirely external manner, so that it is still possible to separate them and often to do this even down to parts of a sentence or to the very words.

(c) Examination of the Documentary Theory:

(i) Style and Peculiarities of Language:

It is self-evident that certain expressions will be repeated in historical, in legal, and in other sections similar in content; but this is not enough to prove that there have been different sources. Whenever J brings genealogies or accounts that are no less systematic than those of P (compare Genesis 4:17 ff; 10:8 ff; 22:20-24); or accounts and repetitions occur in the story of the Deluge (Genesis 7:2 ff, 7 ff; or 7:4, 12, 17; 8:6; or 7:4; 8:8, 10, 12), this is not enough to make the division into sources plausible. In reference to the linguistic peculiarities, it must be
noted that the data cited to prove this point seldom agree. Thus, e.g. the verb *bara’,* “create,” in Genesis 1:1 is used to prove that this was written by the Priestly Code (P), but the word is found also in 6:7 in J. The same is the case with the word *rekhush,* “possession,” which in 12:5; 13:6; 36:7 is regarded as characteristic of the Priestly Code (P), but in 14:11 f, 16, 21 is found in an unknown source, and in 15:14 in J. In 12:5; 13:12a; 16:3; 17:8 it is said that *‘erets kena`an,* “land of Canaan,” is a proof that this was written by P; but in chapters 42; 44 f; 47; 50 we find this expression in Jahwist and Elohist, in Numbers 32:32 in J (R); compare also Numbers 33:40 (PR) where Numbers 21:1-3 (JE) is quoted; *shipchchah,* “maid servant,” is claimed as a characteristic word of J in contrast to E (compare 16:1 ff); but in 16:3; 29:24, 29 we find this word not only in P but in 20:14; 30:4, 7, 18; in E *Min,* “kind,” is counted among the marks of P (compare e.g. 1:11 ff), but in Deuteronomy 14:13, 14, 18 we find it in Deuteronomy; rather remarkably, too, in the latest find on the Deluge made by Hilprecht and by him ascribed to 2100 BC. Compare on this subject my book, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung, and Orr, POT, chapter vii, section vi, and chapter x, section i; perhaps, too, the Concordance of Mandelkern under the different words. Even in the cases when the characteristic peculiarities claimed for the sources are correct, if the problem before us consisted only in the discovery of special words and expressions in the different sources, then by an analogous process, we could dissect and sever almost any modern work of literature. Particularly as far as the pieces are concerned, which are assigned to the Priestly Code (P), it must be stated that Genesis 1 and 23 are, as far as style and language are concerned, different throughout. Genesis 1 is entirely unique in the entire Old Testament. Genesis 23 has been copied directly from life, which is pictured with exceptional fidelity, and for this reason cannot be claimed for any special source. The fact that the story of the introduction of circumcision in Genesis 17 in many particulars shows similarities to the terminology of the law is entirely natural: The same is true when the chronological accounts refer one date to another and when they show a certain typical character, as is, e.g., the case also in the chronological parts of any modern history of Israel. On the other hand, the method of P in its narratives, both in matter and in form, becomes similar to that of Jahwist and Elohist, just as soon as we have to deal with larger sections; compare Genesis 28:1 ff; 35:9 ff; 47:5 ff, and all the more in Exodus and Numbers.
Against the claim that P had an independent existence, we must mention the fact of the unevenness of the narratives, which, by the side of the fuller accounts in Genesis 1; 17 and 23, of the genealogies and the story of the Deluge, would, according to the critics, have reported only a few disrupted notices about the patriarchs; compare for this in the story of Abraham, 11:27,31 f; 12:4b f; 13:6a 11b,12a; 16:1a,3,15 f; 19:29; 21:1b,2b-5; 25:7-11a; and in its later parts P would become still more incomprehensible on the assumption of the critics (see III below). No author could have written thus; at any rate he would not have been used by anybody, nor would there have been such care evinced in preserving his writings.

(i) Alleged Connection of Matter:

The claim that the different sources, as they have been separated by critics, constitute a compact and connected whole is absolutely the work of imagination, and is in conflict with the facts in almost every instance. This hypothesis cannot be consistently applied, even in the case of the characteristic examples cited to prove the correctness of the documentary theory, such as the story of the Deluge (see III, 2, in each case under (2)).

(ii) The Biblico-Theological Data:

The different Biblical and theological data, which are said to be characteristic in proof of the separation into sources, are also misleading. Thus God in J communes with mankind only in the beginning (Genesis 2 f; 16 ff; 11:5; 18 f), but not afterward. In the beginning He does this also, according to the Priestly Code (P), whose conception of God, it is generally claimed, was entirely transcendent (compare Genesis 17:1,22; 35:9,13). The mediatorship of the Angel of Yahweh is found not only in E, (Genesis 21:17, ‘Elohim), but also in J (Genesis 16:7,9-11). In 22:11 in E, the angel of Yahweh (not of the ‘Elohim) calls from heaven; theophanies in the night or during sleep are found also in J (compare Genesis 15:12 ff; 26:24; 28:13-16; 32:27). In the case of the Priestly Code (P), the cult theory, according to which it is claimed that this source does not mention any sacrifices before Exodus 6:1 ff, is untenable. If it is a fact that theocracy, as it were, really began only in Exodus 6, then it would be impossible that P would contain anything of the cults before Exodus 6; but we have in P the introduction of the circumcision in Genesis 17; of the Sabbath in 2:1 ff; and the prohibition against eating blood in 9:1 ff; and in addition the drink offerings mentioned...
in 35:14, which verse stands between 35:13 and 15, and, ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), is only in the interests of this theory attributed to the redactor. If then theory here outlined is not tenable as far as P is concerned, it would, on the other hand, be all the more remarkable that in the story of the Deluge the distinction between the clean and the unclean (7:2 ff.8) is found in J, as also the savor of the sacrifice, with the term *reach ha-nichoach*, which occurs so often in P (compare <010821>Genesis 8:21 with <041503>Numbers 15:3,7,10,13 f,24; 18:17); that the sacrifices are mentioned in <010820>Genesis 8:20 ff, and the number 7 in connection with the animals and days in 7:4; 8:8,10,12 (compare in the Priestly Code (P), e.g. Leviticus8:33; 13:5 f,21,26 f,31,33,10,54; 14:8 f,38 f; 14:7,51; 16:14 f; Numbers 28:11; 29:8, etc.); further, that the emphasis is laid on the 40 days in <010704>Genesis 7:4,12,17; 8:6 (compare in the Priestly Code (P), Exodus 24:1-8; Leviticus12:2-4; Numbers 13:25; 14:34), all of which are ascribed, not as we should expect, to the Levitical the Priestly Code (P), but to the prophetical J. The document the Priestly Code (P), which, according to a large number of critics, was written during the Exile (see e.g. LEVITICUS, III, 1, or EZEKIEL II, 2) in a most surprising manner, instead of giving prominence to the person of the high priest, would then have declared that kings were to be the greatest blessings to come to the seed of Abraham (<011706>Genesis 17:6,16); and while, on the critical assumption, we should have the right to expect the author to favor particularistic tendencies, he, by bringing in the history of all mankind in Genesis 1 through 11, and in the extension of circumcision to strangers (17:12,23), would have displayed a phenomenal universality. The strongest counter-argument against all such minor and incorrect data of a Biblical and a theological character will always be found in the uniform religious and ethical spirit and world of thought that pervade all these sources, as also in the unity in the accounts of the different patriarchs, who are pictured in such a masterly, psychological and consistent manner, and who could never be the result of an accidental working together and interweaving of different and independent sources (see III below).

**(in) Duplicates:**

In regard to what is to be thought of the different duplicates and contradictions, see below under III, 2, in each case under (2).

**(iv) Manner in Which the Sources Are Worked Together:**
But it is also impossible that these sources could have been worked together in the manner in which the critics claim that this was done. The more arbitrarily and carelessly the redactors are thought to have gone to work in many places in removing contradictions, the more incomprehensible it becomes that they at other places report faithfully such contradictions and permit these to stand side by side, or, rather, have placed them thus. And even if they are thought not to have smoothed over the difficulties anywhere, and out of reverence for their sources, not to have omitted or changed any of these reports, we certainly would have a right to think that even if they would have perchance placed side by side narratives with such enormous contradictions as there are claimed to be, e.g. in the story of the Deluge in P and J, they certainly would not have woven these together. If, notwithstanding, they still did this without harmonizing them, why are we asked to believe that at other places they omitted matters of the greatest importance (see III, 2, 3)? Further, J and E would have worked their materials together so closely at different places that a separation between the two would be an impossibility, something that is acknowledged as a fact by many Old Testament students; yet, notwithstanding, the contradictions, e.g. in the history of Joseph, have been allowed to stand side by side in consecutive verses, or have even intentionally been placed thus (compare, e.g. Genesis 37:25 ff). Then, too, it is in the nature of things unthinkable that three originally independent sources for the history of Israel should have constituted separate currents down to the period after Moses, and that they could yet be dovetailed, often sentence by sentence, in the manner claimed by the critics. In conclusion, the entire hypothesis suffers shipwreck through those passages which combine the peculiarities of the different sources, as e.g. in Genesis 20:18, which on the one hand constitutes the necessary conclusion to the preceding story from E (compare 20:17), and on the other hand contains the name Yahweh; or in 22:14 ff, which contains the real purpose of the story of the sacrificing of Isaac from E, but throughout also shows the characteristic marks of J; or in 39:1, where the so-called private person into whose house Joseph has been brought, according to J, is more exactly described as the chief of the body-guard, as this is done by E, in 40:2,4. And when the critics in this passage appeal to the help of the redactor (editor), this is evidently only an ill-concealed example of a “begging of the question.” In chapter 34, and especially in chapter 14, we have a considerable number of larger sections that contain the characteristics of two or even all three sources, and which accordingly
furnish ample evidence for protesting against the whole documentary theory.

(v) Criticism Carried to Extremes:

All the difficulties that have been mentioned grow into enormous proportions when we take into consideration the following facts: To operate with the three sources J, E and P seems to be rather an easy process; but if we accept the principles that underlie this separation into sources, it is an impossibility to limit ourselves to these three sources, as a goodly number of Old Testament scholars would like to do, as Strack, Kittel, Oettli, Dillmann, Driver. The stories of the danger that attended the wives of the Patriarchs, as these are found in Genesis 12:9 ff and in 26:1 ff, are ascribed to J, and the story as found in Genesis 20:1 ff to E. But evidently two sources are not enough in these cases, seeing that similar stories are always regarded as a proof that there have been different authors. Accordingly, we must claim three authors, unless it should turn out that these three stories have an altogether different signification, in which case they report three actual occurrences and may have been reported by one and the same author. The same use is made of the laughter in connection with the name Isaac in Genesis 17:17; 18:12; 21:6, namely, to substantiate the claim for three sources, P and J and E. But since 21:9 E; 26:8 J also contain references to this, and as in 21:6 JE, in addition to the passage cited above, there is also a second reference of this kind, then, in consistency, the critics would be compelled to accept six sources instead of three (Sievers accepts at least 5, Gunkel 4); or all of these references point to one and the same author who took pleasure in repeating such references. As a consequence, in some critical circles scholars have reached the conclusion that there are also such further sources as J1 and Later additions to J, as also E1 and Later additions to E (compare Budde, Baudissin, Cornill, Holzinger, Kautzsch, Kuenen, Sellin). But Sievers has already discovered five subordinate sources of J, six of the Priestly Code (P), and three of E, making a total of fourteen independent sources that he thinks can yet be separated accurately (not taking into consideration some remnants of J, E and P that can no longer be distinguished from others). Gunkel believes that the narratives in Genesis were originally independent and separate stories, which can to a great extent yet be distinguished in their original form. But if J and E and P from this standpoint are no longer authors but are themselves, in fact, reduced to the rank of collectors and editors, then it is absurd to speak any more of
distinct linguistic peculiarities, or of certain theological ideas, or of intentional uses made of certain names of God in J and E and the Priestly Code (P), not to say anything of the connection between these sources, except perhaps in rare cases. Here the foundations of the documentary theory have been undermined by the critics themselves, without Sievers or Gunkel or the other less radical scholars intending to do such a thing. The manner in which these sources are said to have been worked together naturally becomes meaningless in view of such hypotheses. The modern methods of dividing between the sources, if consistently applied, will end in splitting the Biblical text into atoms; and this result, toward which the development of Old Testament criticism is inevitably leading, will some day cause a sane reaction; for through these methods scholars have deprived themselves of the possibility of explaining the blessed influence which these Scriptures, so accidentally compiled according to their view, have achieved through thousands of years. The success of the Bible text, regarded merely from a historical point of view, becomes for the critic a riddle that defies all solutions, even if all dogmatical considerations are ignored.

(2) In View of the Names for God.

(a) Error of Hypothesis in Principle:

The names of God, Yahweh and Elohim, constituted for Astruc the starting-point for the division of Genesis into different sources (see (1) above). Two chief sources, based on the two names for God, could perhaps as a theory and in themselves be regarded as acceptable. If we add that in Exodus 6:1 ff, in the Priestly Code (P), we are told that God had not revealed Himself before the days of Moses by the name of Yahweh, but only as “God Almighty,” it seems to be the correct thing to separate the text, which reports concerning the times before Moses and which in parts contains the name Yahweh, into two sources, one with Yahweh and the other with Elohim. But just as soon as we conclude that the use made of the two names of God proves that there were three and not two sources, as is done from Genesis 20 on, the conclusive ground for the division falls away. The second Elohist (E), whom Ilgen was the first to propose (see (1) above), in principle and a priori discredits the whole hypothesis. This new source from the very outset covers all the passages that cannot be ascribed to the Yahweh or the Elohist portions; whatever portions contain the name Elohim, as P does, and which nevertheless are prophetical in character after the manner of J, and accordingly cannot be made to fit in either the
Jahwistic or the Elohist source, seek a refuge in this third source. Even before we have done as much as look at the text, we can say that according to this method everything can be proved. And when critics go so far as to divide J and E and P into many subparts, it becomes all the more impossible to make the names for God a basis for this division into sources. Consistently we could perhaps in this case separate a Yahweh source, an Elohim source, a ha-'Elohim source, an ‘El Shadday source, an ‘Adhonay source, a Mal’akh Yahweh source, a Mal’ak ‘Elohim source, etc., but unfortunately these characteristics of the sources come into conflict in a thousand cases with the others that are claimed to prove that there are different sources in the Book of Genesis.

(b) False Basis of Hypothesis:

But the basis of the whole hypothesis itself, namely, Exodus 6:1 ff P; is falsely regarded as such. If Yahweh had really been unknown before the days of Moses, as Exodus 6:1 ff P is claimed to prove, how could J then, in so important and decisive a point in the history of the religious development of Israel, have told such an entirely different story? Or if, on the other hand, Yahweh was already known before the time of Moses, as we must conclude according to J, how was it possible for P all at once to invent a new view? This is all the more incredible since it is this author and none other who already makes use of the word Yahweh in the composition of the name of the mother of Moses, namely Jochebed (compare Exodus 6:20 and Numbers 26:59). In addition, we do not find at all in Exodus 6:1 ff that God had before this revealed Himself as ‘Elohim, but as ‘El Shadday, so that this would be a reason for claiming not an ‘Elohim but an ‘El Shadday source for P on the basis of this passage (compare 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 48:3 P — 43:14 E! compare also 49:25 in the blessing of Jacob). Finally, it is not at all possible to separate Exodus 6:1 ff P from that which immediately precedes, which is taken from JE and employs the name Yahweh; for according to the text of P we do not know who Moses and who Aaron really were, and yet these two are in Exodus 6:1 ff regarded as well-known persons. The new revelation of God in Exodus 6:1 ff (P) by the side of 3:1 ff (JE and E) is also entirely defensible and rests on a good foundation; for Moses after the failure of Exodus 5 needed such a renewed encouragement *(see EXODUS II, 2, 1).* If this is the case, then the revelation of the name of Yahweh in Exodus 6:1 ff cannot mean that that name had before this not been known at all,
but means that it had only been relatively unknown, i.e. that in the fullest and most perfect sense God became known only as Yahweh, while before this He had revealed His character only from certain sides, but especially as to His Almighty Power.

**(c)** Improbability That Distinction of Divine Names Is without Significance:

In view of the importance which among oriental nations is assigned to names, it is absolutely unthinkable that the two names Yahweh and Elohim had originally been used without any reference to their different meanings. The almost total omission of the name Yahweh in later times or the substitution of the name Elohim for it in Psalms 42 through 83 is doubtless based in part on the reluctance which gradually arose in Israel to use the name at all; but this cannot be shown as probable for older times, in which it is claimed that E was written. In the case of P the rule, according to which the name Elohim is said to have been used for the pre-Mosaic period, and the reason for the omission of Yahweh would have been an entirely different one. Then, too, it would be entirely inexplicable why J should have avoided the use of the name Elohim. The word Elohim is connected with a root that signifies “to fear,” and characterizes God from the side of His power, as this is, e.g., seen at once in Genesis 1. Yahweh is splendidly interpreted in Exodus 3:14 ff; and the word is connected with the archaic form hawah for hayah, “to be,” and the word characterizes God as the being who at all times continues to be the God of the Covenant, and who, according to Genesis 2:4-3:24, can manifestly be none other than the Creator of the universe in Genesis 1:1 through 2:3, even if from Genesis 12 on He, for the time being, enters into a special relation to Abraham, his family and his people, and by the use of the combined names Yahweh-Elohim is declared to be identical with the God who created the world, as e.g. this is also done in the section Exodus 7:8 through 13:16, where, in the 10 plagues, Yahweh’s omnipotent power is revealed (compare EXODUS, II, 2, 2); and in 9:30 it is charged against-Pharaoh and his courtiers, that they did not yet fear Yahweh-Elohim, i.e. the God of the Covenant, who at the same time is the God of the universe (compare also 1 Kings 18:21,37,39; Jonah 4:6).

**(d)** Real Purpose in Use of Names for God:
But now it is further possible to show clearly, in connection with a number of passages, that the different names for God are in Genesis selected with a perfect consciousness of the difference in their meanings, and that accordingly the choice of these names does not justify the division of the book into various sources.

(i) Decreasing Use of Yahweh:

The fact that the toledhoth of Terah, of Isaac, and of Jacob begin with the name Yahweh but end without this name. In the history of Abraham are to be noted the following passages: Genesis 12:1,4,7,8,17; 13:4,10,13,14,18; 14:22; 15:1,2,8; 16:2,5-7,9,10,11,13; 17:1; in the history of Isaac: 25:21,22,23; 26:2,12,22,24,25,28,29; and in the toledhoth of Jacob 38:7,10; 39:2,3,1. In these passages the beginnings are regularly made with the name Yahweh, although with decreasing frequency before the name Elohim is used, and notwithstanding that in all these sections certain selections from P and E must also be considered in addition to J. Beginning with Genesis 12, in which the story of the selection of Abraham is narrated, we accordingly find emphasized, at the commencement of the history of each patriarch, this fact that it is Yahweh, the God of the Covenant, who is determining these things. Beginning with Genesis 40 and down to about Exodus 2 we find the opposite to be the case, although J is strongly represented in this section, and we no longer find the name Yahweh (except in one passage in the blessing of Jacob, which passage has been taken from another source, and hence is of no value for the distinction of the sources J, E and P; this is the remarkable passage Genesis 49:18). In the same way the story of Abraham (Genesis 25:1-11) closes without mention being made of the name of Yahweh, which name is otherwise found in all of these histories, except in Genesis 23 (see below). The toledhoth of Isaac, too, use the name Yahweh for the last time in 32:10 and from this passage down to Genesis 37:2 the name is not found. It is accordingly clear that in the history of the patriarchs there is a gradual decrease in the number of times in which the name Yahweh occurs, and in each case the decrease is more marked; and this is most noticeable and clearest in the history of Joseph, manifestly in order to make all the more prominent the fact that the revelation of God, beginning with Exodus 3:1 ff, is that of Yahweh. These facts alone make the division of this text into three sources J, E and P impossible.

(ii) Reference to Approach of Man to God, and Departure from Him:
The fact, further, that the approach of an individual to God or his departure from God could find its expression in the different uses made of the names of God is seen in the following. In connection with Ishmael and Lot the name Yahweh can be used only so long as these men stood in connection with the kingdom of God through their relation to Abraham (compare Genesis 16:7,9,10,11,13 and 13:10; 19:13 f,16), but only the name Elohim can be used as soon as they sever this connection (compare Genesis 21:12,17,19,20 and 19:29). On the other hand, ‘Elohim’ is used in the beginning of the history of the Gentile Abimelech (Genesis 20:3,6,11,13,17; 21:22 f); while afterward, when he has come into closer relations to the patriarchs, the name Yahweh is substituted (Genesis 26:28,29). A similar progress is found in separate narratives of the patriarchs themselves, since in Genesis 22:1 ff and chapter 28 the knowledge of Elohim is changed into that of Yahweh (compare 22:1,3,1 with 22:11,14,15,16, and 28:12 with 28:13,16).

Other Reasons:

[‘Elohim] can, further, in many cases be explained on the basis of an implied or expressed contrast, generally over against men (compare Genesis 22:8,12; in the second of these two passages the fear of God is placed in contrast to godlessness); Genesis 30:2; 31:50; 32:2 f; compare with 32:4 and 8; 32:29; 35:5; or on the basis of an accommodation to the standpoint of the person addressed, as in 3:1-5 (serpent); 20:3,6,11,13,17; 23:6; 39:9 (Gentiles); or on the basis of grammar, as in 23:6; 32:3; 28:17,22; because the composition with the proper name Yahweh could never express the indefinite article (a prince of God, a camp of God, a Bethel or house of prayer); or finally in consequence of the connection with earlier passages (compare 5:1 ff with chapter 1; 21:2,4; 28:3 ff; 35:9 ff with chapter 17). A comparison of these passages shows that, of course, different reasons may have induced the author to select the name Elohim, e.g. 23:6; 28:12; 32:12.

Systematic Use in History of Abraham:

That the names for God are systematically used is finally attested by the fact that in the history of Abraham, after the extensive use of the name Yahweh in its beginning (see above), this name is afterward found combined with a large number of other and different names; so that in each case it is Yahweh of whom all further accounts speak, and yet the name of
Yahweh is explained, supplemented and made clear for the consciousness of believers by the new appellations, while the full revelation of His being indeed begins only in Exodus 3 and 6:1 ff, at which place the different rays of His character that appeared in earlier times are combined in one brilliant light. The facts in the case are the following. In the story of Abraham, with which an epoch of fundamental importance in the history of revelation begins, we find Yahweh alone in Genesis 12 f. With the exception of chapter 23, where a characteristic appellation of God is not found, and 25:1-11, where we can claim a decadence in the conception of the Divinity (concerning 23:6; 25:11; see above, the name of Yahweh is retained in all of these stories, as these have been marked out (III, 2, 6); but beginning with chapter 14 they do not at all use any longer only one name for God. We here cite only those passages where, in each case, for the first time a new name for God is added, namely, 14:18, ‘El `Elyon; 14:19, Creator of heaven and of earth; 15:2, ‘Adhonay; 16:7, the Angel of Yahweh; 16:13, the God that seeth; 17:1, ‘El Shadday; 17:3, ‘Elohim; 17:18, ha-`Elohim; chapters 18 f, special relation to the three men (compare 18:2 and 19:1); 18:25, the Judge of the whole earth; 20:13, ‘Elohim constructed as a plural; 21:17, the Angel of God; 24:3, the God of heaven and the God of the earth; 24:12, the God of Abraham.

(e) Scantiness of the Materials for Proof:

If we add, finally, that to prove the hypothesis we are limited to the meager materials found in Genesis 1:1 through Exodus 6:1 if; that in this comparatively small number of chapters Genesis 40 to Exodus 2 cannot be utilized in this discussion (see above under (d); that all those passages, in which J and E are inseparably united must be ignored in this discussion; that all other passages in which J and E are often and rapidly interchanged from the very outset are suspiciously akin to begging the question; that Genesis 20:18, which with its “Yahweh” is ascribed to R, is absolutely needed as the conclusion of the preceding Elohim story; that in 21:33 with its “Yahweh” (Yahweh) in the Jahwist (Jahwist), on the other hand, the opening Elohim story from E, which is necessary for an explanation of the dwelling of Abraham in the south country, precedes; that the angel of Yahweh (22:11) is found in E; that 2:4 through 3:24 from J has besides Yahweh the name Elohim, and in 3:1b-5 only Elohim (see above); that in 17:1; 21:1 P Yahweh is found; that 5:29, which is ascribed to J, is surrounded by portions of the Priestly Code (P), and contains the name
Yahweh, and would be a torso, but in connection with chapter 5 the Priestly Code (P), in reality is in its proper place, as is the intervening remark (5:24 P); that, on the other hand, in 4:25; 6:2,4; 7:9; 9:27; 39:9 Elohim is found — in view of all these facts it is impossible to see how a greater confusion than this could result from the hypothesis of a division of the sources on the basis of the use made of the names of God. And then, too, it is from the very outset an impossibility, that in the Book of Genesis alone such an arbitrary selection of the names for God should have been made and nowhere else.

(f) Self-Disintegration of the Critical Position:

The modern critics, leaving out of consideration entirely their further dissection of the text, themselves destroy the foundation upon which this hypothesis was originally constructed, when Sievers demands for Genesis 1 (from P) an original Yahweh Elohim in the place of the Elohim now found there; and when others in Genesis 18 f J claim an original Elohim; and when in 17:1 through 21:1 the name Yahweh is said to have been intentionally selected by P.

(g) Different Uses in the Septuagint:

Naturally it is not possible to discuss all the pertinent passages at this place. Even if, in many cases, it is doubtful what the reasons were for the selection of the names for God, and even if these reasons cannot be determined with our present helps, we must probably, nevertheless, not forget that the Septuagint in its translation of Genesis in 49 passages, according to Eerdman’s reckoning, and still more according to Wiener’s, departs from the use of the names for God from the Hebrew original. Accordingly, then, a division of Genesis into different sources on the basis of the different names for God cannot be carried out, and the argument from this use, instead of proving the documentary theory, has been utilized against it.

III. THE STRUCTURE OF THE INDIVIDUAL PERICOPES.

In this division of the article, there is always to be found (under 1) a consideration of the unity of the Biblical text and (under 2) the rejection of the customary division into different sources.
The conviction of the unity of the text of Genesis and of the impossibility of dividing it according to different sources is strongly confirmed and strengthened by the examination of the different pericopes. Here, too, we find the division on the basis of the typical numbers 4, 7, 10, 12. It is true that in certain cases we should be able to divide in a different way; but at times the intention of the author to divide according to these numbers practically compels acceptance on our part, so that it would be almost impossible to ignore this matter without detriment, especially since we were compelled to accept the same fact in connection with the articles Exodus (II); Leviticus (II, 2); Day of Atonement (I, 2, 1), and also Ezekiel (I, 2, 2). But more important than these numbers, concerning the importance or unimportance of which there could possibly be some controversy, are the fundamental religious and ethical ideas which run through and control the larger pericopes of the [toledhoth] of Terah, Isaac and Jacob in such a way that it is impossible to regard this as merely the work of a redactor, and we are compelled to consider the book as the product of a single writer.

1. The Structure of the Prooemium (Genesis 1 through 2:3):

The structure of the prooemium (Genesis 1:1 through 2:3) is generally ascribed to P. Following the introduction (Genesis 1:1, 2; creation of chaos), we have the creation of the seven days with the Sabbath as a conclusion. The first and the second three days correspond to each other (1st day, the light; 4th day, the lights; 2nd day, the air and water by the separation of the waters above and the waters below; 5th day, the animals of the air and of the water; 3rd day, the dry land and the vegetation; 6th day, the land animals and man; compare also in this connection that there are two works on each day). We find Exodus also divided according to the number seven (see Exodus, II, 1; compare also Exodus 24:18b through 31:18; see Exodus, II, 2, 5, where we have also the sevenfold reference to the Sabbath idea in Ex, and that, too, repeatedly at the close of different sections, just as we find this here in Genesis); and in Leviticus compare chapters 23; 25; 27; see Leviticus, II, 2, 2; the VIII, IX, and appendix; and in Genesis 4:17 ff J; 5:1-24 P; 6:9 through 9:29; 36:1 through 37 I (see under 2, 1, 2, 3, 1).

2. Structure of the Ten Toledoth:

The ten toledoth are found in Genesis 2:4 through 50:26.
1. The Toledhoth of the Heavens and the Earth (Genesis 2:4 through 4:26):

(1) The Biblical Text.
   
   (a) Genesis 2:4-25, Paradise and the first human beings;
   
   (b) 3:1-24, the Fall;
   
   (c) 4:1-16, Cain and Abel;
   
   (d) 4:17-26, the Cainites, in seven members (see under 1 above) and Seth. The number 4 appears also in 5:1 through 6:8 (see under 2); 10:1 through 11:9 (see under 4); and especially 11:27 through 25:11 (under 6). Evidently (a) and (b), (c) and (d) are still more closely connected.

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 1:1 through 2:4a P and 2:4b through 4:26 J).

Chronicles 2 does not contain a new account of creation with a different order in the works of creation. This section speaks of animals and plants, not for their own sakes, but only on account of their connection with man. The creation of the woman is only a further development of Genesis 1. While formerly the critics divided this section into 2:4 through 4:26 J, they now cut it up into J1 and j2 (see under II, 2, 1 (c) (because, they say, the tree of life is mentioned only in 2:9 and 3:23, while in 2:17 and 3:3 ff the Divine command is restricted to the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But it is impossible to see why there should be a contradiction here, and just as little can we see why the two trees standing in the midst of the garden should not both have had their significance (compare 2:9; 3:3). It is further asserted that a division of J is demanded by the fact that the one part of J knows of the Fall (6:9 ff), and the other does not know of such a break in the development of mankind (4:17 ff). But the civilization attained by the Cainites could certainly have passed over also to the Sethites (see also 6:2); and through Noah and his sons have been continued after the Deluge. Then, too, the fact that Cain built a city (4:17), and the fact that he became a fugitive and a wanderer (4:12), are not mutually exclusive; just as the beginnings made with agriculture (4:12) are perfectly consistent with the second fact.
2. The Toledhoth of Adam (Genesis 5:1 through 6:8):

(1) The Biblical Text.

(a) Genesis 5:1-24, seven generations from Adam to Lamech (see under 1, and Jude 1:14);

(b) Genesis 5:25-32, four generations from the oldest of men, Methuselah, down to the sons of Noah;

(c) 6:1-4, intermingling of the sons of God and the sons of men;

(d) 6:5-8, corruption of all mankind. Evidently at this place (a) and (b), (c) and (d) correspond with each other.

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 5 P with the Exception of 5:29 (see II, 2, 2 (e)); 5:29; 6:1-8 J).

Genesis 6:7 J presupposes chapter 1 P; as, on the other hand, the fact that the generations that, according to chapter 5 the Priestly Code (P), had in the meanwhile been born, die, presupposes the advent of sin, concerning which only J had reported in chapter 3. In the case of the Priestly Code (P), however, in 1:31 it is said that everything was very good.

3. The Toledhoth of Noah (Genesis 6:9 through 9:29):

(1) The Biblical Text.

Seven sections (see 1 above) viz:

(a) Genesis 6:9-22, the building of the ark;

(b) 7:1-9, entering the ark;

(c) 7:10-24, the increase of the Flood;

(d) 8:1-14, the decrease of the Flood;

(e) 8:15-19, leaving the ark;

(f) 8:22 through 9:17, declaration of a covenant relation between God and Noah;

(g) 9:18-29, transfer of the Divine blessing upon Shem.
(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 7:1-5,7-10,12,16b,17,22 f; 8:2b,3a,6-12,13b,20-22; 9:20-27 J, the Rest from P).

In all the sources are found the ideas that the Deluge was the punishment of God for sin; further, the deliverance of the righteous Noah and his wife and three sons Shem, Ham and Japheth and their wives; the deliverance of the different kinds of animals; the announcement of the covenant relations between God and mankind after the Deluge; the designation of the Deluge with the term mabbul and of the ark with tebhah. In the Babylonian account, which without a doubt stands in some connection with the Biblical, are found certain measurements of the ark, which in the Bible are only in the Priestly Code (P), as also the story of the sending out of the birds when the flood was decreasing, and of the sacrifices of those who had been delivered, which in the Bible are said to be found only in J; and these facts are a very powerful argument against the division into sources.

Further, the Priestly Code (P), in case the critics were right, would have contained nothing of the thanks of Noah for his deliverance, although he was a pious man; and in the case of J we should not be informed what kind of an ark it was into which Noah was directed to go (Genesis 7:1 ff); nor how he can already in Genesis 8:20 build an altar, as he has not yet gone out of the ark; and, further, how the determination of Yahweh, that He would not again curse the earth but would bless it, can be a comfort to him, since only P has reported concerning the blessing (9:1 ff). Even if the distinction is not always clearly made between clean and unclean animals, and different numbers are found in the case of each (6:19 f; 7:14-16 the Priestly Code (P), over against 7:2 f in J), yet this is to be regarded merely as a lack of exactness or, perhaps better, rather as a summary method of procedure. The difficulties are not even made any easier through the separation into sources, since in 7:8 f in J both numbers and the distinction between the two kinds of animals are used indiscriminately. Here, too, in J we find the name Elohim used. The next contradiction that is claimed, namely that the Deluge according to J lasted only 61 days, and is arranged in 40 days (7:4,12,17; 8:6) plus 3 X 7 = 21 days (8:8,10,12), while in P it continues for 1 year and 11 days (7:11,24; 8:3-5,14), is really a self-inflicted agony of the critics. The report of the Bible on the subject is perfectly clear. The rain descends for 40 days (7:12 J); but as in addition also the fountains of the deep are broken up (7:11 P), we find in this fact a reason for believing that they increased still more (7:24 P and 7:17 J). The 40 days in 8:6 J cannot at all be identified with those mentioned in 7:17; for
if this were the case the raven would have been sent out at a time when the waters had reached their highest stage, and even according to J the Deluge covered the entire world. In general see above, II, 2, 1 (c).

4. The Toledhoth of the Sons of Noah (Genesis 10:1 through 11:9):

(1) The Biblical Text.

(a) Genesis 10:2-5, the Japhethites;

(b) 10:6-20, the Hamites;

(c) 10:21-32, the Shemites;

(d) 11:1-9, the Babylonian confusion of tongues. Evidently (a) to (c) is to be regarded as in contrast to (d) (compare also 11:1,9 J in addition to 10:32 P).

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 10:1-7,20,22 f,31 f the Priestly Code (P), the Rest Belonging to J).

The distribution of Genesis 10 between P and J is actually ridiculous, since in this case J does not speak of Japheth at all, and the genealogy of the Hamites would connect directly with the Priestly Code (P), a phenomenon which must have been repeated in 10:24 ff. The Jewish Midrash, in addition, and possibly correctly, counts 70 peoples (compare 46:27; Exodus 1:5; Numbers 11:16,25; Luke 10:1).

5. The Toledhoth of Shem (Genesis 11:10-26):

10 generations (see under II, 1).

6. The Toledhoth of Terah (Genesis 11:27 through 25:11):

(1) The Biblical Text.

After the introduction (Genesis 11:27-32), theme of the history of Abraham is given in Genesis 12:1-4a (12:1, the promise of the holy land; 12:2, promise of many descendants; 12:3, announcement of the double influence of Abraham on the world; 12:4a, the obedience of Abraham’s faith in his trust upon the Divine promise). In contrast to the first three thoughts which characterize God’s relation to Abraham, the fourth is placed, which emphasizes. Abraham’s relation to God (see under
(d)). But both thoughts give complete expression to the intimate communion between God and Abraham. On the basis of these representations, which run through the entire story and thus contribute materially to its unification, this section can also be divided, as one of these after the other comes into the foreground. These four parts (12:4b through 14:24; 15:1 through 18:15; 18:16 through 21:34; 22:1 through 25:11) can each be divided again into four subdivisions, a scheme of division that is found also in Exodus 35:4 through 40:38; Leviticus 11-15; 16 (compare Exodus, II, 2, 7; Leviticus, II, 2, 2, III and IV; Day of Atonement, I, 2, 1), and is suggested by Deuteronomy 12 through 26 (compare also my book, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung, the results of the investigation of which work are there reproduced without entering upon the details of the argument).

(a) Genesis 12:4b through 14:24, in which the reference to the promised land is placed in the foreground; see 12:1, and the passages and statements in parentheses in the following:

(i) 12:4b-8, Abraham’s journey to Canaan (12:5 the Priestly Code (P), 6,7,8 J);

(ii) 12:9 through 13:4, descent to Egypt from Canaan, and return (12:9,10; 13:1-4J); 13:5-18, separation from Lot (13:6 the Priestly Code (P), 7,9 J, 12a the Priestly Code (P), 14 f,17,18 J); chapter 14, expedition against Chedorlaomer, etc. (Abraham is blessed by the priest-king of the country, and receives as homage from the products of the country bread and wine (14:18 f), while he in return gives tithes (14:20)). The division of this section (12:4b through 14:24) is to be based on the similarity of the closing verses (12:8; 13:4; 13:18).

(b) Genesis 15:1 through 18:15, unfolding of the promise of descendants for Abraham by this announcement that he is to have a son of his own; compare 12:2 and what is placed in parentheses in the following: chapter 15, Yahweh’s covenant with Abraham (15:2,3 JE, 4 J, 5 E, 13,14,16,18 J). The promise is not fulfilled through Eliezer, but only through an actual son (15:3,1); 16:1-16, Hagar gives birth to Ishmael as the son of Abraham. Hagar’s son, too, namely Ishmael, is not the genuine heir, notwithstanding the connection between 16:10 and 12:2 (compare 17:18-20 P); chapter 17 the Priestly Code (P),
promise of the birth of Isaac given to Abraham (17:2-17,19,21); 18:1-15, Sarah also hears that Isaac is promised (18:10,12-15).

(c) Genesis 18:16 through 21:34, the double influence of Abraham on the world; compare 12:3 and what is in parentheses in the following: 18:16 through 19:38, the pericope dealing with Sodom;

(i) 18:16-33, Abraham’s petition for the deliverance of Sodom;

(ii) 19:1-11, the sin of the Sodomites, while Lot shows some of the characteristics of Abraham;

(in) 19:12-28, story of the destruction, in connection with which Lot receives the benefit of his relation to Abraham (19:16,19,21,22);

(iv) Lot ceases to be a part of this history after this destruction; 20:1-18, Abraham with Abimelech (20:6,9 E, 18 R, punishment; 20:7,17, intercession); 21:1-21, Ishmael ceases to be part of this history (21:13,18,20 E); 21:22-34, Abraham’s agreement with Abimelech (the latter seeks Abraham’s friendship and fears his enmity, 21:27,23 E).

(d) Genesis 22:1 through 25:11 ff, Abraham’s faith at its culminating point; compare 12:4a and what is in parentheses in the following:

(i) 22:1-19, the sacrifice of Isaac (22:2,12 E, 16,18 R);

(ii) chapter 23, purchase of the place to bury the dead, which act was the result of his faith in the promised land;

(in) chapter 24 is introduced by 22:20-24, which has no independent character. With the twelve descendants of Nahor compare the twelve sons of Jacob, the twelve of Ishmael (25:12 ff; 17:20), and on the number 12 see Exodus 24:18 through 30:10, under EXODUS, II, 2, 5; Leviticus I-7 under LEVITICUS, II, 2, 2, i, and under EZEKIEL, I, 2, 2. Chronicles 24 itself contains the story of how a wife was secured for Isaac from among his relatives (the faith in the success of this plan is transmitted from Abraham to his servant);

(iv) 25:1-11, the sons of the concubine of Abraham (J and R) cease to be a part of this history; transfer of the entire inheritance to the son of promise (Jahwist); burial in the ground bought for this purpose (P) (all of these concluding acts stand in close connection with Abraham’s
faith). In reference to the force of the names of God in connecting Genesis 11:27 through 25:11, see above under II, 2, 2 (d).


Through the passages ascribed to P breaks are caused in the text of J in Genesis 11:28 f; 12:4a (Lot); in chapter 16, where the conclusion is lacking; in 18:1 (the reference of the pronoun); in 24:67 (Sarah’s death); in 25:1 ff (no mention of Abraham’s death). On the other hand P presupposes the text of J in 11:31 f; 12:4b; 16:1b; 19:29. In the case of E we need mention only the abrupt break in 20:1; and, finally, the text of the Priestly Code (P), leaving out of consideration the larger sections (chapters 17 and 23), is entirely too meager to constitute an independent document.

We will here discuss also the so-called duplicates (see under II, 2, 1, a and c). The different stories concerning the danger in which the wives of Abraham and Isaac were involved in Genesis 12:9 ff J; 20:1 ff E; 26:1 ff J directly presuppose each other. Thus, in 20:13, the Elohist (E), Abraham regards it as a fact that such situations are often to be met with, and consequently the possibility of an occurrence of such an event could not have appeared so remarkable to an Oriental as it does to a modern critic; chapter 26:1 suggests the story in 12:9 ff. The words used here also show that the three stories in question did not originate independently of each other (compare 26:7; 20:5; 12:19 through 26:7; 20:11; 12:12 through 26:10; 20:9; 12:18 through 26:3; 20:1; 12:10 (gur); see under II, 2, 1, c). The two Ishmael pericopes (chapters 16 J and P and 21 E) differ from each other throughout, and, accordingly, are surely not duplicates. The two stories of the conclusion of a covenant in chapters 15 J and 17 P are both justified, especially since in 17:7 the author speaks of an “establishment” of the covenant which already existed since chapter 15. Genesis 17 P and 18:1 ff J are certainly intended to be pendants, so that it is impossible to ascribe them to different authors; compare the analogous beginning of theophanies of Yahweh in 17:1 and 18:1 (even the pronoun referring to Abraham in 18:1 J, unless taken in connection with chapter 17 the Priestly Code (P), is without any context), also the laughing of Abraham and of Sarah (17:17; 18:12 f; see under II, 2, 1 (c)), the prominence given to their age (17:17; 18:11 f), and the designation of the time in 17:11; 18:10,14.
Nor can we quote in favor of a division into sources the passage Genesis 21:14 f E, on the ground that Ishmael is described here as being so small that he could be laid upon the shoulder of his mother and then be thrown by her under a shrub, while according to the Biblical text he must have been 15 years of age (16:16; 21:5 P). For the original does not say that he was carried on her shoulders; and in Matthew 15:30 it is even said of adults that they were thrown down. On the other hand, also according to E, Ishmael could not have been so small a child, for in Genesis 21:18b he is led by the hand, and according to 21:9 he already mocks Isaac, evidently because the latter was the heir of the promise.

Sarah’s age, too, according to Genesis 20 E, does not speak in favor of a division into sources. That she was still a beautiful woman is not claimed here. Evidently Abimelech was anxious only for a closer connection with the powerful Abraham (compare 21:23,17). Then, too, all the sources ascribe an advanced age to Sarah (compare 21:6 J and E; 18:12 f J; 17:17 P).

### 7. The Toledoth of Ishmael (Genesis 25:12-18):

Twelve princes descended from Ishmael (see under 6 (d)).

### 8. The Toledoth of Isaac (Genesis 25:19 through 35:29):

The correct conception of the fundamental thought can be gained at once in the beginning of this section (Genesis 25:22 f): Yahweh’s oracle to Rebekah, that the older of the twins, with whom she was pregnant, should serve the younger; also in Romans 9:10 ff with reference to Malachi 1:2 f; and finally, the constant reference made to Esau in addition to Jacob until the former ceases to be a factor in this history in Genesis 36. Accordingly in the end everything is made dependent on the one hand on Jacob’s election, notwithstanding his wrongdoings, on the other hand, on Esau’s rejection notwithstanding his being the firstborn, or in other words, upon the perfectly free grace of God; and all the different sources alike share in this fundamental thought. But in dividing between the different parts of this section, we must particularly draw attention to this, that in all of these parts both thoughts in some way or other find their expression.

**(1) The Biblical Text.**

Containing 10 parts (see under II, 1), namely

(a) Genesis 25:19-26, the birth of Esau and Jacob;
(b) 25:27-34, Esau despises and loses his birthright;

(c) 26:1-35, Isaac receives the blessing of Abraham, which afterward is transmitted to Jacob, while Esau, through his marriage with heathen women, prepares the way for his rejection (26:34 f);

(d) 27:1-40, Jacob steals the blessing of the firstborn;

(e) 27:41-45, Jacob’s flight out of fear of Esau’s vengeance;

(f) 27:46 through 28:9, Jacob is sent abroad out of fear of his brother’s bad example;

(g) 28:10 through 32:33, Jacob in a strange land and his fear of Esau, which is overcome in his contest of prayer in Peniel on his return: 28:10-22, the ladder reaching to heaven in Bethel when he went abroad; 29:1 through 30:43, twenty years with Laban (see 31:38); 31:1-54, Jacob’s departure from Mesopotamia; 32:1-33, his return home;

(h) chapter 33, reconciliation with Esau, who returns to Seir (verse 16; compare 32:4), while Jacob becomes the owner of property in the Holy Land (33:19 f);

(i) 34:1 through 35:22, Jacob remains in this land, notwithstanding the slaughter made by his sons Simeon and Levi (compare 34:30; 35:5); the new appearance of God in Bethel, with a repetition of the story of the changing of Jacob’s name, with which the story of Jacob’s youth is closed, and which presupposes the episode at Bethel (compare 35:1,6b,9-15 with 28:10 ff), and which is not in contradiction with the first change in the name of Jacob in chapter 32 (compare the twofold naming of Peter in John 1:43 and Matthew 16:18). Esau is yet mentioned in Genesis 35:1,7, where there is a reference made to Jacob’s flight before him;

(j) 35:23-29, Jacob’s 12 sons as the bearers of the promise; while Esau is mentioned only as participating in Isaac’s burial, but inwardly he has no longer any part in the history of the kingdom of God, as is seen from chapter 36, and in 32:4; 33:16 is already hinted at. In this section, too, evidently there are groups, each of two parts belonging together, namely (a) and (b) describing the earliest youth; (c) and (d) in which
Isaac plays a prominent part; (e) and (f) both of which do not exclude but supplement each other in assigning the motives for Jacob’s flight; (g) and (h) Jacob’s flight and reconciliation; (i) and (j) Jacob both according to family and dwelling-place as the recognized heir of the promise.

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources.

As Genesis 25:29 f, 36:26b; 26:34 f; 27:46 through 28:9; 29:24, 29; 31:18; 35:6a, 9-12, 15; 35:22b-29; 36:6-30, 40-43 are ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), it is clear that these are in part such ridiculously small extracts, that we should be justified in attributing them to a sensible author. The whole sojourn in Mesopotamia is ignored in the Priestly Code (P), according to the critics, except the brief notices in 29:24, 29; 33:18. Further, the parts of the rest of the text cannot in many cases be dispensed with; as, e.g. we do not know in 25:26b who was born; nor in 26:34 f who Esau was; nor in 27:46 who Jacob was; nor in 29:24 who Laban was; nor in 29:24, 29 in what connection and for what purposes Leah and Rachel are mentioned. P makes no mention of any promise given to Isaac, which is, however, presupposed in 35:12 and later in Genesis 28:1 ff P is most closely connected with J (compare 12:1-3, the blessing of Abraham, and chapter 24). It is, further, impossible to separate the sources E and J in chapter 28 (ladder reaching to heaven); compare 28:10-12, 17 f, 20-22 E; 28:13-16 J; 28:19, and the name of God in 28:21 R, and this proposed division actually becomes absurd in chapters 29 f in the story of the birth of Jacob’s children, which are said to be divided between the sources J and E.

9. The Toledhoth of Esau (Genesis 36:1 through 37:1):

In 7 divisions (see under 1), namely

(a) Genesis 36:1-5 R, Esau’s family; the different names for Esau’s wives, as compared with 26:34 f; 28:7-9 the Priestly Code (P), are doubtless based on the fact that oriental women are apt to change their names when they marry; and the fact that these names are without further remark mentioned by the side of the others is rather an argument against the division into sources than for it;

(b) 36:6-8, Esau’s change of abode to Seir, which, according to 32:4; 33:14, 16, already took place before Jacob’s return. Only in case that
Esau (35:29) would have afterward remained for a longer period in Canaan, could we think of a new separation in this connection. It is more probable that at this place all those data which were of importance in connection with this separation are once more given without any reference to their difference in point of time;

(c) 36:9-14, Esau as the founder of the Edomites (in 36:9 the word [toledhoth] is repeated from verse 1, while the narrative of the descendants of Esau begins only at this later passage in so far as these were from Seir; compare 36:9 with 36:5, and above, under II, 1);

(d) 36:15-19, the leading line of the sons of Esau;

(e) 36:20-30, genealogy of the original inhabitants of the country, mentioned because of their connection with Esau (compare 36:25 with 36:2);

(f) 36:31-39, the elective kingdoms of Edom;

(g) 36:40-43, the Edomites’ chief line of descent, arranged according to localities. We have here accordingly geographical accounts, and not historical or genealogical, as in 36:15 ff, 20 ff (30); compare also 36:40, 43, for which reason we find also names of women.

10. The Toledhoth of Jacob (Genesis 37:2 through 50:26):

(1) The Biblical Text.

The key to the history of Joseph is found in its conclusion, namely, in Genesis 50:14-21, in the confession of Joseph, in the light of his past, namely, that God has ended all things well; and in 50:22 ff, in his confidence in the fulfillment of the Divine promise in the lives of those God has chosen; compare also Psalm 105:16 ff. According to the two viewpoints in Genesis 50:14-26, and without any reference to the sources, this whole pericope (37:2 through 50:15) is divided into two halves, each of five subdivisions, or a total of ten (see under II, 1). In the exact demonstration of this, not only the contents themselves, but also regard for the different names for God will often render good service, which names, with good effect, are found at the close and in harmony with the fundamental thought of the entire section, namely,
(a) 37:2 through 39:6a, Joseph enters Potiphar’s house (4 pieces, see under 6, 1, namely 37:2-11, the hatred of the brethren, 37:12-36, selling Joseph, 38:1 ff, the Yahweh-displeasing conduct in the house of Judah, compare 38:7,10, 39:1-6, Yahweh’s pleasure in Joseph, in contrast to;

(b) 39:6b-23, Joseph is cast into prison, but Yahweh was with him (39:21,23);

(c) 40:1 through 41:52, the exaltation of Joseph, which at the end especially is shown by the naming of Ephraim and Manasseh as caused by God, but which for the present passes by the history of his family (4 pieces, namely, 40:1, interpretation of the dreams of the royal officials, 41:1-36, interpretation of the two dreams of Pharaoh, 41:37-46a, the exaltation of Joseph, 41:46b-52, Joseph’s activity for the good of the country);

(d) 41:55 through 46:7, Joseph becomes a blessing to his family; compare the promise of God to Jacob in Beersheba to be with him in Egypt in 46:2 ff with 45:6-9 (in four pieces, namely, 41:53-57, the general famine, 42:1-38, the first journey of the brothers of Joseph, 43:14 through 4:34, the second journey (in four subdivisions,

(i) 43:1-14, the departure, (ii) 43:14-34, the reception by Joseph, (in) 44:1-7, final trial of the brethren, (iv) 44:18-34, the intercession of Judah); 45:1 through 46:7, Joseph makes himself known and persuades Jacob to come to Egypt);

(e) 46:8 through 47:26, Joseph continues to be a blessing to his family and to Egypt (in 4 subdivisions, of which the 4th is placed in contrast to the first 3 exactly as this is done in 10:1 through 11:9 and 11:27 through 25:11, namely, (46:8-27, list of the descendants of Jacob, 46:28-34, meeting with Joseph, 47:1-12, Jacob in the presence of Pharaoh, 47:13-26, the Egyptians who have sold themselves and their possessions to Pharaoh laud Joseph as the preserver of their lives). From this point on the attention is now drawn to the future:

(f) 47:27-31, Jacob causes Joseph to take an oath that he will have him buried in Canaan (compare 47:30 J with chapter 23 P) ; in
(e) and

(f) there is also lacking a designation for God;

(g) chapter 48, Jacob adopts and blesses Ephraim and Manasseh (compare also the emphasis placed on the providential guidance of God in 48:8 f, 11, 15 f, especially 48:16 and 20 ff);

(h) 49:1-27, Jacob blesses his 12 sons and prophesies their future fate (here, 49:18, appears the name of Yahweh, which had disappeared since chapter 40; see under II, 2, 2 (d), and other designations for God, 49:24 f);

(i) 49:28-33, Jacob’s death after he had again expressed the wish, in the presence of all his sons, that he should be buried in Canaan;

(j) 50:1-13, the body of Jacob is taken to Canaan. In these 10 pericopes again we can easily find groups of two each, namely, (a) and (b), Joseph’s humiliation (sold, prison); (c) and (d), Joseph becomes a blessing to Egypt and to his family; (g) and (h), blessing of the, grandchildren and the sons of Jacob; (i) and (j), Jacob death and burial; here too the name of God is lacking as in (e) and (f).

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources.

Here, too, the separation of P from the rest of the text as a distinct source is untenable, since in the section from Genesis 37:2 through 46:34, after 37:2, only the following fragments are attributed to this source, namely, 41:46a; 46:6 f (according to some also to 46:27). In the same way P abruptly sets in at 47:5, 27b; 49:28b. Further, 48:3 ff knows nothing of Ephraim or Manasseh, of whom P reports nothing, so that 50:13 f are the only verses that could naturally connect with the preceding statements of P. In 47:5 ff P reports entirely in the manner of ordinary narratives, and there is no sign of any systematic arrangement. But the separation between J and E cannot be carried out either. In the first place, when these two sources are actually separated by the critics, innumerable omissions in the story arise, which we cannot at this place catalogue. The contradictions which are claimed to exist here are the products of the critics’ imagination. It is claimed that according to J it is Judah who plays a prominent role, while according to E it is Reuben; but in 37:21 Reuben is mentioned by J, and the role played by Judah in chapter 38 J is anything but creditable. Why
cannot both of these brethren have played a prominent role, as this was also the case with Simeon (42:24,36; 43:14) and Benjamin (42:13,10,32 ff,36,38; 43:3 ff; 44; 45:14)? Just as little are the Midianites in 37:28,36 E and the Ishmaelites of 37:25,27,28; 39:1 J mutually exclusive or contradictory, since the Midianites in the Gideon story, too, in Judges 7 f; 8:24 are called Ishmaelites (compare in the German the name Prager for traveling musicians, whether they are from Prague or not). In J it is further claimed that Joseph’s master was a private gentleman (Genesis 39:1 ff), while in E he was the captain of the bodyguard (Genesis 40:3 f). But in this instance the documentary theory can operate only when it calls in the assistance of R in Genesis 39:1. The fact that in chapter 39:1 the name of the nationality is added to that of the office, is explained on the ground of the contrast to the Ishmaelites who sold Joseph. Finally, it is claimed to have been caused by the combination of the different sources in such a way that Benjamin in 43:8,29; 44:30,31,33 J is described as a boy, but in 46:21, R or the Priestly Code (P), as the father of ten children. But evidently the author of chapter 46 has in view the number 70 (compare verse 27; see Exodus 1:5; Numbers 11:16,25; Luke 10:1; Exodus 15:27; Judges 12:13; and in Genesis 10 above, under 4.2); and for this reason, e.g. in Genesis 46:17, he mentions only one grand-daughter of Jacob; and for this he mentions all of the descendants of Jacob, even those who were born later in Egypt, but who already, as it were, had come to Egypt in the loins of their fathers, according to the view of the author. It certainly would be remarkable if no more grandchildren had been born to Jacob in Egypt, since Numbers 26 does not mention a single son of any of the sons of Jacob later than those reported in Genesis 46. In 46:27 Joseph’s sons, too, who were born in Egypt, are included in the list, entirely in harmony with Deuteronomy 10:22. For such an arrangement and adjustment of a genealogy compare the 3 X 14 generations in Matthew 1. From this point of view no conclusions, as far as the documentary theory is concerned, can be drawn from the ten sons of Benjamin.

IV. THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER.

1. History of the Patriarchs: (Genesis 12 through 50):

(1) Unfounded Attacks upon the History.

(a) From General Dogmatic Principles:
In order to disprove the historical character of the patriarchs, the critics are accustomed to operate largely with general dogmatic principles, such as this, that no nation knows who its original founder was. In answer to this it can be said that the history of Israel is and was from the beginning to the end unique, and cannot be judged by the average principles of historiography. But it is then claimed that Abraham’s entire life appears to be only one continuous trial of faith, which was centered on the one promise of the true heir, but that this is in reality a psychological impossibility. Over against this claim we can in reply cite contrary facts from the history of several thousands of years; and that, too, in the experience of those very men who were most prominent in religious development, such as Paul and Luther.

(b) From Distance of Time:

Secondly, critics emphasize the long period of time that elapsed between these events themselves and their first records, especially if these records can be accredited to so late a period as the 9th or the 8th century BC. In consequence of this, it is claimed that much of the contents of Genesis is myth or fable; and Gunkel even resolves the whole book into a set of unconnected little myths and fables. Over against this claim we can again appeal to the universal feeling in this matter. I do not think that it can be made plausible, that in any race fables and myths came in the course of time more and more to be accepted as actual facts, so that perchance we should now be willing to accept as historical truths the stories of the Nibelungenlied or Red Riding Hood. But this, according to the critics, must have been the case in Israel. Prophets accepted the story of the destruction of the two cities in the Jordan valley, as recorded in Genesis 19, as correct (compare <sup>40</sup>Amos 4:11; <sup>1</sup>Isaiah 1:9; 3:9; <sup>28</sup>Hosea 11:8); also Abraham as a historical person (<sup>29</sup>Isaiah 29:22; 41:8; 51:1 ff; 7Micah 7:20; 15Jeremiah 33:26; 13Ezekiel 33:24; and possibly 16Malachi 2:15); then Isaac (<sup>7</sup>Amos 7:9,16; 15Jeremiah 33:26); also Jacob (<sup>10</sup>Hosea 12:3 ff; 8Amos 9:8; 15Jeremiah 33:26); also Joseph (<sup>13</sup>Amos 5:6,15); and these prophets evidently thought that these events and persons were regarded as historical by the people in general. In the New Testament we can cite, for Abraham, <sup>22</sup>Matthew 3:9; Galatians 3:4:21 ff; <sup>23</sup>Romans 4:9 ff; 9:7 ff; <sup>24</sup>Hebrews 7:1 ff; 11:8 ff; Jas 2:21 ff, and especially the words of Jesus in <sup>8</sup>Matthew 8:11; <sup>16</sup>Luke 16:22 ff; 52John 8:52 ff; finally in <sup>22</sup>Matthew 22:31 f, the whole argument for the
resurrection of the dead is without a foundation if the patriarchs are not historical personages. Over against this, there was no period in the history of Israel in which it can be shown that these stories of Genesis were regarded only as myths. If these events were actual occurrences, then those things which the patriarchs experienced were so unique that these experiences were not forgotten for a long time. Then, too, we can also refer to the strength of the memory of those nations that were not accustomed to have written records of their history.

(c) From Biblical Data:

Finally, the attempt has been made to discover in the Bible itself a pre-Mosaic stage in its ideas of man concerning God, which is claimed to contradict the higher development of Divine ideas in the patriarchs, for which purpose the critics appeal to Ezekiel 23:3,1; 20:7 ff; Joshua 24:14 ff. But at these places it is evident that the idolatry of the people is pictured as apostasy. And when in Exodus 6:2 ff the name of Yahweh is as a matter of fact represented as something new, it is nevertheless a fact that in these very passages the revelation given is connected with the history of the patriarchs. The same is true of Exodus 3:1 ff. The whole hypothesis that the religion before the days of Moses was polytheistic has not been derived from the Bible, but is interpreted into it, and ends in doing violence to the facts there recorded (compare my book, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit).

(d) From Comparison with Religion of Arabia:

The critics further compare the pre-Mosaic religion of Israel with the low grade of religion in Arabia in the 5th century after Christ; but in order to do this, they must isolate Israel entirely, since all the surrounding nations at the time of the Tell el-Amarna Letters had attained to an altogether different and higher stage of religious development and civilization.

(2) Unsatisfactory Attempts at Explaining the Patriarchal Age.

(a) Explanation Based on High Places:

In denying the historical character of the account of the patriarchs in Genesis, the critics are forced to contrive some scheme in explanation of the existence of these stories, but in doing this they make some bad breaks. Thus, e.g., they say that the Israelites when they entered Canaan found
there the high places of the heathen peoples; and since if they wanted to make use of these in the service of Yahweh they must first declare them legitimate places of worship, this was done by inventing the history of the patriarchs, who long before this are said to have already consecrated all these places to the Yahweh worship. But how is it possible on this supposition to explain the story of Joseph, which transpired in Egypt? Then, too, the reasons for the origin of the other stories of the patriarchs would be enshrouded in a remarkable mystery and would be of very inferior character. Again, it is nowhere declared in the passages of Genesis that here come into consideration that they are reporting the beginnings of a permanent cult when they give an account of how God appeared to the patriarchs or when they erected altars in His honor. And, finally, while it is indeed true that the cult localities of the patriarchs are in part identical with those of later times (compare Bethel, Beersheba) — and this is from the outset probable, because certain places, such as hills, trees, water, etc., as it were, of themselves were suitable for purposes of the cult — yet such an identification of earlier and later localities does not cover all cases. And can we imagine that a prophetical method of writing history would have had any occasion in this manner to declare the worship of calves in Bethel a legitimate service?

(b) The Dating Back of Later Events to Earlier Times:

But we are further told that the pre-prophetic condition of affairs in Israel was in general dated back into the primitive period, and this was done in such a way that the character of Abraham was regarded as reproducing ideal Israel, and the character of Jacob the empirical Israel in the past; something that certainly is from the outset an odd speculation of too much learning! If this explanation is correct, what shall we then do with Isaac and Joseph? And why is the whole story of the condition of civilization pictured in Genesis so entirely different from that of later times? And is Abraham really a perfect ideal? Is he not rather, notwithstanding his mighty faith, a human being of flesh and blood, who can even doubt (Genesis 15:2 f; 17:17); who can make use of sinful means to realize the promise (Genesis 16, Hagar); who tells a falsehood, although for the best of purposes, namely, to protect his wife (Genesis 12:9 ff), and for this reason must accept the rebuke of the heathen Abimelech (Genesis 20:9 f)? In addition, Abraham is married to his half-sister (Genesis 20:12), which, according to Deuteronomy 27:22; Leviticus18:9,11; 20:17, is
forbidden with the penalty of death for the transgressor. In the same way Jacob, according to Genesis 29 f, has two sisters as wives, which is also declared by Leviticus 18:18 to be a crime.

(c) The Patriarchs as heroes eponymi:
In the third place, it is said that the people have in the persons of the patriarchs made for themselves eponymous heroes. But why did they make so many at one time? In addition, Abraham cannot possibly be regarded as such a hero as Jacob or Israel is, and in exceptional cases also Isaac and Joseph (Amos 7:9, 16; 5:6, 15). It is not correct to place genealogies like those in Genesis 10:1 ff; 25:1 ff, 13 ff on a level with the stories concerning the patriarchs. In the latter case we are dealing with individualities of pronounced character, who in the experiences of their lives represent great fundamental principles and laws in the kingdom of God — Abraham, the principle of the grace of God, to which faith on the part of man is the counterpart; Jacob, the principle of Divine election; Joseph, that of the providential guidance of life; while Isaac, it is true, when he becomes prominent in the history, evinces no independent character, but merely follows in the footsteps of Abraham (compare 26:1 ff, 3 ff, 15, 18, 24 ff), but is in this very imitative life pictured in an excellent way.

(d) Different Explanations Combined:
If we combine two or more of these different and unsatisfactory attempts at an explanation of the history of the patriarchs, we must become all the more distrustful, because the outcome of this combination is such an inharmonious scheme.

(3) Positive Reasons for the Historical Character of Genesis.
The individuality of the patriarchs as well as their significance in the entire development of the history of the kingdom of God, and their different missions individually; further, the truthful portraiture of their method of living, which had not yet reached the stage of permanent settlement; and, finally, the fact that the prophets, the New Testament and above all Jesus Himself regard their historical character as something self-evident (see (1b) above), make the conviction a certainty, that we must insist upon their being historical personages; especially, too, because the attacks on this view (see (1) above), as also the efforts to explain these narratives on other
grounds (see (2) above), must be pronounced to be failures. To this we must add the following: If Moses were the founder of the religion of Israel, it would scarcely have been possible that a theory would have been invented and have found acceptance that robs Moses of this honor by the invention of the story of the patriarchs. Rather the opposite would be the case. Besides, this older revelation of God is absolutely necessary in order to make Moses’ work and success intelligible and possible. For he himself expressly declares that his work is based on the promises of God given to the fathers. Through this connection with the older revelation it was possible for Moses to win the attention and the confidence of the people (compare Exodus 2:24; 3:6,13 ff; 4:5; 6:3,1; 15:2; 32:13 f; 33:1; compare also my book, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit, 117 ff; and Strack, Genesis, 93 ff).

Individuality of Patriarchs:

In so far as the history of the patriarchs contains miracles, they are in perfect harmony with the entire character of sacred history (compare EXODUS, III, 2); and as far as the number of miracles is concerned, there are in fact fewer reported in the days of the patriarchs than in the times of Moses. On the view that the history of the patriarchs, which is earlier than the period of Moses, was an invention and not history, the opposite condition of affairs could be expected. Leaving out of consideration the unsatisfactory instances cited under V, 2, below, there is to be found also in the Book of Genesis absolutely no reference to indicate events of a later period, which would throw a doubt on the historical character of what is here reported. In every direction (e.g. in connection with theophanies and the cult worship), there is a noticeable progress to be seen in going from Genesis to Exodus, a fact which again is an important argument for the historical reliability of the contents of both books. Finally, we add the following. Chronicles 14 (the Chedorlaomer and the Melchizedek episodes) has through recent archaeological researches been brilliantly confirmed as far as the names are concerned, as also in reference to the political conditions of the times, the general historical situation and the chronology. In the same way the religious conditions of Egypt, as described in Genesis 12, and in the entire history of Joseph, are so faithfully pictured that it is absolutely impossible to regard these accounts as the work of imagination. These accounts must be the outcome, on the part of the author, of a personal knowledge of these things and conditions, as they are absolutely correct, even to the details of the coloring.
2. The Primitive History of Genesis 1 through 11:

(1) Prominence of the Religious Element.
In the primitive history as recorded in the opening chapters of Genesis we must yet emphasize, more than is done elsewhere, that the chief interest for the Christian is found in the religious and moral teachings of this account; and that these teachings remain unshaken, even when chronological, historical, archaeological, physical, geographical or philological sciences would tempt us to reach negative conclusions. It is a wise thing, from the outset, not to be too timid in this direction, and to concede considerable liberty in this matter, when we remember that it is not the purpose of the Bible to give us scientific knowledge in scientific forms, but to furnish us with religious and ethical thoughts in a language which a childlike mind, that is open to Divine things, can understand.

(2) Carefulness as Regards Divergent Results of Scientific Research.
On the other hand, it is right over against the so-called “results” of these different sciences to be very critical and skeptical, since in very many cases science retracts today what with a flourish of trumpets it declared yesterday to be a “sure” result of investigations; e.g. as far as the chronology is concerned, the natural and the historical sciences often base their computations on purely arbitrary figures, or on those which are constructed entirely upon conclusions of analogy, and are far from conclusive, if perchance the history of the earth or of mankind has not at all times developed at the same pace, i.e. has moved upward and downward, as e.g. a child in its earlier years will always learn more rapidly than at any later period of its life.

(3) Frequent Confirmation of the Bible by Science.
But finally the Holy Scriptures, the statements of which at this period are often regarded slightingly by theologians, are regarded much more highly by men of science. This is done, e.g., by such scientists as Reinke and K.E. von Baer, who declare that Moses, because of his story of the creation, was a man of unsurpassed and unsurpassable scientific thought; or when many geological facts point to such an event as the Deluge in the history of the earth. The history of languages, as a whole and in its details, also furnishes many proofs for the correctness of Genesis 10, and that chapter
has further been confirmed in a most surprising manner by many other discoveries (compare the existence of Babel at a period earlier than Nineveh, and the colonizing of Assur by Babel). Then facts like the following can be explained only on the presupposition that the reports in Genesis are correct, as when a Dutchman in the 17th century built an ark after the measurements given in Genesis and found the vessel in every particular adapted to its purposes; and when today we again hear specialists who declare that the modern ocean sailing vessel is being more and more constructed according to the relative proportions of the ark.

(4) **Superiority of the Bible over Heathen Mythologies.**

Finally, the similarity of the Biblical and the Babylonian accounts of the creation and the Deluge, as these have been discovered by learned research (and we confine ourselves to these two most important reports) — although this similarity has been misinterpreted and declared to be hostile to the historical reliability and the originality of Genesis 1 and Genesis 6 through 9 — does not prove what critics claim that it does. Even if we acknowledge that the contents of these stories were extant in Babylon long before the days of Moses, and that these facts have been drawn from this source by Israel, there yet can be no question that the value of these accounts, the fact that they are saturated with a monotheistic and ethical spirit, is found only in Israel and has been breathed into them only by Israel. For the inner value of a story does not depend upon its antiquity, but upon its spirit. But even this conception of the matter, which is shared by most theologians, cannot satisfy us. When we remember how Babylonian mythology is honeycombed by the grossest superstition and heathenism, and that our ethical feelings are often offended by it in the most terrible manner, it is really not possible to see how such a system could have had any attraction for Israel after the Spirit, and how a man who thought as a prophet could have taken over such stories. If Israel has been a pathfinder in the sphere of religion, as is acknowledged on all hands, why do the critics always talk of their borrowing from others? And then, since similar stories are found also among other nations, and as the natural sciences are anything but a unit in hostility to the Biblical narratives, all these factors can find a satisfactory explanation only on the supposition that there existed an original or primitive revelation, and that in Israel this revelation was transmitted in its greater purity, while among the other nations it was emptied of its contents or was perverted. In this way the
The universality of these stories can be explained, as also the inferiority in character of similar stories among the other nations.

**Babylonian and Biblical Stories**

The particularly close connection that exists between the Babylonian and the Biblical versions of these stories is in perfect harmony with the fact that it was from Babylon that the dispersion of mankind set in. The purity of the Biblical tradition is further attested by the fact that it reports the actual history of all mankind (see under I, 2), while the mythologies of other nations are restricted nationally and locally, i.e. the beginnings of the history of the individual nations and the beginnings of the history of mankind are identical, and the earliest history is always reported as taking place in the native land of the people reporting it. The fact that in earlier times there prevailed in Babylon too a purer knowledge of God, which, however, steadily degenerated, is proved by many data, and especially by the recently discovered fragment of a Deluge story, according to which the God who destroyed the world by the Flood and the God who delivered the one family is the same God, which is in perfect agreement with the Bible, but is in contradiction to the later Babylonian story. That in earlier times a purer conception of God prevailed, seems to be confirmed also by the experiences of the missionaries. Evolutionism, i.e. the development of a higher conception of God out of a lower, is nothing but an unproved theory, which at every step is contrary to actual facts. Compare also my book, Die Entwicklung der Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit, 129 ff, and Schmidt, Die babylonische Religion: Gedanken über ihre Entwicklung, a dissertation in which the fact that religion naturally degenerates is proved also as far as the Greeks, the Egyptians, the East Indians and the Chinese are concerned.

**V: ORIGIN AND AUTHORSHIP OF GENESIS.**

1. **Connection with Mosaic Times:**

That the Book of Genesis stands in some kind of literary connection with the succeeding books of the Pentateuch is generally acknowledged. But if this is the case, then the question as to the origin and the time of the composition of this whole body of books can be decided only if we take them all into consideration. In this article we have only to consider those facts which are found in Genesis for the solution of this problem. It is self-evident that the conclusion we have reached with reference to the literary
unity of the book is of great importance for this question (see under II and III above). The historical character of the book, as demonstrated under IV above, also speaks emphatically for this claim that the literary composition of the book must have taken place when the memory of these events was still trustworthy, and the impression and experiences were still fresh and had not yet faded. Such individualistic and vivid pictures of historical personages as are reported by Genesis, such a faithful adherence to the accounts of the civilization in the different countries and districts and at different times, such detailed accounts of foreign customs, conditions and historical events, could scarcely have been possible, if the Mosaic age with its powerful new impressions, the period of the Judges, with its characteristic apostasy, or even the division of Israel into two kingdoms, with its dire effects on the external union of the people, had all passed by before these accounts were actually written down. On the other hand, the highly developed prophetic conception of these events, and the skillful plan of the book demand that the author must have been a religious and ethical personality of the first rank. And as, finally, it is scarcely credible that Moses would have failed to provide for a systematic report of the great past of the people, for which account, before this and as long as only family histories were involved, there was no need felt, and as the subsequent books of the Pentateuch, which are acknowledged in a literary way to be connected with Genesis, in many of their parts expressly declare that Moses was their author (compare EXODUS, IV), the Mosaic authorship of this book is as good as proved. This is not to deny that older sources and documents were used in the composition of the book, such as perhaps the genealogical tables or the events recorded in Genesis 14, possibly, too, some referring to the history of the times before the Deluge and before Abraham. This is probable; but as all the parts of the book have been worked together into a literary unity (see under II and III above), and as such sources are not expressly mentioned, it is a hopeless task to try to describe these different sources in detail or even to separate them as independent documents, after the manner refuted under II and III above, as a theory and in its particulars. And for the age of Genesis, we can refer to the fact that the personal pronoun here is still used for both genders, masculine and feminine, which is true also of the word na`ar (“youth”), a peculiarity which is shared also by the other books of the Pentateuch almost throughout.
2. Examination of Counter-Arguments:

(1) Possibility of Later Additions.

In itself it would be possible that from time to time some explanatory and interpreting additions could have been made to the original text, in case we find indications of a later period in some statements of the book. But that in this case these additions could not have been made by any unauthorized persons, but only officially, should, in the case of a book like Genesis, be regarded as self-evident. But in our times this fact must be emphasized all the more, as in our days the most radical ideas obtain in reference to the way in which sacred books were used in former times. And then it must be said that we cannot prove as an absolute certainty that there is a single passage in Genesis that originated in the post-Mosaic period.

(2) “Prophecy after the Event” Idea.

It is self-evident also that the fulfillment of a prophecy is not an evidence of a “prophecy after the event” (vaticinium post evenrum), altogether independently of the fact that in this case Genesis 12:1-3, which is still in process of fulfillment, could not have been written down even today (compare on this matter, perhaps, Noah’s prophecy (9:25 ff); or the prediction of the career of Esau (25:23; 27:40); or of Ishmael (16:10 ff; 21:18); or Jacob’s blessing (Genesis 49)). The last-mentioned case cannot in any way be interpreted as the product of a later time; compare the curse of Levi in 49:5-8 as compared with the honor bestowed on this tribe already in the Mosaic period (Exodus 32:26-29; Deuteronomy 33:8-11), and in the time of the Judges (Judges 17:7-13; 1 Samuel 2:27 f). Zebulun, too, according to Genesis 49:13 is regarded as being settled on the coast, which is not in agreement with historical reality (compare Joshua 19:10-16,27). In the same way the curse on Simeon in Genesis 49:5-7, which declared that his tribe should be distributed among Israel, was not fulfilled in the time when the people entered Canaan (compare Joshua 19:1 and 2 Chronicles 34:6). In Genesis 49:10 “Shiloh” cannot refer to the coming of the tabernacle to Shiloh (compare Joshua 18:1); for Shiloh is, on the other hand, to be interpreted personally and Messianically. As long as Shiloh was of any importance (compare 1 Samuel 1 ff), Judah was not in the possession of the scepter; but when this scepter did come into the control of Judah, Shiloh had long
since ceased to be of any significance (compare my book, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, 360 f).


In \textit{Genesis} 12:6; 13:7, it is claimed that it is presupposed that at the time of the author there were no longer any Canaanites in the country, so that these verses belong to a much later period than that of Moses. But on this supposition these verses would be altogether superfluous and therefore unintelligible additions. For that in the time of Abraham the Canaanites had not yet been expelled by Israel, was a self-evident matter for every Israelite. As a matter of fact, the statements in both verses can easily be interpreted. Abraham leaves his native country to go into a strange land. When he comes to Canaan, he finds it inhabited by the Canaanites (compare 10:6,15; 9:25 ff). This could have made his faith to fail him. God, accordingly, repeats His promise at this very moment and does so with greater exactness (compare 13:7 with 13:1), and Abraham shows that God can trust his faith (13:7 f). The question whether the Canaanites no longer existed at the time the book was written, has nothing at all to do with the meaning of these verses. The same is true of 13:7, on account of the presence of the Canaanites and of the Perizzites, which latter tribe had probably come in the meanwhile and is not yet mentioned in \textit{Genesis} 10, but is mentioned in 15:20, and which makes the separation of Abraham and Lot only all the more necessary.

That in \textit{Genesis} 22:2 the land of Moriah is mentioned is claimed by the critics to be a proof that this passage was written after the times of David and even of Solomon, because according to \textit{2 Chronicles} 3:1 the temple stood on Matthew Moriah. But as in this latter passage one particular mountain is called Moriah, but in Abraham`s time a whole country was so called, it is scarcely possible that \textit{Genesis} 22:2 could have been written at so late a period.

Usually, too, the list of 8 Edomite kings, who ruled before there was a king of Israel, according to \textit{Genesis} 36:31 ff, is cited as a proof that this part was written only after the establishment of the kingdom in Israel, although the time down to the age of Saul would be entirely too long for only eight kings, as already in the Mosaic period there were kings in Edom (\textit{Numbers} 20:14). Then, too, we find in the days of Solomon a
hereditary kingdom in Edom (1 Kings 11:14), while in Genesis 36:31 ff we have to deal with an elective kingdom. Also it would be impossible to understand why this list of kings is carried down only so far and no farther, namely down to the time when there were kings in Israel. This statement can properly be interpreted only in the light of 17:6,16, where the promise is given to Abraham that kings should be found among his descendants (compare also 17:20 with 25:16); and in the light of chapter 14, where Abraham is explicitly brought into connection with kings in a number of ways (with the four kings of the East, whom he conquers; with the five kings of the Jordan valley, whom he assists; with the King’s Vale (14:17), which prepared the way for the Melchizedek episode; and with this Priest-King himself, who blesses him and to whom he gives tithes (14:18 ff); with the king of Sodom, whom he rebukes (14:21 ff)). Accordingly, the statement in 36:31 is not merely a dry historical notice, but is a reference to the blessing of God, which is realized in Israel at a much later time than in the kindred tribe of Esau, and which puts the faith of Israel to a new test. As the death of the last Edomite king is not mentioned (compare 36:39 in contrast to the preceding passage and to 1 Chronicles 1:50 f), but as detailed family data are given, we are doubtless dealing here with living contemporaries of Moses, in whose time already the Edomites possessed a kingdom (Numbers 20:14; Judges 11:17), just as this was the case with Amalek (Numbers 24:7), with Moab (Numbers 21:26; 22:4) and Midian (Numbers 31:8). And why would a later writer have mentioned neither Selah (Petra), so important in later times (compare Isaiah 16:1; Judges 1:36; 2 Kings 14:7), nor Ezion-Geber (1 Kings 9:26, 2 Chronicles 8:17 f), among the places given in Genesis 36:40 ff? In Moses’ time, however, the last-mentioned place was only prairie (Numbers 33:35 f).

Just as little is it an argument against the Mosaic times that Hebron is mentioned in Genesis 13:18; 23:2, which city, according to Joshua 14:15; 15:13, is called Kiriath-arba, a name which Genesis also is acquainted with (compare 23:2), and which in its signification of “city of Arba” points to an originally proper name. Hebron is the older name, which was resumed at a later period, after it had in the meanwhile been supplanted by the Canaanitic name, just as the name of Salem, which occurs already in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, for a period of time gave way to the name of Jebus, but was afterward resumed. That Hebron was an old city and that it existed at a period earlier than the Arba mentioned in
Joshua 14:15; 15:13, and from whom its later name was derived, can be concluded from Numbers 13:22.

Further, the mention of Daniel in 14:14 does not necessarily favor the view that this chapter did not originate until after Joshua 19:47. Judges 18:29, where Leshem or Laish is changed into Daniel (2 Samuel 24:6; compare 24:2 and 24:15), does make the existence of another Daniel probable. Since in Genesis 14:2,3,7,17 so many ancient names are mentioned, and as the author is most fully informed as to the conditions of the political complexion of the old nations of that time (14:5-7), it would be incomprehensible if he should not have made use of the ancient names Laish and Leshem. However, if this Daniel was really meant, we should at most have to deal with a revision, such as that pointed out above. Some other less important arguments against the origin of Genesis from the Mosaic times we can here ignore. The most important argument for the Mosaic origin of the book, in addition to those mentioned under 1, will now be discussed.

VI. SIGNIFICANCE.

1. Lays Foundation for the Whole of Revelation:

In the history of the creation the most important feature for us is the fact that the world was created out of nothing (compare Genesis 1:1 and the word bara’), which guarantees the absoluteness of God and His perfect control of the entire material world; further, the creation of man, as the crown of all creation, for which all things previously created prepare, and who is to rule over them, but who — most important of all — is created after the image of God in Genesis (1:26 f), and whose body has been created by the hand of God and his soul breathed into him by God (2:7). On this fact, too, in the end, is founded the possibility of man’s redemption even after the Fall (5:1,3; compare Colossians 3:9; Ephesians 4:24), as also the possibility of the incarnation of Jesus Christ, who also is the image of God (Colossians 1:15; 2 Corinthians 4:4). Then, too, another all-important factor for us is the unity of the human race, for thereby is made possible and can be understood the fact that all men have become subject to sin and all can be the recipients of grace (Romans 5:12 ff, 1 Corinthians 15:22 f,45 f). Also the need of redemption is brought out strongly in the Book of Genesis. Compare in connection with the Fall, the pains that shall attend the birth of a child, the cursing of the
land, death (3:15 ff), which finds its first victim in Abel, and the
monotonous and emphatic repetition of the formula, “and he died,” in
Genesis 5, as characterizing the dismal fate of mankind, and which finds its
expression in the rapid decrease of the length of life in the genealogies and
in the ages of the patriarchs (5:1 ff; 11:10 ff; 25:7; 35:28; 47:28; 50:26;
Psalm 90:10), and in the irresistible and increasing power of death. By
the side of this, sin at once assumes its most horrible form (Genesis 3,
doubt, pride, fear, boldness of Eve and Adam), and is propagated and
increases; compare the murder and the despair of Cain (Genesis 4:1 ff),
which is still surpassed by the defiant blasphemy of Lamech (4:23 f); and in
the same way, death, which is coming more and more rapidly (see above),
is a proof for this, that sin is being more and more intimately interwoven
with the human race. Compare further, the corruption of the whole earth,
which brings with it as a consequence the judgment of the Deluge (6:5 ff),
after the period of grace extending over 120 years had fruitlessly passed
by; the lack of reverence on the part of Ham (9:22); the arrogance in
connection with the building of the tower of Babel (11:1 ff); the Sodomitic
sin in 18:16 through 19:15; the daughters of Lot (19:30 ff). Still worse is
it, that the elect also are not without blame. On Abraham, see IV, 1, 2b;
then concerning Noah (9:21) and Lot’s fearful drunkenness (19:32 ff);
Isaac’s and Rebekah’s preference for Esau or Jacob (25:28); Jacob’s
deceptions of various kinds, his preference for Joseph (37:3); the horrible
deeds of Simeon and Levi (34:25 ff; 49:5 ff); Reuben’s incest (35:22; 49:3
f); the cruelty of the brethren of Joseph toward him and his father (chapter
37); finally, Joseph’s pride and his reporting his brethren (37:2, 5 ff). In
short, wherever we look, we see in Genesis already a proof for the truth of
Romans 3:23, “All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God.”

2. Preparation for Redemption:

By the side of this need of salvation there is to be found also the longing
for salvation; compare the name of Noah (Genesis 5:29), and the word
of blessing from the lips of Jacob (Genesis 49:18); and, further, the fact
that Abraham reaches out after the promised heir in Genesis 15 through 18,
and his desire for the possession of the land (12 through 14; 23; 28:20 ff;
33:19 f); and especially from 47:27 on. And in harmony with this need and
this longing for redemption we find above all other things the saving and
the promising grace of God. He does not cause the bodily death to follow
immediately upon the Fall in Genesis 3 (although the beginning of the
spiritual death sets in at once with the separation from God); He provides
for mankind by Himself making garments for them out of skins (3:21); even the expulsion from Paradise is not merely a punishment; God fears that man might live forever if he should eat from the tree of life (3:22 ff). He sets enmity between the human race and the seed of the serpent, so that at least the possibility of a moral contest yet exists; He strengthens the good in Cain (4:7); He removes the pious Enoch (5:24); He saves Noah and his family and makes a covenant with him (8:21 ff); He gives His promise to Abraham (12:1-3) and makes a covenant with him (chapters 15; 17); He delivers Lot (19:13 ff); He is willing even to preserve Sodom at Abraham’s prayer, if there are as many as 10 just men in the city (18:32); He bestows a blessing on Ishmael also (16:10 ff; 17:20; 21:13 ff), and permits Isaac to bless Esau (27:39 ff); but above all He is with Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. It is indeed true that the thought runs through Genesis that not all men are capable of receiving His grace, and that not all are drawn to the Father. Cain’s sacrifice is not acceptable before God, as was Abel’s; the Cainites with their advance in civilization (4:17 ff), to whom Lamech also belonged, are different from Seth (4:26; 5:1 ff), who continues the line of the elect. Finally, the godly, too, permit themselves to be deceived (6:1 ff), and Noah stands alone in his piety. After that Ham is cursed in his youngest son, Canaan (9:22; compare 10:6); but Shem is blessed to such a degree that his blessing is to extend to Japheth also; cf, further, the elimination from sacred history of Lot (19:29 ff); of Ishmael (25:12 ff), and of Esau (36:1 ff); of Sodom and Gomorrah (chapter 19); then the choice of Jacob in preference to Esau (25:19 through 37:1); the preference of Ephraim over Manasseh (48:17 ff); the transmission of the Messianic promises to Judah (49:10; compare my book, Messianische Erwartung, 360 f), so that at the close of Genesis we find already the hope of a personal Messiah expressed, in whom also the word (3:15) that was originally spoken to all mankind is to be entirely fulfilled, and in whom also the blessing given to Abraham shall find its significance and realization for the benefit of all mankind (12:3, and see above, 1, 2 and 3). But in the history of Abraham this fact also becomes clear, that in the end this was all grace on the part of God, and faith on the part of man; and because both grace and faith are in Genesis placed and emphasized at the very beginning of the history of mankind, and before the giving of the law (Exodus 19 ff); then this grace and faith cannot be abrogated through the latter or made ineffective. Not by works but by faith is man saved (compare Galatians 3:2; Romans 4; Hebrews 11:8 ff; Jas 2:21 ff). But the guidance of individuals and of His people by God, the ways which He took with His
elect, become clear and intelligible ultimately in the history of Joseph; and all and everything must in the end serve the good of those who are His.

**LITERATURE.**

Against the separation into documents we mention, of older works: Havernick, Specielle Einleitung in den Pent; Hengstenberg, Beiträge zur Einleitung, II, III; Keil, Einleitung in das Altes Testament, and his Commentary on Gen; Ewald, Die Komposition der Genesis. Of later works: Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Eerdmans, Die Komposition der Genesis; Moller, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung. Against the evolutionary theory: Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Wiener, Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism and Wiener, Origin of the Pentateuch; Green, Unity of Book of Genesis; Moller, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit (here also further lit.). On modern archaeological researches: Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Jeremias, Das Altes Testament im Lichte des alten Orients; Urquhart, Die neueren Entdeckungen und die Bibel (to be used with caution; the work is reliable in the facts but not careful in its conclusions and in its account of Old Testament criticism). Further, compare the histories of Israel by Kohler, König, Kittel, Oettli, Klostermann, Stade, Wellhausen: the Commentaries on Genesis by Keil, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Lange, Strack, Gunkel, Holzinger; the Introductions to the Old Testament by Kuenen, Strack, Baudissin, König, Cornill, Driver; the Biblical Theologies by Marti, Smend, Budde, Schulz, Oehler. Finally compare Sievers, Metrische Studien, II: “Die hebraische Genesis.”

*Wilhelm Moller*

**GENNAEUS; GENNEUS**

*<ge-ne’-us>, <ge-ne’-us>* ([Γενναῖος, Gennaios]): Father of Apollonius, one of the Syrian generals who troubled the Jews while Lysias was governor for Antiochus Eupator (2 Macc 12:2). The description is added to distinguish the Apollonius here mentioned from several others of the same name. See *APOLLONIUS*. There is no need with Luther to take the name simply as an adjective “des edlen Apollonius.” The name occurs elsewhere as a proper name.
GENNESARET, LAKE OF

<ge-nes'-a-ret>

See GALILEE, SEA OF.

GENNESARET, LAND OF

<ge-nes'-a-ret> [ἡ ψηΓεννησαρέτ, he ge Gennesaret]):

1. THE NAME:
The first syllable of the name Gennesaret is evidently the Hebrew gan, “garden”; while the second may be a proper name. Possibly, however, the name may represent the Hebrew ganne sarim, “princely gardens.” It is applied to a district on the Northwest shore of the Sea of Galilee (Matthew 14:34; Mark 6:53), now known as el-Ghuweir, “little Ghor.” It curves round from el-Mejdel in the South, to `Ain et-Tineh, or Khan Minyeh, in the North, a distance of over 3 miles, with an average breadth from the sea to the foot of the mountains of about a mile. The soil is deep, rich loam, of amazing fertility. In the South it is watered by the stream from Wady el-Chamam, the gorge that opens to the West of el-Mejdel.

2. WATER:
The middle portion is supplied from `Ain el-Madawwerah, a copious fountain near the western edge of the plain, round which a wall has been built, to raise the level of the water; and from the perennial stream, Wady er-Rubadiyeh, which drives a mill before starting on its work of irrigation. Farther North, Wady el-`Amud brings down much water in the rainy season. The water from `Ain et-Tabgha was brought round the promontory at `Ain et-Tineh by a conduit cut in the rock. It was used to drive certain mills, and also to refresh the neighboring land. This seems to be the fountain called “Capharnaum” by Josephus (BJ, III, x, 8). This writer extols the productiveness of the plain. He says the “soil is so fruitful that all sorts of trees can grow upon it.”

3. FERTILITY:
The walnut, the palm, the olive and the fig, which usually require diverse conditions, flourish together here. “One may call this place the ambition of
nature; ... it is a happy contention of the seasons, as if each of them claimed this country; for it not only nourishes different sorts of autumnal fruit beyond men’s expectation, but preserves them a great while.” He says that it supplies grapes and figs through ten months of the year, and other fruits as they ripen together throughout the year (same place). The fruits of Gennesaret had such high repute among the rabbis that they were not allowed in Jerusalem at the time of the feasts, lest any might be tempted to come merely for their enjoyment (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 45 f).

Centuries of neglect made a sad change in the plain. It was largely overgrown with thorn-bushes, and it yielded one of the finest crops of thistles in the country. Cultivation was confined to the Southwest part; and the rest furnished grazing ground for a tribe of nomads. Recently the German Catholics made extensive purchases, including the village of el-Mejdel. Considerable portions have also passed into the hands of Jews. The land is almost entirely cleared, and it rewards the toil of the husbandman with all its ancient generosity.

W. Ewing

GENTILES

<jen’-tilz> ([גוי, goy], plural [מעיון, goyim]; [ἔθνος, ethnos], “people,” “nation”): Goy (or Goi) is rendered “Gentiles” in the King James Version in some 30 passages, but much more frequently “heathen,” and oftener still, “nation,” which latter is the usual rendering in the Revised Version (British and American), but it, is commonly used for a non-Israelitish people, and thus corresponds to the meaning of Gentiles.” It occurs, however, in passages referring to the Israelites, as in Genesis 12:2; Deuteronomy 32:28; Joshua 3:17; 4:1; 10:13; 2 Samuel 7:23; Isaiah 1:4; Zephaniah 2:9, but the word (‘am) is the term commonly used for the people of God. In the New Testament ethnos is the word corresponding to goy in the Old Testament and is rendered “Gentiles” by both VSS, while ([λαός, laos]) is the word which corresponds to ‘am. The King James Version also renders Ἑλληνες, “Gentiles” in six passages (John 7:35; Romans 2:9,10; 3:9; 1 Corinthians 10:32; 12:13), but the Revised Version (British and American) renders “Greeks.”

The Gentiles were far less sharply differentiated from the Israelites in Old Testament than in New Testament times. Under Old Testament regulations they were simply non-Israelites, not from the stock of Abraham, but they
were not hated or despised for that reason, and were to be treated almost on a plane of equality, except certain tribes in Canaan with regard to whom there were special regulations of non-intercourse. The Gentile stranger enjoyed the hospitality of the Israelite who was commanded to love him (Deuteronomy 10:19), to sympathize with him, “For ye know the heart of the stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt” (Exodus 23:9 the King James Version). The Kenites were treated almost as brethren, especially the children of Rechab (Judges 1:16; 5:24; Jeremiah 35). Uriah the Hittite was a trusted warrior of David (2 Samuel 11); Ittai the Gittite was captain of David’s guard (2 Samuel 18:2); Araunah the Jebusite was a respected resident of Jerusalem. The Gentiles had the right of asylum in the cities of refuge, the same as the Israelites (Numbers 35:15). They might even possess Israelite slaves (Leviticus 25:47), and a Gentile servant must not be defrauded of his wage (Deuteronomy 24:15). They could inherit in Israel even as late as the exile (Ezekiel 47:22,23). They were allowed to offer sacrifices in the temple at Jerusalem, as is distinctly affirmed by Josephus (BJ, II, xvii, 2-4; Ant, XI, viii, 5; XIII, viii, 2; XVI, ii, 1; XVIII, v, 3; CAp, II, 5), and it is implied in the Levitical law (Leviticus 22:25). Prayers and sacrifices were to be offered for Gentile rulers (Jeremiah 29:7; Baruch 1:10,11; Ezr 6:10; 1 Macc 7:33; Josephus, BJ, II, x, 4). Gifts might be received from them (2 Macc 5:16; Josephus, Ant, XIII, in, 4; XVI, vi, 4; BJ, V, xiii, 6; CAp, II, 5). But as we approach the Christian era the attitude of the Jews toward the Gentiles changes, until we find, in New Testament times, the most extreme aversion, scorn and hatred. They were regarded as unclean, with whom it was unlawful to have any friendly intercourse. They were the enemies of God and His people, to whom the knowledge of God was denied unless they became proselytes, and even then they could not, as in ancient times, be admitted to full fellowship. Jews were forbidden to counsel them, and if they asked about Divine things they were to be cursed. All children born of mixed marriages were bastards. That is what caused the Jews to be so hated by Greeks and Romans, as we have abundant evidence in the writings of Cicero, Seneca and Tacitus. Something of this is reflected in the New Testament (John 18:28; Acts 10:28; 11:3).

If we inquire what the reason of this change was we shall find it in the conditions of the exiled Jews, who suffered the bitterest treatment at the hands of their Gentile captors and who, after their return and establishment in Judea, were in constant conflict with neighboring tribes and especially with the Greek rulers of Syria. The fierce persecution of Antiochus IV,
who attempted to blot out their religion and Hellenize the Jews, and the
desperate struggle for independence, created in them a burning patriotism
and zeal for their faith which culminated in the rigid exclusiveness we see
in later times.

H. Porter

GENTILES, COURT OF THE

See TEMPLE.

GENTILES, ISLES OF THE

See ISLES OF THE GENTILES.

GENTLENESS

<jen'-t'-l-nes> ([h ən; `anah]; [ἐπιείκεια, epieikeia], [χρηστότης, chrestotes]): In 2 Samuel 22:36 `anah, “to bend low,” “to condescend,” is translated “gentleness,” “Thy gentleness hath made me great,” the Revised Version, margin “or condescension”; so also Psalm 18:35, where the word is `anwah “humility,” “gentleness,” or “condescension.” In the New Testament epieikeia (“fairness,” “moderation,” in Acts 24:4 translated “clemency”) is in 2 Corinthians 10:1 translated “gentleness,” “the meekness and gentleness of Christ” (2 Macc 2:22 “favor,” the Revised Version (British and American) “forbearance”); chrestotes, “kindness,” “usefulness,” is translated “gentleness” in Galatians 5:22 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “kindness”; chrestos is the word translated “kind” (to the unthankful and evil, Luke 6:35), and chrestotes seems to carry in it a similar idea of active kindness.

Gentle occurs in the Old Testament only in the Revised Version (British and American) of Jeremiah 11:19, “I was like a gentle lamb” (kebhes). In the New Testament it is the translation of epios, “mild,” “gentle” (1 Thessalonians 2:7; 2 Timothy 2:24), and of epieikes, “fitting” “proper,” etc. (1 Timothy 3:3 the Revised Version (British and American); Titus 3:2; Jas 3:17; 1 Peter 2:18); also, with article, Philippians 4:5 (the King James Version “moderation,” the Revised Version (British and American) “forbearance”). In 2 Macc 15:12 Onias is said (the King James Version) to be “gentle (praos) in condition,” the Revised Version (British and American) “in manner.”
GENUBATH

<ge-nu’-bath> ([t b “ nÂ genubhath], “theft”): Son of Hadad, the fugitive Edomite prince, born and brought up at the court of Egypt, whither Hadad had fled when David conquered Edom (1 Kings 11:20). His mother was a sister of Tahpenes, queen of the Pharaoh who ruled Egypt at that time, and who belonged to the notoriously weak and uninfluential 21st dynasty.

GEOGRAPHY

<j-e-o-g'-ra-fi>

See PALESTINE; TABLE OF NATIONS; WORLD.

GEOLOGY, OF PALESTINE

<j-e-o-l’-o-ji>, The geology of Palestine cannot be discussed intelligently without taking into consideration the surrounding regions. The accompanying map shows, with considerable freedom, the distribution of the superficial strata of Syria, Palestine and Sinai, with parts of Asia Minor, Arabia and Egypt. (Data for this map were obtained from the “Geological Map of Egypt” (1:1,000,000) and from the “Carte geologique internationale de l’Europe” (1:1,500,000).) It will be noted that Crystalline, or Archean, rocks (A) occupy extensive areas in Asia Minor, and that they are found in the South in Sinai, Western Arabia, and Eastern and Southern Egypt. Relatively small areas of Paleozoic rocks (P) adjoin the Crystalline rocks in Sinai and Arabia and East of Caesarea in Asia Minor. A notable area of Paleozoic occurs Southeast of the Dead Sea. This is also adjacent to Crystalline rocks, which could not be indicated on the map on account of their slight superficial extent. Bordering either the Crystalline or the Paleozoic rocks in Egypt, Sinai and Arabia are large areas of Nubian Sandstone (N). The Nubian Sandstone in turn is generally bounded by Upper Cretaceous limestone (C), and the last by Tertiary deposits (T). The Quaternary, or Recent, deposit (R) and also the Eruptive rocks (E) sustain no constant relations to any particular ones of the other formations. The Quaternary follows the great rivers and the seacoasts. The Eruptive rocks usually overlie the others. They occupy extensive areas in Asia Minor, Syria and Arabia.
If we concentrate our attention upon the Crystalline, Cretaceous, and Tertiary, which are the most extensive formations, we find that the Crystalline rocks are abundant in the South and in the North, that the Cretaceous are most widely spread in Palestine and Southern Syria, and the Tertiary in Northern Syria and Egypt. We may believe that the Crystalline areas of the North and South have been land since the end of the Archean age, and that what are now Syria, Palestine and most of Egypt remained sea for a long time afterward. The Paleozoic areas were lifted above the sea and added to the northern and southern land areas during or at the end of the Paleozoic era. The regions in which we find Nubian Sandstone or Upper Cretaceous limestone became land by the end of the Mesozoic era. Finally the Tertiary areas were lifted out of the sea. During the Quaternary period the Nile and the rivers of Mesopotamia have added large areas to the land surface.

1. CRYSTALLINE ROCKS (A):

The Crystalline rocks consist mainly of granite and crystalline schists, frequently interrupted with dikes of porphyry, diorite and other eruptives. It will be seen by the map that the Crystalline rocks are nowhere adjacent to the Mediterranean, but that they touch the Nile at Acwan, where the river in pouring over these rocks makes the First Cataract, or rather did before the construction of the great dam. Granite quarried at Acwan could be loaded on boats and conveyed to any city on the shores of the Mediterranean, and it is the granite of Acwan of which are composed not only many of the monuments of Egypt, but also the pillars which adorned many temples in Syria and Palestine.

2. PALEOZOIC ROCKS (P):

The Paleozoic rocks of Sinai and Arabia are of Carboniferous age, but do not include any beds of coal. Those East of Caesarea are Devonian. Those Southeast of the Dead Sea are the oldest of all, being of Cambrian age.

3. TRIASSIC AND JURASSIC ROCKS (JAHWIST):

Several formations which are well developed in the British Islands, are not found in Palestine, but a small Triassic area is found near the Gulf of Alexandretta, while Jurassic strata are found in the region of Hermon and in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. The small scale of the accompanying map makes it impossible to represent accurately the extent of these rocks.
4. NUBIAN SANDSTONE (N):

This name was given by Russegger, who in the middle of the 19th century followed and studied this formation from the Sudan to Syria. Wherever the Nubian Sandstone is found in contact with the Upper Cretaceous limestone it underlies the latter conformably. In Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon and Hermon (but not farther South) it is conformably underlaid by Jurassic limestone. It follows, therefore, that its upper strata (the only ones found in the North) must be of Lower or Middle Cretaceous age. In the South, however, the Jurassic limestone is entirely absent. In Western Sinai the Nubian Sandstone rests conformably on Carboniferous limestone, and by the Dead Sea on Cambrian limestone, while at Petra and at many other places it rests unconformably on Crystalline rocks. While the consideration of the age of the Nubian Sandstone presents no difficulty in Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon and Hermon, it is a very different matter in Western Sinai, and by the Dead Sea. Sandstone is generally supposed to be formed more rapidly than most other rocks. It is, therefore, rather staggering to try to conceive of even the 2,000 ft. of sandstone at the Southeast end of the Dead Sea as having been in process of formation from the Cambrian to the Cretaceous. The Nubian Sandstone is commonly brown or reddish, but in places shows great variety of color. The temples and tombs of Petra were all carved in this rock. It is in places very friable, and in others compact and hard. The sands of the Arabian deserts have been in the main derived from it, being carried by the prevailing west winds. Where it is covered by a sheet of eruptive rock (charrah), it is protected from erosion, with the result that the land to the East is not converted into a sandy desert (Hogarth, Penetration of Arabia). It frequently includes strata of clay and shale and thin seams of coal or lignite, and must have been deposited in seas which were at the time relatively shallow.

5. UPPER CRETACEOUS LIMESTONE (C):

This is the principal rock of Palestine, Lebanon, and Anti-Lebanon. Many of its strata are very fossiliferous, and no doubt exists as to its age. It furnishes the best of building stone and is a source of lime. The soils formed from it are fertile, and the mountain sides have been terraced by the patient labor of centuries.
6. TERTIARY ROCKS (T):

A notable Tertiary fossil is the Nummulite, which occurs in abundance in the rock of the pyramids of Gizeh and in other places. Relatively small masses of Tertiary strata (not shown on the map) are found on the coast at the mouths of the principal streams of Lebanon, showing that while the mass of Lebanon had risen from the sea by the beginning of the Tertiary, the elevation was not complete. The principal river courses had, however, already been formed, and the streams were already carrying into the sea the scourings of the rocks of early Lebanon, which were being laid down to form these Tertiary strata.

7. QUATERNARY AND RECENT STRATA (R):

These consist mainly of the superficial deposits of the Nile, the Euphrates and other large streams. At various points along the coast of Syria and Palestine are extensive sand dunes. Frequently under the loose sand, or exposed, is found a sandstone which instead of being entirely siliceous, like most sandstones, is partly calcareous, containing from 15 to 25 per cent of calcium-carbonate. This is probably an aeolian formation, i.e. consolidated under the influence of the atmosphere, and not formed under the sea, like most stratified rocks. It is easily worked and is much used for building.

8. PALESTINE:

It may be gathered from the foregoing statements that the rocks of Palestine are mainly Cretaceous. The Jurassic limestone, which in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon underlies the Nubian Sandstone, is absent in Palestine, but, at least in Eastern Palestine, as in Lebanon, we find the Upper Cretaceous limestone to be underlaid by the Nubian Sandstone. A striking feature of the geology of Palestine is the Jordan valley fault. At some time, probably at the beginning of the Tertiary period, when Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon, and the Judean hills were being lifted out of the sea, the earth’s crust was rent for at least several hundred miles along a line nearly North and South, or more exactly from a little West of South to a little East of North. This line runs through the Gulf of `Aqabah, the Wadi-`Arabah, the Dead Sea, the Jordan valley, the Sea of Tiberias, the Chuleh, and the valley between Hermon and Anti-Lebanon on the one hand and Lebanon on the other. The resulting disturbance of the strata is most evident in the region of the Dead Sea. There is no evidence that the two walls of the fissure
separated from one another, but the East wall slipped up and the West wall
down for perhaps 2,000 ft, so that on the East shore of the Dead Sea and
in the valleys entering the Jordan, Dead Sea, and `Arabah from the East,
the Nubian Sandstone is exposed, underlying the Upper Cretaceous
limestone, while on the West side, even down to the level of the Dead Sea,
1,290 ft. below the Mediterranean, the Nubian Sandstone is nowhere
visible, although it may be presumed to exist there also below the upper
limestone. (See the accompanying ideal section, after Lartet, through
Judea, the Dead Sea and Moab.) The great fault and the subsidiary faults
which accompany it occasioned the outpourings of igneous rock which are
abundant along the line of the fault. The numerous hot springs (e.g.
Tiberins, Wadi-Yarmuk, Wadi-Zarqa-Ma`in (Callirrhoe), Wadi-ul-Chisa)
may be due to subterranean streams of water coming in contact with
deeply buried and still heated masses of igneous rock.

Alfred Ely Day

GEON

<ge’-on>.

See GIHON (Apocrypha).

GEPHYRUN

<ge-fi’-run> ([Γεφυρούν, Gephuroun]): In 2 Macc 12:13, referring to the
capture by Judas of a stronghold East of Jordan, the Revised Version
(British and American) reads, “And he also fell upon a certain city
Gephyrun, .... it was named Gaspin.” There appears to be some confusion
in the text. There is nothing to indicate the relation between the two
names. the King James Version renders, “He went also about to make a
bridge.” The name of the city in Josephus (Ant., XII, viii, 5) is EPHRON
(which see).

GERA

<ge’-ra> ([אֶרֶץ gera’], “grain”): A family name of the tribe of Benjamin,
hence, not necessarily a separate individual in (3) and (4) below:

(1) A son of Benjamin (<Genesis 46:21>).
(2) According to 1 Chronicles 8:3,5,7, son of Bela and grandson of Benjamin. The name is repeated (8:5) in the list of Bela’s sons.

(3) Father, or ancestor, of the judge Ehud (Judges 3:15).

(4) Father, or ancestor, of Shimei, the Benjamite, who cursed David when he fled from Absalom (2 Samuel 16:5; 19:16,18; 1 Kings 2:8).

GERAH

<ge’-ra> ([hr Ge’erah], “grain” or “kernel”): A weight, the 20th part of a shekel (Exodus 30:13; Leviticus 27:25; Numbers 3:47; 18:16; Ezekiel 45:12).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

GERAR

<ge’-rar> ([Ir G gerar], “circle,” “region”; Γεραρά, Gerara): A town in the Philistine plain South of Gaza (Genesis 10:19), where both Abraham and Isaac sojourned for a time, and where they came into contact with Abimelech, king of Gerar (Genesis 20 and 26, passim). The place has not been fully identified, but the site is probably in one of the branches of Wady Sheri’a, at a place called Um Jerrar, near the coast Southwest of Gaza and 9 miles from it (SWP, III, 389-90). The site answers fairly well to the statements of Eusebius and Jerome, Eusebius, Onomasticon, that it was 25 (Roman) miles South of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin). It is actually 30 English miles, but distances were not very accurately determined in early times. Gerar was known in the first 5 centuries AD, when it was the seat of a bishopric, and its bishop, Marcian, attended the Council of Chalcedon 451 AD, It was also the seat of a monastery.

The statements in Genesis indicate that Gerar belonged to the Philistines, and we are led to infer that Abimelech was king of that people, but it is quite certain that they did not occupy this region until after the time of Abraham, in fact only a short time before the Exodus. It is probable, however, that the writer of Genesis would refer to the country as it was known in his day. The town certainly existed in the Philistine period, for it is mentioned in connection with Asa, who defeated the Ethiopian host under Zerar and pursued them in their flight unto Gerar (2 Chronicles
Besides the locality of Um Jerrar, another place in the vicinity known as Jurf el-Jerrar has been thought by some to be the site of Gerar. Jerrar in Arabic means “jars,” and it is doubtful whether it represents the Hebrew Gerar. Jurf means usually “steep declivity,” or “precipice,” and at the place mentioned many fragments of pottery were found, but this does not necessarily indicate the site of an ancient town. The site of Gerar is discussed in Thomson’s LB, I, 196-99 (ed. 1882); Robinson’s BR, II, 43-44; PEFS, 1871, 84; 1875, 162-64; 1881, 38.

**GERASA; GERASENES**

<ger’-a-sa>, <ger’-a-senz> ([Γέρασσα, Gerasa]; [Γερασηνῶν, Gerasenon]):

### 1. COUNTRY OF THE GERASENES:

The town itself is not named in Scripture, and is referred to only in the expression, “country of the Gerasenes” (Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37; see Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Appendix, 11). This describes the district in which Christ met and healed the demoniac from the tombs, where also took place the destruction of the swine. It was on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, and must have been a locality where the steep edges of the Bashan plateau drop close upon the brink of the lake. This condition is fulfilled only by the district immediately South of Wady Semak, North of Qal‘at el-Chucn. Here the slopes descend swiftly almost into the sea, and animals, once started on the downward run, could not avoid plunging into the depths. Many ancient tombs are to be seen in the face of the hills. Gerasa itself is probably represented by the ruins of Kurseh on the South side of Wady Semak, just where it opens on the seashore. The ruins of the town are not considerable; but there are remains of a strong wall which must have surrounded the place. Traces of ancient buildings in the vicinity show that there must have been a fairly numerous population in the district.

### 2. HISTORY:

The great and splendid city in the Decapolis is first mentioned as taken after a siege by Alexander Janneus, 85 BC (BJ, I, iv, 8). Josephus names it as marking the eastern limit of Peraea (BJ, III, in, 3). He calls the
inhabitants Syrians, when, at the beginning of the Jewish revolt, the district round Gerasa was laid waste. The Syrians made reprisals, and took many prisoners. With these, however, the Gerasenes dealt mercifully, letting such as wished go free, and escorting them to the border (BJ, II, xviii, 1, 5). Lucius Annius, at the instance of Vespasian, sacked and burned the city, with much slaughter (BJ, IV, ix, 1). From this disaster it appears soon to have recovered, and the period of its greatest prosperity lay, probably, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries of our era. It became the seat of a bishopric, and one of its bishops attended the Council of Chalcedon. Reland (Pal, II, 806) notes certain extant coins of Gerasa, from which it is clear that in the 2nd century it was a center of the worship of Artemis. It was besieged by Baldwin II, in 1121 AD. Mention is made of the strength of the site and the mighty masonry of its walls. William of Tyre calls the city Jarras, and places it 16 miles East of Jordan (Hist, xii, 16). The distance is about 19 miles from the river. It was conquered by the Moslems in the time of Omar (Guy le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 462). The sultan of Damascus is said to have fortified it; but there is nothing to show that the Moslems occupied it for any length of time.

3. DESCRIPTION:

Modern Jerash lies on both banks of Wady Jerash, about 6 miles from its confluence with Wady ez-Zerqa (the Jabbok). It is almost 20 miles from Amman (Philadelphia), and 22 from Fahl (Pella). The ruins are wide and imposing and are better preserved than any others on the East of Jordan. They include several splendid temples, theaters, basilica, palaces and baths, with hippodrome and naumachia. The triumphal arch to the South of the city is almost entire. Two paved streets with double colonnades cut through the city at right angles, four massive pedestals still marking the point of intersection. An excellent account of the ruins is given in Thomson’s LB, III, 558 ff.

There is nothing above ground of older date than the 2nd and 3rd centuries of our era; but there is no reason to doubt that the Greek city of Gerasa stood on the same site. The presence of a copious spring of sweet water makes it probable that the site has been occupied from olden time; but no trace remains of any ancient city. Some would identify the place with RAMOTH-GILEAD, which see.
The site is now occupied by a colony of Circassians, and there is reason to fear that, unless something is done to preserve them, many valuable remains of antiquity will perish.

W. Ewing

GERGESENESES

<gur’-ge-senz>, <gur-ge-senz’>: A false reading of “Gadarenes” retained in the King James Version of Matthew 8:28.

See GADARA.

GERIZIM, MOUNT

<ger’-i-zim>, <ge-ri’-zim> ([םב"ר יבג] har gerizzim)

1. SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES:

Named in the directions for the reading of the law (Deuteronomy 11:29), and in the account of that great ceremony (Deuteronomy 27:12; Joshua 8:33 f). Mts. Ebal and Gerizim stood over against each other, and on their sides the peoples were placed, half upon one and half upon the other, while in the vale which separates the mountains stood the ark, with the Levites. Those who stood on Gerizim responded to the blessings, those on Matthew Ebal to the cursings, as these were spoken “with a loud voice” by the Levites. From a spur of Matthew Gerizim Jotham spoke his taunting parable to the men of Shechem (Judges 9:7). The name appears no more in canonical Scripture. In consequence of the dispute which arose over the marriage of Manasseh, who belonged to the high-priestly family, with a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite (Nehemiah 13:28), a temple was built on Gerizim as a rival to that in Jerusalem (circa 432 BC). This was the beginning of the schism which lasts to the present day (Ant., XI, viii, 2, 4). See SAMARITANS. The temple was destroyed by John Hyrcanus circa 110 BC (Ant., XIII, ix, 1; BJ, I, ii, 6).

2. DESCRIPTION:

Matthew Gerizim, the modern Jebel et-Tur, stands on the South, Matthew Ebal on the North, of the narrow pass which cuts through the mountain range, opening a way from the sea to the Jordan. In the throat of this pass to the West, on the South of the vale, and close to the foot of Gerizim, lies
the town of Nablus, the ancient Shechem. Here copious fountains rise, filling the valley with beauty and fruitfulness. The sides of the mountain are steep and rocky on East and North; on the West the ascent is more gradual, and here, by means of a system of terraces carried almost to the summit, it is cultivated with great care and success. Its height is 2,849 ft. above the level of the sea, 228 ft. lower than its northern companion.

3. SAMARITAN TRADITIONS:

Abraham came through the pass and camped near Gerizim at the oak of Moreh (Genesis 12:6). According to Samaritan tradition it was on this mountain that he prepared to sacrifice Isaac, and at Salem, not far distant, he met Melchizedek (Genesis 14:17 ff). The scene of Jacob’s dream is placed at Khirbet Lauzeh on the summit (Genesis 28:11 f). In a little hollow West of the ridge, the Samaritans annually celebrate the Passover in accordance with the directions of the Pentateuch. This is done in the open air, their temple having long since disappeared.

4. ANTIQUITIES:

The most important remains on the mountain today are those of Justinian’s fortress, built in 533 AD, to protect the church which had been erected in 475 AD. Near the center of the plateau is a bare piece of rock, on which, tradition says, the altar stood in the Samaritan temple. A cup-like hollow in it may have been used for libations. In the western wall of el-Qal’ah, Justinian’s castle, there are 12 stones under which, it is said, are the stones which Israel took from the bed of the Jordan (Joshua 4:20).

Gerizim was certainly “this mountain” pointed to by the woman of Samaria in her conversation with Jesus (John 4:20 f); the cliffs of the mountain almost overhanging the Well of Jacob.

For the reason why Gerizim was chosen for the blessing and Ebal for the cursing we are left to conjecture. The directions were fixed by one looking to the East, not, as with us, looking to the North. For one standing in the valley, therefore, Gerizim was on the right hand, “the side of good fortune” (Driver, Deuteronomy on 11:28).

Onom places Ebal and Gerizim much nearer the Jordan valley. This was doubtless to meet the difficulty raised by the long distance from Ai to Shechem. But their nearness to the “oaks of Moreh” (Deuteronomy
11:30) points to this locality, and this is confirmed by Josephus, who speaks of Shechem, the metropolis of the Samaritans, as “a city situated at Matthew Gerizim” (Ant., XI, viii, 6).

Andronicus, appointed governor of Gerizim by Antiochus Epiphanes, is mentioned in 2 Macc 5:23 (the King James Version “Garizim”).

**W. Ewing**

**GERON**

<ge’-run> ([Γέρων, Geron]): Not much seems to be gained by translating with the Revised Version, margin “Geron, an Athenian,” for “an old man of Athens” in 2 Macc 6:1.

**GERRENIANS**

<ge-re’-ni-anz> ([Ἔως τῶν Γερρηνῶν, heos ton Gerrenon]): The name indicates the southern limit of the territory assigned by Antiochus Eupator to the government of Judas Maccabeus when he “left Hegemonides governor from Ptolemais even unto the Gerrenians” (2 Macc 13:24, the King James Version “Gerrhenians”). It is not easy to say exactly who the Gerrenians were. They were wrongly associated by Grotius with the town Gerrha, and are with more probability connected with the ancient city of Gerar, Southeast of Gaza. One manuscript reads Gerarenon, which could easily be corrupted into Gerrenon, and would place the government of Hegemonides between Ptolemais and Gerar.

**J. Hutchison**

**GERSHOM**

<gur’-shom> ([גֵרְשום, gereshom], from garash, “to cast out”; explained, however, in Exodus 2:22 and 18:3 as from gur, “For he said, I have been a sojourner in a foreign land”):

(1) Firstborn son of Moses and Zipporah. The only details of his life contained in the Pentateuch are the account of his circumcision (Exodus 4:25), and his remaining under the care of Jethro, while Moses was in Egypt leading the Exodus. His descendants were numbered among the tribes of Levi (1 Chronicles 23:14). One of them apparently was the Jonathan who officiated as priest of the idolatrous sanctuary at Dan, and whose descendants held the office until the captivity. The Massoretic Text
inserts a suspended \( n \), in the name of Moses (\( h v m \)), causing it to be lead \( [h v nm, Manasseh] \), for the purpose, according to tradition, of disguising the name out of respect for the revered Lawgiver. Another descendant described as a “son” was Shebuel, a ruler over the treasuries of David.

(2) A son of Levi, so called in 1 Chronicles 6:16,17,20,43,12,71 (Hebrew 1,2,5,28,47,56); 15:7; elsewhere GERSHON (which see).

(3) A descendant of Phinehas, the head of a father’s house, who journeyed with Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem in the reign of Artaxerxes (Ezr 8:2).

Ella Davis Isaacs

GERSON; GERSHONITES

\(<gur’-shon>, <gur’-shon-its>\) ([\( \text{\textit{gur}}’\text{-}\text{\textit{shon}}, \text{\textit{gur}}’\text{-}\text{\textit{shon-its}}\)], written also gereshom): Firstborn of the 3 sons of Levi (Exodus 6:16; Numbers 3:17; 1 Chronicles 6:1,16 m; 23:6). He had two sons, Libni, also known as Ladan (1 Chronicles 23:7; 26:21), and Shimei (Exodus 6:17; Numbers 3:18; 1 Chronicles 6:17,20), and consequently two groups of descendants, enumerated in the census taken in the Wilderness of Sinai (Numbers 3:21 ff) and that in the Plains of Moab (Numbers 26:57). In the distribution of functions among the Levites, the Gershonites were charged with the carrying of the curtains, coverings, screens, hangings, cords and instruments of the tabernacle and the tent of meeting on the journeys in the wilderness, under the supervision of Ithamar the son of Aaron. Their function was thus more exalted than that of the Merarites, who carried the boards, and less so than that of the Kohathites, who carried the most holy utensils and symbols. The Gershonites were given two wagons with four oxen — half as many as the Merarites, according to their service (Numbers 7:7). Thirteen cities were assigned to the Gershonites in Northern Palestine by Eleazar and Joshua (Joshua 21:6,27-33 parallel 1 Chronicles 6:62,71-76).

Among the Gershonites who achieved distinction in later Biblical times was the family of Asaph, the singers from the time of David to the days of the Second Temple (1 Chronicles 6:31-47; 25:1-7; 15:7,17,19; 16:5,7; 2 Chronicles 25:15; Ezr 2:41; 3:10; Nehemiah 11:17,22; 12:35; 1 Chronicles 9:15). Other Gershonites named are the heads of the fathers’ houses in the days of David in connection with the dividing of the Levites into courses (1 Chronicles 23:7-11); the superintendents of the
treasuries of the house of the Lord of the same time (1 Chronicles 26:21,22; 29:8); and, finally, Gershonites are mentioned among those who cleansed the house of the Lord in the days of Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 29:12,13).

Ella Davis Isaacs

GERSON

<gur'-sun> ([Гερσων, Gerson]; 1 Esdras 8:29): Called Gershom in Ezr 8:2.

GERUTH CHIMHAM

<ge'-rooth kim'-ham> ([т W גטע יכ酡, geruth kimham]): If the reading geruth is correct, a “lodging-place” or “khan” on the highway to Egypt, may be meant (Jeremiah 41:17). It may have been built by Chimham son of Barzillai; or it may have been named from him as owner of the land on which it stood. But probably with Josephus we should read gidhroth, “hurdles” or “sheep pens” (Ant., X, ix, 5).

GERZITES

<gur'-zits> (1 Samuel 27:8 King James Version margin).

See GIRZITES.

GESHEM

<ge'-shem> ([עגש, gesheh], [חגש, gashmu]; [Гешам, Gesam], “rain storm”): An Arabian, probably chief of an Arabian tribe that had either settled in Southern Palestine during the exile in Babylon, or had been settled in or near Samaria by Sargon (Nehemiah 2:19; 6:1,2,6). He was a confederate of Sanballat and Tobiah, and strenuously opposed the building of the wall under Nehemiah. He with the others mocked at the first efforts to build the wall, and afterward repeatedly sought to entice
Nehemiah to the plains of Ono. The name also occurs in the form Gashmu, perhaps an Assyrian form of the same name Geshem.

J. J. Reeve

GESHUR

<ge’-shur> ([ר ו ג geshur], “bridge”): An Aramean kingdom (2 Samuel 15:8) of no great size which lay probably to the South of Maacah, and formed with it the western boundary of the land of Bashan (Deuteronomy 3:14; Joshua 12:5; 13:11). The territory of these two probably corresponded roughly with modern Jaulan. It may not have reached quite to the Jordan on the West; in which case the Geshurites literally dwelt “in the midst” of Israel (Joshua 13:13), since they were not expatriated by the half-tribe of Manasseh, and they retained their independence. David married Maacah, daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur, who became the mother of Absalom and Tamar (2 Samuel 3:3). To Talmai Absalom fled for safety after the murder of Amnon (2 Samuel 13:37 f), and thence Joab brought him back to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 14:23). The Geshurites and Aram are said to have taken the cities of Jair — i.e. Havvoth-jair — which lay in the land of Gilead (1 Chronicles 2:23). It is possible that “Geshurites” should be read, with Vulgate, Syriac, etc., instead of “Ashurites” in 2 Samuel 2:9. The only difficulty is that Geshur was an independent kingdom, and there is nothing to show how it was brought under the sway of the son of Saul. In the catalogue of land still to be possessed in Joshua 13:2, the King James Version reads “Geshuri,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the Geshurites,” referring evidently to a district bordering on the Philistines. Both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render the same word by “Geshurites” in 1 Samuel 27:8, where apparently the same territory is indicated as invaded by David. In neither passage is the text above suspicion; in 1 Samuel 27:8 Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus omits the name. No satisfactory explanation has been suggested.

W. Ewing

GESHURITES

<gesh’-u-rits>, <ge-shoo’-rits> ([ר ו ג geshuri]). See preceding article.
GESTURE

<jes’-tur>, <jes’-tur>: The Oriental is rich in gestures by which feelings are expressed and force added to words. Of this we have abundant illustration in the Bible. Almost every available part of the body was employed in gesture. In salutations the whole body was bowed, sometimes to the ground (Genesis 18:2; 19:1; 33:7; 42:6; 33:3, 7 t), falling on the face to the ground and bowing to the ground, 3 times (1 Samuel 20:41; compare Genesis 23:7; 2 Samuel 9:8; 18:21; 1 Kings 2:19); it was common also to embrace and kiss (Exodus 18:7), etc., weeping for joy. Esau “fell on (Jacob’s) neck, and kissed him: and they wept” (Genesis 33:4); compare Joseph and his brethren (Genesis 45:14,15); David and Jonathan (1 Samuel 20:41), and the father of the prodigal (Luke 15:20). We have the kiss also in the story of Judas with his Master (Matthew 26:49). Bowing the knee was also in Egypt an act of homage to a superior (Genesis 41:43); bowing the knee and bowing down were common in prayer and worship (1 Kings 19:18; 2 Chronicles 6:13; Ezr 9:5; Isaiah 45:23); in prayer the head and whole body were also bowed (Genesis 24:26; 2 Kings 5:18; 2 Chronicles 29:28 f). The rabbins decreed that in prayer “in bowing down, the back must be bent so low that every vertebra becomes conspicuous,” and endless questions arose as to what it was lawful to do during prayer (Edersheim). We read also of prayer offered standing (1 Samuel 1:26; 1 Kings 8:22; Matthew 6:5; Mark 11:25), lifting up and spreading forth the hands (1 Kings 8:22; 2 Chronicles 6:13; Ezr 9:5; Nehemiah 8:6; 1 Timothy 2:8); “lifting up the hands” was synonymous with prayer (Psalm 77:2; 141:2; Lamentations 2:19; 1 Timothy 2:8); falling on the knees in pleading (1 Kings 1:13).

Reverence for the aged was expressed by rising up in their presence (Leviticus19:32, “Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head”; compare Lamentations 5:12). The hand was also laid on the mouth in token of respect (Job 29:9); in token of blessing the right hand was placed on the head (Genesis 48:14; compare 49:26; Proverbs 10:6). The hands were laid on the head of the animal to be sacrificed; on the scapegoat and sin offering as denoting the transference of sin; on the burnt offering, perhaps as representing the offerer (Leviticus1:4; 16:21). The hands were lifted up in blessing (Leviticus9:22), in solemn swearing (Genesis 14:22; Exodus 6:8 m; Deuteronomy 32:40), in defiance and threatening (2 Samuel 20:21); extended in pleading (Isaiah 65:2). Giving the
hand or joining hands as a pledge of friendship and fidelity (2 Kings 10:15; Proverbs 11:21) was the origin of the widespread custom of “shaking hands”; “striking hands” signified the clenching of a bargain or agreement (Proverbs 6:1 the Revised Version (British and American)); as a solemn pledge the hand was placed under the thigh of the person to whom it was given (Genesis 24:2; 47:29); plucking the hand out of the bosom was a sign of action (Psalm 74:11); clapping the hands, of rejoicing (2 Kings 11:12; Psalm 47:1; 98:8; Isaiah 55:12), also of ridicule, contempt and rejoicing over one (Job 27:23; Lamentations 2:15; Nahum 3:19). We read of “beckoning with the hand” (Luke 5:7; John 13:24), preliminary to speaking (Acts 12:17; 13:16; 19:33; 21:40; 26:1, he “stretched forth his hand”); drooping of the hands indicated failure, weakness or distress (Hebrews 12:12; compare Isaiah 35:3; Ecclesiasticus 25:23); washing the hands (publicly) was a declaration of innocence, “of freedom from complicity” (Deuteronomy 21:6,7; Matthew 27:24).

The head lifted up was a sign of arrogance or pride (Psalm 83:2); of exaltation, or recovery from trouble, etc. (Judges 8:28; Psalm 27:6; 110:7; Zec 1:21); to cover the head was a symbol of grief or mourning (2 Samuel 15:30; Nehemiah 6:12; Jeremiah 14:3), also putting the hand on the head (2 Samuel 13:19; Jeremiah 2:37), or ashes, dust or earth (Joshua 7:6; 1 Samuel 4:12; 2 Samuel 12; 13:19; Nehemiah 4:1); wagging (or shaking) the head expressed contempt or malicious enjoyment (Job 16:4; Psalm 64:8; Jeremiah 18:16; Lamentations 2:15; with “hissing,” compare Matthew 27:39; Mark 15:29; compare Psalm 22:7; 44:14; 109:25; Jeremiah 48:27).

Uncovering the feet was a sign of grief (2 Samuel 15:30; Isaiah 20:2,4); lifting up the heel against one was a symbol of opposition (Psalm 41:9; John 13:18); shaking the dust from the feet, of freeing from responsibility and of complete rejection (Matthew 10:14; Acts 13:51; at Corinth Paul “shook out his raiment,” Acts 18:6); strong joyous feeling found (as elsewhere) expression in dancing (Exodus 15:20; 2 Samuel 6:14,16).

Shooting out the lip was an expression of contempt (Psalm 22:7); to incline the ear signified attention (Psalm 45:10); rending the garments expressed the sense of horror (as in the presence of disaster, blasphemy,
etc.) (Numbers 14:6; Joshua 7:6; 1 Samuel 4:12; 2 Samuel 1:2; 13:19; 15:32; Matthew 26:65; Acts 14:14); the smile indicated favor and gave confidence (Job 29:24); lifting up the eyelids was a sign of pride (Proverbs 30:13); Isaiah speaks also of the “outstretched necks and wanton eyes” of the haughty daughters of Zion, “walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet” (Isaiah 3:16). The perverse man “winketh with his eyes .... speaketh with his feet ..... maketh signs with his fingers” (Proverbs 6:13).

It is interesting to note the gestures ascribed in the Gospels to Jesus. The expression of His eyes is often referred to; we read how He “lifted up his eyes on his disciples” before pronouncing the Beatitudes, indicating a loving regard for them (Luke 6:20); how He “looked upon” the young ruler and “loved him,” and, with another expressive “look” (round about) — a sad look — said, “How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God” (Mark 10:21,23); how He “looked up to heaven” before He blessed and brake the loaves (Matthew 14:19; Mark 6:41; Luke 9:16); also before healing (Mark 7:34); how He “looked round” on His adversaries in the synagogue (Luke 6:10), “with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart” (Mark 3:5); how He “turned and looked upon Peter” so that he remembered his boasting and fall, and went out and wept bitterly (Luke 22:61); we read also how He took a little child into His arms and held him up as an example to His disciples (Mark 9:36), and how He “took (little children) in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them” (Mark 10:16); how He “stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground” when the woman accused of adultery was brought to Him, then “lifted up himself” and spake, again “stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground,” till the woman’s accusers had departed one by one, condemned and ashamed, when He again “lifted up himself” and sent the woman away (John 8:6 ff); how on His way to the tomb of Lazarus, He was agitated, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “was troubled,” margin “troubled himself.” Meyer has “shuddered.” Some translation “shook himself” (John 11:33).

See, further, ATTITUDES.

W. L. Walker
GET; GETTING

A great many Hebrew words are in the Old Testament translated “get,” “got,” etc. The word “get” has two meanings:

(1) with the idea of movement, “to go,” etc.;

(2) with that of acquisition, “to gain,” “obtain,” etc.

(1) In the first sense the most frequent words are *bo*’, “to come, or go in” (*Genesis* 45:17; *1 Samuel* 22:5, etc.); *yalakh* “to go on” (*Genesis* 12:1; 22:2; *Exodus* 5:4; *Jeremiah* 5:5, etc.); *yaradh*, “to go down” (*Genesis* 42:2; *Joel* 3:13); ‘*alah*, “to go up” (*Genesis* 44:17; *Isaiah* 40:9; *Jeremiah* 49:31, etc.). Other words are *nudh*, “to move off” (*Jeremiah* 49:30 the King James Version; *Daniel* 4:14); *nasa*, “to remove” (*Numbers* 14:25); *yatsa*, “to go out” (*Genesis* 19:14; 31:13; *Exodus* 11:8).

(2) In the sense of acquisition, the words most frequently translated “get,” etc., are *`asah*, “to do,” “to make” (*Genesis* 12:5; 31:1; *Deuteronomy* 8:17,18); *qanah*, “to get,” “obtain” (*Genesis* 4:1; *Proverbs* 4:5,7; *Ecclesiastes* 2:7 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “bought”; *Jeremiah* 13:1, the Revised Version (British and American) “buy”); *matsa* “to find” (*Numbers* 31:50; *2 Samuel* 20:6); *rakhash*, “to acquire,” “gain” (*Genesis* 31:18; 36:6 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “gathered”; 46:6).

For “get” the Revised Version (British and American) has “mount” (Deuteronomy 28:43), “buy” (Proverbs 17:16; Jeremiah 13:1; 19:1); for “get you down” (Joel 3:13), “tread ye,” margin “get you down”; “get” for “possess” (Luke 18:12); “get them away” for “gather themselves together” (Psalm 104:22); “get us” for “apply” (Psalm 90:12); “let us get grain” for “therefore we take up corn for them,” and for “that we might buy corn” (Nehemiah 5:2,3); “get you no” for “provide neither” (Matthew 10:9); “getteth prudence” for “is prudent,” margin “dealeth prudently” (Proverbs 15:5); “getteth” for “coveteth” (Habakkuk 2:9).

W. L. Walker

GETHER

<ge’-ther> ([רְבָּעַת, gether]): In Genesis 10:23 named as one of the 4 sons of Aramaic In 1 Chronicles 1:17 mentioned simply among the sons of Shem.

GETHSEMANE

<geth-sem’-a-ne> ([Γεθσυμανεί, Gethsemani] (for other spellings and accents see Thayer, under the word); probably from the Aramaic [µγημαν] t G’, gath shemanim], “oil press”): Mentioned (Matthew 26:36; Mark 14:32) as a place (chorion), margin “enclosed piece of ground,” to which Jesus and the disciples retired after the last supper; in John 18:1 it is described as a “garden” ([κήπος, kepos]), while Luke (22:40) simply says “place” ([τόπος, topos]). From John 18:1 it is evident that it was across the Kidron, and from Luke 22:39, that it was on the Mount of Olives. Very possibly (Luke 21:37; 22:39) it was a spot where Jesus habitually lodged when visiting Jerusalem. The owner — whom conjecture suggests as Mary the mother of Mark — must have given Jesus and His disciples special right of entry to the spot.

Tradition, dating from the 4th century, has fixed on a place some 50 yds. East of the bridge across the Kidron as the site. In this walled-in enclosure once of greater extent, now primly laid out with garden beds, by the owners — the Franciscans — are eight old olive trees supposed to date from the time of our Lord. They are certainly old, they appeared venerable to the traveler Maundrell more than two centuries ago, but that they go
back to the time claimed is impossible, for Josephus states (BJ, VI, i, 1) that Titus cut down all the trees in the neighborhood of Jerusalem at the time of the siege. Some 100 yards farther North is the “Grotto of the Agony,” a cave or cistern supposed to be the spot “about a stone’s cast” to which our Lord retired (Luke 22:41). The Greeks have a rival garden in the neighborhood, and a little higher up the hill is a large Russian church. The traditional site may be somewhere near the correct one, though one would think too near the public road for retirement, but the contours of the hill slopes must have so much changed their forms in the troubled times of the first and second centuries, and the loose stone walls of such enclosures are of so temporary a character, that it is impossible that the site is exact. Sentiment, repelled by the artificiality of the modern garden, tempts the visitor to look for a more suitable and less artificial spot farther up the valley. There is today a secluded olive grove with a ruined modern olive press amid the trees a half-mile or so farther up the Kidron Valley, which must far more resemble the original Gethsemane than the orthodox site.

E. W. G. Masterman

GEUEL

<gu’-el>, <ge-u’-el> ([גֵּעֶל] ge’u’el), “majesty of God”): The spy from the tribe of Gad (Numbers 13:15), sent by Moses to spy out the land of Canaan.

GEZER

<ge’-zer> ([גֶּזֶר] gezer): A city of great military importance in ancient times, the site of which has recently been thoroughly explored. The excavations at this spot are the most thorough and extensive of any in Palestine, and have not only done much to confirm the history of the place, as known from Biblical and other sources, but have also thrown a flood of light upon the general history, civilization and religion of Palestine in pre-Israelite and Israelite times.

1. THE DISCOVERY AND POSITION OF THE SITE:

The long-lost site of Gezer was discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau in 1873, and his suggestion that the modern name for the place, Tell Jezer (or Tell el Jezereh) was a survival of the ancient name was confirmed by his further discovery of three bilingual inscriptions, in Hebrew and Greek, cut
on surfaces of rock by a certain Alkios, apparently once the governor of the city; in one of them occurred the expression “the boundary of Gezer.”

The natural features and the position of Tell Jezer abundantly explain the extreme importance of Gezer in ancient times. The buried remains crown a narrow hill, running from Northwest to Southeast, about 1,700 ft. long by 300 to 500 ft. broad. The approach is steep on every side, and in early times, before the accumulation around the sides of the rubbish of some millenniums, must have been much more so. The hill stands, like an outpost, projecting into the great plain, and is connected with the low hills behind it, part of the Shephelah, with but a narrow neck. At the foot of the hill runs a great high road from Egypt to Syria; to the North lies the Vale of Aijalon, across which runs the modern carriage road to Jerusalem, and up which ran the great high road, by the Beth-horons, to the platenu North of Jerusalem; to the South lies the Vale of Sorek, where stood Bethshemesh, and along which went a great highway from the country of the Philistines to the hill country of Judah. Today the Jerus-Jaffa railway, after sweeping some miles away in the plain round the whole western and southern sides of the site, passes along this open vale to plunge into the narrow defile — the Wady Isma`in, which it follows to Jerusalem. From the summit of the Tell, a vast expanse of country is visible between the long blue line of the Mediterranean to the West, and the abrupt and lofty mountains of Judah to the East. That it has been all through history the scene of military contest is fully understood when its strategic position is appreciated; no military leader even today, if holding the highlands of Palestine against invasion, could afford to neglect such an outpost.

2. HISTORY OF GEZER:

Although the excavation of the site shows that it was occupied by a high civilization and a considerable population at an extremely early period, the first historical mention is in the list of the Palestinian cities captured by Tahutmes III (XVIIIth Dynasty, about 1500 BC). From this time it was probably under Egyptian governors (the Egyptian remains at all periods are considerable), but from the Tell el-Amarna Letters, a century or so later, we learn that Egyptian influence was then on the wane. Three of these famous clay tablets are dated from Gezer itself and are written in the name of the governor Yapachi; he was then hard pressed by the Khabiri, and he appealed for help in vain to Egypt. In other letters belonging to this series, there are references to this city. In one, a certain freebooter named Lapaya
makes excuses that he had broken into the city. He “has been slandered. Is it an offense that he has entered Gazri and levied the people?” (no. CCXL, Petrie’s translation).

In the well-known “Song of Solomon of Triumph” of Merenptah, who is considered by many to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus, occurs the expression “Gezer is taken.” (In connection with this it is interesting to notice that an ivory pectoral with the cartouche of Meren-ptah was unearthed at Gezer.)

In the time of Joshua’s invasion a certain “king of Gezer” named Horam ([µ r h εhoram], but in Septuagint [Aιλάμ, Ailam], or [ʾΕλάµ, Elam]) came to the assistance of Lachish against the Israelites, but was slain ([Joshua 10:33]). Gezer was taken, but the Canaanites were not driven out, but remained in servitude ([Joshua 16:10; Judges 1:29]). The city became one of the towns on the southern border of Ephraim ([Joshua 16:3]), but was assigned to the Kohath clan of the Levites ([Joshua 21:21]). In 2 Samuel 5:25 (the King James Version “Gazer”) we read that David chased the Philistines after their defeat in the valley of Rephaim “from Geba until thou come to Gezer,” showing that this was on the frontier of the Philistine territory; and in 1 Chronicles 20:4 it states, “There arose war at Gezer with the Philistines; then Sibbecai the Hushathite slew Sippai, of the sons of the giant; and they were subdued.”

In the corresponding account in 2 Samuel 21:18 the scene of this event is said to be Gob, which is probably a copyist’s error — b wg for rzg.

According to Josephus (Ant., VIII, vi, 1), at the commencement of Solomon’s reign Gezer was in the hands of the Philistines, which may explain 1 Kings 9:16, where it is stated that a certain Pharaoh, whose daughter Solomon married, captured and burnt Gezer and gave the site to his daughter. Solomon rebuilt it (9:17). There are no further references to Gezer during the later Jewish monarchy, but there are several during the Maccabean period. Judas pursued Gorgias to “Gazara and into the plains of Idumaea and Azotis and Jamnia” (1 Macc 4:15); Bacchides, after his defeat by Jonathan, “fortified also the city of Bethsura, and Gazara, and the tower, and put forces in them and provision of victuals” (1 Macc 9:52 the King James Version); a little later Simon “camped against Gazara and besieged it round about; he made also an engine of war, and set it by, the city and battered a certain tower, and took it” (1 Macc 13:43 the King James Version), after which he purified it (1 Macc 13:47,48). From
Josephus (Ant., XIII, viii, 2) we gather that Antiochus had taken Gezer from the Jews.

The governor, Alkios, who made the bilingual inscriptions, may come in about this time or a little later; the rock inscriptions, of which half a dozen are now known, give no information regarding their date.

In the period of the Crusades this site, under the name “Mount Gisart,” was a crusading fort and gave its name to a family. Here King Baldwin IV gained a victory over Saladin in 1177, and in 1191 the latter monarch camped here while conducting some fruitless negotiations with King Richard Coeur de Lion. In 1495 a skirmish occurred here between the governor of Jerusalem and certain turbulent Bedouin. The history of Gezer, as known, is thus one of battles and sieges extending over at least 3,000 years; from the archaeological remains we may infer that its history was similar for at least 1,000 years earlier.

3. HISTORY OF THE EXCAVATIONS:

In 1904 the Palestine Exploration Fund of England obtained a “permit” for the excavation of Tell Jezer. The whole site was the private property of certain Europeans, whose agent, living much of the time on the Tell itself, was himself deeply interested in the excavations, so that unusually favorable conditions obtained for the work. Mr. (now Professor) R. A. Stewart Macalister, M.A., was sent out, and for 3 years (1904-7) he instituted an examination of the hidden remains in the mound, after a manner, till then, unexampled in Palestine exploration. His ambition was to turn over every cubic foot of soil down to the original rock, so that nothing of importance could be overlooked. As at the expiration of the original “permit” much remained unexplored, application was made to the authorities for a second one, and, at the end of 1907, Mr. Macalister embarked on a further 2 years of digging. Altogether he worked for the greater part of 5 years, except for necessary interruptions of the work due to unfavorable weather. Some two-thirds of the total accumulated debris on the mound was ransacked, and besides this, many hundreds of tombs, caves and other antiquarian remains in the neighborhood were thoroughly explored.
4. CHIEF RESULTS OF THE EXPLORATIONS:

It was found that the original bare rock surface of the hill was crowned with buried remains, in some parts 20 and 30 ft. deep, made up of the debris of all the cities which had stood on the site during three or four thousand years; on the part excavated there were no remains so late as the commencement of the Christian era, the Gezer of that time, and the crusading fort, being built on a neighboring site. The earliest inhabitants were Troglopytes living in the many caves which riddled the hill surface; they were apparently a non-Sem race, and there was some evidence that they at least knew of cremation. These, or a race soon after — the earliest Semites — enclosed the hilltop with high earth rampart faced with rough stones — the earliest “walls” going back at least before 3000 BC. At an early period — probably about 3000 BC — a race with a relatively high civilization fortified the whole hilltop with a powerful and remarkably well-built wall, 14 ft. thick, with narrow towers of short projection at intervals of 90 ft. At a point on the South side of this was unearthed a very remarkable, massive, brick gateway (all the other walls and buildings are of stone), with towers on each side still standing to the height of 16 ft., but evidently once much higher. This gate showed a strong Egyptian influence at work long before the first historic reference (XVIIIth Dynasty), for both gateway and wall to which it belonged had been ruined at an early date, the former indeed, after its destruction, was overlaid by the buildings of a city, which from its datable objects — scarabs, etc. — must have belonged to the time of Amenhotep III, i.e. as early as 1500 BC.

The later wall, built, we may conclude, soon after the ruin of the former, and therefore about 1500 BC, was also a powerful construction and must have existed considerably over a thousand years, down, indeed, till 100 BC at least, when Gezer disappears from history as a fortitled site. These walls enclosed a larger area than either of the previous ones; they show signs of destruction and repairs, and Mr. Macalister is of the opinion that some of the extensive repairs — in one place a gap of 150 ft. — and the 28 inserted towers are the work of Solomon (1 Kings 9:17). This wall must have existed in use through all we know of Gezer from Bible sources. When, from the ruined remains, we reconstruct in imagination these mighty ramparts, we need not wonder that the’ Hebrews, fresh from long wanderings in the wilderness, found it no easy task to capture cities so fortified as was this (Numbers 13:28; Deuteronomy 1:28).
The foundations of a powerful building, which were found inserted in a gap in the southern walls, turned out conclusively to be the palace of Simon Maccabeus — who captured the city (1 Macc 13:43) — a graffito being found upon one of its stones running thus:

***Πάμπρα(ζ) Σιμώνος κατεπάγη π(ῦρ) βασίλειον

which seems to mean, “Pamphras, may he bring down (fire) on the palace of Simon.”

Within the city walls the foundations of some seven or eight cities of various successive periods were found, superimposed one above the other. The city’s best days appear to have been shortly before the time of Joshua; the next, perhaps, at the time of the Judges. With the period to which we should probably assign the arrival of the Hebrews, there is a great increase in the population, the hitherto inviolate environs of the “temple” being encroached upon by private dwellings: an interesting commentary on Joshua 16:10.

The great “High Place” which was uncovered is one of unique interest, and its discovery has thrown a flood of light upon the religion of the early Canaanites, that religion — “the worship of Baal and Ashteroth” — which was the great rival of the purer religion of Israel. This Ba`al temple, or bamoth, consisted of a row of 8 matstseboth or rude stone pillars ranging in height from 5 ft. 5 inches to 10 ft. 9 inches (see HIGH PLACE; PILLAR), together with a curious trough which may have been a socket for the ‘Asherah (see ASHERAH), or some kind of altar. The area around these pillars had a kind of rough floor of consolidated earth under which were found a number of large jars containing infant bones, considered to be the remains of infant sacrifice. In close proximity to this “temple” was a double cave, the construction of which strongly suggested that it had been arranged for the giving of oracles. This high place had been used for very many centuries; the matstseboth were not all of one period but had gradually been increased from one to seven, and an eighth of a more definitely sculptured form — as a simulacrum priapi — had been added some time later. In the accumulated rubbish around these pillars were found enormous numbers of small stone phallic images, together with pottery plaques of Astarte, made with rude exaggeration of the sexual organs.

See BAAL; ASHEROTH.
Another monument of great interest — and high antiquity — was the great rock-cut tunnel. It is about 23 ft. high, and 13 ft. wide, and descends by 80 steps, 94 1/2 ft. through the solid rock, to a cave in which there is a spring. It is very similar to the great tunnel known as “Warren’s tunnel and shaft” which was clearly constructed by the early Jebusites to reach from within the city’s walls to the fountain of Gihon (see SILOAM; ZION). This Gezer tunnel must date at least to 2000 BC; it is evident from the nature of the accumulated debris which blocked its mouth that it was actually abandoned about 1400 BC. Its antiquity is confirmed by the fact that it was evidently excavated with flint knives.

At a much later period in history, in that of the Maccabees, the water supply of the city, in time of siege, at any rate, was largely dependent on an enormous open cistern which Mr. Macalister cleared of earth and found capable of containing 2,000,000 gallons of water. Among the smaller “finds” which throw light upon the Bible history may be mentioned two much broken, cuneiform tablets, both referring to land contracts, which, from the names of the eponyms, can be dated to 651 and 649 BC respectively. They therefore belong to the time of the last, and one of the greatest, of the Assyrian monarchs, Ahurbanipal, the “noble Osnappar” of Ezr 4:10, and they show that he was not only a great conqueror, but that in Palestine he had an organized government and that legal civil business was transacted in the language of Assyria.

The illumination of Old Testament history which the excavations of Gezer have afforded can here be only hinted at, but references to it will occur in many of the articles in other parts of this Encyclopedia.

**LITERATURE.**

In Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer Professor R. A. S. Macalister has described in a popular form with illustrations some of his most remarkable discoveries; while in the Memoirs of the Excavations at Gezer (1912), published by the Palestine Exploration Fund, Professor Macalister deals with the subject exhaustively.

_E. W. G. Masterman_

**GEZRITES**

<gez’-rits>.
See GIRZITES.

GHOST

<ghost> ([νρν, nephesh]; [πνευμα, pneuma]) : “Ghost,” the middle-English word for “breath,” “spirit,” appears in the King James Version as the translation of nephesh (“breath,” “the breath of life,” animal soul or spirit, the vital principle, hence, “life”), in two places of the Old Testament, namely, Job 11:20, “the giving up of the ghost” (so the Revised Version (British and American)), and Jeremiah 15:9, “She hath given up the ghost”; gawa`, “to gasp out, “expire” (die), is also several times so translated (Genesis 25:8,17; 35:29; 49:33; Job 3:11; 10:18; 13:19; 14:10; Lamentations 1:19). In Apocrypha (Tobit 14:11) psuche is translated in the same way as nephesh in the Old Testament, and in 2 Macc 3:31, en eschate pneoe is rendered “give up the ghost,” the Revised Version (British and American) “quite at the last gasp.”

In the New Testament “to give up the ghost” is the translation of ekpneo, “to breathe out” (Mark 15:37,39; Luke 23:46; so the Revised Version (British and American)); of ekpsucho, “to breathe out,” “expire” (Acts 5:5,10; 12:23); in Matthew 27:50, apheken to pneuma, and in John 19:30, paredoken to pneuma, are rendered respectively, “yielded” and “gave up the ghost,” the Revised Version (British and American) “yielded up his spirit,” “gave up his spirit.”

“The Holy Ghost” is also frequent in the King James Version; in the American Standard Revised Version it is invariably changed to “Holy Spirit,” in the English Revised Version sometimes only, chiefly in the Gospels.

See HOLY SPIRIT; SPIRIT.

W. L. Walker

GHOST, HOLY

See HOLY SPIRIT.

GIAH

<gi’-a> ([גיא, giach]): An unidentified place on the route followed by Abner in his flight, pursued by Joab (2 Samuel 2:24). Septuagint
renders Gai, corresponding to the Hebrew ge, “valley.” The form giach may be due to corruption of the text.

GIANTS

<ji’-ants> The word appears in the King James Version as the translation of the Hebrew words [µ y 普通话 nephilim] (Genesis 6:4; Numbers 13:33); [µ 普通话 ‘repha’im] (Deuteronomy 2:11,20; 3:11,13; Joshua 12:4, etc.); [ap ; rapha’] (1 Chronicles 20:4,6,8), or [hp ; raphah] (2 Samuel 21:16,18,20,22); in one instance of [r ዊ ጪ gibbor], literally, “mighty one” (Job 16:14).

In the first two cases the Revised Version (British and American) changes “giants” into the Hebrew words “Nephilim,” and “Rephaim,” respectively (see these words). The “Nephilim of Genesis 6:4 are not to be confounded with the “mighty men” subsequently described as the offspring of the unlawful marriages, of “the sons of God” and “the daughters of men.” It is told that they overspread the earth prior to these unhallowed unions. That the word, whatever its etymology, bears the sense of men of immense stature is evident from the later passages; Numbers 13:33. The same is true of the “Rephaim,” as shown by the instance of Og (Deuteronomy 3:11; Joshua 12:4). There is no doubt about the meaning of the word in the ease of the giants mentioned in 2 Samuel 21 and 1 Chronicles 20.

See also ANTEDILUVIANS.

James Orr

GIANTS, VALLEY OF THE

See REPHAIM, VALLEY OF.

GIBBAR

<gib’-ar> ([s ጪ Gibbar], “hero”): In Ezr 2:20 the “children of Gibbar” are mentioned among those who returned with Zerubbabel. The parallel passage (Nehemiah 7:25) has “children of Gibeon.”
GIBBETHON

(gib'-e-thon): A city in the territory of Daniel in the plain named with Eltekeh and Baalath (Joshua 19:44), and assigned to the Kohathite Levites (Joshua 21:23). Later we find it in the hands of the Philistines; and it was while besieging the city that Nadab was slain by Baasha (1 Kings 15:27). After 25 years Omri, the general of Baasha, was here made king of the army when news reached them of Zimriregicide (1 Kings 16:15 ff). It may possibly be identified with Kibbiah, which lies about 16 miles Southeast of Jaffa; but no certain identification is possible.

W. Ewing

GIBEA

(gib'-e-a), “hill”): A grandson of Caleb (1 Chronicles 2:49). His father was Sheva, whose mother was Maacah, Caleb’s concubine (1 Chronicles 2:48).

GIBEAH

(gib'-e-a), “hill”): The Hebrew word denotes generally an eminence or hill, in distinction from har, which is used for mountain, or mountain range. It occurs, however, in two instances, as a place-name. Under GEBA (which see) we have seen that Geba, Gibeah, and Gibeon are liable to be confused. This arises from their resemblance in form and meaning.

1. An unidentified city in the territory of Judah (Joshua 15:57). It is named in the group containing Carmel, Ziph and Kain; it is therefore probably to be sought to the Southeast of Hebron. It may be one of the two villages mentioned by Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. “Gabathon”), Gabaa and Gabatha; in the East of the Daroma. It is probably identical with Gibeah mentioned in 2 Chronicles 13:2.

2. A city described as belonging to Benjamin (Joshua 18:28; Judges 19:14) Gibeah of Benjamin (1 Samuel 13:2,15; 14:16), Gibeah of the children of Benjamin (2 Samuel 23:29), Gibeah of Saul (1 Samuel 11:4; Isaiah 10:29), and possibly, also, Gibeah of God (1 Samuel 10:5 margin); see GIBEATH, 4.
1. HISTORY:

The narrative in which it first appears is one of extraordinary and tragic interest, casting priceless light on the conditions prevailing in those days when “there was no king in Israel” (Judges 19 ff). A Levite sojourning on the farther side of Matthew Ephraim was deserted by his concubine who returned to her father’s house in Beth-lehem-judah. Thither he went to persuade her to return. Hospitably entertained by her father, he tarried till the afternoon of the fifth day. The evening was nigh when they came over against Jebus — Jerusalem — but, rejecting his servant’s suggestion that they should lodge in this “city of a stranger” — i.e. the Jebusite — the Levite pressed on, and when they were near to Gibeah the sun set. They entered the city and sat down in the street. The laws of hospitality today do not compel the entertainment of strangers who arrive after sunset. But it may have been through disregard of all law that they were left unbefriended. An old man from Matthew Ephraim took pity on them, invited them to his house, and made himself responsible for their necessities. Then follows the horrible story of outrage upon the Levite’s concubine; the way in which he made known his wrongs to Israel; and the terrible revenge exacted from the Benjamites, who would not give up to justice the miscreants of Gibeah.

Gibeah was the home of Saul, the first king of Israel, and thither he returned after his election at Mizpah (1 Samuel 10:26). From Gibeah he summoned Israel to assemble for the relief of Jabesh-gilead, which was threatened by Nahash the Ammonite (1 Samuel 11:4 ff). In the wars of Saul with the Philistines, Gibeah seems to have played a conspicuous part (1 Samuel 13:15). Here were exposed the bodies of the seven sons of Saul, slain by David’s orders, to appease the Gibeonites, furnishing the occasion for Rizpah’s pathetic vigil (2 Samuel 21:1 ff). Gibeah is mentioned in the description of the Assyrian advance on Jerusalem (Isaiah 10:29).

2. IDENTIFICATION:

The site now generally accepted as that of Gibeah is on Teleil el-Ful, an artificial mound about 4 miles North of Jerusalem, a short distance East of the high road to Shechem. A little way North of Teleil el-Ful, the high road bifurcates, one branch turning eastward to Jeba`, i.e. Geba (which should be read instead of “Gibeah” in Judges 20:31); the other continuing
northward to Bethel. Not far from the parting of the ways, on the road to Jeba` lies erRam, corresponding to Ramah (Judges 19:13). At Gibeah, about 30 furlongs from Jerusalem, Titus encamped for the night on his advance against the city from the North Teleil el-Ful quite satisfactorily suits all the data here indicated.

The words in Judges 20:33 rendered by the King James Version “the meadows of Gibeah,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Maareh-geba” — simply transliterating — and the Revised Version, margin “the meadow of Geba” (or Gibeah), by a slight emendation of the text, read “from the west of Gibeah,” which is certainly correct.

W. Ewing

GIBEATH (1)

<gib’e-ath> ([t b Gibh’ath]): This is the status constructus of the foregoing (Gibeah). It is found in several compound place-names.

(1) Gibeath-ha-araloth ([t vO r b; t b Gibh’ath ha’araloth]). English Versions of the Bible translate literally, “hill of the foreskins”; but the margins suggest the proper name. Here the Israelites were circumcised after the passage of the Jordan (Joshua 5:3). The place was therefore between that river and Jericho.

(2) Gibeath Phinehas ([s j nY ph it b Gibh’ath pinechac]), the burial place of Eleazar the son of Aaron in Matthew Ephraim (Joshua 24:33 the King James Version “a hill that pertained to Phinehas,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the hill of Phinehas,” the Revised Version, margin “Gibeah of Phinehas”). Conder would identify it with ‘Awertah in the plain of Makhneh, not far from Nablus, where “the Samaritans show the tombs of Phinehas and Eleazar, Abishuah and Ithamar” (Tent Work, 41 f). The “tomb of Eleazar” is 18 ft. long, plastered all over and shaded by a splendid terebinth.” Guerin places it at Jibia, 3 miles North of Qaryat el-`Anab (Judee, III, 37 f; Samarie, 106 ff). There is no certainty.

(3) Gibeath hammoreh ([h r Mb at b Gibh’ath hamoreh]), a hill on the North side of the valley from the camp of Gideon, beside, which lay the Midianites (Judges 7:1, English Versions of the Bible “the hill of Moreh”; the Hebrew is literally, “hill of the teacher”). It is probably identical with Jebel Duchy, which rises on the North of the Vale of Jezreel.
Moore (Judges, 200) mistakenly calls the mountain Nabi Dachi. This is, of course, the name of the “prophet” whose shrine crowns the hill.

See MOREH.

(4) Gibeath ha-Elohim ([םיִהוּל אֶלֹהִים], gibh‘ath ha-‘elohim), the place where Saul, after leaving Samuel, met the company of prophets, and prophesied with them (1 Samuel 10:5, 10). It is defined as the place “where is the garrison (or pillar) of the Philistines.” This may be intended to distinguish it from GIBEAH (2), with which it is often identified. In this case it may be represented by the modern Ramallah, about 10 miles North of Jerusalem.

See also TABOR.

(5) Gibeath ha-Hachilah (1 Samuel 23:19; 26:1) is identical with HACHILAH (which see).

(6) Gibeath Ammah (2 Samuel 2:24) is identical with AMMAH (which see).

(7) Gibeath Gareb (Jeremiah 31:39) is identical with GAREB (which see).

W. Ewing

GIBEATH (2)

(Joshua 18:28).

See GIBEAH (2).

GIBEATHITE

See SHEMAAH.

GIBEON

([גִּבְיָן]): One of the royal cities of the Hivites (Joshua 9:7). It was a greater city than Ai; and its inhabitants were reputed mighty men (Joshua 10:2). It fell within the territory allotted to
Benjamin (Joshua 18:25), and was one of the cities given to the Levites (Joshua 21:17).

1. THE GIBEONITES:

By a stratagem the Gibeonites secured for themselves and their allies in Chephirah, Beeroth and Kirjath-jearim immunity from attack by the Israelites. Terrified by the fate of Jericho and Ai, a company disguised as ambassadors from a far country, their garments and shoes worn, and their provisions moldy as from the length of their journey, went to Joshua at Gilgal, and persuaded him and the princes of Israel to make a covenant with them. Three days later the deception was discovered and the wrath of the congregation of Israel aroused. In virtue of the covenant their lives were secured; but for their duplicity Joshua cursed them, and condemned them to be bondsmen, “hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God” (Joshua 9:23), “for the congregation and for the altar of the Lord” (Joshua 9:27 the King James Version). This points to their employment in the sanctuary; and possibly may shed some light on the massacre of the Gibeonites by Saul (2 Samuel 21:1 ff). The rest of the Canaanites resented the defection of the Hivites which so greatly weakened the forces for defense, and, headed by Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem, they assembled to wreak vengeance on Gibeon. The threatened city appealed to Joshua, who made a swift night march, fell suddenly upon the confederates, routed them, and “chased them by the way of the ascent of Beth-horon, and smote them to Azekah, and unto Makkedah” (Joshua 10:1 ff).

A three years’ famine in the days of David was attributed to God’s anger at the unexpiated crime of Saul in slaying the Gibeonites. He did this “in his zeal for .... Israel and Judah,” who may have fretted at the inconvenience of having the Gibeonites among them. The latter believed that Saul’s desire was to destroy them utterly. When David tried to arrange matters with them they stood upon their ancient rights, claiming life for life. They would take no rights blood money: they demanded blood from the family of the slayer of their people. This demand David could not resist, and handed over to them seven sons of Saul (2 Samuel 21:1 ff).
2. THE CHAMPIONS:

The army of Ishbosheth under Abner, and that of David under Joab, met at the pool of Gibeon. An attempt to settle the quarrel, by means of 12 champions on either side, failed, as each man slew his fellow, and the 24 perished side by side. A “sore battle” ensued in which Abner was beaten; he was pursued by the fleet-footed Asahel, brother of Joab, whom he slew.

See HELKATH-HAZZURIM.

Possibly we should read “Gibeon” instead of “Geba” in 2 Samuel 5:25, as in the parallel passage, 1 Chronicles 14:16 (HDB, under the word)

From Baal-perazim David was to make a circuit and fall upon the Philistines who were encamped in the plan of Rephaim West of Jerusalem. Perhaps, however, we should read “Gibeah” in both places. Cheyne (EB, under the word) thinks the hill town of Baal-perazim may be intended.

3. MURDER OF AMASA:

When, after the death of Absalom and the suppression of his rebellion, Bichri raised the standard of revolt, Amasa was sent to call out the men of Judah against him. Tarrying longer than the time appointed, there was danger lest Bichri might have opportunity to strengthen his position; so David dispatched Abishai and the troops that were with him to attack Bichri at once. Joab went with this expedition. Obviously he could never be content with a second place. The force of Amasa was met at “the great stone of Gibeon.” There Joab treacherously slew that unsuspecting general, and, himself assuming command, stamped out the rebellion with his accustomed thoroughness (2 Samuel 20:4 ff). “The great stone” appears to have been well known, and may have possessed some religious character.

4. THE SANCTUARY:

Gibeon was the seat of an ancient sanctuary, called in 1 Kings 3:4 “the great high place.” Here, according to 2 Chronicles 1:3, was the tabernacle made in the wilderness — but see 1 Kings 8:4. It was the scene of Solomon’s great sacrifice after which he slept in the sanctuary and dreamed his famous dream (1 Kings 3:4 ff; 9:2; 2 Chronicles 1:3,13, etc.).
By “the great waters that are in Gibeon” Johanan overtook Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, and freed the captives he had taken from Mizpah (Jeremiah 41:11 ff). Among those who returned with Zerubbabel were 95 “children of Gibeon” (Nehemiah 7:25; compare 3:7). At Gibeon Cestius Gallus encamped when marching against Jerusalem from Antipatris (BJ, II, xix, 1).

5. IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION:

The ancient city is represented by the modern village el-Jib. It is fully 5 miles Northwest of Jerusalem, and about a mile North of Neby Samwil on a double knoll, with terraced slopes, but rocky and precipitous to the East. The village stands amid striking remains of antiquity. About a hundred paces from the village to the East is a large reservoir with a spring. Lower down, among the olives, are the remains of another and larger reservoir, which collected the overflow from the first. This is probably the “pool” of 2 Samuel 2:13, and “the great waters” of Jeremiah 41:12. El-Jib stands in the midst of a rich upland plain not far South of the great pass which goes down by way of the Beth-horons into the vale of Aijalon.

W. Ewing

GIBEONITES

<gib’-e-un-its>. Inhabitants of GIBEON (which see).

GIBLITES

<gib’-lits>.

See GEBALITES.

GIDDALTI

<gi-dal’-ti> ([yT | ‹ “giddalti], “I magnify (God)”: A son of Heman (1 Chronicles 25:4,29), one of David’s musicians.

GIDDEL

<gid’-el> ([ | D giddel], “very great,” “stout”):
The name of the head of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2:47 = Nehemiah 7:49 = 1 Esdras 5:30 (here as Cathua)).

The name of the head of a family of Solomon’s servants (Ezr 2:56 = Nehemiah 7:58 = 1 Esdras 5:33 (here Isdael)).

GIDEON

His family and home:

Gideon was also named Jerubbaal (Judges 6:32) and Jerubbesheth (2 Samuel 11:21), youngest son of Joash, of the clan of Abiezer in the tribe of Manasseh. His home was at Ophrah, and his family an obscure one. He became the chief leader of Manasseh and the fifth recorded judge of Israel. The record of his life is found in Judges 6 through 8.

The Midianite oppression:

Gideon seems to have held this worship in contempt, and to have pondered deeply the causes of Israel’s reverses and the injuries wrought upon his own family by the hand of the Midianites.

The Call of Gideon:

It is probable that Gideon had already distinguished himself in resistance to the Midianites (Judges 6:12), but he now receives Divine commission to
assume the leadership. Having taken his own little harvest to a secret place for threshing, that it might escape the greed of the Midianites, he is surprised while at work by a visit from the Lord in the form of an angel. However this scene (Judges 6:11 ff) and its miraculous incidents may be interpreted, there can be no question of the divineness of Gideon’s call or that the voice which spoke to him was the voice of God. Neither the brooding over the death of his brothers at Tabor (Judges 8:18) nor the patriotic impulses dwelling within him can account for his assumption of leadership. Nor did he become leader at the demand of the people. He evidently had scarcely thought of himself as his country’s deliverer. The call not only came to him as a surprise, but found him distrustful both of himself (Judges 6:15) and of his people (Judges 6:13). It found him too without inclination for the task, and only his conviction that the command was of God persuaded him to assume leadership. This gives the note of accuracy to the essential facts of the story. Gideon’s demand for a sign (Judges 6:17) being answered, the food offered the messenger having been consumed by fire at the touch of his staff, Gideon acknowledged the Divine commission of his visitor, and at the place of visitation built an altar to Yahweh (Judges 6:19 ff).

4. HIS FIRST COMMISSION:

The call and first commission of Gideon are closely joined. He is at once commanded to destroy the altars of Baal set up by his father at Ophrah, to build an altar to Yahweh at the same place and thereon to offer one of his father’s bullocks as a sacrifice (Judges 6:25 f). There is no reason to look on this as a second version of Gideon’s call. It is rather the beginning of instruction, and is deeply significant of the accuracy of the story, in that it follows the line of all revelation to God’s prophets and reformers to begin their work at home. Taking ten men, under the cover of darkness, Gideon does as commanded (Judges 6:27). The morning revealed his work and visited upon him the wrath of the people of Ophrah. They demand of Joash that he put his son to death. The answer of Joash is an ironical but valid defense of Gideon. Why should the people plead for Baal? A god should be able to plead his own cause (Judges 6:28 ff). This defense gained for Gideon the name Jerubbaal (yerubba`al, i.e. yarebh bo ha-ba`al, “Let Baal plead,” Judges 6:32 the King James Version).

The time intervening between this home scene and the actual campaign against the Midianites cannot definitely be named. It is probable that it took
months for Gideon even to rally the people of his own clan. The fact is that all the subsequent events of the story are somewhat confused by what looks like a double narrative in which there are apparent but not vital differences. Without ignoring this fact it is still possible to get a connected account of what actually transpired.

5. GIDEON’S ARMY:

When the allied invaders were in camp on the plain of Jezreel, we find Gideon, having recruited the Abiezrites and sent messengers to the various tribes of Israel (Judges 6:34 f), pitching his camp near the Midianites. The location of the various camps of Gideon is difficult, as is the method of the recruiting of the tribes. For instance, Judges 6:35 seems to be in direct contradiction to 7:23, and both are considered of doubtful origin. There was evidently, however, a preliminary encampment at the place of rallying. While waiting here, Gideon further tested his commission by the dry and wet fleece (6:37 ff) and, convinced of God’s purpose to save Israel by his leadership, he moves his camp to the Southeast edge of the plain of Jezreel nearby the spring of Harod. From his point of vantage here he could look down on the tents of Midian. The account of the reduction of his large army from 32,000 to 300 (7:2 ff) is generally accepted as belonging to a later tradition, Neither of the tests, however, is unnatural, and the first was not unusual. According to the account, Gideon at the Lord’s command first excused all the fearful. This left him with 10,000 men. This number was reduced to 300 by a test of their method of drinking. This test can easily be seen to evidence the eagerness and courage of men for battle (Jos).

6. THE MIDIANITES’ DISCOMFITURE AND FLIGHT:

Having thus reduced the army and having the assurance that the Lord would deliver to him and his little band the forces of Midian, Gideon, with a servant, went by night to the edge of the camp of his enemy, and there heard the telling and interpretation of a dream which greatly encouraged him and led him to strike an immediate blow (Judges 7:9 ff). Again we find a conflict of statement between Judges 7:20 and 7:22, but the conflict is as to detail only. Dividing his men into three equal bands, Gideon arranges that with trumpets, and lights concealed in pitchers, and with the cry, “The sword of Yahweh and of Gideon!” they shall descend and charge the Midianites simultaneously from three sides. This stratagem
for concealing his numbers and for terrifying the enemy succeeds, and the Midianites and their allies flee in disorder toward the Jordan (7:18 ff). The rout was complete, and the victory was intensified by the fact that in the darkness the enemy turned their swords against one another. Admitting that we have two narratives (compare 7:24; 8:3 with 8:4 ff) and that there is some difference between them in the details of the attack and the progress of the conflict, there is no need for confusion in the main line of events. One part of the fleeing enemy evidently crossed the Jordan at Succoth, being led by Zebah and Zalmunna. The superior force followed the river farther south, toward the ford of Bethbarah.

7. DEATH OF OREB AND ZEEB

Gideon sent messengers to the men of Ephraim (7:24), probably before the first attack, asking them to intercept the Midianites, should they attempt to escape by the fords in their territory. This they did, defeating the enemy at Beth-barah and slaying the princes Oreb and Zeeb (“the Raven” and “the Wolf”). As proof of their victory and valor they brought the heads of the princes to Gideon and accused him of having discounted their bravery by not calling them earlier into the fight. But Gideon was a master of diplomacy, as well as of strategy, and won the friendship of Ephraim by magnifying their accomplishment in comparison with his own (8:1 ff).

Gideon now pursues Zebah and Zalmunna on the East side of the river. The people on that side are still in great fear of the Midianites and refuse even to feed his army. At Succoth they say to him, “Are the hands of Zebah and Zalmunna now in thy hand, that we should give bread unto thine army?” ( Judges 8:6). At Penuel he meets with the same refusal ( Judges 8:8). Promising to deal with Succoth and Penuel as they deserve when he is through with his present task, Gideon pushes on with his half-famished but courageous men, overtakes the Midianites, defeats them, captures Zebah and Zalmunna, and, returning, punishes, according to his promise, both Succoth and Penuel ( Judges 8:7,9,13 ff).

8. DEATH OF ZEBAH AND ZALMUNNA:

Thus was the power of the Midianites and the desert hordes broken in Canaan and a forty years’ peace came to Israel. But the two Kings of Midian must now meet their fate as defeated warriors. They had led their forces at Tabor when the brothers of Gideon perished. So Gideon
commands his young son Jether to slay them as though they were not worthy of death at a warrior’s hand (Judges 8:20). The youth fearing the task, Gideon himself put them to death (Judges 8:21).

9. GIDEON’S EPHOD:

The people clamored to make Gideon king. He refused, being moved possibly by a desire to maintain theocracy. To this end he asks only the jewelry taken as spoil in the battles (Judges 8:24 ff), and with it makes an ephod, probably an image of Yahweh, and places it in a house of the Lord at Ophrah. By this act it was later thought that Gideon contributed to a future idolatry of Israel. The narrative properly closes with Judges 8:28.

10. HIS DEATH:

The remaining verses containing the account of Gideon’s family and death (Judges 8:30 ff) and the record of events immediately subsequent to Gideon’s death (Judges 8:33 ff) come from other sources than the original narrators.

C. E. Schenk

GIDEONI

<gid-e-o’-ni> ([ỳn[ d ʿg ʿ gidhʿoni]): The father of Abidan who was prince of Benjamin, mentioned only in connection with the son (Numbers 1:11; 2:22; 7:60,65; 10:24).

GIDOM

<gi’-dom> ([µ[ d ʿg ʿ gidhʿom]): The limit eastward, from Gibeah toward the wilderness, of the pursuit of Benjamin by Israel (Judges 20:45). No name suggesting this has yet been recovered. It is not mentioned elsewhere.

GIER-EAGLE

<jer’-e-g’-l> ([µ j r ; racham]; [κύκνος, kuknos], in Leviticus, [πορφυρίων, porphurion], in Deuteronomy): The name applied to one of the commonest of the vultures, and not an eagle at all. The word is derived from a Hebrew root, meaning “to love,” and was applied to the birds
because mated pairs seldom separated. These were smaller birds and inferior to the largest members of the family. They nested on a solid base, lived in pairs, and not only flocked over carrion as larger species permitted, but also ate the vilest offal of all sorts, for which reason they were protected by a death penalty by one of the Pharaohs. Because of this the birds became so frequent and daring around camps, among tent-dwellers, and in cities, that they were commonly called “Pharaoh’s chickens.” They are mentioned in the Bible in the lists of abominations found in Leviticus 11:13 and Deuteronomy 14:12 (the King James Version “ossifrage”); Deuteronomy 14:17 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “vulture”).

Gene Stratton-Porter

GIFT

<gift> ([h n-gnu " , mattanah], [h j nj-ni minchah], [d j c , shochadh]; [δωρον, doron], [δωρεά, dorea], [χάρισμα, chairisma]): In Genesis 25:6; Exodus 28:38; Numbers 18:6,7,29; Ezekiel 20:26, etc., mattanah, “a gift,” is so rendered; minchah, an offering or present, used especially of the “meat offerings,” is translated “gift” (2 Samuel 8:2, 6 the King James Version; 2 Chronicles 26:8), in which passages “tribute” is meant, as the Revised Version (British and American); 32:23; Psalm 45:12. A few other words occur singly, e.g. ‘eshkar, “a reward” (Psalm 72:10); mas’eth, “lifting up” (Nehemiah 2:18); nathun is translated “gifts” (Numbers 8:19; the Revised Version, margin “Hebrew nethunim, given”); nedheh, nadhan, “impure gifts” (Ezekiel 16:33); nisse’th, “a thing lifted up” (2 Samuel 19:42); shochadh means “a bribe” (Exodus 23:8; Deuteronomy 16:19; 2 Chronicles 19:7; Proverbs 6:35; 17:8,23; Isaiah 1:23; Ezekiel 22:12); in each instance the American Standard Revised Version has “bribe” except Proverbs 6:35, “gifts”; teramah, “a present” (Proverbs 29:4), may also mean a bribe, the King James Version “he that receiveth gifts,” the Revised Version (British and American) “he that exacteth gifts,” margin “imposeth tribute, Hebrew a man of offerings.”

In the New Testament doron, “a present,” “gift” (from didomi, “to give”), is translated “gift” (Matthew 2:11; 5:23,14 bis; Mark 7:11 the King James Version; Hebrews 5:1; Revelation 11:10, etc., referring chiefly to gifts or offerings to God); dorea, “a free gift” (John 4:10;
Acts 2:38; Romans 5:15, 17; 2 Corinthians 9:15; Hebrews 6:4, etc., referring to the gifts of God; *dorema*, “a free gift” (Romans 5:16; Jas 1:17, the English Revised Version “boon”); *dosis*, “giving” (Jas 1:17, “every good gift,” the Revised Version, margin “giving”); *charisma*, “grace,” “favor,” a benefit or good conferred, is also used of Divine gifts and favors, especially of the supernatural gifts imparted by the Holy Spirit (*charismata*) enumerated in Romans 12; 1 Corinthians 12; the word occurs translated “gift, gifts” (Romans 1:11), “some spiritual gift” (Romans 5:15, 16, “free gift”; 6:23, “The gift of God is eternal life,” the Revised Version (British and American) “free gift”; 11:29; 1 Corinthians 1:7; 7:7; 2 Corinthians 9:15, 11; 1 Timothy 4:14, 2 Timothy 1:6; 1 Peter 4:10); *charis*, “grace,” “favor” (2 Corinthians 8:4, the Revised Version (British and American) “grace”); *merismos*, “distribution,” “parting” (Hebrews 2:4, the Revised Version, margin “distributions”); *anathema*, “a thing devoted to God,” is once (Luke 21:5) used of “the goodly gifts” (the Revised Version (British and American) “offerings”) which adorned the Temple at Jerusalem.

In the Revised Version (British and American) “gift” is substituted in the text of Genesis 33:11 for blessing, margin Hebrew “blessing”; “boasteth himself of his gifts falsely” (Proverbs 25:14) for “boasteth himself of a false gift,” margin Hebrew “in a gift of falsehood”; “a parting gift” for “presents” (Micah 1:14); “Given to God” for “a gift” (Mark 7:11).

W. L. Walker

GIFT OF TONGUES

See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

GIFTS OF HEALING

See HEALING.

GIFTS, SPIRITUAL

See SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

GIHON (1)

<gi’-hon> ([׳יְרָם gichon]; [Γηών, Geon]): One of the four rivers of Eden (Genesis 2:13). It is said to compass the Whole land of Cush
(Ethiopia), probably a province East of the Tigris. The Gihon is thought by Sayce to be the Kerkha, coming down from Luristan through the province known in the cuneiform texts as Kassi, probably the Cush of the Bible.

*See EDEN.*

Used figuratively of wisdom in Sirach 24:27, “as Gihon (the King James Version Geon) in the days of vintage.”

**GIHON (2)**

([ hannay gichon], [ hannay gichon] (in 1 K), from root [ jayach] “to burst forth”):

(1) See preceding article.

(2) The Nile in *Jeremiah 2:18* Septuagint ([ηνων, Geon]); in Hebrew [sichor] (see SHIHOR).

(3) A spring in Jerusalem, evidently sacred, and, for that reason, selected as the scene of Solomon’s coronation (1 Kings 1:38). It is without doubt the spring known to the Moslems as ‘Ain Umm edition deraj (“the spring of the steps”) and to the Christians as ‘Ain Sitti Miriam (“the spring of the lady Mary”), or commonly as the “Virgin’s Fount.” It is the one true spring of Jerusalem, the original source of attraction to the site of the early settlers; it is situated in the Kidron valley on the East side of “Ophel,” and due South of the temple area. *See JERUSALEM.* The water in the present day is brackish and impregnated with sewage. The spring is intermittent in character, “bursting up” at intervals: this feature may account for the name Gihon and for its sacred characters. In New Testament times it was, as it is today, credited with healing virtues. *See BETHESDA.* Its position is clearly defined in the Old Testament. Manasseh “built an outer wall to the city of David, on the West side of Gihon, in the valley” (= Nahal, i.e. the Kidron; 2 Chronicles 33:14). From Gihon Hezekiah made his aqueduct (2 Chronicles 32:30), now the Siloam tunnel.

*See SILOAM.*

The spring is approached by a steep descent down 30 steps, the water rising deep underground; the condition is due to the vast accumulation of rubbish — the result of the many destructions of the city — which now fills the valley bed. Originally the water ran down the open valley. The water
rises from a long deep crack in the rock, partly under the lowest of the steps and to a lesser extent in the mouth of a small cave, 11 1/2 ft. long by 5 ft. wide, into which all the water pours. The village women of Siloam obtain the water at the mouth of the cave, but when the supply is scanty they actually go under the lowest step — where there is a kind of chamber — and fill their vessels there. At the farther end of this cave is the opening leading into the aqueduct down which the water flows to emerge after many windings at the pool of Siloam. The first part of this aqueduct is older than the time of Hezekiah and led originally to the perpendicular shaft, connected with “Warren’s tunnel” described elsewhere (see SILOAM; ZION).

The preeminent position of importance which Gihon held in the eyes of the earlier inhabitants of Jerusalem is shown by the extraordinary number of passages, rock cuttings, walls and aqueducts which exist all about the spring. Walls have been made at different periods to bank up the waters and direct them into the channels provided for them. Of aqueducts, besides the “Siloam aqueduct,” two others have been formed. One running from the source at a considerable lower level than that of Hezekiah was followed by the present writer (see PEFS, 1902, 35-38) for 176 ft. It was very winding, following apparently the West side of the Kidron valley. It was a well-cemented channel, about 1 1/2 ft. wide and on an average of 4 1/2 ft. high, roofed in with well-cut stones. There are no certain indications of age, but in the writer’s opinion it is a much later construction than Hezekiah’s aqueduct, though the rock-cut part near the source may be older. It was discovered by the Siloam fellahin, because, through a fault in the dam, all the water of the “Virgin’s Fount” was disappearing down this channel. A third aqueduct has recently been discovered running off at a higher level than the other two. It is a channel deeply cut in the rock with curious trough-like stones all along its floor. It appears to be made for water, but one branch of it actually slopes upward toward its end. The pottery, which is early Hebrew, shows that it is very ancient. The whole accumulated debris around the source is full of pre-Israelite and early Israelite pottery.

E. W. G. Masterman
GILALAI

<gil’-a-li>, <gi-la’-li> ([yl “ | gilalay]): A musician in the procession at the dedication of the wall, son of a priest (Nehemiah 12:36).

GILBOA, MOUNT

<gil-bo’-a> ([ B b G “ r h ” , har hagilboa], “Mount of the Gilboa”):
Unless we should read “Gilboa” for “Gilead” in Judges 7:3 (see GILEAD, 2) this mountain is mentioned in Scripture only in connection with the last conflict of Saul with the Philistines, and his disastrous defeat (1 Samuel 28:4; 31:1,8; 2 Samuel 1:6,21; 21:12; 1 Chronicles 10:1,8). If Zer’in be identical with Jezreel — a point upon which Professor R.A.S. Macalister has recently cast some doubt — Saul must have occupied the slopes on the Northwest side of the mountain, near “the fountain which is in Jezreel” (1 Samuel 29:1). The Philistines attacked from the plain, and the battle went sore against the men of Israel, who broke and fled; and in the flight Jonathan, Abinadab and Malchishua, sons of Saul, were slain. Rather than be taken by his lifelong foes, Saul fell upon his sword and died (1 Samuel 31:1 ff).

The modern name of the mountain is Jebel Faq’a. It rises on the eastern edge of the plain of Esdraelon, and, running from Zer’in to the Southeast, it then sweeps southward to join the Samarian uplands. It presents an imposing appearance from the plain, but the highest point, Sheikh Burqan, is not more than 1,696 ft. above sea level. In the higher reaches the range is rugged and barren; but vegetation is plentiful on the lower slopes, especially to the West. The Kishon takes its rise on the mountain. Under the northern cliffs rises `Ain Jalud, possibly identical with HAROD, WELL OF, which see. In Jelbun, a village on the western declivity, there is perhaps an echo of the old name.

W. Ewing

GILEAD (1)

<gil’-e-ad> ([d | G “ , ha-gil’adh], “the Gilead”): The Name is explained in Genesis 31:46 ff,51, as derived from Hebrew gal, “a cairn,” and `edh, “witness,” agreeing in meaning with the Aramaic yegharsahadhutha’. The Arabic jilead means “rough,” “rugged.”
(1) A city named in Hosea 6:8; 12:11, possibly to be identified with Gilead near to Mizpah (Judges 10:17). If this is correct, the ancient city may be represented by the modern Jil`ad, a ruin about 5 miles North of es-Salt.

(2) A mountain named in Judges 7:3. Gideon, ordered to reduce the number of men who were with him, commanded all who were “fearful and trembling” to “return and depart from Matthew Gilead.” the Revised Version, margin reads “return and go round about from Matthew Gilead.” Gideon and his army lay to the South of the plain of Jezreel on the lower slopes of Gilboa. It has been suggested (Studer, Comm., at the place) that, as the Midianites lay between the men of the northern tribes and their homes, they were told to cross the Jordan, make a detour through Gilead, and thus avoid the enemy. Possibly, however, we should read Gilboa for Gilead; or part of the mountain may have borne the name of Gilead. The last suggestion is favored by the presence of a strong spring under the northern declivity of Gilboa, nearly 2 miles from Zer`in, possibly to be identified with the Well of Harod. In the modern name, `Ain Jalud, there may be an echo of the ancient Gilead.

(3) The name is applied generally to the mountain mass lying between the Yarmuk on the North, and Wady Chesban on the South; the Jordan being the boundary on the West, while on the East it marched with the desert.

1. THE LAND OF GILEAD:

Mount Gilead — literally, “Mount of the Gilead” — may refer to some particular height which we have now no means of identifying (Genesis 31:23). The name Jebel Jil`ad is still, indeed, applied to a mountain South of Nahr ez-Zerqa and North of es-Salt; but this does not meet the necessities of the passage as it stands. The same expression in Deuteronomy 3:12 obviously stands for the whole country. This is probably true also in Song of Solomon 4:1. The name Gilead is sometimes used to denote the whole country East of the Jordan (Genesis 37:25; Joshua 22:9; 2 Samuel 2:9, etc.). Again, along with Bashan, it indicates the land East of Jordan, as distinguished from the Moab plateau (Deuteronomy 3:10; Joshua 13:11; 2 Kings 10:33).
2. BASHAN:

In the North Gilead bordered upon Geshur and Maacah (Joshua 13:11,13); and here the natural boundary would be formed by the deep gorge of the Yarmuk and Wady esh-Shellaleh. In pre-Israelite times the Jabbok (Nahr ez-Zerqa), which cuts the country in two, divided the kingdom of Sihon from that of Og (Deuteronomy 3:16; Joshua 12:2). The frontiers between the tribes of Reuben, Gad and Manasseh cannot be indicated with any certainty. Probably they varied at different times (compare Joshua 13:24 ff; 1 Chronicles 5:8,9,11,16). It greatly increases the difficulty that so many of the cities named are still unidentified. But in any case it is clear that the bulk of Gilead fell to Gad, so that Gilead might stand for Gad (Judges 5:17). HAVVOTH-JAIR (which see), “the villages of Jair,” lay in Gilead (Judges 10:4). The modern division of the country follows the natural features. From the Yarmuk to Nahr ez-Zerqa is the district of ʿAjlun; and from the Zerqa to the Arnon is el-Belqa.

3. GEOLOGY:

The geological formation is the same as that of Western Palestine, but the underlying sandstone, which does not appear West of the Jordan, forms the base slopes of the chain of Moab and Gilead, and is traceable as far as the Jabbok. It is covered in part by the more recent white marls which form the curious peaks of the foothills immediately above the Jordan valley; but reaches above them to an elevation of 1,000 ft. above the Mediterranean on the South, and forms the bed of the Buqeiʿa basin farther East, and 1,000 ft. higher. Above this lies the hard, impervious dolomite limestone which appears in ‘the rugged hills round’ the Jabbok and in Jebel ʿAjlun, rising on an average 1,500 ft. above the sandstone and forming the bed of the copious springs. It also dips toward the Jordan valley, and the water from the surface of the plateau, sinking down to the surface of their formation, bursts out of the hill slopes on the West in perennial brooks. It was from the ruggedness of this hard limestone that Gilead obtained its name. Above this again is the white chalk of the desert plateau, the same as that found in Samaria and Lower Galilee, with bands of flint or chert in contorted layers, or strewn in pebbles on the surface. Where this formation is deep the country is bare and and, supplied by cisterns and deep wells. Thus the plateau becomes desert, while the hill slopes abound in streams.
and springs; and for this reason Western Gilead is a fertile country, and Eastern Gilead is a wilderness (Conder, DB, under the word).

4. MOUNTAINS:

The uplands of Gilead may be described as the crumpling of the edge of the great eastern plateau ere it plunges into the Ghor. The average height of the range is about 4,000 ft. above the Jordan valley, or 3,000 ft. above the Mediterranean. The greatest height is toward the South, where it culminates in Jebel Osh’a (3,597 ft.), to the North of es-Salt. This mountain commands a most spacious view. To the East of it lies the hollow (an old lake bottom) of el-Buqei`a, fully 1,500 ft. lower. In the North we have Jebel Hakart (3,408 ft.) W, of Reimun. Almost as high (3,430 ft.) is Jebei Kafkafah, about 12 miles to the Northeast. A striking point (2,700 ft.) fully 2 miles Northwest of `Ajlun, is crowned by Qal`at er-Rabad, whence again a view of extraordinary extent is gained.

5. STREAMS AND PRODUCTS:

The Yarmuk and the Zerqa — see JABBOK — are the main streams, but almost every valley has its perennial brook. While not so rich as the volcanic loam in the North and in and the South, the soil of Gilead amply repays the labor of the husbandman. Of flowers the most plentiful are the phlox, the cistus and the narcissus. Hawthorn, mastic and arbutus abound, while many a glen and slope is shady with shaggy oak woods, and, in the higher reaches, with pines. The streams are fringed with oleander. The monotony of the stony plateau is broken by clumps of the hardy white broom. In the lower ground are found the tamarisk and the lotus, with many a waving cane-brake. The scenery is more beautiful and picturesque than that of any other district of Palestine. The soil is not now cultivated to any great extent; but it furnishes ample pasture for many flocks and herds (Song of Solomon 6:5).

The Ishmaelites from Gilead (Genesis 37:25) were carrying “spicery and balm and myrrh.” From old time Gilead was famed for its BALM (which see). The loT, translated “myrrh” in the above passage, was probably the gum produced by the Cistus ladaniferus, a flower which still abounds in Gilead.
6. HISTORY:

After the conquest, as we have seen, Gilead passed mainly into the hands of Gad. An Ammonite attack was repulsed by the prowess of Jephthah (Judges 11:1 ff); and the spite of the Ephraimites was terribly punished (Judges 12:1 ff). Gilead at first favored the cause of Ishbosheth (2 Samuel 2:9), but after the murder of that prince the Gileadites came with the rest of Israel to David (2 Samuel 5:1). By the conquest of the fortress Rabbah, which the Ammonites had continued to hold, the land passed finally under the power of David (2 Samuel 12:26 ff). David fled to Mahanaim from Absalom, and that rebel prince perished in one of the forests of Gilead (2 Samuel 17:24; 18:6 ff). Joab’s census included Gilead (2 Samuel 24:6). Solomon had two commissariat districts in Gilead (1 Kings 4:13 f,19). Before Ramoth-gilead, which he sought to win back from the Syrians who had captured it, Ahab received his death wound (1 Kings 22:1 ff). The Syrians asserted their supremacy in Gilead (2 Kings 10:32 f) where Moab and Israel had contended with varying fortune (M S). At length Tiglath-pileser overran the country and transported many of the inhabitants (2 Kings 15:29). This seems to have led to a reconquest of the land by heathenism, and return to Gilead was promised to Israel (Zec 10:10).

At a later time the Jewish residents in Gilead were exposed to danger from their heathen neighbors. On their behalf Judas Maccabeus invaded the country and met with striking success (1 Macc 5:9 ff). Alexander Janneus, who had subdued Gilead, was forced to yield it again to the king of Arabia (Ant., XIII, xiv, 2; BJ, I, iv, 3). During the Roman period, especially in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, the land enjoyed great prosperity. Then were built such cities as Gadara and Gerasa, which are still imposing, even in ruins. The appearance of the Moslem armies was the signal for its decay. Attempts were made to recover it for Christianity by Baldwin I (1118 AD) and Baldwin II (1121 AD); and the Crusaders left their mark in such strong-holds as Kal’at er-Rabad and the castle at es-Salt. With the reassertion of Moslem supremacy a curtain falls over the history of the district; and only in comparatively recent times has it again become known to travelers. The surveys directed by the Palestine Exploration Fund, in so far as they have been carried out, are invaluable. North of the Jabbok are many villages, and a fair amount of cultivation. Es Salt is the only village of any importance in the South. It is famous for its raisins. Its spacious
uplands, its wooded and well-watered valleys have been for centuries the pasture-land of the nomads.

**LITERATURE.**

Useful information will be found in Merrill, East of the Jordan; Oliphant, Land of Gilead; Thomson, LB; and especially in Conder, Heth and Moab, and in Memoirs of the Survey of Eastern Palestine

_W. Ewing_

**GILEAD (2)**

([ד | גילад]:

(1) A son of Machir, grandson of Manasseh (Numbers 26:29,30).

(2) The father of Jephthah (Judges 11:1,2).

(3) A Gadite, the son of Michael (1 Chronicles 5:14).

**GILEAD, BALM OF**

*See BALM OF GILEAD.*

**GILEAD, MOUNT**

*See GILEAD (2).*

**GILEADITES**

<gil’e-ad-its>:

(1) A branch of the tribe of Manasseh (Numbers 26:29).

(2) Natives of the district of Gilead (Judges 10:3; 11:1, etc.).

**GILGAL**

<gil’-gal> ([ג | גילגאל], “circle”; [Γάλγαλα, Galgala]): The article is always with the name except in Joshua 5:9. There are three places to which the name is attached:

(1) The first camp of Israel after crossing the Jordan (Joshua 4:19; 5:9,10; 9:6; 10:7; 14:6; 15:7; Deuteronomy 11:30). According to
Joshua 15:7 it lay to the North of the valley of Achor, which formed the border between Judah and Benjamin. Here 12 memorial stones taken from the bed of the river were set up by Joshua, after the miraculous crossing of the Jordan; and here (Joshua 5:5 ff) the people were circumcised preparatory to their possession of the land, when it is said in Josh, with a play upon the word, “This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you.” Whereupon the Passover was celebrated (Joshua 5:10) and the manna ceased (Joshua 5:12). To Gilgal the ark returned every day after having compassed the city of Jericho during its siege (Joshua 6:11). Hither the Gibeonites came to make their treaty (Joshua 9:3 ff), and again (Joshua 10:6) to ask aid against the Amorites. Gilgal was still the headquarters of the Israelites after the battle with the Amorites (Joshua 10:15); again after Joshua’s extensive victorious campaign in the hill country of Judea extending to Kadesh-barnea and Gaza (Joshua 10:15 ff); and still later upon his return from the great battle at the Waters of Merom (Joshua 14:6). At the conclusion of the conquest (Joshua 18:1), the headquarters were transferred to Shiloh on the summit of the mountain ridge to the West.

Gilgal reappears frequently in subsequent history. Samuel (1 Samuel 7:16) made it one of the three places where he annually held circuit court, the other places being Bethel and Mizpah. The Septuagint text adds that these were holy places. The place continued as one of special resort for sacrifices (1 Samuel 10:8; 13:8,9,10; 15:21), while it was here that Samuel hewed Agag to pieces before the Lord (1 Samuel 15:33), and that Saul was both crowned (1 Samuel 11:14,15) and rejected as king. It was at Gilgal, also (2 Samuel 19:15), that the people assembled to welcome David as he returned from his exile beyond Jordan during Absalom’s rebellion. The early prophets refer to Gilgal as a center of idolatry in their day (Hosea 4:15; 9:15; 12:11; Amos 4:4; 5:5). Micah (6:5) represents Gilgal as at the other end of the Dead Sea from Shittim.

In 1874 Conder recognized the name Gilgal as surviving in Barker Jiljuilieh, a pool beside a tamarisk tree 3 miles East of old Jericho. The pool measures 100 ft. by 84, and is surrounded with a wall of roughly hewn stones. North of the pool Bliss discovered lines of masonry 300 yds. long, representing probably the foundations of an ancient monastery. South of the pool there are numerous mounds scattered over an area of one-third of a square mile, the largest being 50 feet in diameter, and 10 feet in height.
On excavation some pottery and glass were found. These ruins are probably those of early Christian occupation, and according to Conder there is nothing against their marking the original site. Up to the Middle Ages the 12 stones of Joshua were referred to by tradition.

(2) According to 2 Kings 2:1; 4:38, Elisha for a time made his headquarters at Gilgal, a place in the mountains not far from Bethel identified by Conder as Jiljilia, standing on a high hill on the North side of the Wady el-Jib. It is lower than Bethel, but the phrase in 2 Kings 2:2, “they went down to Beth-el,” may refer to their initial descent into the wady. It could not have been said that they went down from Gilgal to Bethel in the Jordan valley. The place seems to be referred to in Neb 12:29 as Beth-gilgal.

(3) Gilgal of the nations: In Joshua 12:23 Gilgal is mentioned as a royal city associated with Dor, evidently upon the maritime plain. Dor is identified with Tantura, while Conder identifies this Gilgal with Jiljuilieh, 30 miles South of Dor and 4 miles North of Anti-patris.

George Frederick Wright

GILOH

<gi’-lo> ([h | ג giloh]): A town in the hill country of Judah mentioned along with Jattir, Socoh, Debir, Eshtemoa, etc. (Joshua 15:51). Ahithophel came from here (2 Samuel 15:12) and is called the Gilonite (2 Samuel 23:34). Driver infers from this last that the original form was Gilon, not Giloh. Probably the ruins Kb. Jala, in the hills 3 miles Northwest of Hulhul, mark the site (PEF, III, 313, Sh XXI).

GILONITE

<gi’-lo-nit>. See preceding article.

GIMEL

<ge’-mel>, <gim’-el> (ג g): The 3rd letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and used as such to designate the 3rd part of Psalm 119; transliterated in this Encyclopedia with the dagesh as “ג”, and without the dagesh as “gh” (aspirated “g”). It came also to be used for the number three (3), and with the dieresis for 3,000. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.
GIMZO

<gin’-zo> ([וּמְזָו gimzo]; [Γαυζό, Gamzo]): A town of Judah on the border of the Philistine plain, captured by the Philistines in the days of Ahaz (2 Chronicles 28:18). It is the modern Jimzu, a small mud village about 3 1/2 miles Southeast of Ludd (Lydda), on the old mule road from there to Jerusalem (Robinson, BR, II, 248-49; SWP, II, 297).

GIN

<jin> ([נ גע moqesh], [גא” pach]): A noose of hair or wire for snaring wild birds alive. There are over half a dozen traps and net devices indicated by different terms in the Bible. The gin was of horse-hair for small birds and wire for larger ones. It is mentioned in Amos 3:5: “Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, where no gin is set for him? shall a snare spring up from the ground, and have taken nothing at all?” Job writing in mental and physical discomfort on the ash heap included all methods mentioned in one outburst:

“For he is cast into a net by his own feet.
And he walketh upon the toils.
A gin shall take him by the heel,
And a snare shall lay hold on him,
A noose is hid for him in the ground.
And a trap for him in the way” (Job 18:8 ff).

Gene Stratton-Porter

GINATH

<gi’-nath> ([ת n’ גא ginath]): Father of Tibni, the unsuccessful rival of Omri (1 Kings 16:21,22).

GINNETHOI; GINNETHON

<gin-e-tho’-i>, <gin’e-thon> (the King James Version Ginnetho), ([וֹנֵה ginnethoi], and [וֹנֵה ginnethon]): The head of a priestly family. Ginnethoi (Ginnetho) is found in Nehemiah 12:4, and Ginnethon in 10:6; 12:16.
GIRDLER
<gur’-d’-l>.

See ARMOR; DRESS.

GIRGASHITE
<gur’-ga-shit> ([גֵּרֶגֶּשֶּה גֶּרֶגֶּשֶּה, Gergesaios]; also punctuated (?) Girgasite (Genesis 10:16 the King James Version)): A son of (the land of) Canaan (Genesis 10:16), and accordingly enumerated along with the Canaanite in the list of tribes or nationalities inhabiting that country (Genesis 15:21; Deuteronomy 7:1; Joshua 3:10; 24:11; Nehemiah 9:8). It has been supposed that the name survived in that of “the Gergesenes,” the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “the Gadarenes”), of Matthew 8:28, on the East side of the Sea of Galilee; Josephus (Ant., I, vi, 2), however, states that nothing was known about it. The inscriptions of the Egyptian king, Ramses II, mention the Qarqish who sent help to the Hittites in their war with Egypt; but Qarqish was more probably in Asia Minor than in Syria. Pinches (The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records, 324) would identify the Girgashites with the Kirkishati of an Assyrian tablet; the latter people, however, seem to have lived to the East of the Tigris, and it may be that, as in the case of the Hittites, a colony of the Qarqish, from Asia Minor, was established in Palestine.

A. H. Sayce

GIRL
<gurl>: Twice in the Old Testament as the rendering of מַלְאֹת, yaldah (Joel 3:3; Zec 8:5), in both cases in association with boys. Same word rendered “damsel” in Genesis 34:4.

See DAUGHTER; MAID, MAIDEN.

GIRZITES
<gur’-zits>.

See GIZRITES.
GISHPA

<gish’-pa> (the King James Version Gispa; [א פ י ג’ gishpa’]): An officer of the Nethinim (<א ח ת נהemiah 11:21). A comparison with Ezr 2:43 makes it probable that he is to be identified with Hasupha, and quite possible that this word is a corruption of Hasupha.

GITTAH-HEPHER

<git-a-he’-fer> ([ר כ י ג’יה hepГ gittah chepher]): the King James Version (<בראשית Josh 19:13) for Gath-hepher. Gittah is correctly Gath with the Hebrew letter, he (“h”) locale, meaning “toward Gath.”

GITTAIM

<git’-a-im> ([א י ו ל כ ג’ gittayim]): The town to which the Beerothites tied, and where they lived as gerim, or protected strangers (<דaniel 2 Samuel 4:3). The place need not have been beyond the boundaries of Benjamin, so it may be identical with Gittaim of <א ח ת נהemiah 11:33, which was occupied by Benjamites after the exile. It is named with Hazor and Ramah; but so far the site has not been discovered.

GITTITES

<git’-its> ([א יект כ ג’ gittim], plural of [א ו ג’ gitty]): The inhabitants of Gath. They are mentioned along with the inhabitants of the other chief Philistine cities in <בראשית Josh 13:3. It would seem that numbers of them emigrated to Judah, for we find 600 of them acting as a bodyguard to David with Ittai at their head (<דaniel 2 Samuel 15:18 ff; 18:2). Obed-edom, to whom David entrusted the ark when he was frustrated in bringing it into the city of David, was a Gittite (<דaniel 2 Samuel 6:11 f; <ענני 1 Chronicles 13:13). The Gittites seem to have been remarkable for their great stature (<דaniel 2 Samuel 21:19; <ענני 1 Chronicles 20:5 ff).

GITTITH

<git’-ith>.

See MUSIC; PSALMS.
GIVE

([^t " n; nathan], [b h" y; yahabh], [μ Wc , sum]; [διδωμι, didomi]):

"Give" is a very common word in the Old Testament. It is most frequently the translation of nathan, "to give" (Genesis 1:29; 3:6; Exodus 2:9; Deuteronomy 18,20, etc., over 800 instances); nathan is also translated “to give up” (Deuteronomy 23:14; Isaiah 43:6; Hosea 11:8); of yahabh, “to give” (Genesis 30:1; 1 Chronicles 16:28 the King James Version). In Psalm 55:22 we have the perfect with suffix, “Cast thy burden upon Yahweh,” margin “what he hath given thee”; elsewhere it is the imperative “Give!” (the King James Version in Gen, “Go to”); sum, “to put,” “place” (Numbers 6:26; Proverbs 8:29); rum, “to lift up,” “exalt” (2 Chronicles 30:24 bis; 35:7,8,9, “to give to”); shubh, “to cause to turn back” (Leviticus25:51,52; 2 Kings 17:3, “to give again”); various other words are in single instances translated “give.”

In the New Testament, the common word is didomi, “to give” (Matthew 4:9; John 1:12; Revelation 1:1; 21:6, etc.); we have also apodidomi, “to give away (from one’s self)” (Matthew 12:36; Luke 16:2; Acts 4:33; 19:40; Revelation 22:12); diadidomi, “to give throughout” (Revelation 17:13); epididomi, “to give upon or besides” (Matthew 7:9,10; John 13:26); metadidomi, “to give a share” (Romans 12:8); paradidomi, “to give over to” (Romans 1:28; 1 Corinthians 13:3; Galatians 2:20, etc.); prodidomi, “to give forth or foremost” (Romans 11:35); aponeomo, “to apportion” (1 Peter 3:7); doreomai, “to give as a gift” (Mark 15:45, the Revised Version (British and American) “granted”; 2 Peter 1:3,4 the King James Version); martureo, “to give testimony or witness” (1 John 5:10); pareisphero, “to bring forward therewith” (2 Peter 1:5); parecho, “to hold near by” (Colossians 4:1; 1 Timothy 6:17); kataphero, “to bear against or down” (Acts 26:10); charizomai, “to grant as a favor” (Luke 7:21; Acts 27:24; Romans 8:32; Galatians 3:18; Philippans 2:9; Philem 1:22 the King James Version). A few other words mostly occurring singly are translated “give.”

Of the many changes in the Revised Version (British and American), the following are among the most important: for “Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies,” “Thou hast also made mine enemies turn their backs unto me” (2 Samuel 22:41; Psalm 18:40); for “He that made him can make his sword to approach unto him” (Job 40:19), the
American Standard Revised Version has “He only that made him giveth him his sword,” the English Revised Version, margin “furnished”; for “hasten after another god” (Psalm 16:4), the American Standard Revised Version has “give gifts for” (ERVm); for “give” (Psalm 29:1,2, etc.), the American Standard Revised Version has “ascribe”; for “give myself unto wine” (Ecclesiastes 2:3), “cheer my flesh with wine”; for “giveth his life” (John 10:11), “layeth down”; “given” is supplied (Acts 19:2), where we read instead of “We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost,” “We did not so much as hear whether the Holy Spirit was given,” margin “there is a Holy Spirit”; for Christ shall give thee light” (Ephesians 5:14), “Christ shall shine upon thee”; for “give in charge” (1 Timothy 5:7), “command”; for “not given to wine” (Titus 1:7), “no brawler,” margin “not quarrelsome over wine”; for “she that liveth in pleasure” (1 Timothy 5:6), “giveth herself to”; for “All scripture is given by inspiration of God” (2 Timothy 3:16), “Every scripture inspired of God,” margin “Every scripture is inspired of God”; for “given to filthy lucre” (Titus 1:7), “greedy of”; in Hebrews 2:16, the American Standard Revised Version has “For verily not of angels doth he give help,” margin “For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold,” etc. (compare Isaiah 41:9; Ecclesiasticus 4:11; 8:9 (in the Greek) the English Revised Version, “not of angels doth he take hold”) (the idea is that of taking hold of to lift up or help); in Ecclesiasticus 13:15 for “giving thanks to his name,” the Revised Version (British and American) reads “make confession to his name”; for “giving all diligent” (2 Peter 1:5), “adding.”

The prominence of “give” in the Bible reminds us that God is the great Giver (Jas 1:5), and of the words of the Lord Jesus, “It is more blessed to give than to receive” (Acts 20:35), “Freely ye received, freely give” (Matthew 10:8).

W. L. Walker

GIZONITE

<gi’-zon-it>: This gentilic name in 1 Chronicles 11:34, “Hashem the Gizonite,” is probably an error for “Gunite” (compare Numbers 26:48), and the passage should be corrected, after 2 Samuel 23:32, into “Jashen the Gunite.”
GIZRITES

<giz’-rits> ([yr ֹגִּזְרִי girzi] (Kethibh); the King James Version Gezrites): Inhabitants of GEZER, (which see). The Qere reads [y רִזְרִי girzi], Girzites (1 Samuel 27:8).

GLAD TIDINGS

<ti’-dingz> ([εὐαγγελίζω, euaggelizo]): “Glad-tidings” occurs in the King James Version in the translation of the verb euaggelizo, “to tell good news” (Luke 1:19; 8:1; Acts 13:32; Romans 10:15); in each instance, except the last, the Revised Version (British and American) translations “good tidings.” The verb is also very frequently translated in the King James Version “to preach the gospel,” the original meaning of which word (god-spell) is “good news or tidings” (Matthew 11:5; Luke 4:18; 7:22; 9:6; 20:1); in the first two passages the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes “good tidings,” margin “the gospel”; in the last two instances “the gospel” is retained, the American Revised Version, margin “good tidings” — the gospel or good tidings being the announcement of the near approach of the promised, longlooked-for salvation and kingdom of God; in Romans 1:15; 15:20; 1 Corinthians 1:17, etc., the King James Version has “the gospel,” namely, that of God’s reconciliation of the world to Himself in Christ; the Revised Version (British and American) in some passages substitutes “good tidings,” or gives this in the margin; but “glad tidings” stands only in Romans 10:15.

W. L. Walker

GLASS

<glas> ([t yok wk z] zekhukhith]; [ὕαλος, hualos]):

1. HISTORY:

Glass is of great antiquity. The story of its discovery by accident, as related by Pliny (NH, xxxvi.65), is apocryphal, but it was natural for the Greeks and Romans to ascribe it to the Phoenicians, since they were the producers of the article as known to them. The Egyptian monuments have revealed to us the manufacture in a time so remote that it must have preceded that of the Phoenicians. A representation of glass-blowing on monuments of the
Old Empire, as formerly supposed, is now regarded as doubtful, but undoubted examples of glazed pottery of that age exist. A fragment of blue glass has been found inscribed with the name of Antef III, of the XIth Dynasty, dating from 2000 or more BC (Davis, Ancient Egypt, 324). The oldest dated bottle, or vase, is one bearing the name of Thothmes III, 1500 or more BC, and numerous examples occur of later date. The close connection between Egypt and Syria from the time of Thothmes on must have made glass known in the latter country, and the Phoenicians, so apt in all lines of trade and manufacture, naturally seized on glass-making as a most profitable art and they became very proficient in it. The earliest glass was not very transparent, since they did not know how to free the materials used from impurities. It had a greenish or purplish tinge, and a large part of the examples we have of Phoenician glass exhibit this. But we have many examples of blue, red and yellow varieties which were purposely colored, and others quite opaque and of a whitish color, resembling porcelain (Perrot and Chipiez, Art in Ancient Phoenicia and Its Dependencies). But both they and the Egyptians made excellent transparent glass also, and decorated it with brilliant coloring on the surface (ib; Beni Hasan, Archeol. Survey of Egypt, Pt IV). Layard (Nineveh and Babylon) mentions a vase of transparent glass bearing the name of Sargon (522-505 BC), and glass was early known to the Babylonians.

2. MANUFACTURE:

Phoenicia was the great center, and the quantities found in tombs of Syria and Palestine go to confirm the statement that this was one of the great industries of this people, to which ancient authors testify (Strabo, Geog.; Pliny, NH). Josephus refers to the sand of the Belus as that from which glass was made (BJ, II, x, 2). It seems to have been especially adapted for the purpose, but there are other places on the coast where plenty of suitable sand could be obtained. The potash required was obtained by burning certain marine and other plants, and saltpeter, or niter, was also employed. The manufacture began centuries BC on this coast, and in the 12th century AD a factory is mentioned as still being worked at Tyre, and the manufacture was later carried on at Hebron, even down to recent times (Perrot and Chipiez).

Both the Egyptians and Phoenicians gained such proficiency in making transparent and colored glass that they imitated precious stones with such skill as to deceive the unwary. Necklaces are found composed of a mixture
of real brilliants and glass imitations. Cut glass was manufactured in Egypt as early as the XVIIIth Dynasty, and diamonds were made use of in the article Glass composed of different colors in the same piece was made by placing layers of glass wire, of different colors, one above the other and then fusing them so that they became united in a solid mass without intermingling. Colored designs on the surface were produced by tracing the patterns, while the glass was still warm and plastic, deep enough to receive the threads of colored glass which were imbedded in them. The whole was heated again sufficiently to fuse the threads and attach them to the body. The surface was then made even by perishing. By this process vessels and ornaments of very beautiful design were produced. Many of the specimens, as found, are covered by an exquisite iridescence which is due wholly to the decomposition of the surface by chemical action, from lying buried for centuries in the soil which thus acts upon it. This is often lost in handling by the scaling off of the outer surface.

Glass, in the strict sense, is rarely mentioned in Scripture, but it was certainly known to the Hebrews, and occurs in Job 28:17 (translated “crystal” in the King James Version). Bottles, cups and other vessels in glass must have been in use to some extent. The wine cup of Proverbs 23:31 and the bottle for tears mentioned in Psalm 56:8 were most likely of glass. Tear bottles are found in great quantities in the tombs throughout the land and were undoubtedly connected with funeral rites, the mourners collecting their tears and placing them in these bottles to be buried with the dead. As mourners were hired for the purpose, the number of these bottles would indicate the extent to which the deceased was honored. These were, of course, small, some quite diminutive (see illustration), as also were the vials or pots to contain the ointment for the eyebrows and eyelashes, used to heighten the beauty of the women, which was probably a custom among the Hebrews as well as their neighbors. Rings, bracelets and anklets of glass are very common and were doubtless worn by the Hebrew women (see Isaiah 3:18 f). In the New Testament the Greek hualos occurs in Revelation 21:18,21, and the adjective derived from it hualinos in 4:6 and 15:2. In the other passages, where in the King James Version “glass” occurs, the reference is to “looking-glass,” or mirror, which was not made of glass, but of bronze, and polished so as to reflect the light similar to glass. The Hebrew word for this is "gillayon" (Isaiah 3:23), or "mar’ah" (Exodus 38:8), and the Greek "esoptron,"
esoptron] (1 Corinthians 13:12; Jas 1:23; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 7:26; Sirach 12:11).

The composition of the Phoenician glass varies considerably. The analysis shows that, besides the ordinary constituents of silica, lime, lead, potash or soda, other elements are found, some being used for the purpose of coloring, such as manganese to give the purplish or violet hue, cobalt for blue, copper for red, etc. The articles illustrated above are of ordinary transparent glass with an iridescent surface, caused by decomposition, as mentioned above, indicated by the scaly appearance. Numbers 1, 4 and 5 are tear bottles, number 4 being only 1 3/4 inches in height; numbers 2 and 3 are ointment vases which were used for the ointment with which ladies were accustomed to color their eyebrows and eyelashes to enhance their beauty. This custom still prevails in the East. The small ladle by the side of the larger vase is of bronze, used in applying the ointment. This vase is double and 6 3/4 inches high, ornamented with glass wire wound upon it while plastic. The larger vases (numbers 6 and 7) are about 6 inches in height. The hand-mirror (“looking-glass” the King James Version) is bronze, and had originally a polished surface, but is now corroded.

**GLASS, SEA OF**

([θάλασσα υαλίνη, thalassa hualine]; Revelation 4:6; 15:2): In the vision of heaven in these two apocalyptic passages a “glassy sea” is seen before the throne of God. The pure translucency of the sea is indicated in the former reference by the words, “like unto crystal”; and the fiery element that may symbolize the energy of the Divine holiness is suggested in the latter passage by the trait, “mingled with fire.” On the margin of this sea — on the inner side — stood the victorious saints, with harps, singing the song of Moses and of the Lamb (Revelation 15:2-4). The imagery here points to a relation with the triumphal song in Exodus 15, after the deliverance from Pharaoh at the Red Sea. It is not easy to define the symbolism precisely. The sea, reflecting in its crystalline depths the purity and holiness of the Divine character and administration, speaks at the same time of difficulties surmounted, victory obtained and safety assured, the after-glow of the Divine judgments by which this result has been secured still illuminating the glassy expanse that has been crossed.

James Orr
GLEANING

<glen’-ing> ([f q” ־l ; laqat], [l ־ ” [ ; `alal]): The custom of allowing the poor to follow the reapers in the field and glean the fallen spears of grain is strikingly illustrated in the story of Ruth (<Ruth> 2:2-23). This custom had back of it one of the early agricultural laws of the Hebrews (Leviticus 19:9; 23:22; <Deuteronomy> 24:19-21). Breaking this law was a punishable offense. The generosity of the master of the crop determined the value of the gleanings, as the story of Ruth well illustrates (<Ruth> 2:16). A reaper could easily impose upon the master by leaving too much for the gleaners, who might be his own children. The old Levitical law no longer holds in the land, but the custom of allowing the poor to glean in the grain fields and vineyards is still practiced by generous landlords in Syria. The writer has seen the reapers, even when they exercised considerable care, drop from their hands frequent spears of wheat. When the reapers have been hirelings they have carelessly left bunches of wheat standing behind rocks or near the boundary walls. The owner usually sends one of his boy or girl helpers to glean these. If he is of a generous disposition, he allows some needy woman to follow after the reapers and benefit by their carelessness. It is the custom in some districts, after the main crop of grapes has been gathered, to remove the watchman and allow free access to the vineyards for gleaning the last grapes. Gideon touched the local pride of the men of Ephraim when he declared that the glory of their conquest surpassed his, as the gleanings of their vineyards did the whole crop of Abiezer (<Judges> 8:2). Gleaned is used of a captured enemy in <Judges> 20:45.

Figurative: Israel, because of her wickedness, will be utterly destroyed, even to a thorough gleaning and destruction of those who first escape (<Jeremiah> 6:9). The same picture of complete annihilation is given in <Jeremiah> 49:9,10.

James A. Patch

GLEDE

<gled> ([h a r ; ra`ah]; [γύψ, gups]): A member of the hawk species. It is given among the list of abominations in <Deuteronomy> 14:13, but not in the Leviticus list (Leviticus 11:14). The kite is substituted. The Arabs might have called one of the buzzards the glede. In England, where specimens of
most of these birds appear in migration, the glede is synonymous with kite, and was given the name from glide, to emphasize a gliding motion in flight. See illustration, p. 1235.

**GLISTERING**

<glis’-ter-ing> ([Ē Ψ, pukh], “dye” (spec. “stibium”), “fair colors”; [στιλβοντα, stilbonta]): “Glistening stones’ (1 Chronicles 29:2) is better than the ‘inlaid’ of the Revised Version (British and American); for some kind of colored, brilliant stone seems meant” (HDB, II, 182); compare Isaiah 54:11 Revised Version, margin. The term is employed in Mark 9:3 to denote the white, lustrous appearance of Christ’s garments at the transfiguration. It occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. For once the Divine effulgence shone through the veil of the humiliation (compare John 1:14).

**GLITTER; GLITTERING**

<glit’-er>, <glit’-er-ing> ([q r B; baraq], “lightning”): The word is used in sense of “glittering” in the Old Testament with “sword,” “spear” (Deuteronomy 32:41; Job 20:25; Ezekiel 21:10,28; Nahum 3:3; Habakkuk 3:11). In Ezekiel 21:10 the Revised Version (British and American) changes “glitter” to “as lightning,” and in Deuteronomy 32:41 the Revised Version, margin gives, “the lightning of my sword.” In Job 39:23, where the word is different (lahabh), the Revised Version (British and American) has “flashing.”

**GLORIFY**

<glo’-ri-fi>: The English word is the equivalent of a number of Hebrew and Greek words whose essential significance is discussed more fully under the word GLORY (which see). The word “glorious” in the phrases “make or render glorious” is used most frequently as a translation of verbs in the original, rather than of genuine adjectives. In dealing with the verb it will be sufficient to indicate the following most important uses.

1) Men may glorify God, that is, give to Him the worship and reverence which are His due (Isaiah 24:15; 25:3; Psalm 22:23; Daniel 5:23; Sirach 43:30; Matthew 5:16, and generally in the Synoptic Gospels and in some other passages of the New Testament).
(2) God, Yahweh (Yahweh), glorifies His people, His house, and in the New Testament, His Son, manifesting His approval of them and His interest in them, by His interposition on their behalf (Isaiah 55:5; Jeremiah 30:19; The Wisdom of Solomon 18:8; Sirach 45:3; John 7:39, and often in the Fourth Gospel).

(3) By a usage which is practically confined to the Old Testament, Yahweh glorifies Himself, that is, secures the recognition of His honor and majesty, by His direction of the course of history, or by His interposition in history, either the history of His own people or of the world at large (Leviticus 10:3; Isaiah 26:15; Ezekiel 28:22; Haggai 1:8).

Walter R. Betteridge

GLORIOUS

<glo'-ri-us>: The adjective “glorious” is used in the majority of cases as the translation of one of the nouns which are fully discussed in the article GLORY, and the general meaning is the same, for the glorious objects or persons have the quality which is described by the word “glory,” that is, they are honorable, dignified, powerful, distinguished, splendid, beautiful or radiant. It is worthy of note that in many passages in the New Testament where the King James Version has “glorious,” the Revised Version (British and American) has the noun “glory.” So among others in Romans 8:21, the King James Version has “glorious liberty,” the Revised Version (British and American) “liberty of the glory of the sons of God.” The obsolete use of the word glorious in the sense of “boastful,” “vain-glorious,” “eager for glory,” as it is used in Wycliffe, Tyndale and Bacon, and once or twice in Shakespeare, as in Cymbeline, I, 7, in the first speech of Imogen, “Most miserable is the desire that’s glorious,” and in Gower’s Prologue to Pericles, 1,9, “The purchase of it is to make men glorious” occurs at least once in the apocryphal books, Additions to Esther 16:4 the King James Version, “but also lifted up with the glorious words of lewd persons.”

Walter R. Betteridge

GLORY

<glo'-ri> (substantive):
I. METHOD OF TREATMENT.

In this article we deal, first, with a group of words, translated “glory” in the English Versions of the Bible, and in which the ideas of size, rarity, beauty and adornment are prominent, the emphasis being laid in the first instance in each case upon some external physical characteristic which attracts the attention, and makes the object described by the word significant or prominent.

These are ([ת ר דא"", ‘addereth’]) perhaps to be connected with the Assyrian root ‘adaru, meaning “wide,” “great”; ([ר ד”ה; hadhar], [ג ר ד ה} hadharah]), perhaps with root-meaning of “brightness”; ([ד ו"ה, hodhi]), with essentially the same meaning of “brightness,” “light”; ([י ה ג ] Tehar]), Psalm 89:44, translated “glory” in the King James Version, in the Revised Version (British and American) rendered “brightness”; ([א ע י ] yeqara’], an Aramaic root meaning “rare”; ([ה ר א פ י ת] tiph’arah]), with the root-meaning of “beauty “; and finally ([י ב ק ] tsebhi]), perhaps on the basis of the Assyrian cabu, meaning “desire,” “desirable.”

Secondly, this article will discuss the most common and characteristic word for “glory” in the Old Testament, the Hebrew ([ד ב ק ; kabhodh]) including the special phrase “the glory of God” or “the glory of Yahweh.”

In dealing with the Old Testament usage, attention will also be called to the original Hebrew of the Book of Ecclesiasticus or Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, cited in this article as Sir. Thirdly, with the Greek word ([δ ξα, doxa]) in the Apocrypha and in the New Testament. The nouns kauchema, kauchesis, translated “glory” or “glorying” in the New Testament, will be dealt with in the concluding paragraphs in which the use of the word glory as a verb will briefly be discussed. It will be possible within the limits of this article to give only the main outlines of the subject as illustrated by a few of the most significant references. The lexicons and the commentaries must be consulted for the details.

II. GENERAL USE OF THE TERM.

In the first group, as has already been stated, the ideas of beauty, majesty and splendor are prominent. And these qualities are predicated first of all,
of things. David determines to make the temple which Solomon is to build “a house of fame and of glory” (1 Chronicles 22:5).

1. As Applied to External Things:

Then, and more commonly, glory belongs to men, and especially to men of prominence, like kings. This glory may consist in wealth, power, portion, or even in the inherent majesty and dignity of character of its possessor. The reference is most frequently, however, to the external manifestations. Physical power is suggested in Deuteronomy 33:17, where “glory” of the King James Version is replaced by “majesty” in the Revised Version (British and American). The king’s glory consists in the multitude of his people (Proverbs 14:28). The glory and the pomp of the rebellious people shall descend into Sheol (Isaiah 5:14). Here the reference is clearly to those external things upon which the people depend, and the possession of which is the ground of their confidence.

2. As Applied to Yahweh:

But chiefly glory is the possession and characteristic of Yahweh, and is given by Him to His people or to anything which is connected with Him. In Isaiah 60:7 the Lord promises to glorify the house of His glory, and the meaning is clearly that He will impart to His house something of the beauty and majesty which belong to Him. Glory is one of the qualities which are distinctive of Yahweh (1 Chronicles 29:11); and Isaiah, in one of his earliest utterances, uses the word “glory” to describe Yahweh’s self-manifestation in judgment to bring to naught the pride and power of men (Isaiah 2:10,19,21). The use of the word in Psalm 78:61 is not quite certain. The most natural interpretation would perhaps be to refer it to the ark as the symbol of the presence of Yahweh, but in view of the parallel word “strength,” it is perhaps better to interpret glory as meaning power, and to suppose that the Psalmist means that Yahweh allowed His power to be temporarily obscured, and Himself to be seemingly humiliated on account of the sin of His people.

III. THE USES OF KABHODH.

The use and significance of kabhodh in the Old Testament and in Sirach: The fundamental idea of this root seems to be “weight,” “heaviness,” and hence in its primary uses it conveys the idea of some external, physical
manifestation of dignity, preeminence or majesty. At least three uses may be distinguished:

1. Material Wealth:

In Genesis 31:1 (margin “wealth”) it describes the flocks and herds which Jacob has acquired; in Psalm 49:16 f, as the parallelism indicates, it refers to the wealth of the sinner; and in Isaiah 10:3 it is said that in the day of desolation the heartless plunderers of the poor shall not know where to leave their ill-gotten gain. This idea is also probably to be found in Haggai 2:7, where the parallelism seems to indicate that the glory with which Yahweh will fill the house is the treasure which He will bring into it. See also Sirach 9:11, where the glory of the sinner which is not to be envied is probably his wealth.

2. Human Dignity and Majesty:

It describes the majesty and dignity or honor of men due to their adornment or to their position. In Genesis 45:13, Joseph bids his brethren tell their father of his glory in Egypt; according to Exodus 28:40, the priestly garments are intended for the glorification of their wearers; in 1 Samuel 4:21 f, the loss of the ark means, for Israel, the loss of her glory, that which gave her distinction from, and preeminence over, her neighbors; in Isaiah 22:23 it is said that Eliakim is to be a throne of glory, i.e. the source and manifestation of the splendor and dignity of his father’s house; in Job 19:9 the complaint that God has stripped him of his glory must be taken to refer to his dignity and honor. Reference may also be made to the numerous passages in which the glory of Israel and other nations describes their dignity, majesty or distinction; so we hear of the glory of Ephraim (Hosea 9:11), of Moab (Isaiah 16:14), of Kedar (Isaiah 21:16). This use is quite common in Sir. Sirach 3:10 f states that the glory of man comes from the honor of his father; the possessor of wisdom shall inherit glory (4:13; 37:26); note also 4:21 with
its reference to “a shame that is glory and grace,” and 49:5 where the forfeited independence of Judah is described by the terms “power” and “glory.”

3. “My Soul”: the Self:

Closely related to this use of kabhodh to describe the majesty of men is the group of passages in which the phrase “my glory,” in parallelism with [V p n, nephesh], “soul,” “self,” or some similar expression, means the man himself in his most characteristic nature. In the blessing of Jacob (Genesis 49:6) we read, “Unto their assembly, my glory, be not thou united.” Other passages are Psalm 4:2; 7:5; 16:9; 30:12; 57:8; 108:1 and perhaps Job 29:20. Some recent interpreters, partly because of the Septuagint rendering in Genesis 49:6 (ta hepata mou), “my liver,” and partly because of the Assyrian root, kabittu, meaning “temper” or “heart” (see Delitzsch, Assyrisches Handwortebuch, 317a), would read in all these passages kabhedh, literally, “liver” as in Lamentations 2:11, and interpret the figure as referring to the emotions as the expression of the self. The arguments in favor of the change are not without weight. Of course on either interpretation the language is highly figurative. It hardly seems necessary to change the reading, especially as the Septuagint renders the passages in the Psalms and in Job by doxa, the ordinary Greek rendering for kabhodh, and it does not seem improbable that in poetry the word kabhodh might be used to describe the man himself indicating that man as such is honorable and glorious, possibly because as in Psalm 8:1, he is thought of as having been crowned by his Creator with glory and honor.

Before leaving this use of kabhodh it is necessary to call attention to the fact that in a few cases it is used to describe things, perhaps because these things are thought of as practically personified. The “glory of the forest” (Isaiah 10:18) is clearly a personification, referring to the majestic force of the Assyrians. We may probably assume a personification also in the case of the glory of Lebanon in Isaiah 35:2; 60:13, and the nature of the parable in Ezekiel 31 makes it probable that personification is intended in 31:18.

4. Self-manifestation of God (Yahweh):

But unquestionably the most important use of the word kabhodh is its employment either with the following gen. God or Yahweh, or absolutely,
to describe the method or the circumstances of the self-manifestation of God. In discussing this subject we shall deal first of all with the use of the term as connected with actual or historical manifestations of the Deity, and then with its use to describe the characteristic features of the ideal state of the future, or, otherwise stated, the Messianic kingdom.

(1) **Exodus 23:18 ff.**

The significance of the phrase in its earliest occurrence is by no means clear. Notwithstanding the uncertainty as to the exact documentary connection of the famous passage in Exodus 33:18 ff, it seems quite certain that we may claim that this is the earliest historical reference that the Old Testament contains to the glory of Yahweh. “And he (Moses) said, Show me, I pray thee, thy glory. And he (Yahweh) said Thou canst not see my face; .... and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand until I have passed by: and I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back; but my face shall not be seen.” The passage in its present form bears unmistakable evidences of the editorial hand, due perhaps, as Baentsch (Hand-kommentar zum Altes Testament, “Ex-Lev-Nu,” 279) suggests, to a desire to transform the primitive, concrete, physical theophany into a revelation of the ethical glory of God, but in its basis it belongs to the Jahwist (Jahwist) and is therefore the earliest literary reference to the glory of God in the Old Testament. The glory of Yahweh is clearly a physical manifestation, a form with hands and rear parts, of which Moses is permitted to catch only a passing glimpse, but the implication is clear that he actually does see Yahweh with his physical eyes.

It seems not improbable that in its original form it was related that Moses saw the glory, i.e., the form of Yahweh, and thus that we are to find in this narrative the source for the statement in Numbers 12:8, that he (Moses) will behold (or perhaps better rendering the tense as a frequentative), beholds the form of Yahweh (see also the description in Exodus 24:9-11). The mention of the cloud (Exodus 34:5) as the accompaniment of the manifestation of Yahweh suggests that the form of Yahweh was thought of as being outlined in cloud and flame, and that Yahweh was originally thought of as manifesting Himself in connection with meteorological or more probably volcanic phenomena.
Later the glory of Yahweh and the form of Yahweh are no longer identical terms, but the glory is still the physical manifestation of the Divine presence. This is clear from Isaiah’s account of his great inaugural vision. The prophet sees the enthroned Yahweh with His skirts filling the temple. There is no indication of what it was that he saw or how he recognized that it was Yahweh. The attendant *seraphim* in addition to the solemn “Holy, Holy, Holy” declare that “the whole earth is full of his glory.”

Unquestionably His glory is here regarded as something visible, something, a part of which at least, Isaiah sees. The glory as such has no ethical significance except in so far as it is the method of manifestation of one who is undoubtedly an ethical being. The phraseology suggests that the skirts which fill the temple and the glory which fills the whole earth refer to the phenomena of fire and smoke. Some think that the smoke is caused by the clouds of incense that would fill the temple in connection with the sacrificial observances. But in view of Isaiah’s horror of these observances, this interpretation is very questionable. A more probable interpretation connects the clouds and gloom with the phenomena of a great storm, and even possibly of an earthquake, for it seems highly plausible that the call of Isaiah in the year of the death of King Uzziah coincided with the great earthquake in the days of Uzziah referred to in Zec 14:5. (It seems at least probable that the references to the darkness and light in Zec 14:6 f may have their origin in the phenomena attendant upon this earthquake. It is probable that the earthquake by which the prophecy of Amos is dated (Amos 1:1) is also this same historic earthquake.) The clouds and fire attendant upon this storm or earthquake become the media by which the glory of Yahweh is made known to the youthful prophet, and this glory partly reveals and partly conceals the presence of Yahweh of which, through, and in part by means of, these phenomena, Isaiah is made so vividly conscious.

This conception of Isaiah that the glory of Yahweh fills the earth is closely related to the thought of Psalm 19:1 that “the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork,” the difference being that in the psalm Yahweh’s glory is manifested in the ordinary rather than in the extraordinary phenomena. Parallel thoughts may be found in
Psalm 8:1; 57:5; 108:5; 113:4. In Psalm 29:1,2,3,1, as in Isaiah, the glory of Yahweh is revealed in the extraordinary physical phenomena which the psalm describes. Glory here is a purely external, meteorological thing and is the manifestation of the presence of Yahweh, no matter whether the psalm is regarded, as it usually is, as a description of a thunderstorm, or whether with von Gall and others it is taken as a description of the phenomena which accompany the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom (see Joel 2:30 f the English Revised Version).

(4) **Sinai and the Temple.**

Deuteronomy 5:24 indicates that in theophany at the time of the giving of the law, the glory and the greatness of Yahweh consisted in the fire and thick darkness which enveloped the mountain, and out of which Yahweh spoke to the people. Essentially the same idea is expressed in the account of the dedication of Solomon’s temple (1 Kings 8:10 f; 2 Chronicles 5:14). The cloud which filled the house of Yahweh, preventing the priests from ministering, is identified with the glory of Yahweh which filled the house. It is noteworthy that in 2 Chronicles 7:1-3 the glory of Yahweh which fills the house manifests itself in the form of the cloud of smoke from the sacrifices which were consumed by the fire coming down from heaven.

(5) **Ezekiel’s Visions.**

Perhaps the most elaborate description of the glory of Yahweh to be found in the Old Testament is that given by Ezekiel in the various accounts of his visions. It is not easy to interpret his conception, but it seems clear that he does not identify the glory with the stormy clouds, the fire, the cherubim and the chariots. “The appearance of the likeness of the glory of Yahweh” (Ezekiel 1:28) is not applied to all the phenomena which have been described in the preceding verses, but only to the likeness of form which looked like a man above the sapphire throne (1:26). The same idea is indicated in 9:3 which states that “the glory of the God of Israel was gone up from the cherub, whereupon it was”; that is, the glory is something peculiar to Yahweh, and is not quite identical with the phenomena which accompany it. This is true of all his visions. The glory of Yahweh manifests itself with all the accompaniments which he describes with such richness of imagery, but the accompaniments are not the glory. For other descriptions of the glory of Yahweh in Ezekiel, see 3:12,23; 8:4; 10:4,18 ff; 11:22 f.
Very similar to this conception of Ezekiel is that given in those passages of the Pentateuch which are usually assigned to the Priestly Code. When the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron on account of the lack of food, the glory of Yahweh appeared in the cloud as they “looked toward the wilderness” (Exodus 16:7,10; compare Exodus 24:16 f). And just as in Ezekiel, the glory is distinguished from its attendant circumstances; for after the completion of the Tent of Meeting, the cloud covers the tent, and the glory of Yahweh fills the tabernacle (Exodus 40:34 f; see also Leviticus 9:6,23; Numbers 14:21 f; 16:19,42; 20:6). The same thought is suggested in the references in Sirach 17:13; 45:3.

(6) Messianic Ideal.

These passages just cited stand on the border between the historical and the ideal descriptions of the glory of Yahweh, for whatever may be one’s views as to the historical worth of P’s account of the Exodus and the wilderness sojourn, all must agree in seeing in it really the program or constitution for the ideal state of the future. And in this state the distinguishing characteristic is to be the manifest presence of Yahweh in His sanctuary, and this manifestation is the glory. This is the view of Ezekiel, for whom the essential action in the establishment of the new community is the return of the glory of Yahweh to the house of Yahweh (Ezekiel 43:2,4,5; 44:4). The same thought is expressed very clearly in Isaiah 4:5 f, which may be rendered on the basis of a slight rearrangement and regrouping of the original, `And Yahweh will create over .... Matthew Zion ...., a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over everything the glory (of Yahweh) shall be a canopy and a pavilion, and it shall serve as a shelter from the heat, and a refuge and a covert from the storm and the rain.’ This translation has the advantage that it furnishes an intelligible and characteristic conclusion to the description of the Messianic age which the chapter contains. Isaiah 11:10, reading with the Revised Version, margin, “and his resting-place shall be glory,” has the same thought, for it is clearly the glory of Yahweh that is manifested in the resting-place of the root of Jesse, and this resting-place can be none other than Matthew Zion (compare also Isaiah 24:23).

The Psalms and Deuteronomy-Isaiah have many passages in which this phase of the thought is brought out. For both books the restoration of the people from captivity is to be accompanied by, or, perhaps better, itself is,
a revelation of the glory of Yahweh (Isaiah 40:5). The children of Israel have been created for the glory of Yahweh, and hence they must be restored that His glory may be made manifest (Isaiah 43:7). The light of the restored community is to be the glory of Yahweh (Isaiah 60:1 f). The presence of Yahweh brings grace and glory (Psalm 84:11), and His salvation of those that fear Him causes glory to dwell in the land (Psalm 85:9). To these and many similar passages in Isaiah and the Psalms may also be added Sirach 36:14, which refers probably to the manifestation of God in glory in the Messianic kingdom.

(7) Its Ethical Content.

But these passages make it quite evident that “glory” is not always used in the external, literally or figuratively physical sense. It comes to have an ethical significance, and this because, like the holiness with which it is associated in Isaiah 6, it is connected with Yahweh, who is more and more exclusively viewed as an ethical being. As holiness gradually loses its physical sense of aloofness, apartness, and comes to describe moral purity, so glory, because it is an attribute or expression of Yahweh, comes to have a moral sense. This transformation, as we have seen, is already being made in the present text of Exodus 33:18,20, and the connection with holiness in Isaiah 6 makes it almost certain that Isaiah gave the word an ethical connotation. So the God of glory of Psalm 29:3 suggests a moral quality because Yahweh is a moral being. All doubt on this matter disappears when we find the word “glory” used as the term for the essential nature of Yahweh, as we have already found it to be used of man. In Isaiah 42:8, “I am Yahweh, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another,” the meaning would seem to be, my essential character and power, that is, my glory, I will not share with other gods (compare also Isaiah 48:11). And in Isaiah 58:8 the glory must be taken in a figurative sense and refer to Yahweh Himself in His saving grace, who attends His people in advance and in the rear. It hardly seems possible to deny the ethical sense in Ezekiel 39:21, where the manifestation of the glory of Yahweh comes as a result of the execution of His purposes of justice and righteousness upon His people. And in Habakkuk 2:14, the glory of Yahweh which is to be known throughout the earth cannot be limited to any physical, external thing. It is equivalent to the righteous and just will of Yahweh. These passages are sufficient to prove the ethical significance of the word [kabhodh], but it may be worth while to quote one more passage and this time from Psalm 97 with its wonderful description of
the blessings of the righteous rule of Yahweh. It is stated in 97:6 that “the heavens declare his righteousness, and all the peoples have seen his glory.” His righteousness may include, as Kirkpatrick suggests, “His faithfulness to His people and His sovereign justice in the punishment of all,” or it may refer only to the former of these qualities; but in any case, it is a moral act, and by it the peoples recognize the glory of Yahweh as the supreme moral ruler.

IV. IN APOCRYPHA AND NEW TESTAMENT.

“Glory” in the apocryphal books and in the New Testament is almost exclusively the translation of the Greek noun *doxa*. In all these writings the Old Testament usage seems to be the most important, and it seems to be the fact, if one may judge from the Septuagint and from the original Hebrew of Sir, that the Greek noun *doxa*, in the great majority of cases, represents the Hebrew *kabhodh*, so that the underlying thought is Hebrew, even though the words may be Greek

1. In the Apocrypha:

   (1) As Applied to External Things.

   It will be perhaps a little more convenient to deal with the usage of the Apocrypha separately, following essentially the order that has been adopted for the Old Testament discussion of *kabhodh*, and bearing in mind that the usage of Sir has been discussed under the Old Testament. The use of the word “glory” to describe the honor, reputation and splendor which belong to men is quite common. In this sense 1 Esdras 1:33 refers to the glory of Josiah, while in The Wisdom of Solomon 10:14 the perpetual glory given by The Wisdom of Solomon to Joseph must be interpreted in the same way. In 2 Macc 5:16,20 glory refers to the beautification and adornment of the temple in a sense like that of tiph’arah in 236007 Isaiah 60:7. In Judith 15:9 “glory” is the translation of the Greek *gauriama*, and indicates that Judith is the pride of Israel.

   (2) As Applied to God.

   But the most significant use of *doxa* in the Apocrypha is that in which it refers to the light and splendor which are regarded as the invariable accompaniments of God. The reference may be to the historic manifestation of God in glory at Matthew Sinai, as in 2 Esdras 3:19, or to
the manifestation of God in Israel, which is to be the especial characteristic of the Messianic kingdom. In 1 Esdras 5:61 songs sung to the praise of the Lord, “because his goodness and his glory are forever in all Israel,” are based upon the hope that Yahweh is about to establish the Messianic kingdom among the people who have bound themselves to obey His law. In several passages in 2 Esdras the reference seems to be not to the Messianic kingdom in the historical sense, but rather to that kingdom of God which the saints are to inherit after death. This is clearly the thought in 2 Esdras 2:36 and in 7:52; also in 8:51 where the context shows clearly that the reference is to the glory of Paradise, which is the heritage of all those who are like Ezra in their devotion to Yahweh (compare also 2 Esdras 10:50).

But most frequently in the Apocrypha, in a sense which approximates that of the New Testament, the word “glory” refers to the blaze of light and splendor which is the essential expression of the holy majesty of Yahweh. The prayer of Manasseh refers to the unbearable majesty of the glory of Yahweh; while 2 Esdras 8:30, trusting in Yahweh’s glory is equivalent to trusting in Yahweh Himself; and in 16:53 the oath “before God and his glory” is simply before the Lord God Himself. The same thought is expressed in Tobit 12:15; 13:14; The Wisdom of Solomon 7:25. In the Song of Solomon of Three Children, verses 31,33, the glory of Yahweh refers to His self-manifestation in His heavenly kingdom, and this is undoubtedly the significance in the frequently recurring doxologies, “Thine is the glory forever.”

2. In the New Testament:

(1) As Applied to Men.

In the New Testament, much the same variety of usage is to be noted as in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, and it is not easy to trace the exact relationship and order of the various meanings. The ordinary classical use of the word in the sense of “opinion,” “judgment,” “view,” occurs in Hellenistic Greek only in 4 Macc 5:17 (18) on the authority of Thayer.

It is perhaps as convenient to follow generally the order adopted in the preceding discussion. In some places the word refers to the manifestations and insignia of rank and power, as in the familiar phrase, “Solomon in all his glory” (Matthew 6:29), or the glory of the kingdoms of the world (Matthew 4:8), or the glory of the kings and nations of the earth which
shall be brought into the heavenly city (Revelation 21:24,26). *Doxa* also defines the praise, honor and dignity of men. This is the meaning in John 5:41,44, where Christ distinguishes between His accusers and Himself in that He receives not glory from men, while they receive glory one of another (compare also John 7:18). In Ephesians 3:13, Paul declares that his tribulations for those to whom he is writing are a glory or distinction to them, while in 1 Thessalonians 2:20 he declares that the Thessalonian Christians are his glory and joy.

(2) As applied to God.

Closely related to this usage is the employment of the word to ascribe honor and praise to God; see Luke 17:18, where only the stranger returned to give glory to God; or John 9:24, where the man who had been born blind is bidden to give glory to God; or the phrase “to the glory of God” in Romans 15:7, where the meaning is to secure the honor and praise of God among men. Similar is the use in the frequently recurring doxologies such as, “Glory to God in the highest,” “to him,” that is, to God, “be glory,” etc.

While the foregoing meanings are frequently illustrated in the New Testament, it is undoubtedly true that the characteristic use of the word *doxa* in the New Testament is in the sense of brightness, brilliance, splendor; and first of all, in the literal sense, referring to the brightness of the heavenly bodies, as in 1 Corinthians 15:40 f, or to the supernatural brightness which overcame Saul of Tarsus on the road to Damascus (Acts 22:11).

(3) As Applied to the Saints.

But the most common use of the word is to describe the brilliance which is the characteristic of all persons who share in the heavenly glory. Moses, Elijah and Jesus Himself have this glory on the Mountain of Transfiguration (Luke 9:31 f). It was the same glory which gave the angel who came out of heaven power to lighten the earth (Revelation 18:1), and also which shone about the shepherds when the angel appeared unto them (Luke 2:9). Paul refers to this glory, when he speaks of the face of Moses as it appeared after God had spoken with him (2 Corinthians 3:7 f). And as in the case of Moses, so here, the source of this glory is God Himself, who is the God of glory (Acts 7:2, and frequently).
(4) As Applied to the Messianic Kingdom.

It is also used to describe the ideal Messianic kingdom of the future. It is applied to Christ to describe His royal majesty when He comes to set up His kingdom. So James and John ask to sit, one on His right hand and one on His left in His glory (Mark 10:37). Christ is to appear in glory with the angels (Matthew 16:27 and often), for His condition in the coming age as it was before the incarnation is a condition of glory (Luke 24:26; John 17:5,22,24). But not merely the Messiah, but also all His followers shall share in the glory of the Messianic kingdom. This use is so common that it is scarcely necessary to illustrate it by reference. This glory is to be revealed to all Christians in the future (Romans 8:18,21; 9:23; compare also 1 Corinthians 2:7; 2 Corinthians 4:17).

3. Its Ethical Significance:

In all these cases it has a distinctly ethical signification, for it is the term which is used to describe the essential nature, the perfection of the Deity, and is shared by others because they are made partakers of the Divine nature. So Paul refers to “the glory of the incorruptible God” (Romans 1:23; compare also Ephesians 1:17 f, and often). And the essential nature of Christ comes to be described in the same way. He has glory as of the only begotten of the Father (John 1:14); he shows His glory in the performance of miracles (John 2:11); and like the Father, He is the Lord of glory (1 Corinthians 2:8).

As a verb in the Old Testament the most common signification of the word “glory” is, to make one’s boast in or of anything, usually of the pious glorying in Yahweh (Yahweh), but occasionally with some other reference, as in Jeremiah 9:23 of man glorying in his riches, might or wisdom. In all these cases it represents the Hebrew hith-hallel. In Exodus 8:9 the phrase, “Have thou this glory over me,” is the translation of the Hebrew hith-pa’er, and means take to thyself the honor or distinction as regards me. In 2 Kings 14:10 it translates the Hebrew hik-kabhedh, “honor thyself,” i.e. be satisfied with the home which you have already attained.

In the Apocryphal books it means either “glorify thyself,” the middle voice of the verb doxazo, as in Sirach 3:10, where the original Hebrew has hith-kabbedh, or “to exult,” “boast over,” as in Judith 9:7, where it represents the Greek gauromai; or “to boast,” “take pride in,” where it represents, as it does usually in the New Testament, the Greek kauchaomai (Sirach
17:9; 24:1; 38:25; 39:8; 48:4, in the second and fourth of which cases it represents the Hebrew hith-pa’er).

In the New Testament the verb is used 3 times in James, and several times in the Epistles of Paul, and everywhere is used to translate the verb kauchaomai, or, in two cases in James, the same verb is compounded with the preposition kata. In all these cases the meaning is “to take pride in,” “to congratulate oneself,” upon anything.

In this connection attention may be called to the use of the noun “glorying,” once or twice rendered “to glory,” where the meaning is either the occasion or ground of glorying, or sometimes the act of glorying. The original has kauchema or kauchesis. This usage occurs in Jas 4:16; Hebrews 3:6, and several times in the Epistles of Paul.
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Walter R. Betteridge

**GLOWING, SAND**

<glow’-ing>, (Isaiah 35:11).

*See MIRAGE.*

**GLUTTON; GLUTTONOUS**

<glut’-’n>, <glut’-’n-us> ([z; zalal], “to be lavish”; [φάγος, phagos]): “Glutton” (from glut, to swallow greedily) is the translation of zolel from zalal, “to shake or pour out,” “to be lavish, a squanderer.” In Deuteronomy 21:20, “This our son ... is a glutton, and a drunkard,” the
word may mean a squanderer or prodigal; the English Revised Version has “a riotous liver.” In \textit{Proverbs 23:21}, “For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty” (following zole bhasar, “squanderers of flesh,” the Revised Version (British and American) “gluttonous eaters of flesh”), “glutton” in the usual sense is intended; “a man gluttonous,” “a gluttonous man” (the Revised Version) (\textit{phagos}, “an eater,” “a glutton”) was a term applied to Christ in His freedom from asceticism (\textit{Matthew 11:19}; \textit{Luke 7:34}).

The Revised Version has “idle gluttons” (margin Greek, “bellies”) for “slow bellies” (\textit{Titus 1:12); “gluttonous” “gluttons,” for “riotous” (\textit{Proverbs 23:20; 28:7}).

\textit{W. L. Walker}

\textbf{GNASH}

\texttt{\textlt<nash> ([q r ” j ; charaq]; [βρυγμός, brugmos]): “Gnash” is used of grinding or striking together the teeth in rage, pain or misery of disappointment. In the Old Testament it is the translation of \textit{charak}, a mimetic word, and represents for the most part rage, anger, hatred (\textit{Job 16:9}, “He gnasheth upon me with his teeth,” the Revised Version (British and American) “hath gnashed upon me”; \textit{Psalm 35:16; 37:12; 112:10}, grief; \textit{Lamentations 2:16}, contempt or derision); \textit{brucho}, “to gnash the teeth in rage,” indicates anger, rage, Septuagint for \textit{charaq} (\textit{Acts 7:54}, of Stephen, “They gnashed on him with their teeth”). The several instances of \textit{brugmos}, “gnashing,” in the Gospels seem to express disappointment rather than anger (\textit{Matthew 8:12},”There shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the weeping and the gnashing of teeth”; \textit{Matthew 13:42,50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30}; \textit{Luke 13:28} — a vivid representation of the misery of disappointed expectations; compare Ecclesiasticus 30:10, “lest thou shalt gnash thy teeth in the end,” \textit{gompheazo}, “to have the teeth set on edge”); \textit{trizo} (\textit{Mark 9:18}), which means “to give out a creaking, grating sound,” “to screak,” is used in the New Testament (in the above instance only) to mean “to grate or gnash with the teeth,” indicating the effect of a paroxysm, the Revised Version (British and American) “grindeth his teeth.”

\textit{W. L. Walker}
GNAT

<nat> (in English Versions of the Bible, only in Matthew 23:24, [κώνωψ, konops]. In Exodus 8:16, for English Versions of the Bible “lice,” one of the plagues of Egypt, [µ NK i kinnim], [µ yNK i kinniym], or [µ NK i kinnam], we find in the Revised Version, margin “sand flies” or “fleas” (Gesenius “gnat”; Mandelkern “culex”). For kemo ken (Isaiah 51:6), English Versions of the Bible “in like manner,” Septuagint [structors ταῦτα, hosper tauta], Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) sicut haec, the Revised Version, margin has “like gnats” since [‘K eken], elsewhere “thus,” may here be taken to be a singular of the form [µ yNK i kinnim], which occurs in Exodus 8): In the New Testament passage, the difference between the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) should be noted. “Strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel” is changed to “strain out the gnat and swallow the camel,” the reference being to the inconsistency of the Jewish religious leaders in taking extraordinary pains in some things, as in the preparation of food, while leaving weightier matters unattended to.

In Isaiah 51:6, the suggestion of the Revised Version, margin, “They that dwell therein shall die like gnats,” seems a decided improvement on the “shall die in like manner” of English Versions of the Bible, especially as ken, “thus” (see supra), is a repetition of kemo, whose meaning is practically the same, “in like manner” being the rendering in English Versions of the Bible of kemo ken.

As to the creatures, kinnim, of the Egyptian plague, there is little choice between “lice” of English Versions of the Bible and the others suggested, except as we may be influenced by the Septuagint rendering, skniphes, which may mean “gnats” or “mosquitoes.”

See FLEA; LICE.

Alfred Ely Day

GNOSTICISM

<nos'-ti-siz'-m>:

Gnosticism — except perhaps in 1 Timothy 6:20, where Paul warns Timothy against “the gnosis, which is falsely so called” — is not directly
alluded to in the New Testament. Nevertheless its leaven was actually working, as will immediately be seen, and constituted a most serious peril in the apostolic church. “That strange, obscure movement, partly intellectual, partly fanatical .... in the 2nd century spread with the swiftness of an epidemic over the church from Syria to Gaul” (Law, The Tests of Life, 26). It is therefore of high importance to gain a right conception of the nature of this potent and-Christian influence. This is not easy. The difficulty in dealing with Gnosticism is that it was not a homogeneous system of either religion or philosophy, but embraced many widely diversified sects holding opinions drawn from a great variety of sources. “The infinitely varied shapes assumed by the systems render it almost impossible to classify them, or even to give an account of their leading ideas, which shall not be open to objection. We might as well try to classify the products of a tropical jungle, or the shapes and hues of the sunset clouds, which change under our view as we look at them” (Orr, The Progress of Dogma, 58).

I. GENERAL DEFINITION.

On the general definition of Gnosticism a few authorities may be cited. “Gnosticism,” says Dr. Gwatkin, “may be provisionally described as a number of schools of philosophy, oriental in general character, but taking in the idea of a redemption through Christ, and further modified in different sects by a third element, which may be Judaism, Hellenism, or Christianity .... the Gnostics took over only the idea of a redemption through Christ, not the full Christian doctrine, for they made it rather a redemption of the philosophers from matter, than a redemption of mankind from sin” (Early Church History to AD 313, II, 20).

Dr. Orr writes, “Gnosticism may be described generally as the fantastic product of the blending of certain Christian ideas — particularly that of redemption through Christ — with speculation and imaginings derived from a medley of sources (Greek, Jewish, Parsic; philosophies; religions, theosophies, mysteries) in a period when the human mind was in a kind of ferment, and when opinions of every sort were jumbled together in an unimaginable welter. It involves, as the name denotes, a claim to `knowledge,’ knowledge of a kind of which the ordinary believer was incapable, and in the possession of which `salvation’ in the full sense consisted. This knowledge of which the Gnostic boasted, related to the
subjects ordinarily treated of in religious philosophy; Gnosticism was a species of religious philosophy” (The Early Church, 71).

Neander has described Gnosticism as “the first notable attempt to introduce into Christianity the existing elements of mental culture, and to render it more complete on the hitherto rather neglected side of theoretical knowledge; it was an attempt of the mind of the ancient world in its yearning after knowledge, and in its dissatisfaction with the present, to bring within its grasp and to appropriate the treasures of this kind which Christianity presented” (Antignostikus, Intro, 199).

Gnosticism accordingly comprehends in itself many previously existing tendencies; it is an amalgam into which quite a number of different elements have been fused. A heretical system of thought, at once subtle, speculative and elaborate, it endeavored to introduce into Christianity a so-called higher knowledge, which was grounded partly on the philosophic creed in which Greeks and Romans had taken refuge consequent on the gradual decay and breaking-up of their own religions, partly, as will be shown, on the philosophies of Plato and of Philo, and still more on the philosophies and theosophies and religions of the East, especially those of Persia and of India.

“For a long time the pagan beliefs had ceased to be taken seriously by thoughtful men and had been displaced by various creeds derived from philosophical speculation. These in themselves were abstract and unsatisfying, but had been partly vitalized by union with theosophies of the East. An attempt was made on the part of this philosophical religion to effect an alliance with Christianity. A section of the church was dissatisfied with the simplicity of the gospel, and sought to advance to something higher by adopting the current speculations ..... The late books of the New Testament are all occupied, more or less, with this movement, which was the more dangerous as it threatened the church from within” (Professor E. Scott, The Apologetic of the New Testament, 14).

Gnosticism, though usually regarded as a heresy, was not really such: it was not the perverting of Christian truth; it came, rather, from outside. Having worked its way into the Christian church, it was then heretical. “Although it became a corrupting influence within the church, it was an alien by birth. While the church yet sojourned within the pale of Judaism, it enjoyed immunity from this plague; but as soon as it broke through these
narrow bounds, it found itself in a world where the decaying religions and philosophies of the West were in acute fermentation under the influence of a new and powerful leaven from the East; while the infusion of Christianity itself into this fermenting mass only added to the bewildering multiplicity of Gnostic sects and systems it brought forth” (Law, The Tests of Life, 26).

II. SOURCES OF Gnosticism.

Mansel (in his work on The Gnostic Heresies, 32) sums up the principal sources of Gnosticism in these three, Platonism, the Persian religion, and the Buddhism of India. To Platonism it owed much of its philosophical form and tendencies. From the Dualism of the Per religion it derived its speculations regarding the origin of evil, and much of what it taught about emanations. To Buddhism, he thinks, it owed the doctrine of the antagonism between matter and spirit, and the unreality of derived existence — the germ of Docetism. Mansel also holds that there is the possibility that Gnosticism derived certain of its features from the Kabbala (qabbalah), or secret teaching of the Jews in the two books, the Cepher yetsirah, or Book of Creation, and the Zohar, or Book of Light. An influence of Buddhism on Gnosticism, however, may safely be doubted, as there is no reason to believe that the knowledge of Buddhist doctrine had so early penetrated into the West. The Jewish works named by Mansel are really products of the Middle Ages (Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 144-45). The other sources named were really influential. We notice two — the Alexandrian philosophy and the Parsic dualism.

1. Alexandrian Philosophy:

Alexandrian philosophy endeavored to unite Greek philosophy and Hebrew religion. Philo, the great Jewish commentator of Alexandria, had tried to interpret the ancient Jewish Scriptures by the aid of the Greek philosophy, to expound the Old Testament in terms of Plato’s thought and to discover allegorical meanings where none were intended. In Philo’s teaching there is a sharp line drawn between God and the material world: with him God cannot exert any action upon the world of matter, except through intermediate agency, the Jewish angels and the heathen demons. Philo has much to say in regard to the Logos. His utterances on this subject may be compared with what is said of the attributes of “Wisdom” in chapter 8 of the Book of Prov, and also with the Logos or “Word” of the Gospel of John. With Philo, the Logos is the power of God, or the Divine reason
endowed with energy, and embracing within itself all subordinate powers. The Logos is impersonal in its relations to God; and herein is one huge difference between Philo’s conception and that in the gospel. Philo teaches that the Logos is the only firstborn of God, the chief of the angels, the viceroy of God, and representative of man.

See LOGOS.

According to Philo the creation of the universe was a gradual molding out of matter; hence, arises evil. He also teaches the preexistence of the soul, which is now imprisoned in the flesh. The wise man, therefore, will break the thralldom of the flesh, and will rise by a sort of ecstasy to the immediate vision of God. It will be seen how much of this teaching was assimilated by the various Gnostic sects.

2. Zoroastrianism:

The Zoroastrian or Persian system was based on the assumption that there existed two original and independent powers of good and evil, of light and darkness, Ormuzd (Ahura-Mazda), the wise Lord, and Ahriman (Angra-Mainyu), the wicked spirit. These powers were believed to be equal, and each supreme in his own domain. The earth, which was created by Ormuzd, became the battlefield of the two powers. Ahriman led away the first man and woman from their allegiance to Ormuzd, and so all evils result to mankind.

“In oriental (Persian) dualism,” says Professor Bousset, “it is within this material world that the good and the evil powers are at war, and this world beneath the stars is by no means conceived as entirely subject to evil. Gnosticism has combined the two, the Greek opposition between spirit and matter, and the sharp Zoroastrian dualism, which, where the Greek mind conceived of a higher and a lower world, saw instead two hostile worlds standing in contrast to each other like light and darkness. And out of the combination of these two dualisms arose the teaching of Gnosticism with its thoroughgoing pessimism and its fundamental asceticism” (“Gnosticism,” in Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition, XII, 154).

III. NATURE OF Gnosticism.

“Gnosticism,” says Dr. Gwatkin, “is Christianity perverted by learning and speculation” (Early Church History 73). The intellectual pride of the Gnostics refined away the gospel into a philosophy. The clue to the
understanding of Gnosticism is given in the word from which it is derived — *gnosis*, “knowledge.” Gnosticism puts knowledge in the place which can only rightly be occupied by Christian faith. To the Gnostic the great question was not the intensely practical one, “What must I do to be saved from sin?” but “What is the origin of evil?” “How is the primitive order of the universe to be restored?” In the knowledge of these and of similar questions, and in the answers given to these questions, there was redemption, as the Gnostic understood it.

“These little Gnostic sects and groups all lived in the conviction that they possessed a secret and mysterious knowledge, in no way accessible to those outside, which was not to be proved or propagated, but believed in by the initiated, and anxiously guarded as a secret. This knowledge of theirs was not based on reflection or scientific inquiry and proof, but on revelation. It was derived directly from the times of primitive Christianity, from the Savior Himself and His disciples and friends, with whom they claimed to be connected by a secret tradition, or else from later prophets, of whom many sects boasted. It was laid down in wonderful mystic writings, which were in the possession of the various circles.

“In short, Gnosticism in all its various sections, its form and its character, falls under the category of mystic religions, which were so characteristic of the religious life of decadent antiquity. In Gnosticism, as in the other mystic religions, we find the same contrast of the initiated and the uninitiated, the same loose organization, the same kind of petty sectarianism and mystery-mongering. All alike boast a mystic revelation and a deeply veiled wisdom” (Bousset, op. cit., 153).

**Chief Points in Gnosticism:**

The questions, therefore, with which Gnosticism concerned itself were those of the relation of the finite and the infinite, the origin of the world and of evil, the cause, meaning, purpose and destiny of all things, the reason of the difference in the capacities and in the lot in life of individual men, the method of salvation. The following may be regarded as the chief points in the characteristics of the Gnostic systems:

1. A claim on the part of the initiated to a special knowledge of the truth, a tendency to regard knowledge as superior to faith, and as the special possession of the more enlightened, for ordinary Christians did not possess this secret and higher doctrine.
(2) The essential separation of matter and spirit, the former of these being essentially evil, and the source from which all evil has arisen.

(3) An attempt at the solution of the problems of creation and of the origin of evil by the conception of a Demiurge, i.e. a Creator or Artificer of the world as distinct from the Supreme Deity, and also by means of emanations extending between God and the visible universe. It should be observed that this conception merely concealed the difficulties of the problem, and did not solve them.

(4) A denial of the true humanity of Christ, a docetic Christology, (which looked upon the earthly life of Christ and especially on His sufferings on the cross as unreal.

(5) The denial of the personality of the Supreme God, and the denial also of the free will of man.

(6) The teaching, on the one hand, of asceticism as the means of attaining to spiritual communion with God, and, on the other hand, of an indifference which led directly to licentiousness.

(7) A syncretistic tendency which combined certain more or less misunderstood Christian doctrines, various elements from oriental and Jewish and other sources.

(8) The Scriptures of the Old Testament were ascribed to the Demiurge or inferior Creator of the world, who was the God of the Jews, but not the true God. Some of these characteristic ideas are more obvious in one, and some of them in others of the Gnostic systems. The relation of these ideas to Christian facts and doctrines is dealt with more particularly below.

IV. GNOSTICISM IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

In the New Testament and the Apostolic Age.

The germ of Gnosticism in the Christian church made its appearance in the apostolic age, and is referred to by Paul in several of his epistles, notably in that to the Colossians and in the Pastoral Epistles. It is also referred to by the apostles Peter and Jude; references to it are found, besides, in the Apocalypse, the First Epistle of John and the Gospel of John.
1. Colossians:

In Col a great deal is said regarding a false teaching, an insidious theosophist doctrine, the teachers of which were alienating the Christians in Colosse from the gospel, and were disseminating their speculations, which led to the worship of angels in contrast to the worship of Christ, to esoteric exclusiveness wholly opposed to the universality of the gospel, and to an asceticism injurious to Christian freedom, and derogatory to the human body as indwelt by the Holy Ghost. These tenets are identical with the more fully developed Gnosticism of the generation succeeding that of the apostles; and at the root of the Colossian false teaching there lay the same error which the Gnostic mind had no way of meeting, namely, that there could be no connection between the highest spiritual agency, that is God, and gross corporeal matter.

From this theoretical basis arose another error — that as sin is inherent in the material substance of the body, therefore the only way by which perfection can be reached is to punish the body by asceticism, so that through the infliction of pain and the mortification of the flesh the region of pure spirit may be reached, and thus man may be etherealized and become like God. This ascetic tendency is wonderfully widespread; it reappears century after century, and shows itself in many forms of religion, not merely in distorted forms of Christianity, but in the Hindu religions, in Buddhism and elsewhere. In the Epistle to the Colossians, accordingly, there are definite references to ascetic practices which were inculcated by the false teachers at Colosse. The very terms which they employed have been preserved, “Touch not,” “Taste not,” “Handle not.” It was in this way that these teachers had “at their own hand” invented a worship different from that of the Christian faith, which endeavored to attain the deliverance of the soul by “the neglecting of the body” (Colossians 2:21,23 the King James Version). These Gnostic teachers showed these tendencies still more boldly when Paul wrote his First Epistle to Timothy (see below), for he describes them as “forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats” (1 Timothy 4:3). These ascetic practices were afterward taught by various Gnostic sects, the Encratites, the followers of Saturninus, and others.

These tendencies in the Colossian church Paul set himself to correct in his epistle. The method which he adopts is not so much to demolish error, as to establish the contrary truth, setting before the Colossians the person and
work of Christ, Christ the Creator, Christ in whom there dwells not merely some or even much of the fullness of God, but all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; Christ the God of providence, the Upholder of all things, in whom matter and all creatures and all events “consist” and have their being; Christ the Reconciler who has reconciled us unto God through the blood of the cross. In view of truths like these, Colossian error and all other forms of Gnosticism crumble into decay and vanish.

See COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

2. 1 Corinthians: “Knowledge” at Corinth:

The Epistle to the Colossians is the first of the Pauline Epistles in which distinctively Gnostic teaching is found in its attack upon the Christian faith. But from incidental notices in epistles of Paul written at an earlier period, it can be seen how congenial was the soil into which Gnostic teaching was about to fall. For even in Corinth when Paul wrote his First Epistle to the church there, there had been a claim on the part of some that they possessed “knowledge,” as if others were destitute of it, a claim which the apostle refuses to admit, and meets with stern resistance. They thought themselves “wise,” they were given to disputing, they professed that they “all had knowledge” (1 Corinthians 8:1), nay, they could “know all mysteries and all knowledge” (1 Corinthians 13:2); but this knowledge did not edify them, did not build them up, it only puffed them up (1 Corinthians 8:1); it did not make them sympathetic or tender-hearted toward the weak (1 Corinthians 8:7-11).

3. Pastoral Epistles:

In 1 Timothy 6:20,21 Paul speaks of the “knowledge (the gnosis) which is falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith.” In other places in that epistle reference is made to tenets which are exactly those of Gnosticism. In 1:4 the apostle speaks of “fables and endless genealogies, which minister questionings, rather than a dispensation of God which is in faith.” Philo had given a great impetus to an allegorizing interpretation of the Old Testament. His writings were well known and were popular in many of the Jewish schools. These fanciful interpretations would hinder the growth of the Christian church; and this allegorizing of Scripture, joined to the teaching of the genealogies of the eons, would leave no place for a Redeemer. In 4:3, as already noted, Paul describes ascetic practices which were regarded by their votaries as most
meritorious. To abstain from marriage and from various kinds of food was the teaching of the Essenes and also of the Gnostics. This ascetic teaching was unnatural, as contrary to the constitution of the world, as that has been arranged by a holy and wise Creator, and it is also subversive of Christian liberty. Nothing can be esteemed common or unclean without throwing a reproach upon the Creator.

**Antinomian Development.**

But another and contrary result also followed from the principles of the sinfulness of matter and of redemption as deliverance from the flesh, namely, that there was an easier way of relief, by treating the soul and the body as separate entities which have nothing in common. Let the soul go its way on the wings of spiritual thought, while the body may indulge its fleshly desires. For, so it was held, as body and soul are entirely distinct in their nature, the spiritual cannot be defiled by anything, however carnal and gross, that the body can do. This was the antinomian development of Gnosticism. Many traces of this are apparent in the Pastoral Epistles and in 2 Peter and Jude. The Gnostics, against whom Paul warns Timothy, were “lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, haughty, rollers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, without self-control, fierce, no lovers of good, traitors, headstrong, puffed-up, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God; holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof” (2 Timothy 3:2,3,4). Such, too, is the testimony borne regarding them by Ignatius (Law, The Tests of Life, 30): (“They give no heed to love, caring not for the widow, the orphan or the afflicted, neither for those who are in bonds, nor for those who are released from bonds, neither for the hungry nor the thirsty.” Such persons professed that they knew God, but by their works they denied Him; they were “abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate” (Titus 1:16). They enticed others into sins of impurity (2 Timothy 3:5,6). They allured others through the lusts of the flesh; and the means by which they succeeded in doing this was that they spoke great swelling words of vanity, and the end was that in their destroying of others they themselves also were surely destroyed (2 Peter 2:12,18). They were ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ; they gave themselves up to the sins of the flesh, and ran riotously after error in hope of a gain in money; they were sensual men, not having the Spirit (Jude 1:4,8,11,19) The entire Epistle of Jude is directed against this
antinomian and licentious development of Gnosticism, and against its terrible permission of an unholy life (see below on the Book of Revelation).

4. 1 John:

In the First Epistle of John there is a distinct polemical purpose. There is no book of the New Testament which is more purposeful in its attack of error. There is “the spirit of error” (1 John 4:6), opposing the Spirit of truth. “Many false prophets are gone out into the world” (1 John 4:1), and this from the church itself, “They went out from us, but they were not of us” (1 John 2:19); and these false prophets are distinctly named “the antichrist” (1 John 2:22) and “the liar” (same place), and “the deceiver and the antichrist” (2 John 1:7). This peril, against which the apostle writes, and from which he seeks to defend the church, was Gnosticism, as is proved by what is said again and again in the epistle of the characteristics of this insidious and deadly teaching.

(1) Gnostic Claims.

The Gnostic claim to knowledge throws light upon many passages in this epistle. John refers to his opponents’ using such phrases as “I know God,” “I abide in Christ,” “I am in the light.” These lofty claims were made by persons who did not love their brethren on earth, who did not walk in Christ’s footsteps, and who were destitute of love. The apostle therefore describes these lofty claims as false, because those who made them possessed neither love nor obedience.

In contrast to these Gnostic claims — for those who made them were no other than the early Gnostics — John shows how the Christ of history is the Christ of experience: for those to whom he is writing know Christ, who is from the beginning, and they know the Father. “We know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life” (1 John 5:20). This knowledge of God and communion with Him are attained, not by Gnostic speculation, but by the obedience of faith, the outcome of which is brotherly love and a life in which the Christian walks even as Christ did (1 John 2:6). And thus also obedience and brotherly love are the test of the profession which any man may make that he knows God. “Every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him,” (1 John 2:29); “Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother” (1 John 3:10).
(2) Its Loveless Nature.

Gnosticism was distinguished by an unethical, loveless intellectualism. This seems to be the explanation of the false teaching against which this epistle is directed. The apostle describes the dry head-knowledge which left the heart and life untouched by love, and which led men, while they professed to love God, nevertheless to remain destitute of love to their fellow-men. (They did not fold their human brethren to their hearts, they were dead to the fact that where pity dwells, the love of God dwells also. In Gnosticism knowledge was in itself the supreme end and purpose of life, the sum of highest good to which a man could attain, the crown of life. The system was loveless to the core.

(3) Docetism.

Now, when the attempt was made to amalgamate these Gnostic ideas with the Christian faith, the inevitable result was Docetism. Just because God cannot have any immediate contact with matter, therefore the incarnation of Almighty God in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ is inconceivable. From this position it is, of course, only a step to deny that the incarnation and the true human life of Christ ever took place at all.

(4) The Antichrist.

The Antichrist of the First Epistle of John is docetic Gnosticism. The soul of the apostle rushes onward, with glowing zeal for the honor of his Master whom Gnosticism dishonored, to identify personally the historical Jesus with the Divine Being, “the Son of God,” “the Word of Life,” “the Christ.” “Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, even he that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also” (1 John 2:22,23). It should be noted that the last clause in 1 John 2:23, which is printed in italics in the King James Version, is restored in the Revised Version (British and American) to its rightful position in the original text. “Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already” (1 John 4:2,3).
(5) Its Antinomian Side.

The antinomian side of Gnosticism is not so directly referred to in the First Epistle of John as Docetism is; but evidences are manifest that the apostle had it clearly before him. “Little children,” he writes, “let no man lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous: he that doeth sin is of the devil” (1 John 3:7,8). And these were the methods by which those deceivers endeavored to lead the members of the church astray. They alleged that sin was a thing indifferent in itself. It made no difference to the spiritual man whether he sinned with his body or not. It is for this reason that the apostle, in opposing those teachers, insists that “sin is lawlessness” (1 John 3:4); “All unrighteousness is sin” (1 John 5:17); “Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin” (1 John 3:9); “In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother” (1 John 3:10). The whole passage presupposes, as familiar to its readers, a doctrine of moral indifferentism, according to which the status of the `spiritual’ man is not to be tested by the commonplace facts of moral conduct” (The Tests of Life, 34).

See JOHN, FIRST EPISTLE OF.

5. “To Know the Depths”: Revelation:

As time advanced, and the later books of the New Testament were written, Gnosticism assumed more of its distinctive peculiarities. “Those who had knowledge” regarded themselves as a superior order of believers. One of their phrases was “to know the depths” (Revelation 2:24 the King James Version), and this was valued far more highly than love and obedience. “From this language, we may, I think, infer the existence of an Ophite sect, boasting of its peculiar gnosis, before the date of the Apocalypse” (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 105). The claim of the Ophites was that they alone knew “the depths.” “Yes,” is the apostle’s reply to claims of this kind, “yes, the depths, but not of God, the depths of Satan”; for such is a just description of a teaching which ascribed the origin and the working of evil to God. It is in the light of Gnostic teaching of this sort that the meaning can be seen of the same apostle’s language in his First Epistle, “And this is the message which we have heard from him and announce unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all” (1 John 1:5).
The Nicolaitans.

In the Epistles to the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse there are other references to Gnosticism. Who the Nicolaitans were (Revelation 2:6,15) is not absolutely certain; but it is not unlikely that they were so called because of their having assumed the name of “Nicolaus, a proselyte of Antioch” (Acts 6:5). The first step to the reception of Gentile believers into the Christian church on an equal footing with the Jews may have been the appointment of Nicolaus as one of the first deacons, for the facts that he was a native of Antioch and a proselyte, show that he had been a heathen by birth. And it is noteworthy to find such a person appointed to office in the church at so very early a period, even before the conversion of the apostle Paul. The Nicolaitans therefore may have distorted in an antinomian sense the doctrine taught by Nicolaus, who in all probability proclaimed the liberty of the gospel, as his fellow-deacon, Stephen, did (Acts 7 throughout). But the liberty claimed by the Nicolaitans was liberty to sin. They are mentioned in the Epistle to Ephesus, and their deeds are characterized as deeds which Christ hates (Revelation 2:6). Their name occurs again in the Epistle to Pergamum, and there also their doctrine is described as a doctrine which the Lord hates (Revelation 2:15). Their teaching was one of licentiousness — eating things sacrificial to idols, and committing fornication (Revelation 2:14). Again in the Epistle to Thyatira, the Gnostics are spoken of as practicing the same evil courses, and as holding a doctrine of “the depths of Satan” (Revelation 2:20,21,24 the King James Version) — see above. The persons mentioned in the Epistle to Philadelphia were also evidently Gnostics. They are described as being “of the synagogue of Satan” (Revelation 3:9).

“In the language of Jude, as in that of Peter, which it closely imitates, we may clearly discern a reference to the Gnostic sect of the Nicolaitans mentioned by name in Revelation. The comparison in all these passages, of the error condemned with that of Balaam, is decisive as to the identity of the persons intended. The other characteristics noted by Peter are also repeated by Jude — their denial of the Lord, their profligate lives, their contempt of government, and evil speaking of dignities and of things that they know not, their pollution of the feasts of charity, their great swelling words. The antinomian, no less than the ascetic side of Gnosticism, seems by this time to have fully manifested itself” (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 71).
V. THE CHRISTIAN ANTITHESIS.

The principal points of contrast between Gnosticism and Christian teaching in regard to leading doctrines will now be apparent, and can be briefly summarized.

1. God and the World:

According to the Gnostics, God is thought of as the ultimate, nameless, unknowable Being, of whom they speak as the “Abyss.” He is perfect, but the material world is alien to the Divine nature. How then does it come to exist at all? What is the source of its imperfections and evils?

How Did the World Originate?

The Gnostic answer is that the pleroma or fullness of the Deity (see FULLNESS) could flow out in no other way than in emanations or eons or angels, all of which are necessarily imperfect, the highest of these emanations or eons or angels being more spiritual than the grade immediately below it. Of these eons there is a gradation so numerous, that at length the lowest of them is almost wholly corporeal, the spiritual element having been gradually diminished or eliminated, until at last the world of man and of matter is reached, the abode of evil. In this way the gulf is bridged between God and the world of mankind. The highest eons approximate closely to the Divine nature, so spiritual are they and so nearly free from matter. These form the highest hierarchy of angels, and these as well as many other grades of the angelic host are to be worshipped.

In opposition to this view, Christian faith worships God as the free self-sufficient Creator, infinitely good and wise and powerful and holy, the Author of all things, and affirms creation as an incomprehensible fact revealed to faith, and which rises above the grasp of the understanding. “By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear” (Hebrews 11:3 the King James Version).

2. Evil:

The doctrine of evil follows directly from the above account of the relation of God to the world. According to Gnosticism the manifestation of God is possible only through self-limitation on His part, for in His essence God is the unfathomable Abyss. Through this Divine self-limitation are evolved,
first, the Divine powers or attributes, which previously were hidden in the Abyss of His being. These Divine powers (the pleroma) become the principles of all further developments of life. Life continues to be unfolded in such a way that its successive grades sink farther and farther from the purity of God, the life is feebler the nearer they come to matter, with which, at length, they blend. Such, according to Gnosticism, is the origin of evil.

Whenever men are not content with acknowledging evil to be the act of their own free will, which has chosen to forsake its absolute dependence upon God; whenever they go beyond this and seek for another origin of evil, then one of two results follows. They either limit the holiness of God, and find the cause of evil in God Himself, thus annihilating all distinction between good and evil — which is Pantheism; or they limit the power of God by granting the existence of an eternal evil power beyond the control of God — which is Dualism. In avoiding Pantheism, Gnosticism accepted the dualistic solution, ascribing to evil an eternal self-subsistent nature, which is to make it absolute as God Himself is. As absolute self-subsistence can be affirmed of none but God, the eternally self-subsistent evil of Dualism must be God, which it cannot possibly be, because it is not good. Here is the self-contradiction on which Gnosticism was wrecked.

(1) The Christian Doctrine of Sin.

Directly contrary to this is the Christian doctrine, according to which evil is the refusal of the creature-will to lean absolutely and utterly on God, upon His care and love and upholding grace. Sin is that which ought not to be; it has no right to exist at all; it is defiance of God; it is moral transgression; its magnitude cannot be exaggerated. If it could, it would dethrone God. It has defied His righteousness and wisdom and holiness and even His grace. Sin therefore is dealt with by God in two ways, either by direct punishment or by redemption, in which provision is made for its removal by its being borne by the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world.

The Gnostic idea of the origin of evil follows at once from, and is inseparably involved in, their dualistic interpretation of nature. The question “What is sin?” is no mere academic or philosophical discussion, in which one opinion may be as good as another. “Everything in Christianity is connected more or less directly with the great facts of Sin and Redemption; and the plan of Redemption, which is the essence of
Christianity, cannot be rightly understood until the doctrine of Sin be adequately recognized and established. Here, certainly, if anywhere, Christian theology must fight pro aris et focis” (Julius Muller, quoted in Dr. Orr’s Sin as a Problem of Today, 6).

(2) Sin and the Moral Law.

The universality of sin, its persistence, its gravity, its power to destroy and to deprave — these are facts which can hardly be exaggerated. To view sin aright, it is impossible to leave out of sight its relation to moral law, to God, and to His kingdom. Sin is the transgression of moral law; it is transgression also against a holy God, of whose character and will moral law is a transcript or reflection. “Sin is transgression against God, the substitution of the creature-will for the will of the Creator; revolt of the creature-will from God” (Sin as a Problem of Today, 7). It is the resolve of the will to make itself independent of God and to renounce His authority. Sin is self-will, false independence, freedom which ends in bondage and misery.

But in Gnosticism sin is something quite different; it is not the act and the disposition of the human will in rebellion against God; it is only a physical fact or quality inherent in the body and in matter everywhere. Redemption therefore does not consist in the work of Christ for us on the cross, and the applying of the benefits of that work by the Holy Spirit of God in the renewal of the moral nature of man. Redemption is simply each man’s efforts to secure emancipation from the flesh — from physical evil.

3. Christ and Redemption:

It is easily seen that a system of this kind had no need of Christ and leaves no place for redemption in the Christian sense of that term. Redemption in this scheme of thought is not deliverance from sin, it is not removal of guilt and renewing of the mind. It is something quite different, and consists in the restoration of the cosmic order and illumination of the mind of the select few through knowledge. Christ is not the Savior who saves His people from their sins, and who gives them unceasingly, through union with Himself, deliverance from the power of sin. He is only one of the eons, the highest of them. He is an originated being, and not God. There is thus no place in Gnosticism either for the creation of the universe by God, or for the incarnation and work of Christ. Once grant that matter is essentially evil, and there is excluded the possibility of Christ’s having
assumed a true human nature, simply for the one reason that the world and human nature are originally and necessarily evil. Thus, as already seen, we are landed in Docetism.

The Christology of the Gnostics accordingly assumed one of two types. “One class of early Gnostics separated the spiritual being Christ from the man Jesus; they supposed that the Christ entered Jesus at the time of His baptism, and left Him at the moment of His crucifixion. Thus the Christ was neither born as a man nor suffered as a man. In this way they obviated the difficulty, insuperable to the Gnostic mind, of conceiving the connection between the highest spiritual agency and gross corporeal matter, which was involved in the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation and Passion, and which Gnostics of another type more effectually set aside by the doctrine of Docetism, i.e. by assuming that the human body of our Lord was only a phantom body, and not real flesh and blood. Irenaeus represents the former class as teaching that `Jesus was the receptacle of the Christ,’ and that the Christ `descended upon Him from heaven in the form of a dove, and after He had declared to mankind the nameless Father, entered again into the pleroma imperceptibly and invisibly.’ Here no names are given. But in another passage he ascribes precisely the same doctrine, without however naming the pleroma, to Cerinthus” (Lightfoot, Colossians, 264). How strenuously this doctrine was combated in apostolic circles has already been shown in speaking of John’s First Epistle.

4. Asecticism and Antinomianism:

The necessary consequence of the Gnostic theory in an ascetic morality which passed over by sure steps into antinomian license has likewise been fully illustrated in the foregoing, and need not be further enlarged on. The whole has its root in a false intellectualism, to which the gospel in its inculcation of humility, faith and dependence upon God’s Spirit for guidance into truth is, in its inmost principle, opposed.

VI. HARNACK’S VIEW OF GNOSTICISM.

Harnack’s view of Gnosticism differs from that now given in laying the chief emphasis on its Judeo-Hellenistic side. He describes well how, when Christianity appeared, an extensive spiritualizing or allegorizing of the Old Testament had already taken place. “This spiritualizing was the result of a philosophic view of religion, and this philosophic view was the outcome of a lasting influence of Greek philosophy, and of the Greek spirit generally,
upon Judaism. In consequence of this view, all facts and sayings of the Old Testament in which one could not find his way, were allegorized. Nothing was what it seemed, but was only the symbol of something invisible. The history of the Old Testament was here sublimated to a history of the emancipation of reason from passion” (History of Dogma, I, 223). This allegorical interpretation disclosed to the mature mind a wealth of relations, of hints and of intuitions from the Old Testament, which to the uninitiated was only a dry record of fact. This view of the Old Testament gave its readers a strange interest, which proceeded to transfer their ancient Jewish hopes into the world of Greek philosophy, and transformed the result into a metaphysic. When these thinkers entered the Christian church, Christian hopes and terms were added to the already existing Judaic-Greek- Alexandrian compound, and such was Gnosticism. It represented the acute secularizing or Hellenizing of Christianity. The Gnostics “are therefore those Christians, who, in a swift advance, attempted to capture Christianity for Hellenic culture, and Hellenic culture for Christianity, and who gave up the Old Testament in order to facilitate the conclusion of the covenant between the two powers and make it possible to assert the absoluteness of Christianity” (p. 227).

Harnack indeed grants that there were other elements in Gnosticism, but he strongly asserts that the Greek element was the predominating one. In this he seems to us to be in error. Laying the chief emphasis on Hellenism, he fails to give the due and preponderating place to eastern dualism. As already seen, an eastern dualistic theosophy is the chief element in Gnosticism. This eastern source is also acknowledged by Harnack, but only as if it were subsidiary to Hellenism. As he regards it, “Gnosticism was an acute Hellenizing of Christianity” (p. 230).

In regard to the fundamental philosophic doctrines of Gnosticism, the indefinable nature of the Divine primeval Being, the sinfulness of matter, the fullness of God in eons, the Demiurge, etc., Harnack agrees generally with other writers, and adds, “All these are ideas for which we find the way prepared in the philosophy of the time, anticipated by Philo, and represented in neo-Platonism as the great final result of Greek philosophy” (p. 233).
VII. INFLUENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF GNOSTICISM.

Gnosticism is peculiarly the heresy of the 2nd century, and in itself a proof of the extent to which a knowledge of the Christian faith had, at that early period, penetrated in literary and philosophical circles. Though it is true that Christianity at first influenced chiefly the humbler classes, yet it was not among these persons that the various Gnostic heresies arose.

1. Not a Heresy of the Humbler Classes:

Gnosticism “was a product which did not spring up spontaneously in the minds of the mechanics and slaves and women and children, whom most, like Celsus, suppose to have formed the bulk of the Christian communities, but could only have taken its rise in minds of a more cultured and speculative cast. This, indeed, was its claim — to be a religion of gnosis (knowledge), for the more highly trained or elite. It could only exist at all, therefore, as the result of a Christian ferment which had entered these speculative circles, and was there powerfully at work. Baur rightly appreciates the situation, when he says: `Gnosticism gives the clearest proof that Christianity had now come to be one of the most important factors in the history of the time, and it shows especially what a mighty power of attraction the new Christian principles possessed for the highest intellectual life then to be found either in the pagan or in the Jewish world.’ Above all, these systems are a striking witness to the impression produced on the heathen mind by the great Christian idea of redemption. `When the Gnostic systems,’ says Neander, `describe the movement which was produced in the kingdom of the Demiurge by the appearance of Christ as the manifestation of a new and mighty principle which had entered the precincts of this lower world, they give us to understand how powerful was the impression which the contemplation of the life of Christ and His influence on humanity, had left on the minds of the founders of these systems, making all earlier institutions seem to them as nothing in comparison with Christianity.’ We must beware, therefore, of underestimating either the extent or the intensity of this great intellectual ferment set up by the gospel in the heart of heathenism” (Orr, Neglected Factors, etc., 196).

2. Cerinthus: His Teaching:

The earliest of the Gnostics known to us by name is Cerinthus, the antagonist of the apostle John. It seems to be beyond reasonable doubt that
these two encountered each other at Ephesus. Irenaeus relates on the authority of those who heard the story from Polycarp how the apostle and Cerinthus met in the public baths in that city. When John discovered that Cerinthus was in the same building with him, he instantly left, exclaiming that he could not remain while Cerinthus, the enemy of God and of man, was there. From the accounts which have been preserved of Cerinthus and of his teaching, it can be gathered that he taught that the world was created not by the Supreme God, but by an inferior power, and that he also taught a docetic theory of the Incarnation. Caius of Rome, a disciple of Irenaeus, records that Cerinthus held that there would be a millennium of unrestrained sensuality. Dionysius of Alexandria (circa 260 AD) more than confirms this. “Thus so far as they go, the historical data harmonize with the internal evidence of the Epistle (of John) itself, in giving the impression that the different tendencies it combats are such as were naturally combined in one consistently developed Gnostic system, and that the object of its polemic is, throughout, one and the same” (The Tests of Life, 37).

As regards the Gospel of John there is the testimony of Irenaeus, that it was written to oppose that form of Gnosticism which was taught by Cerinthus, and, before him, by the Nicolaitans. The nature of that heresy may be stated in the words of Irenaeus himself:

“A certain Cerinthus,” he says, “in Asia, taught that the world was not made by the Supreme God, but by some power altogether separate and distinct from that Sovereign Power which is over the universe, and one ignorant of the God who is over all things. He taught, moreover, that Jesus was not born of a virgin (for this seemed to him to be impossible), but was the son of Joseph and Mary, born after the manner of other men; though preeminent above other men in justice and prudence and wisdom; and that after His baptism the Christ, in the form of a dove, descended upon Him from that Sovereign Power which is over all things; and that He then announced the unknown Father and wrought miracles; but that, at the end, the Christ departed again from Jesus, and that Jesus suffered and was raised from the dead, while the Christ continued impassible, as a spiritual being” (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 74).

3. The Gospel of John:

Such a passage as John 19:34,35 seems to refer to docetic Gnosticism, and to be a personal protest against it. After describing the piercing of
Christ’s side by the soldier’s spear, and how “straightway there came out blood and water,” the apostle adds, “And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe.” There are many other passages which seem to be directed against Docetism, e.g. “The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory)” (1:14); “Jesus therefore, being wearied with his journey, sat thus by the well” (4:6); “Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing” (20:27).

Cerinthus seems to have taught that the religion of Christ was identical with undiluted Mosaism, including even circumcision and the earthly kingdom of the future. The Cerinthian theory, however, was held under various forms by its adherents, some teachers holding that the God of the Old Testament was, at the best, a subordinate angel of limited power, wisdom and goodness, and that the creation of the world was very imperfect. Others went so far as to identify the God of the Old Testament with Satan. The ethic of systems such as these was antinomian, sometimes even going the length of libertinism.

Generally, the forms under which Gnosticism appeared varied greatly in different periods. Some went farther than others from the Christian faith.

4. Various Sects:

Some communities, such as the Encratites, laid the greatest stress on the necessity for asceticism; other communities were wholly docetic; the Carpocratians taught the philosophy and communism of Plato. One of these teachers, Epiphanes, was honored as a god, and this sect crowned the image of Jesus along with those of Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle.

Further, there were impostors of all varieties: magicians, soothsayers, jugglers, deceivers and hypocrites, “who appeared using mighty words with a host of unintelligible formulas and taking up with scandalous ceremonies in order to rob men of their money” (Harnack, op. cit., 239), and even for viler purposes.

1. The Ophites.

Gnosticism, before reaching its full development, is chiefly represented by the ophite sects or systems. These were so named from the word ophis, “serpent,” to which they paid honor as the symbol of intelligence. They
held that the Creator of the world was an ignorant and imperfect being, Ialdaboth, the Son of Chaos; and that it was a meritorious act when the serpent persuaded Adam and Eve to disobey him. There were several of the ophite sects, such as the Cainites, who reversed all the standards of moral judgment, choosing as their heroes the persons whom the Bible condemned, such as Cain, the men of Sodom, Esau and Korah.

(2) Valentinus.

By the time of Justin Martyr (circa 150 AD), Gnosticism had become divided into a variety of sects and schools, Valentinians, Basilideans, Saturninians and Marcionites. In the Valentinian system, Christ and the Holy Spirit were two eons. The Valentinians granted that ordinary Christians were better than the heathen, and that they might look forward to a kind of salvation; even now ordinary Christians occupied a middle position, better than the “hylic” or “psychic,” but inferior to the “pneumatic” or “spiritual,” as the Gnostics termed themselves.

(3) Basilides.

The Basilideans take their name from Basilides of Alexandria, a man of powerful intellect. He and his son Isidore taught this system, which was afterward considerably modified for the purpose of popular apprehension. The world is continuously evolved from a pansperma or “seed of the world,” in which all things were originally potentially contained. It is ruled by two great Archons, who yet subserve the designs of the Supreme. There are no eons, but the highest “light” descends through the successive spheres till it rests on Jesus of Nazareth. The process is complete when the Divine element (“sonship”) is all drawn out and restored to God; oblivion then falls on lower intelligences. Many fine sayings are attributed to Basilides, e.g. “I will say anything rather than doubt the goodness of Providence” (Orr, The Early Church, 75).

(4) Saturninus.

The Saturninians were so called from Saturninus, said to be a disciple of Menander, who in turn is said to have been a disciple of Simon Magus. The system of Saturninus is marked both by a strong dualism and by a gloomy asceticism. He is also reported to have been one of the founders of the Encratite heresy, which condemned marriage. Tatian, Justin Martyr’s disciple, became a member of this Gnostic sect, holding, it is alleged, the
usual theory of eons, and that there was a Demiurge, who was not the Supreme God.

(5) Marcion.

Marcion, a native of Pontus, taught in Rome circa 140-55 AD. His system differs much from ordinary Gnostic theories, except that he absolutely distinguished between the God of the Old Testament, who is regarded as merely great, harsh, rigorous, and the good God of the New Testament, who is wholly love. He also held to the usual Gnostic dualism and docetism. Marcion’s system has been described as an overstrained Paulinism, as he lays the stress on faith, not on knowledge. Marcion was the author of a book called the Anthitheses, which contrasted the Old Testament with the New Testament. He also drew up a canon of Scripture, which contained only one gospel, namely, Luke in a mutilated state, and ten Epistles of Paul. Marcion was a rigorous ascetic. In the Lord’s Supper he allowed only water to be used instead of wine. The Marcionites refused baptism to married persons. This sect or “church” endured for several centuries.

5. Relation to the Old Testament:

“All the Gnostic systems had one feature in common, namely, that they regarded the Old Testament and the New Testament as revelations of two different Gods, and considered the mission of Christ to proceed from a higher power than the God of the Jewish religion, who was identified with the Demiurge, or Maker of the world. But under this common assumption there was room for two very opposite estimates of the older revelation and of the God whom it reveals. Some of the Gnostic sects regarded the Demiurge as being altogether alien from and opposed to the Supreme God; others considered him merely as a subordinate power, inferior but not hostile to the Supreme God, and acting before the coming of a more perfect revelation, as his unconscious organ” (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 45). “There can be no doubt that the Gnostic propaganda was seriously hindered by the inability to organize and discipline churches, which is characteristic of all philosophic systems of religion” (Harnack, History of Dogma, I, 252). “From about 210 they ceased to be a factor of the historical development, though the church of Constantine and Theodosius was alone really able to suppress them” (ibid., 251).
6. The Christian Verities:

In contrast to Gnosticism the Christian church held fast to these great facts, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, preexistent before the Incarnation, and manifest in the flesh and crucified for us men and for our salvation; that He rose from the dead; that the Old Testament is a true revelation of the one supreme and holy God, the Creator of all things. Dualism, the eternity of matter and its inherent evil, as well as Docetism and oriental mythologies were accordingly rejected as contrary to the Christian faith.

7. Influence on Theology:

During the period of the prevalence of Gnosticism there took place the earlier developments of Christian theology. Gnosticism gave a powerful impetus to the formation of a New Testament canon of Scripture; and to the shaping of the earliest creed.

See APOSTLES’ CREED.

8. Truth Underlying Docetism:

In the revulsion from Gnosticism and Docetism it should not be forgotten that there is truth to be found even amid the errors of these systems. Docetism was an over-statement of a great truth, an over-statement so large as to destroy the true humanity of our Lord. But the truth in Docetism is that the eternal Christ touches and appeals to and has a definite relationship to and actually influences every human heart; and also, that, to the Christian believer, Christ is more and does more than this; Christ dwells in the believer’s heart by faith, “Christ in you, the hope of glory” (Colossians 1:27). “Docetism was not all folly. Rather we may regard it as one primitive form of the assertion of that mystical element which has never been wanting to Christianity from the first days until now, and we may be sure, never will be wanting to it” (Sanday, Christologies Ancient and Modern, 9).

VIII. MODERN GNOSTICISM.

Gnosticism in its ancient form has passed away, but it is interesting to observe how its spirit reappears from time to time in modern days. Gnosticism, as already seen, is not one aspect of thought alone, but many. And in one form or another it is seen again and again. For example, the modern denial of the virgin birth of our Lord is that form of Gnosticism
which taught that the man Jesus became Christ only at His baptism, when the Holy Spirit descended upon Him from heaven.

Phases of Gnostic teaching are reproduced in modern pantheistic philosophies and other forms of religious doctrine, which hold that there has been no objective atonement and no resurrection of Christ from the dead. “Basilides with his powerful speculative grasp and all-embracing evolutionary process might be termed the Hegel of the movement; Valentinus with his robe of fantasy and triple fall and redemption was its Schelling; Marcion with his severe practical bent, his doctrine of faith, and his antitheses of the just God and the good, might without straining be termed its Ritschl” (Orr, The Progress of Dogma, 59).

“Fichte said, ‘There were no external realities at all, they were the mere objectivity of the subject or creations of the inward eye’; after Fichte came Schelling, and Schelling said, ‘Then this creating eye is God’s own eye’; and after Schelling came Hegel, and Hegel said that ‘God and man are one, and God all men, and all men God, and the whole universe God eternally thinking in the process of development,’ and that or something like it is Hegelianism. I feel in studying this philosophy, as Baron Humboldt says he felt, when he experienced the first shock of an earthquake. I feel a dreadful sense of restlessness and insecurity. The ground seems to give way beneath, and the earth and the heaven to dissolve, the universe becomes a dream, a myth” (W.B. Robertson, D.D., Martin Luther, German Student Life, etc., 138).

“Philosophy,” says Mansel, “striving after a first principle which shall be one and simple and unconditioned and incapable of all further analysis in thought, is naturally tempted to soar above that complex combination of attributes which is implied in our conception of personality, and in endeavoring to simplify and purify our representation of the Divine nature, ends by depriving it of every attribute which can make God the object of any religious feeling or the source of any moral obligation” (The Gnostic Heresies, 11). God is no longer the author and source of goodness and truth and moral law, but the mind is occupied with the metaphysical relation between God and the world, as absolute and relative, cause and effect, principle and consequence, and God becomes identical with the world.
It is easily seen how teaching of this sort strikes at the root of all religion and morality. The personality of God, the personality and free will of man, the existence of moral evil, the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, the redemption which He accomplished for the world, His resurrection, the whole significance of His person and His work — all is denied. This is the spirit and the meaning of Gnosticism.

Dr. Gwatkin sums up the matter thus: “Gnosticism undermined Christian monotheism by its distinction of the Creator from the Supreme, Christian morals by its opposition of the philosopher to the unlearned, Christian practice by its separation of knowledge from action; and it cut away the very basis of the gospel whenever it explained away its history. In every case it had got hold of truth on one side — the reality of evil in the world, the function of knowledge in religion, the difference between the letter and the spirit; but fragments of truth are not enough for a gospel, which is false if all truth is not summed up in Christ. Therefore, there could be no peace between the Gnostic illuminati and the Christian churches” (Early Church History, II, 68).

**LITERATURE.**


**GO**

(["l " h; halakh], [5l " y; yalakh], [a νθ, bo’], [a x y; yatsa’]; [ἀγω, ago], [ὑπάγω, hupago], [ἀναβαίνω, anabaino], [ἐρχομαι, erchomai], [ἀπέρχομαι, aperchomai], [πορεύομαι, poreuomai]): “Go” (“went,” etc.) occurs very frequently in the English Bible, and is the translation of a great many different Hebrew and Greek terms. As the word implies
movement of all kinds, physical and mental, it has naturally many applications.

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In the Old Testament *halakh* and *yalakh* are among the commonest words, meaning “to go” in its original sense of “to walk,” but also in the most varied senses, according to the verbal conjugations, etc., the preposition attached, and the words in connection with which the terms stand; *halakh* and *yalakh* are often used figuratively (translated “to walk,” etc.) for to live, to pursue a way of life, e.g. “to walk ever in his ways” (Deuteronomy 19:9; compare Psalm 15:2; 89:30; 1 Kings 2:3 f; 3:3, etc.); to die, “He departed (Hebrew “went”) without being desired” (2 Chronicles 21:20); *bo’,* properly “to go in,” “to enter” (e.g. Genesis 7:9), is very common, and *yatsa’,* “to go or come out,” also occurs frequently; *yatsa’,* has frequently the meaning “to go forth,” e.g. Genesis 8:7, “He sent forth a raven, and it went forth.” Other frequent words are *yaradh,* “to go down” (Genesis 11:7, etc.); *alah,* “to go or come up” (Genesis 2:6, etc.; Isaiah 15:5, “go it up,” the King James Version); used also figuratively, e.g. “to rise up or excel” “Thou excellest them all” (Proverbs 31:29), “to come up on the nears,” to be remembered. “The former things shall not be remembered, nor come into mind” (Isaiah 65:17; compare Jeremiah 3:16); *abhar,* “to go or pass over,” “to cross” (Genesis 41:46, etc.), also used figuratively “to pass away,” e.g. “as chaff that passeth away” (Isaiah 29:5), “passeth by transgression” (Micah 7:18); *shubh,* “to go again” (Genesis 43:2, etc.); *saTah* and *cur,* “to go aside,” occur several times with the meaning of wrongdoing (e.g. Numbers 5:12; Deuteronomy 28:14, the Revised Version (British and American) “turn aside”); *nasa’,* “to remove” (Exodus 14:15), “Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward” (Exodus 14:19 “removed”; Numbers 2:24 etc.); *‘azal* (Aramaic), “to go away or about” (Ezr 4:23; Daniel 2:17, etc.). Many other words occur only once or twice, e.g. *‘arach,* “to travel” Job (34:8); *‘ashar,* “to go straight or right” (Proverbs 4:14; 9:6, the Revised Version (British and American) “walk”); *darakh,* “to tread” (Isaiah 59:8); *dadhah,* “to go softly” (Psalm 42:4; Isaiah 38:15, the Revised Version, margin “as in solemn procession”); *raghal,* “to stir” “to move” “I taught Enhraim to go” (Hosea 11:3, the Revised Version (British and American) “to walk”).
The obsolete expression “go to” (derived from Tyndale) is the translation of *yahabh* in Genesis 11:3,4,7; 38:16; Exodus 1:10, “come on,” the Revised Version (British and American) “come”; of *bo’* (2 Kings 5:5 the Revised Version (British and American)), “go now”; *na’* (Judges 7:3; Isaiah 5:5; Jeremiah 18:11, omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)).

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

In the New Testament *anabaino* is “to go up” (Matthew 3:16; 5:1, etc.); *erchomai*, “to go on” (Matthew 12:9, etc.); *aperchomai*, “to go off or away” (Matthew 2:22; 4:24, etc.); *poreuomai*, “to go or pass on” (Matthew 2:8,20, etc.); *hupago*, “to go away” (Matthew 5:41; 8:32, etc.). We have also other combinations with different shades of meaning, e.g. *huperbaino*, “to go over or beyond” (1 Thessalonians 4:6); *eiserchomai*, “to go into” (Matthew 7:13; 15:11, etc.); *proporeuomai*, “to go before” (Luke 1:76; Acts 7:40), and other forms; *ago* (agomen), “Let us go” (Matthew 26:46; John 14:31, etc.); *age* is rendered “go to” (Jas 4:13; 5:1), the Revised Version (British and American) “come.”

“Go about (to)” the King James Version is the translation of *zeteo*, “to seek,” in John 7:19, “Why go ye about to kill me?” the Revised Version (British and American) “Why seek ye?” and Romans 10:3; of *peirazo*, “to try,” “attempt” (Acts 24:6, the Revised Version (British and American) “assayed”), and of *peiraomai* (26:21, the Revised Version (British and American) “assayed”), of *epicheireo* “to lay hands on” (Acts 9:29), which remains in the English Revised Version unchanged, the American Standard Revised Version “seeking”; “to let go” is the translation of *apoluo* “to loose off” or “away” (Luke 14:4, etc.), “to go astray,” of *planao* (Matthew 18:12, etc.).

Various other words occurring singly are translated by forms of “go,” e.g. *phero*, “to bear on,” the King James Version “Let us go on unto perfection” (Hebrews 6:1, see below); *epiduo*, “to go in upon,” “Let not the sun go down upon your Wrath” (Ephesians 4:26).

is substituted for “pass” (Exodus 12:12), “came” (Exodus 13:4), “away” (Exodus 19:24), “be put” (Leviticus 6:12), “enter” (Job 34:23), “return” (Ecclesiastes 1:7), “come” (Micah 4:2; compare Zec 14:18b, 19), “should be cast” (Matthew 5:30); “if I go up” for “I will come up” (Exodus 33:5); “make to go forth” for “bring forth” (Psalm 37:6); “let them go” for “gave them up” (Psalm 81:12). For the phrase, “go a whoring,” the American Standard Revised Version has “play the harlot” (Exodus 34:15 f, etc., “commit fornication”); for “go about even now” (Deuteronomy 31:21, the American Standard Revised Version), “frame this day”; for “go well” (Proverbs 30:29), “are stately in their march”; for “suffer us to go” (Matthew 8:31), “send us” (a different text); for “not to think of men above that which is written” (1 Corinthians 4:6), “not (to go) beyond the things which are written”; for “that no man go beyond” (1 Thessalonians 4:6), “transgress,” margin “overreach”; for “Let us go on unto perfection” (Hebrews 6:1), the English Revised Version “and press.” the American Standard Revised Version “Let us press on unto perfection.”

W. L. Walker

GOAD

<god> ([b b r; dorebhan], [d m] m” , malmadh]; [kéntropov, kentron]):
The goad used by the Syrian farmer is usually a straight branch of oak or other strong wood from which the bark has been stripped, and which has at one end a pointed spike and at the other a flat chisel-shaped iron. The pointed end is to prod the oxen while plowing. The flattened iron at the other end is to scrape off the earth which clogs the plowshare. The ancient goad was probably similar to this instrument. It could do villainous work in the hands of an experienced fighter (Judges 3:31). If 1 Samuel 13:21 is correctly translated, the goads were kept sharpened by files.

Figurative: “The words of the wise are as goads” (Ecclesiastes 12:11). The only reference to goads in the New Testament is the familiar passage, “It is hard for thee to kick against the goad” (Acts 26:14). It was as useless for Saul to keep on in the wrong way as for a fractious ox to attempt to leave the furrow. He would surely be brought back with a prick of the goad.

James A. Patch
GOAH; GOATH

<go'-a>, <go'-ath> ([h [ Ogo`ah]; the King James Version; Septuagint reads [eξ eklektōn λιθων, ex eklekton lithon]): A place named in describing the boundaries of Jerusalem as restored in the “days to come” (Jeremiah 31:39). If Gareb is the Northeast hill, then probably Goah is to be identified with the Northwest hill, which is called by Josephus “the camp of the Assyrians” (BJ, V, vii, 3; xii, 2).

See JERUSALEM.

GOAT

<got>:

1. NAMES:

The common generic word for “goat” is [z[ e`ez] (compare Arabic `anz, “she-goat”; [α`ξ, aix]), used often for “she-goat” (Genesis 15:9; Numbers 15:27), also with [yδ G] gedhi], “kid,” as [μ yZ] iyd G] gedhi `izzim], “kid of the goats” (Genesis 38:17), also with [r y[ v ; sa`ir], “he-goat,” as [μ yZ] i r y[ v] se`ir `izzim], “kid of the goats” or “he-goat,” or translated simply “kids,” as in 1 Kings 20:27, “The children of Israel encamped before them like two little flocks of kids.” Next, frequently used is [r y[ c ; sa`ir], literally, “hairy” (compare Arabic sha`r, “hair”; [χήρ, cher], “hedgehog”; Latin hircus, “goat”; hirtus, “hairy”; also German Haar; English “hair”), like `ez and `attudh used of goats for offerings. The goat which is sent into the wilderness bearing the sins of the people is sa`ir (Leviticus16:7-22). The same name is used of devils (Leviticus17:7; 2 Chronicles 11:15, the Revised Version (British and American) “he-goats”) and of satyrs (Isaiah 13:21; 34:14, the Revised Version, margin “he-goats,” the American Standard Revised Version “wild goats”). Compare also [μ yZ] it r ” y[ c ] se`irath `izzim], “a female from the flock” (Leviticus4:28; 5:6). The male or leader of the flock is [d Wf [ , `attudh]; Arabic `atud, “yearling he-goat”; figuratively “chief ones” (Isaiah 13:21; 34:14, the Revised Version, margin “he-goats,” the American Standard Revised Version “wild goats”). A later word for “he-goat,” used also figuratively, is [r yp k ; tsaphir] (2 Chronicles 29:21; Ezr 8:35; Daniel 8:5,8,21). In Proverbs 30:31, one of the four things “which are stately in going” is the he-goat, [v yf ” , tayish] (Arabic tais, “he-
goat”), also mentioned in Genesis 30:35; 32:14 among the possessions of Laban and Jacob, and in 2 Chronicles 17:11 among the animals given as tribute by the Arabians to Jehoshaphat. In Hebrews 9:12,13,19; 10:4, we have [τρόγγος, tragos], the ordinary Greek word for “goat”; in Matthew 25:32,33, [ἐριφος, eriphos], and its diminutive [ἐριφίον, eriphion]; in Hebrews 11:37 [δέρμα αἰγείον, derma aigeion], “goatskin,” from aix (see supra). “Kid” is [γενις, gedhi] (compare En-gedi 1 Samuel 23:29), feminine [η γενις, gedhiyah] (Song of Solomon 1:8), but also `ez, gedhi `izzim, se`ir `izzim, se`ir `izzim, se`irath `izzim, bene `izzim, and eriphos. There remain [澳门, ya`alah] (Proverbs 5:19), the King James Version “roe,” the Revised Version (British and American) “doe”; [אקו, ‘aqqo] (Deuteronomy 14:5), English Versions of the Bible “wild goat”; and [גי מי, zemer] (Deuteronomy 14:5), English Versions of the Bible “chamois.”

2. WILD GOATS:

The original of our domestic goats is believed to be the Persian wild goat or pasang, Capra aegagrus, which inhabits some of the Greek islands, Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, Afghanistan, and Northwestern India. It is called wa`l (compare Hebrew ya`el) by the Arabs, who in the North apply the same name to its near relative, the Sinaitic ibex, Capra beden. The last, doubtless the “wild goat” (ya`el) of the Bible, inhabits Southern Palestine, Arabia, Sinai, and Eastern Egypt, and within its range is uniformly called beden by the Arabs. It is thought by the writer that the “chamois” (zemer) of Deuteronomy 14:5 may be the Persian wild goat. The word occurs only in this passage in the list of clean animals. See CHAMOIS; DEER; ZOOLOGY. Wild goats are found only in Southern Europe, Southwestern Asia, and Northeastern Africa. They include the well-known, but now nearly extinct, Alpine ibex, steinbok, or bouquetin, the markhor, and the Himalayan ibex, which has enormous horns. The so-called Rocky Mountain goat is not properly a goat, but is an animal intermediate between goats and antelopes.
3. DOMESTIC GOATS:

Domestic goats differ greatly among themselves in the color and length of their hair, in the size and shape of their ears, and in the size and shape of their horns, which are usually larger in the males, but in some breeds may be absent in both sexes. A very constant feature in both wild and domestic goats is the bearded chin of the male. The goats of Palestine and Syria are usually black (Song of Solomon 4:1), though sometimes partly or entirely white or brown. Their hair is usually long, hanging down from their bodies. The horns are commonly curved outward and backward, but in one very handsome breed they extend nearly outward with slight but graceful curves, sometimes attaining a span of 2 ft. or more in the old males. The profile of the face is distinctly convex. They are herded in the largest numbers in the mountainous or hilly districts, and vie with their wild congener in climbing into apparently impossible places. They feed not only on herbs, but also on shrubs and small trees, to which they are most destructive. They are largely responsible for the deforested condition of Judea and Lebanon. They reach up the trees to the height of a man, holding themselves nearly or quite erect, and even walk out on low branches.

4. ECONOMY:

Apart from the ancient use in sacrifice, which still survives among Moslems, goats are most valuable animals. Their flesh is eaten, and may be had when neither mutton nor beef can be found. Their milk is drunk and made into cheese and semn, a sort of clarified butter much used in cooking. Their hair is woven into tents (Song of Solomon 1:5), carpets, cloaks, sacks, slings, and various camel, horse and mule trappings. Their skins are made into bottles (no’dh; Greek askos; Arabic qirbeh) for water, oil, semn, and other liquids (compare also Hebrews 11:37).

5. RELIGIOUS AND FIGURATIVE:

Just as the kid was often slaughtered for an honored guest (Judges 6:19; 13:19), so the kid or goat was frequently taken for sacrifice (Leviticus 4:23; 9:15; 16:7; Numbers 15:24; Ezr 8:35; Ezekiel 45:23; Hebrews 9:12). A goat was one of the clean animals (Deuteronomy 14:4). In Daniel, the powerful king out of the West is typified as a goat with a single horn (8:5). One of the older goats is the leader of the flock. In some parts of the country the goatherd makes
different ones leaders by turns, the leader being trained to keep near the
goat-herd and not to eat so long as he wears the bell. In Isaiah 14:9,
“... stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth,” the
word translated “chief ones” is `attudh, “he-goat.” Again, in Jeremiah
50:8, we have “Go forth out of the land of the Chaldeans, and be as the he-
goats before the flocks.” In Matthew 25:32, in the scene of the last
judgment, we find “He shall separate them one from another, as the
shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats.” It is not infrequent to find a
flock including both goats and sheep grazing over the mountains, but they
are usually folded separately.

Alfred Ely Day

GOATSKEINS

<got'-skinz> ([ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν, en aigeiois dermasin]): Such skins
are mentioned only once (Hebrews 11:37), where the wearing of
goatskins, indicating extreme poverty, is referred to, by implication, as the
possible lot of the faithful Christian, even as it had been of others. Ascetics
of different religions, especially of the Moslem sects, are frequently seen
going about Syria and Palestine today, clad in sheepskins or goatskins, a
sign of their renunciation of all things worldly.

GOATS’ HAIR

([ἐζ, 'ez]): The word for she-goat is used elliptically to mean goats’ hair,
which was used in the tabernacle furnishings in the form of curtains
(Exodus 26:7; 36:14). Goats’ hair was probably used in the Midianite
and Israelite camps in much the same way as in the Bedouin camps today
(compare Numbers 31:20). The tents, tent ropes and rugs are made of
spun goats’ hair. The provision sacks which hold wheat, rice, etc., and the
saddlebags are made of the same material. A strip of the cloth rolled up
furnishes a bolster for the head while sleeping (compare 1 Samuel
19:13,16). Goats’ hair cloth is admirably suited to stand the hard usage of
a frequently shifting encampment. The children of Israel appreciated its
utility, even for the tabernacle, where to the modern critical eye it would
have looked out of place, matched against scarlet and fine linen
(Exodus 25:4; 35:6,26). The fact that goats’ hair was used is good
indication of the comparative crudeness of the tabernacle, when contrasted
with present-day furnishings.
See also HAIR; WEAVING.

James A. Patch

GOB

<gob> ([ב גוֹב, gobh]): A place mentioned in 2 Samuel 21:18 f as the scene of two of David’s battles with the Philistines. The name appears here only. In the parallel passage, 1 Chronicles 20:4, it is called Gezer (compare Ant, VII, xii, 2). Certain texts read “Nob” for “Gob,” while Syriac and Septuagint read “Gath.” The latter is probably correct.

GOBLET

<gob’-let> ([גַ'גָנ, ‘aggan]): A bowl or basin (Song of Solomon 7:2), the only place where the word is used. ‘Aggan is used in the plural in Exodus 24:6 and Isaiah 22:24, and is translated “basins” and “cups.” These “basins” were used to hold the blood of the sacrifices and must have been of moderate size. The “cups” were bowl-shaped vessels and belonged evidently to the smaller class of vessels used in a house.

GOD

<god> ([יָהָה, ‘Elohim], [א̞ל ʾEl], [עָלִי, ‘Elyon], [יָד "י", Shadday], [ח̞וֹה י̞", Yahweh]; [Θεός, Theos]):

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE GENERAL IDEA.

1. The Idea in Experience and in Thought:

Religion gives the idea of God, theology construes and organizes its content, and philosophy establishes its relation to the whole of man’s experience. The logical order of treating it might appear to be, first, to establish its truth by philosophical proofs; secondly, to develop its content into theological propositions; and finally, to observe its development and action in religion. Such has been the more usual order of treatment. But the actual history of the idea has been quite the reverse. Men had the idea of God, and it had proved a creative factor in history, long before reflection upon it issued in its systematic expression as a doctrine. Moreover, men had enunciated the doctrine before they attempted or even felt any need to define its relation to reality. And the logic of history is the truer
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philosophy. To arrive at the truth of any idea, man must begin with some portion of experience, define its content, relate it to the whole of experience, and so determine its degree of reality.

Religion is as universal as man, and every religion involves some idea of God. Of the various philosophical ideas of God, each has its counterpart and antecedent in some actual religion. Pantheism is the philosophy of the religious consciousness of India. Deism had prevailed for centuries as an actual attitude of men to God, in China, in Judaism and in Islam, before it found expression as a rational theory in the philosophy of the 18th century. Theism is but the attempt to define in general terms the Christian conception of God, and of His relation to the world. If pluralism claims a place among the systems of philosophy, it can appeal to the religious consciousness of that large portion of mankind that has hitherto adhered to polytheism.

But all religions do not issue in speculative reconstructions of their content. It is true in a sense that all religion is an unconscious philosophy, because it is the reaction of the whole mind, including the intellect, upon the world of its experience, and, therefore, every idea of God involves some kind of an explanation of the world. But conscious reflection upon their own content emerges only in a few of the more highly developed religions. Brahmanism, Buddhism, Judaism, Islam and Christianity are the only religions that have produced great systems of thought, exhibiting their content in a speculative and rational form. The religions of Greece and Rome were unable to survive the reflective period. They produced no theology which could ally itself to a philosophy, and Greek philosophy was from the beginning to a great extent the denial and supersession of Greek religion.

Biblical literature nearly all represents the spontaneous experience of religion, and contains comparatively little reflection upon that experience. In the Old Testament it is only in Second Isaiah, in the Wisdom literature and in a few Psalms that the human mind may be seen turning back upon itself to ask the meaning of its practical feelings and beliefs. Even here nothing appears of the nature of a philosophy of Theism or of religion, no theology, no organic definition and no ideal reconstruction of the idea of God. It never occurred to any Old Testament writer to offer a proof of the existence of God, or that anyone should need it. Their concern was to bring men to a right relation with God, and they propounded right views of God only in so far as it was necessary for their practical purpose. Even the
fool who “hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Psalm 14:1; 53:1), and the wicked nations “that forget God” (Psalm 9:17) are no theoretical atheists, but wicked and corrupt men, who, in conduct and life, neglect or reject the presence of God.

The New Testament contains more theology, more reflection upon the inward content of the idea of God, and upon its cosmic significance; but here also, no system appears, no coherent and rounded-off doctrine, still less any philosophical construction of the idea on the basis of experience as a whole. The task of exhibiting the Biblical idea of God is, therefore, not that of setting together a number of texts, or of writing the history of a theology, but rather of interpreting the central factor in the life of the Hebrew and Christian communities.

2. Definition of the Idea:

Logically and historically the Biblical idea stands related to a number of other ideas. Attempts have been made to find a definition of so general a nature as to comprehend them all. The older theologians assumed the Christian standpoint, and put into their definitions the conclusions of Christian doctrine and philosophy. Thus, Melanchthon: “God is a spiritual essence, intelligent, eternal, true, good, pure, just, merciful, most free and of infinite power and wisdom.” Thomasius more briefly defines God as “the absolute personality.” These definitions take no account of the existence of lower religions and ideas of God, nor do they convey much of the concreteness and nearness of God revealed in Christ. A similar recent definition, put forward, however, avowedly of the Christian conception, is that of Professor W. N. Clarke: “God is the personal Spirit, perfectly good, who in holy love creates, sustains and orders all” (Outline of Christian Theology, 66). The rise of comparative religion has shown that “while all religions involve a conscious relation to a being called God, the Divine Being is in different religions conceived in the most different ways; as one and as many, as natural and as spiritual, as like to and manifested in almost every object in the heavens above or earth beneath, in mountains and trees, in animals and men; or, on the contrary, as being incapable of being represented by any finite image whatsoever; and, again, as the God of a family, of a nation, or of humanity” (E. Caird, Evolution of Religion, I, 62). Attempts have therefore been made to find a new kind of definition, such as would include under one category all the ideas of God possessed by the human race. A typical instance of this kind of definition is that of
Professor W. Adams Brown: “A god in the religious sense is an unseen being, real or supposed, to whom an individual or a social group is united by voluntary ties of reverence and service” (Christian Theology in Outline, 30). Many similar definitions are given: “A supersensible being or beings” (Lotze, Asia Minor Fairbairn); “a higher power” (Allan Menzies); “spiritual beings” (E.B. Tylor); “a power not ourselves making for righteousness” (Matthew Arnold). This class of definition suffers from a twofold defect. It says too much to include the ideas of the lower religions, and too little to suggest those of the higher. It is not all gods that are “unseen” or “supersensible,” or “making for righteousness,” but all these qualities may be shared by other beings than gods, and they do not connote that which is essential in the higher ideas of God. Dr. E. Caird, looking for a definition in a germinative principle of the genesis of religion, defines God “as the unity which is presupposed in the difference of the self and not-self, and within which they act and re-act on each other” (op. cit., I, 40, 64). This principle admittedly finds its full realization only in the highest religion, and it may be doubted whether it does justice to the transcendent personality and the love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. In the lower religions it appears only in fragmentary forms, and it can only be detected in them at all after it has been revealed in the absolute religion. Although this definition may be neither adequate nor true, its method recognizes that there can be only one true idea and definition of God, and yet that all other ideas are more or less true elements of it and approximations to it. The Biblical idea does not stand alone like an island in mid-ocean, but is rather the center of light which radiates out in other religions with varying degrees of purity.

It is not the purpose of this article to deal with the problem of the philosophy of religion, but to give an account of the idea of God at certain stages of its development, and within a limited area of thought. The absence of a final definition will present no practical difficulty, because the denotation of the term God is clear enough; it includes everything that is or has been an object of worship; it is its connotation that remains a problem for speculation.

3. The Knowledge of God:

A third class of definition demands some attention, because it raises a new question, that of the knowledge or truth of any idea whatsoever. Herbert Spencer’s definition may be taken as representative: God is the unknown and unknowable cause of the universe, “an inscrutable power manifested to
us through all phenomena” (First Principles, V, 31). This means that there can be no definition of the idea of God, because we can have no idea of Him, no knowledge “in the strict sense of knowing.” For the present purpose it might suffice for an answer that ideas of God actually exist; that they can be defined and are more definable, because fuller and more complex, the higher they rise in the scale of religions; that they can be gathered from the folklore and traditions of the lower races, and from the sacred books and creeds of the higher religions. But Spencer’s view means that, in so far as the ideas are definable, they are not true. The more we define, the more fictitious becomes our subject-matter. While nothing is more certain than that God exists, His being is to human thought utterly mysterious and inscrutable. The variety of ideas might seem to support this view. But variety of ideas has been held of every subject that is known, as witness the progress of science. The variety proves nothing.

And the complete abstraction of thought from existence cannot be maintained. Spencer himself does not succeed in doing it. He says a great many things about the “unknowable” which implies an extensive knowledge of Him. The traditional proofs of the “existence” of God have misled the Agnostics. But existence is meaningless except for thought, and a noumenon or first cause that lies hidden in impenetrable mystery behind phenomena cannot be conceived even as a fiction. Spencer’s idea of the Infinite and Absolute are contradictory and unthinkable. An Infinite that stood outside all that is known would not be infinite, and an Absolute out of all relation could not even be imagined. If there is any truth at all in the idea of the Absolute, it must be true to human experience and thought; and the true Infinite must include within itself every possible and actual perfection. In truth, every idea of God that has lived in religion refutes Agnosticism, because they all qualify and interpret experience, and the only question is as to the degree of their adequacy and truth.

A brief enumeration of the leading ideas of God that have lived in religion will serve to place the Biblical idea in its true perspective.

4. Ethnic Ideas of God:

(1) Animism:

Animism is the name of a theory which explains the lowest (and perhaps the earliest) forms of religion, and also the principle of all religion, as the belief in the universal presence of spiritual beings which “are held to affect
or control the events of the material world, and man’s life here and hereafter; and, it being considered that they hold intercourse with men, and receive pleasure or displeasure from human actions, the belief in their existence leads naturally, and, it might almost be said, inevitably, sooner or later, to active reverence and propitiation” (E.B. Tylor, Primitive Culture, I, 426-27). According to this view, the world is full of disembodied spirits, regarded as similar to man’s soul, and any or all of these may be treated as gods.

(2) Fetishism:

Fetishism is sometimes used in a general sense for “the view that the fruits of the earth and things in general are divine, or animated by powerful spirits” (J.G. Frazer, Adonis, Attis, Osiris, 234); or it may be used in a more particular sense of the belief that spirits “take up their abode, either temporarily or permanently, in some object, ..... and this object, as endowed with higher power, is then worshipped” (Tiele, Outlines of the History of Religion, 9).

(3) Idolatry:

Idolatry is a term of still more definite significance. It means that the object is at least selected, as being the permanent habitation or symbol of the deity; and, generally, it is marked by some degree of human workmanship, designed to enable it the more adequately to represent the deity. It is not to be supposed that men ever worship mere “stocks and stones,” but they address their worship to objects, whether fetishes or idols, as being the abodes or images of their god. It is a natural and common idea that the spirit has a form similar to the visible object in which it dwells. Paul reflected the heathen idea accurately when he said, “We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man” (Acts 17:29).

(4) Polytheism:

The belief in many gods, and the worship of them, is an attitude of soul compatible with Animism, Fetishism, and Idolatry, or it may be independent of them all. The term Polytheism is more usually employed to designate the worship of a limited number of well-defined deities, whether regarded as pure disembodied spirits, or as residing in the greater objects of Nature, such as planets or mountains, or as symbolized by images “graven by art and device of man.” In ancient Greece or modern India the
great gods are well defined, named and numerable, and it is clearly understood that, though they may be symbolized by images, they dwell apart in a spiritual realm above the rest of the world.

(5) Henotheism:

There is, however, a tendency, both in individuals and in communities, even where many gods are believed to exist, to set one god above the others, and consequently to confine worship to that god alone. “The monotheistic tendency exists among all peoples, after they have reached a certain level of culture. There is a difference in the degree in which this tendency is emphasized, but whether we turn to Babylonia, Egypt, India, China, or Greece, there are distinct traces of a trend toward concentrating the varied manifestations of Divine powers in a single source” (Jastrow, The Study of Religion, 76). This attitude of mind has been called Henotheism or Monolatry — the worship of one God combined with the belief in the existence of many. This tendency may be governed by metaphysical, or by ethical and personal motives, either by the monistic demands of reason, or by personal attachment to one political or moral rule.

(6) Pantheism:

Where the former principle predominates, Polytheism merges into Pantheism, as is the case in India, where Brahma is not only the supreme, but the sole, being, and all other gods are but forms of his manifestation. But, in India, the vanquished gods have had a very complete revenge upon their vanquisher, for Brahma has become so abstract and remote that worship is mainly given to the other gods, who are forms of his manifestation. Monolatry has been reversed, and modern Hinduism were better described as the belief in one God accompanied by the worship of many.

(7) Deism:

The monistic tendency, by a less thorough application of it, may take the opposite turn toward Deism, and yet produce similar religious conditions. The Supreme Being, who is the ultimate reality and power of the universe, may be conceived in so vague and abstract a manner, may be so remote from the world, that it becomes a practical necessity to interpose between Him and men a number of subordinate and nearer beings as objects of
worship. In ancient Greece, Necessity, in China, Tien or Heaven, were the Supreme Beings; but a multiplicity of lower gods were the actual objects of worship. The angels of Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Islam and the saints of Romanism illustrate the same tendency. Pantheism and Deism, though they have had considerable vogue as philosophical theories, have proved unstable and impossible as religions, for they have invariably reverted to some kind of polytheism and idolatry, which seems to indicate that they are false processes of the monistic tendency.

(8) **Semitic Monolatry:**

The monistic tendency of reason may enlist in its aid many minor causes, such as tribal isolation or national aggrandizement. It is held that many Serer tribes were monolatrists for either or both of these reasons; but the exigencies of intertribal relations in war and commerce soon neutralized their effects, and merged the tribal gods into a territorial pantheon.

(9) **Monotheism:**

Monotheism, ethical and personal: One further principle may combine with Monism so as to bring about a stable Monotheism, that is the conception of God as standing in moral relations with man. Whenever man reflects upon conduct as moral, he recognizes that there can be only one moral standard and authority, and when God is identified with that moral authority, He inevitably comes to be recognized as supreme and unique. The belief in the existence of other beings called gods may survive for a while; but they are divested of all the attributes of deity when they are seen to be inferior or opposed to the God who rules in conscience. Not only are they not worshipped, but their worship by others comes to be regarded as immoral and wicked. The ethical factor in the monistic conception of God safeguards it from diverging into Pantheism or Deism and thus reverting into Polytheism. For the ethical idea of God necessarily involves His personality, His transcendence as distinct from the world and above it, and also His intimate and permanent relation with man. If He rules in conscience, He can neither be merged in dead nature or abstract being, nor be removed beyond the heavens and the angel host. A thoroughly moralized conception of God emerges first in the Old Testament where it is the prevailing type of thought.
II. THE IDEA OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Course of Its Development:

Any attempt to write the whole history of the idea of God in the Old Testament would require a preliminary study of the literary and historical character of the documents, which lies beyond the scope of this article and the province of the writer. Yet the Old Testament contains no systematic statement of the doctrine of God, or even a series of statements that need only to be collected into a consistent conception. The Old Testament is the record of a rich and varied life, extending over more than a thousand years, and the ideas that ruled and inspired that life must be largely inferred from the deeds and institutions in which it was realized; nor was it stationary or all at one level. Nothing is more obvious than that revelation in the Old Testament has been progressive, and that the idea of God it conveys has undergone a development. Certain well-marked stages of the development can be easily recognized, without entering upon any detailed criticism. There can be no serious question that the age of the Exodus, as centering around the personality of Moses, witnessed an important new departure in Hebrew religion. The most ancient traditions declare (perhaps not unanimously) that God was then first known to Israel under the personal name Yahweh (Yahweh (YHWH) is the correct form of the word, Yahweh being a composite of the consonants of Yahweh and the vowels of ‘adhonay, or lord. Yahweh is retained here as the more familiar form). The Hebrew people came to regard Him as their Deliverer from Egypt, as their war god who assured them the conquest of Canaan, and He, therefore, became their king, who ruled over their destinies in their new heritage. But the settlement of Yahweh in Canaan, like that of His people, was challenged by the native gods and their peoples. In the 9th century we see the war against Yahweh carried into His own camp, and Baal-worship attempting to set itself up within Israel. His prophets therefore assert the sole right of Yahweh to the worship of His people, and the great prophets of the 8th century base that right upon His moral transcendence. Thus they at once reveal new depths of His moral nature, and set His uniqueness and supremacy on higher grounds. During the exile and afterward, Israel’s outlook broadens by contact with the greater world, and it draws out the logical implications of ethical monotheism into a theology at once more universalistic and abstract. Three fairly well-defined periods thus emerge, corresponding to three stages in the development of the Old Testament idea of God: the pre-prophetic period governed by the Mosaic conception,
the prophetic period during which ethical monotheism is firmly established, and the post-exilic period with the rise of abstract monotheism. But even in taking these large and obvious divisions, it is necessary to bear in mind the philosopher’s maxim, that “things are not cut off with a hatchet.” The most characteristic ideas of each period may be described within their period; but it should not be assumed that they are altogether absent from other periods; and, in particular, it should not be supposed that ideas, and the life they represent, did not exist before they emerged in the clear witness of history. Mosaism had undoubtedly its antecedents in the life of Israel; but any attempt to define them leads straight into a very morass of conjectures and hypotheses, archaeological, critical and philosophical; and any results that are thus obtained are contributions to comparative religion rather than to theology.

2. Forms of the Manifestation of God:

Religious experience must always have had an inward and subjective aspect, but it is a long and difficult process to translate the objective language of ordinary life for the uses of subjective experience. “Men look outward before they look inward.” Hence, we find that men express their consciousness of God in the earliest periods in language borrowed from the visible and objective world. It does not follow that they thought of God in a sensuous way, because they speak of Him in the language of the senses, which alone was available for them. On the other hand, thought is never entirely independent of language, and the degree in which men using sensuous language may think of spiritual facts varies with different persons.

(1) The Face or Countenance of God:

The face or countenance (panim) of God is a natural expression for His presence. The place where God is seen is called Peniel, the face of God (Genesis 32:30). The face of Yahweh is His people’s blessing (Numbers 6:25). With His face (the Revised Version (British and American) “presence”) He brought Israel out of Egypt, and His face (the Revised Version (British and American) “presence”) goes with them to Canaan (Exodus 33:14). To be alienated from God is to be hid from His face (Genesis 4:14), or God hides His face (Deuteronomy 31:17,18; 32:20). In contrast with this idea it is said elsewhere that man cannot see the face of God and live (Exodus 33:20; compare Deuteronomy 5:24; Judges 6:22; 13:22). In these later passages, “face” stands for the
entire being of God, as distinguished from what man may know of Him. This phrase and its cognates enshrine also that fear of God, which shrinks from His majesty even while approaching Him, which enters into all worship.

(2) **The Voice and Word of God:**

The voice (qol) and word (dabhar) of God are forms under which His communion with man is conceived from the earliest days to the latest. The idea ranges from that of inarticulate utterance (1 Kings 19:12) to the declaration of the entire law of conduct (Deuteronomy 5:22-24), to the message of the prophet (Isaiah 2:1; Jeremiah 1:2), and the personification of the whole counsel and action of God (Psalm 105:19; 147:18,19; Hosea 6:5; Isaiah 40:8).

(3) **The Glory of God:**

The glory (kabhodh) of God is both a peculiar physical phenomenon and the manifestation of God in His works and providence. In certain passages in Exodus, ascribed to the Priestly Code, the glory is a bright light, “like devouring fire” (24:17); it fills and consecrates the tabernacle (29:43; 40:34,35); and it is reflected as beams of light in the face of Moses (34:29). In Ezekiel, it is a frequent term for the prophet’s vision, a brightness like the appearance of a rainbow (1:28; 10:4; 43:2). In another place, it is identified with all the manifested goodness of God and is accompanied with the proclamation of His name (Exodus 33:17-23). Two passages in Isaiah seem to combine under this term the idea of a physical manifestation with that of God’s effectual presence in the world (3:8; 6:3). God’s presence in creation and history is often expressed in the Psalms as His glory (Psalm 19:1; 57:5,11; 63:2; 97:6). Many scholars hold that the idea is found in Isaiah in its earliest form, and that the physical meaning is quite late. It would, however, be contrary to all analogy, if such phenomena as rainbow and lightning had not first impressed the primitive mind as manifestations of God.

See GLORY.

(4) **The Angel of God:**

The angel (mal’akh) of God or of Yahweh is a frequent mode of God’s manifestation of Himself in human form, and for occasional purposes. It is a primitive conception, and its exact relation to God, or its likeness to man,
is nowhere fixed. In many passages, it is assumed that God and His angel are the same being, and the names are used synonymously (as in Genesis 16:7 ff; 22:15,16; Exodus 3:2,4; Judges 2:4,5); in other passages the idea blurs into varying degrees of differentiation (Genesis 18; 24:40; Exodus 23:21; 33:2,3; Judges 13:8,9). But everywhere, it fully represents God as speaking or acting for the time being; and it is to be distinguished from the subordinate and intermediate beings of later angelology. Its identification with the Messiah and the Logos is only true in the sense that these later terms are more definite expressions of the idea of revelation, which the angel represented for primitive thought.

(5) **The Spirit of God:**

The spirit (ruach) of God in the earlier period is a form of His activity, as it moves warrior and prophet to act and to speak (Judges 6:34; 13:25; 1 Samuel 10:10), and it is in the prophetic period that it becomes the organ of the communication of God’s thoughts to men. See **HOLY SPIRIT**.

(6) **The Name of God:**

The name (shem) of God is the most comprehensive and frequent expression in the Old Testament for His self-manifestation, for His person as it may be known to men. The name is something visible or audible which represents God to men, and which, therefore, may be said to do His deeds, and to stand in His place, in relation to men. God reveals Himself by making known or proclaiming His name (Exodus 6:3; 33:19; 34:5,6). His servants derive their authority from His name (Exodus 3:13,15; 1 Samuel 17:45). To worship God is to call upon His name (Genesis 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25; 1 Kings 18:24-26), to fear it (Deuteronomy 28:58), to praise it (2 Samuel 22:50; Psalm 7:17; 54:6), to glorify it (Psalm 86:9). It is wickedness to take God’s name in vain (Exodus 20:7), or to profane and blaspheme it (Leviticus:8:21; 24:16). God’s dwelling-place is the place where He chooses “to cause his name to dwell” (2 Samuel 7:13; 1 Kings 3:2; 5:3,1; 8:16-19; 18:32; Deuteronomy 12:11,21). God’s name defends His people (Psalm 20:1; Isaiah 30:27). For His name’s sake He will not forsake them (1 Samuel 12:22), and if they perish, His name cannot remain (Joshua 7:9). God is known by different names, as expressing various forms of His self-manifestation (Genesis 16:13; 17:1; Exodus 3:6; 34:6). The
name even confers its revelation-value upon the angel (Exodus 23:20-23). All God’s names are, therefore, significant for the revelation of His being.

(7) **Occasional Forms:**

In addition to these more or less fixed forms, God also appears in a variety of exceptional or occasional forms. In Numbers 12:6-8, it is said that Moses, unlike others, used to see the form (temunah) of Yahweh. Fire, smoke, and cloud are frequent forms or symbols of God’s presence (e.g. Genesis 15:17; Exodus 3:2-4; 19:18; 24:17), and notably “the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night” (Exodus 13:21 f). According to later ideas, the cloud rested upon the tabernacle (Exodus 40:34), and in it God appeared upon the ark (Leviticus 16:2). Extraordinary occurrences or miracles are, in the early period, frequent signs of the power of God (Exodus 7 ff; 1 Kings 17 ff).

The questions of the objectivity of any or all of these forms, and of their relation to the whole Divine essence raise large problems. Old Testament thought had advanced beyond the naive identification of God with natural phenomena, but we should not read into its figurative language the metaphysical distinctions of a Greek-Christian theology.

3. **The Names of God:**

All the names of God were originally significant of His character, but the derivations, and therefore the original meanings, of several have been lost, and new meanings have been sought for them.

(1) **Generic:**

One of the oldest and most widely distributed terms for Deity known to the human race is ‘El, with its derivations ‘Elim, ‘Elohim, and ‘Eloah. Like theos, Dens and God, it is a generic term, including every member of the class deity. It may even denote a position of honor and authority among men. Moses was ‘Elohim to Pharaoh (Exodus 7:1) and to Aaron (Exodus 4:16; compare Judges 5:8; 1 Samuel 2:25; Exodus 21:5,6; 22:7 ff; Psalm 58:11; 82:1). It is, therefore, a general term expressing majesty and authority, and it only came to be used as a proper name for Israel’s God in the later period of abstract monotheism when the old proper name Yahweh was held to be too sacred to be uttered. The meaning of the root ‘El, and the exact relation to it, and to one another, of
'Elohim' and 'Eloah', lie in complete obscurity. By far the most frequent form used by Old Testament writers is the plural 'Elohiym', but they use it regularly with singular verbs and adjectives to denote a singular idea. Several explanations have been offered of this usage of a plural term to denote a singular idea — that it expresses the fullness and manifoldness of the Divine nature, or that it is a plural of majesty used in the manner of royal persons, or even that it is an early intimation of the Trinity; other cognate expressions are found in Genesis 1:26; 3:22; 1 Kings 22:19 f; Isaiah 6:8. These theories are, perhaps, too ingenious to have occurred to the early Hebrew mind, and a more likely explanation is, that they are survivals in language of a polytheistic stage of thought. In the Old Testament they signify only the general notion of Deity.

(2) **Attributive:**

To distinguish the God of Israel as supreme from others of the class 'Elohim, certain qualifying appellations are often added. 'El `Elyon designates the God of Israel as the highest, the most high, among the 'Elohim (Genesis 14:18-20); so do Yahweh `Elyon (Psalm 7:17) and `Elyon alone, often in Psalms and in Isaiah 14:14.

'El Shadday, or Shadday alone, is a similar term which on the strength of some tradition is translated “God Almighty”; but its derivation and meaning are quite unknown. According to Exodus 6:3 it was the usual name for God in patriarchal times, but other traditions in the Pentateuch seem to have no knowledge of this.

Another way of designating God was by His relation to His worshippers, as God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Genesis 24:12; Exodus 3:6), of Shem (Genesis 9:26), of the Hebrews (Exodus 3:18), and of Israel (Genesis 33:20).

Other names used to express the power and majesty of God are tsur, “Rock” (Deuteronomy 32:18; Isaiah 30:29), ‘bhir (construct from ‘abhir), “the Strong One” (Genesis 49:24; Isaiah 1:24; Psalm 132:2); melekh, “King”; ‘adhon, “lord,” and ‘adhonay, “my lord” (Exodus 23:17; Isaiah 10:16,33; Genesis 18:27; Isaiah 6:1). Also ba`al, “proprietor” or “master,” may be inferred as a designation once in use, from its appearance in such Hebrew proper names as Jerubbaal and Ishbaal. The last three names describe God as a Master to whom man stands in the relation of a servant, and they tended to fall into disuse as the
necessity arose to differentiate the worship of Yahweh from that of the gods of surrounding nations.

A term of uncertain meaning is *Yahweh* or ‘*Elohim tsebha’oth*, “Yahweh” or “God of hosts.” In Hebrew usage “host” might mean an army of men, or the stars and the angels — which, apart or in conjunction, made up the host of heaven. God of Hosts in early times meant the war god who led the armies of Israel (1 Samuel 4:4; 2 Samuel 7:8). In 1 Samuel 17:45 this title stands in parallelism with “the God of the armies of Israel.” So all Israel is called the host of Yahweh (Exodus 12:41). In the Prophets, where the term has become a regular appellation, it stands in relation to every form of the power and majesty, physical and moral, of God (e.g. Isaiah 2:12; 6:3,1; 10:23,13). It stands in parallelism with Isaiah’s peculiar title, the Holy One of Israel (Isaiah 5:16,24). It has, therefore, been thought that it refers to the host of heaven. In the Prophets it is practically a proper name. Its original meaning may well have been forgotten or dropped, but it does not follow that a new special significance was attached to the word “hosts.” The general meaning of the whole term is well expressed by the Septuagint translation, *kurios pantokrator*, “Lord Omnipotent.”

(3) *Yahweh (Yahweh).*

This is the personal proper name par excellence of Israel’s God, even as Chemosh was that of the god of Moab, and Dagon that of the god of the Philistines. The original meaning and derivation of the word are unknown. The variety of modern theories shows that, etymologically, several derivations are possible, but that the meanings attached to any one of them have to be imported and imposed upon the word. They add nothing to our knowledge. The Hebrews themselves connected the word with hayah, “to be.” In Exodus 3:14 Yahweh is explained as equivalent to ‘*ehyeh*, which is a short form of ‘*ehyeh* ‘asher ‘*ehyeh*, translated in the Revised Version (British and American) “I am that I am.” This has been supposed to mean “self-existence,” and to represent God as the Absolute. Such an idea, however, would be a metaphysical abstraction, not only impossible to the time at which the name originated, but alien to the Hebrew mind at any time. And the imperfect ‘*ehyeh* is more accurately translated “I will be what I will be,” a Semitic idiom meaning, “I will be all that is necessary as the occasion will arise,” a familiar Old Testament idea (compare Isaiah 7:4,9; Psalm 23).
This name was in use from the earliest historical times till after the exile. It is found in the most ancient literature. According to Exodus 3:13 f, and especially 6:2,3, it was first introduced by Moses, and was the medium of a new revelation of the God of their fathers to the children of Israel. But in parts of Genesis it is represented as being in use from the earliest times. Theories that derive it from Egypt or Assyria, or that would connect it etymologically with Jove or Zeus, are supported by no evidence. We have to be content either to say that Yahweh was the tribal God of Israel from time immemorial, or to accept a theory that is practically identical with that of Exodus — that it was adopted through Moses from the Midianite tribe into which he married. The Kenites, the tribe of Midianites related to Moses, dwelt in the neighborhood of Sinai, and attached themselves to Israel (Judges 1:16; 4:11). A few passages suggest that Sinai was the original home of Yahweh ( Judges 5:4,5; Deuteronomy 33:2). But there is no direct evidence bearing upon the origin of the worship of Yahweh: to us He is known only as the God of Israel.

4. Pre-prophetic Conceptions of Yahweh:

(1) **Yahweh alone the God of Israel.**

Hebrew theology consists essentially of the doctrine of Yahweh and its implications. The teachers and leaders of the people at all times worship and enjoin the worship of Yahweh alone. “It stands out as a prominent and incontrovertible fact, that down to the reign of Ahab .... no prominent man in Israel, with the doubtful exception of Solomon, known by name and held up for condemnation, worshipped any other god but Yahweh. In every national and tribal crisis, in all times of danger and of war, it is Yahweh and Yahweh alone who is invoked to give victory and deliverance” (Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures (3), 21). This is more evident in what is, without doubt, very early literature, even than in later writings (e.g. Judges 5; Deuteronomy 33; 1 Samuel 4 through 6). The isolation of the desert was more favorable to the integrity of Yahweh’s sole worship than the neighborhood of powerful peoples who worshipped many other gods. Yet that early religion of Yahweh can be called monotheistic only in the light of the end it realized, for in the course of its development it had to overcome many limitations.

(a) **His Early Worship:**
The early worship of Yahweh did not exclude belief in the existence of other gods. As other nations believed in the existence of Yahweh (1 Samuel 4:8; 2 Kings 17:27), so Israel did not doubt the reality of other gods (Judges 11:24; Numbers 21:29; Micah 4:5). This limitation involved two others: Yahweh is the God of Israel only; with them alone He makes a COVENANT (which see) (Genesis 15:18; Exodus 6:4,5; 2 Kings 17:34:35), and their worship only He seeks (Deuteronomy 4:32-37; 32:9; Amos 3:2). Therefore, He works, and can be worshipped only within a certain geographical area. He may have been associated with His original home in Sinai long after the settlement in Canaan (Judges 5:4; Deuteronomy 33:2; 1 Kings 19:8,9), but gradually His home and that of His people became identical (1 Samuel 26:19; Hosea 9:3; Isaiah 14:2,25). Even after the deportation of the ten tribes, Canaan remains Yahweh’s land (2 Kings 17:24-28). Early Israelites are, therefore, more properly described as Monolatrists or Henotheists than as Monotheists. It is characteristic of the religion of Israel (in contrast with, e.g. Greek thought) that it arrived at absolute Monotheism along the line of moral and religious experience, rather than that of rational inference. Even while they shared the common Semitic belief in the reality of other gods, Yahweh alone had for them “the value of God.”

(b) Popular Religion:

It is necessary to distinguish between the teaching of the religious leaders and the belief and practice of the people generally. The presence of a higher religion never wholly excludes superstitious practices. The use of Teraphim (Genesis 31:30; 1 Samuel 19:13,16; Hosea 3:4), Ephod (Judges 18:17-20; 1 Samuel 23:6,9; 30:7), Urim and Thummim (1 Samuel 28:6; 14:40, Septuagint), for the purposes of magic and divination, to obtain oracles from Yahweh, was quite common in Israel. Necromancy was practiced early and late (1 Samuel 28:7 ff; Isaiah 8:19; Deuteronomy 18:10. 11 ). Sorcery and witchcraft were not unknown, but were condemned by the religious leaders (1 Samuel 28:3). The burial places of ancestors were held in great veneration (Genesis 35:20; 50:13; Joshua 24:30). But these facts do not prove that Hebrew religion was animistic and polytheistic, any more than similar phenomena in Christian lands would justify such an inference about Christianity.

(c) Polytheistic Tendencies:
Yet the worship of Yahweh maintained and developed its monotheistic principle only by overcoming several hostile tendencies. The Baal-worship of the Canaanites and the cults of other neighboring tribes proved a strong attraction to the mass of Israelites (Judges 2:13; 3:7; 8:33; 10:10; 1 Samuel 8:8; 12:10; 1 Kings 11:5,33; Hosea 2:5,17; Ezekiel 20; Exodus 20:5; 22:20; 34:16,17). Under the conditions of life in Canaan, the sole worship of Yahweh was in danger of modification by three tendencies, coordination, assimilation, and disintegration.

(i) Coordination:

When the people had settled down in peaceful relations with their neighbors, and began to have commercial and diplomatic transactions with them, it was inevitable that they should render their neighbor’s gods some degree of reverence and worship. Courtesy and friendship demanded as much (compare 2 Kings 5:18). When Solomon had contracted many foreign alliances by marriage, he was also bound to admit foreign worship into Jerusalem (1 Kings 11:5). But Ahab was the first king who tried to set up the worship of Baal, side by side with that of Yahweh, as the national religion (1 Kings 18:19). Elijah’s stand and Jehu’s revolution gave its death blow to Baal-worship and vindicated the sole right of Yahweh to Israel’s allegiance. The prophet was defending the old religion and Ahab was the innovator; but the conflict and its issue brought the monotheistic principle to a new and higher level. The supreme temptation and the choice transformed what had been a natural monolatry into a conscious and moral adherence to Yahweh alone (1 Kings 18:21,39).

(ii) Assimilation:

But to repudiate the name of Baal was not necessarily to be rid of the influence of Baal-worship. The ideas of the heathen religions survived in a more subtle way in the worship of Yahweh Himself. The change from the nomad life of the desert to the agricultural conditions of Canaan involved some change in religion. Yahweh, the God of flocks and wars, had to be recognized as the God of the vintage and the harvest. That this development occurred is manifest in the character of the great religious festivals. “Three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep .... and the feast of harvest, the first-fruits of thy labors, which thou sowest in the field: and the feast of ingathering, at the end of the year, when thou gatherest in thy labors out of
the field” (Exodus 23:14-16). The second and the third obviously, and the first probably, were agricultural feasts, which could have no meaning in the desert. Israel and Yahweh together took possession of Canaan. To doubt that would be to admit the claims of the Baal-worship; but to assert it also involved some danger, because it was to assert certain similarities between Yahweh and the Baalim. When those similarities were embodied in the national festivals, they loomed very large in the eyes and minds of the mass of the people (W.R. Smith, Prophets of Israel, 49-57). The danger was that Israel should regard Yahweh, like the Baals of the country, as a Nature-god, and, by local necessity, a national god, who gave His people the produce of the land and, protected them from their enemies, and in return received from them such gifts and sacrifices as corresponded to His nature. From the appearance in Israel, and among Yahweh worshippers, of such names as Jerub-baal, Esh-baal (son of Saul) and Beeliada (son of David, 1 Chronicles 14:7), it has been inferred that Yahweh was called Baal, and there is ample evidence that His worship was assimilated to that of the Canaanite Baalim. The bulls raised by Jeroboam (1 Kings 12:26 ff) were symbols of Yahweh, and in Judah the Canaanite worship was imitated down to the time of Asa (1 Kings 14:22-24; 15:12,13). Against this tendency above all, the great prophets of the 8th century contended. Israel worshipped Yahweh as if He were one of the Baalim, and Hosea calls it Baal-worship (Hosea 2:8,12,13; compare Amos 2:8; Isaiah 1:10-15).

(in) Disintegration:

And where Yahweh was conceived as one of the Baalim or Masters of the land, He became, like them, subject to disintegration into a number of local deities. This was probably the gravamen of Jeroboam’s sin in the eyes of the “Deuteronomic” historian. In setting up separate sanctuaries, he divided the worship, and, in effect, the godhead of Yahweh. The localization and naturalization of Yahweh, as well as His assimilation to the Baals, all went together, so that we read that even in Judah the number of gods was according to its cities (Jeremiah 2:28; 11:13). The vindication of Yahweh’s moral supremacy and spiritual unity demanded, among other things, the unification of His worship in Jerusalem (2 Kings 23).

(d) No Hebrew Goddesses:
In one respect the religion of Yahweh successfully resisted the influence of the heathen cults. At no time was Yahweh associated with a goddess. Although the corrupt sensual practices that formed a large part of heathen worship also entered into Israel’s worship (see ASHERAH), it never penetrated so far as to modify in this respect the idea of Yahweh.

(e) Human Sacrifices:

It is a difficult question how far human sacrifices at any time found place in the worship of Yahweh. The outstanding instance is that of Jephthah’s daughter, which, though not condemned, is certainly regarded as exceptional (Judges 11:30-40). Perhaps it is rightly regarded as a unique survival. Then the story of the sacrifice of Isaac, while reminiscent of an older practice, represents a more advanced view. Human sacrifice though not demanded, is not abhorrent to Yahweh (Genesis 22). A further stage is represented where Ahaz’ sacrifice of his son is condemned as an “abomination of the nations” (2 Kings 16:3). The sacrifice of children is emphatically condemned by the prophets as a late and foreign innovation which Yahweh had not commanded (Jeremiah 7:31; Ezekiel 16:20). Other cases, such as the execution of the chiefs of Shittim (Numbers 25:4), and of Saul’s sons “before Yahweh” (2 Samuel 21:9), and the cherem or ban, by which whole communities were devoted to destruction (Judges 21:10; 1 Samuel 15), while they show a very inadequate idea of the sacredness of human life, are not sacrifices, nor were they demanded by Yahweh’s worship. They were survivals of savage customs connected with tribal unity, which the higher morality of Yahweh’s religion had not yet abolished.

(2) The Nature and Character of Yahweh:

The nature and character of Yahweh are manifested in His activities. The Old Testament makes no statements about the essence of God; we are left to infer it from His action in Nature and history and from His dealing with man.

(a) A God of War:

In this period, His activity is predominantly martial. As Israel’s Deliverer from Egypt, “Yahweh is a man of war” (Exodus 15:3). An ancient account of Israel’s journey to Canaan is called “the book of the Wars of Yahweh” (Numbers 21:14). By conquest in war He gave His people
their land (Judges 5; 2 Samuel 5:24; Deuteronomy 33:27). He is, therefore, more concerned with men and nations, with the moral, than with the physical world.

(b) His Relation to Nature:

Even His activity in Nature is first connected with His martial character. Earth, stars and rivers come to His battle (Judges 5:4,20,21). The forces of Nature do the bidding of Israel’s Deliverer from Egypt (Exodus 8-10; 14:21). He causes sun and moon to stand while He delivers up the Amorites (Joshua 10:12). Later, He employs the forces of Nature to chastise His people for infidelity and sin (2 Samuel 24:15; 1 Kings 17:1). Amos declares that His moral rule extends to other nations and that it determines their destinies. In harmony with this idea, great catastrophes like the Deluge (Genesis 7) and the overthrow of the Cities of the Plain (Genesis 19) are ascribed to His moral will. In the same pragmatic manner the oldest creation narrative describes Him creating man, and as much of the world as He needed (Genesis 2), but as yet the idea of a universal cause had not emerged, because the idea of a universe had not been formed. He acts as one of great, but limited, power and knowledge (Genesis 11:5-8; 18:20). The more universal conception of Genesis 1 belongs to the same stratum of thought as Second Isaiah At every stage of the Old Testament the metaphysical perfections of Yahweh follow as an inference from His ethical preeminence.

(3) The Most Distinctive Characteristic of Yahweh:

The most distinctive characteristic of Yahweh, which finally rendered Him and His religion absolutely unique, was the moral factor. In saying that Yahweh was a moral God, it is meant that He acted by free choice, in conformity with ends which He set to Himself, and which He also imposed upon His worshippers as their law of conduct.

(a) Personality:

The most essential condition of a moral nature is found in His vivid personality, which at every stage of His self-revelation shines forth with an intensity that might be called aggressive. Divine personality and spirituality are never expressly asserted or defined in the Old Testament; but nowhere in the history of religion are they more clearly asserted. The modes of their expression are, however, qualified by anthropomorphisms, by limitations,
moral and physical. Yahweh’s jealousy (Exodus 20:5; Deuteronomy 5:9; 6:15), His wrath and anger (Exodus 32:10-12; Deuteronomy 7:4) and His inviolable holiness (Exodus 19:21,22; 1 Samuel 6:19; 2 Samuel 6:7) appear sometimes to be irrational and immoral; but they are the assertion of His individual nature, of His self-consciousness as He distinguishes Himself from all else, in the moral language of the time, and are the conditions of His having any moral nature whatsoever. Likewise, He dwells in a place and moves from it ( Judges 5:5); men may see Him in visible form (Exodus 24:10; Numbers 12:8); He is always represented as having organs like those of the human body, arms, hands, feet, mouth, eyes and ears. By such sensuous and figurative language alone was it possible for a personal God to make Himself known to men.

(b) Law and Judgment:

The content of Yahweh’s moral nature as revealed in the Old Testament developed with the growth of moral ideas. Though His activity is most prominently martial, it is most permanently judicial, and is exercised through judges, priests and prophets. Torah and mishpat, “law” and “judgment,” from the time of Moses onward, stand, the one for a body of customs that should determine men’s relations to one another, and the other for the decision of individual cases in accordance with those customs, and both were regarded as issuing from Yahweh. The people came to Moses “to inquire of God” when they had a matter in dispute, and he “judged between a man and his neighbor, and made them know the statutes of God, and his laws” (Exodus 18:15,16). The judges appear mostly as leaders in war; but it is clear, as their name indicates, that they also gave judgments as between the people (Judges 3:10; 4:4; 10:2,3; 1 Samuel 7:16). The earliest literary prophets assume the existence of a law which priest and prophet had neglected to administer rightly (Hosea 4:6; 8:1,12; Amos 2:4). This implied that Yahweh was thought of as actuated and acting by a consistent moral principle, which He also imposed on His people. Their morality may have varied much at different periods, but there is no reason to doubt that the Decalogue, and the moral teaching it involved, emanated substantially from Moses. “He taught them that Yahveh, if a stern, and often wrathful, Deity, was also a God of justice and purity. Linking the moral life to the religious idea, he may have taught them too that murder and theft, adultery and false witness, were abhorred and forbidden by their God” (Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures3, 49). The moral
teaching of the Old Testament effected the transition from the national and collective to the individual and personal relation with Yahweh. The most fundamental defect of Hebrew morality was that its application was confined within Israel itself and did little to determine the relation of the Israelites to people of other nations; and this limitation was bound up with Henotheism, the idea that Yahweh was God of Israel alone. “The consequence of this national conception of Yahweh was that there was no religious and moral bond regulating the conduct of the Hebrews with men of other nations. Conduct which between fellow-Hebrews was offensive in Yahweh’s eyes was inoffensive when practiced by a Hebrew toward one who was not a Hebrew (Deuteronomy 23:19 f) ..... In the latter case they were governed purely by considerations of expediency. This ethical limitation is the real explanation of the ‘spoiling of the Egyptians’ “ (Exodus 11:2,3) (G. Buchanan Gray, The Divine Discipline of Israel, 46, 48).

The first line of advance in the teaching of the prophets was to expand and deepen the moral demands of Yahweh. So they removed at once the ethical and theological limitations of the earlier view. But they were conscious that they were only developing elements already latent in the character and law of Yahweh.

5. The Idea of God in the Prophetic Period:

Two conditions called forth and determined the message of the 8th-century prophets — the degradation of morality and religion at home and the growing danger to Israel and Judah from the all-victorious Assyrian. With one voice the prophets declare and condemn the moral and social iniquity of Israel and Judah (Hosea 4:1; Amos 4:1; Isaiah 1:21-23). The worship of Yahweh had been assimilated to the heathen religions around (Amos 2:8; Hosea 3:1; Isaiah 30:22). A time of prosperity had produced luxury, license and an easy security, depending upon the external bonds and ceremonies of religion. In the threatening attitude of Assyria, the prophets see the complement of Israel’s unfaithfulness and sin, this the cause and that the instruments of Yahweh’s anger (Isaiah 10:5,6).

(1) Righteousness:

These circumstances forced into first prominence the righteousness of Yahweh. It was an original attribute that had appeared even in His most martial acts (Judges 5:4; 1 Samuel 12:7). But the prophet’s
interpretation of Israel’s history revealed its content on a larger scale. Yahweh was not like the gods of the heathen, bound to the purposes and fortunes of His people. Their relation was not a natural bond, but a covenant of grace which He freely bestowed upon them, and He demanded as its condition, loyalty to Himself and obedience to His law. Impending calamities were not, as the naturalistic conception implied, due to the impotence of Yahweh against the Assyrian gods (Isaiah 31:1), but the judgment of God, whereby He applied impartially to the conduct of His people a standard of righteousness, which He both had in Himself and declared in judgment upon them. The prophets did not at first so much transform the idea of righteousness, as assert its application as between the people and Yahweh. But in doing that they also rejected the external views of its realization. It consists not in unlimited gifts or in the costliest oblations. “What doth Yahweh require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?” (Micah 6:8). And it tends to become of universal application. Yahweh will deal as a righteous judge with all nations, including Israel, and Israel as the covenant people bears the greater responsibility (Amos 1 through 3). And a righteous judge that metes out even justice to all nations will deal similarly with individuals. The ministry of the prophets produced a vivid consciousness of the personal and individual relation of men to God. The prophets themselves were not members of a class, no order or school or profession, but men impelled by an inner and individual call of God, often against their inclination, to proclaim an unpopular message (Amos 7:14,15; Isaiah 6; Jeremiah 1:6-9; Ezekiel 3:14). Jeremiah and Ezekiel in terms denounced the old idea of collective responsibility (Jeremiah 31:29 ff; Ezekiel 18). Thus in the prophets’ application of the idea of righteousness to their time, two of the limitations adhering to the idea of God, at least in popular religion hitherto, were transcended. Yahweh’s rule is no longer limited to Israel, nor concerned only with the nation as a collective whole, but He deals impartially with every individual and nation alike. Other limitations also disappear. His anger and wrath, that once appeared irrational and unjust, now become the intensity of His righteousness. Nor is it merely forensic and retributive righteousness. It is rather a moral end, a chief good, which He may realize by loving-kindness and mercy and forgiveness as much as by punishment. Hebrew thought knows no opposition between God’s righteousness and His goodness, between justice and mercy. The covenant of righteousness is like the relation of husband to wife, of father to child, one of loving-kindness and everlasting love (Hosea 3:1; 11:4; Isaiah
The stirring events which showed Yahweh’s independence of Israel revealed the fullness of grace that was always latent in His relation to His people (Greg. 33:11; 2 Sam. 24:14). It was enshrined in the Decalogue (Ex. 20:6), and proclaimed with incomparable grandeur in what may be the most ancient Mosaic tradition: “Yah, Yahweh, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abundant in lovingkindness and truth; keeping lovingkindness for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin” (Ex. 34:6,7).

(2) Holiness:

The holiness of Yahweh in the Prophets came to have a meaning closely akin to His righteousness. As an idea more distinctly religious and more exclusively applied to God, it was subject to greater changes of meaning with the development or degradation of religion. It was applied to anything withdrawn from common use to the service of religion — utensils, places, seasons, animals and men. Originally it was so far from the moral meaning it now has that it was used of the “sacred” prostitutes who ministered to the licentiousness of Canaanitish worship (Deut. 23:18).

Whether or not the root-idea of the word was “separateness,” there is no doubt that it is applied to Yahweh in the Old Testament to express his separateness from men and his sublimity above them. It was not always a moral quality in Yahweh; for He might be unapproachable because of His mere power and terror (1 Sam. 6:20; Isaiah 8:13). But in the Prophets, and especially in Isa, it acquires a distinctly moral meaning. In his vision Isaiah hears Yahweh proclaimed as “holy, holy, holy,” and he is filled with the sense of his own sin and of that of Israel (Isaiah 6; compare 1:4; Amos 2:7). But even here the term conveys more than moral perfection. Yahweh is already “the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy” (Isaiah 57:15). It expresses the full Divinity of Yahweh in His uniqueness and self-existence (1 Sam. 2:2; Amos 4:2; Hosea 11:9). It would therefore seem to stand in antithesis to righteousness, as expressing those qualities of God, metaphysical and moral, by which He is distinguished and separated from men, while righteousness involves those moral activities and relations which man may share with God. But in the Prophets, God’s entire being is moral and His whole activity is righteous. The meanings of the terms, though not identical, coincide; God’s holiness is realized in righteousness. “God the Holy One is sanctified in righteousness” (Isaiah 5:16). So
Isaiah’s peculiar phrase, “the Holy One of Israel,” brings God in His most exalted being into a relation of knowledge and moral reciprocity with Israel.

(3) **Universality:**

The moralizing of righteousness and holiness universalized Deity. — From Amos downward Yahweh’s moral rule, and therefore His absolute power, were recognized as extending over all the nations surrounding Israel, and the great world-power of Assyria is but the rod of His anger and the instrument of His righteousness (Amos 1 through 2; Isaiah 10:5; 13:5 ff; 19:1 ff). Idolatrous and polytheistic worship of all kinds are condemned. The full inference of Monotheism was only a gradual process, even with the prophets. It is not clear that the 8th-century prophets all denied the existence of other gods, though Isaiah’s term for them, ‘elilitim (“things of nought,” “no-gods”), points in that direction. At least the monotheistic process had set in. And Yahweh’s control over other nations was not exercised merely from Israel’s point of view. The issue of the judgment upon the two great powers of Egypt and Assyria was to be their conversion to the religion of Yahweh (Isaiah 19:24,25; compare 2:2-4 = Micah 4:1-3). Yet Hebrew universalism never went beyond the idea that all nations should find their share in Yahweh through Israel (Zec 8:23). The nations from the ends of the earth shall come to Yahweh and declare that their fathers’ gods were “lies, even vanity and things wherein there is no profit” (Jeremiah 16:19). It is stated categorically that “Yahweh he is God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath; there is none else” (Deuteronomy 4:39).

(4) **Unity:**

The unity of God was the leading idea of Josiah’s reformation. Jerusalem was cleansed of every accretion of Baal-worship and of other heathen religions that had established themselves by the side of the worship of Yahweh (2 Kings 23:4-8,10-14). The semi-heathen worship of Yahweh in many local shrines, which tended to disintegrate His unity, was swept away (2 Kings 23:8,9). The reform was extended to the Northern Kingdom (2 Kings 23:15-20), so that Jerusalem should be the sole habitation of Yahweh on earth, and His worship there alone should be the symbol of unity to the whole Hebrew race.
But the monotheistic doctrine is first fully and consciously stated in Second Isaiah. There is no God but Yahweh: other gods are merely graven images, and their worshippers commit the absurdity of worshipping the work of their own hands (Isaiah 42:8; 44:8-20). Yahweh manifests His deity in His absolute sovereignty of the world, both of Nature and history. The prophet had seen the rise and fall of Assyria, the coming of Cyrus, the deportation and return of Judah’s exiles, as incidents in the training of Israel for her world-mission to be “a light of the Gentiles” and Yahweh’s “salvation unto the end of the earth” (Isaiah 42:1-7; 49:1-6). Israel’s world-mission, and the ordering of historical movements to the grand final purpose of universal salvation (Isaiah 45:23), is the philosophy of history complementary to the doctrine of God’s unity and universal sovereignty.

(5) **Creator and Lord:**

A further inference is that He is Creator and Lord of the physical universe. Israel’s call and mission is from Yahweh who “created the heavens, and stretched them forth; he that spread abroad the earth and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein” (Isaiah 42:5; compare 40:12,26; 44:24; 45:18; Genesis 1). All the essential factors of Monotheism are here at last exhibited, not in abstract metaphysical terms, but as practical motives of religious life. His counsel and action are His own (Isaiah 40:13). Nothing is hid from Him; and the future like the past is known to Him (Isaiah 40:27; 42:9; 44:8; 48:6). Notwithstanding His special association with the temple in Jerusalem, He is “the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity”; the heaven is His throne, and no house or place can contain Him (Isaiah 57:15; 66:1). No force of history or Nature can withstand His purpose (Isaiah 41:17-20; 42:13; 43:13). He is “the First and the Last,” an “Everlasting God” (Isaiah 40:28; 41:4; 48:12). Nothing can be likened to Him or compared with Him (Isaiah 46:5). As the heavens are higher than the earth, so His thoughts and ways transcend those of men (Isaiah 55:8,9). But anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions still abound. Eyes, mouth, ears, nostrils, hands, arms and face are His; He is a man of war (Isaiah 42:13; 63:1 ff); He cries like a travailing woman (Isaiah 42:14), and feeds His flock like a shepherd (Isaiah 40:11). Thus, alone could the prophet express His full concrete Divinity.
His compassion and love are expressed in a variety of ways that lead up directly to the New Testament doctrine of Divine Fatherhood. He folds Israel in His arms as a shepherd his lambs (Isaiah 40:11). Her scattered children are His sons and daughters whom He redeems and restores (Isaiah 43:5-7). In wrath for a moment He hides His face, but His mercy and kindness are everlasting (Isaiah 54:8). Greater than a mother’s tenderness is Yahweh’s love for Israel (Isaiah 49:15; 66:13).

“It would be easy to find in the prophet proof-texts for everything which theology asserts regarding God, with the exception perhaps that He is a spirit, by which is meant that He is a particular kind of substance” (A.B. Davidson in Skinner, Isa, II, xxix). But in truth the spirituality and personality of God are more adequately expressed in the living human language of the prophet than in the dead abstractions of metaphysics.

6. Idea of God in Post-exilic Judaism:

Monotheism appears in this period as established beyond question, and in the double sense that Yahweh the God of Israel is one Being, and that beside Him there is no other God. He alone is God of all the earth, and all other beings stand at an infinite distance from Him (Psalm 18:31; 24:1 ff; 115:3 ff). The generic name God is frequently applied to Him, and the tendency appears to avoid the particular and proper name Yahweh (see especially Psalms 73 through 89; Job; Ecclesiastes).

(1) New Conditions.

Nothing essentially new appears, but the teaching of the prophets is developed under new influences. And what then was enforced by the few has now become the creed of the many. The teaching of the prophets had been enforced by the experiences of the exile. Israel had been punished for her sins of idolatry, and the faithful among the exiles had learned that Yahweh’s rule extended over many lands and nations. The foreign influences had been more favorable to Monotheism. The gods of Canaan and even of Assyria and Babylonia had been overthrown, and their peoples had given place to the Persians, who, in the religion of Zarathushtra, had advanced nearer to a pure Monotheism than any Gentilerace had done; for although they posited two principles of being, the Good and the Evil, they worshipped only Ahura-Mazda, the Good. When Persia gave way to Greece, the more cultured Greek, the Greek who had ideas to disseminate,
and who established schools at Antioch or Alexandria, was a pure Monotheist.

(2) **Divine Attributes.**

Although we do not yet find anything like a dogmatic account of God’s attributes, the larger outlook upon the universe and the deeper reflection upon man’s individual experience have produced more comprehensive and far-reaching ideas of God’s being and activity.

(a) Faith rests upon His eternity and unchangeablehess (Psalm 90:1,2; 102:27). His omniscience and omnipresence are expressed with every possible fullness (Psalm 139; Job 26:6). His almighty power is at once the confidence of piety, and the rebuke of blasphemy or frowardness (Psalm 74:12-17; 104 et passim; Job 36; 37 et passim; Ecclesiasticus 16:17 ff).

(b) His most exalted and comprehensive attribute is His holiness; by it He swears as by Himself (Psalm 89:35); it expresses His majesty (Psalm 99:3,1.9) and His supreme power (Psalm 60:6 ff).

(c) His righteousness marks all His acts in relation to Israel and the nations around her (Psalm 119:137-144; 129:4).

(d) That both holiness and righteousness were conceived as moral qualities is reflected in the profound sense of sin which the pious knew (Psalm 51) and revealed in the moral demands associated with them; truth, honesty and fidelity are the qualities of those who shall dwell in God’s holy hill (Psalm 15); purity, diligence, kindliness, honesty, humility and wisdom are the marks of the righteous man (Proverbs 10 through 11).

(e) In Job and Proverbs wisdom stands forth as the preeminent quality of the ideal man, combining in itself all moral and intellectual excellences, and wisdom comes from God (Proverbs 2:6); it is a quality of His nature (Proverbs 8:22) and a mode of His activity (Proverbs 3:19; Psalm 104:24). In the Hellenistic circles of Alexandria, wisdom was transformed into a philosophical conception, which is at once the principle of God’s self-revelation and of His creative activity. Philo identifies it with His master-conception, the Logos. “Both *Logos* and Wisdom mean for Him the reason and mind of
God, His image impressed upon the universe, His agent of creation and providence, the mediator through which He communicates Himself to man and the world, and His law imposed upon both the moral and physical universe” (Mansfield Essays, 296). In the Book of Wisdom it is represented as proceeding from God, “a breath of the power of God, and a clear effulgence of the glory of the Almighty .... an unspotted mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness” (7:25,26). In man, it is the author of knowledge, virtue and piety, and in the world it has been the guide and arbiter of its destiny from the beginning (chapters 10 through 12).

(f) But in the more purely Hebrew literature of this period, the moral attribute of God that comes into greatest prominence is His beneficence. Goodness and mercy, faithfulness and loving-kindness, forgiveness and redemption are His willing gifts to Israel. “Like as a father pitieth his children, so Yahweh pitieth them that fear him” (

Psalm 103:13; 145:8; 103:8; Ecclesiasticus 2:11 ). To say that God is loving and like a father goes far on the way to the doctrine that He is Love and Father, but not the whole way; for as yet His mercy and grace are manifested only in individual acts, and they are not the natural and necessary outflow of His nature. All these ideas of God meant less for the Jewish than for the Christian mind, because they were yet held subject to several limitations.

(3) Surviving Limitations.

(a) Disappearing Anthropomorphism:

We have evidence of a changed attitude toward anthropomorphisms. God no longer walks on earth, or works under human limitation. Where His eyes or ears or face or hands are spoken of, they are clearly figurative expressions. His activities are universal and invisible, and He dwells on high forevermore. Yet anthropomorphic limitations are not wholly overcome. The idea that He sleeps, though not to be taken literally, implies a defect of His power (Psalm 44:23).

(b) Localization:

In the metaphysical attributes, the chief limitation was the idea that God’s dwelling-place on earth was on Matthew Zion in Jerusalem. He was no
longer confined within Palestine; His throne is in heaven (Psalm 11:4; 103:19), and His glory above the heavens (Psalm 113:4); but

“In Judah is God known:
His name is great in Israel.
In Salem also is his tabernacle,
And his dwelling-place in Zion”
(Psalm 76:1,2; 110:2; compare Ecclesiasticus 24:8 ff).

That these are no figures of speech is manifested in the yearning of the pious for the temple, and their despair in separation from it (Pss 42; 43; compare 122).

(c) Favoritism:

This involved a moral limitation, the sense of God’s favoritism toward Israel, which sometimes developed into an easy self-righteousness that had no moral basis. God’s action in the world was determined by His favor toward Israel, and His loving acts were confined within the bounds of a narrow nationalism. Other nations are wicked and sinners, adversaries and oppressors, upon whom God is called to execute savage vengeance (Psalm 109; 137:7-9). Yet Israel did not wholly forget that it was the servant of Yahweh to proclaim His name among the nations (Psalm 96:2,3; 117). Yahweh is good to all, and His tender mercies are over all His works (Psalm 145:9; Ecclesiasticus 18:13; compare Psalm 104:14; Zec 14:16, and the Book of Jonah, which is a rebuke to Jewish particularism).

(d) Ceremonial Legalism:

God’s holiness in the hands of the priests tended to become a material and formal quality, which fulfilled itself in established ceremonial, and His righteousness in the hands of the scribes tended to become an external law whose demands were satisfied by a mechanical obedience of works. This external conception of righteousness reacted upon the conception of God’s government of the world. From the earliest times the Hebrew mind had associated suffering with the punishment of sin, and blessedness with the reward of virtue. In the post-exilic age the relation came to be thought of as one of strict correspondence between righteousness and reward and between sin and punishment. Righteousness, both in man and God, was not so much a moral state as a measurable sum of acts, in the one case, of obedience, and in the other, of reward or retribution. Conversely, every
calamity and evil that befell men came to be regarded as the direct and equivalent penalty of a sin they had committed. The Book of Job is a somewhat inconclusive protest against this prevalent view.

These were the tendencies that ultimately matured into the narrow externalism of the scribes and Pharisees of our Lord’s time, which had substituted for the personal knowledge and service of God a system of mechanical acts of worship and conduct.

(4) **Tendencies to Abstractness:**

Behind these defective ideas of God’s attributes stood a more radical defect of the whole religious conception. The purification of the religion of Israel from Polytheism and idolatry, the affirmation of the unity of God and of His spirituality, required His complete separation from the manifoldness of visible existence. It was the only way, until the more adequate idea of a personal or spiritual unity, that embraced the manifold in itself, was developed. But it was an unstable conception, which tended on the one hand to empty the unity of all reality, and on the other to replace it by a new multiplicity which was not a unity. Both tendencies appear in post-exilic Judaism.

(a) **Transcendence:**

The first effect of distinguishing too sharply between God and all created being was to set Him above and apart from all the world. This tendency had already appeared in Ezekiel, whose visions were rather symbols of God’s presence than actual experiences of God. In Daniel even the visions appear only in dreams. The growth of the Canon of sacred literature as the final record of the law of God, and the rise of the scribes as its professional interpreters, signified that God need not, and would not, speak face to face with man again; and the stricter organization of the priesthood and its sacrificial acts in Jerusalem tended to shut men generally out from access to God, and to reduce worship into a mechanical performance. A symptom of this fact was the disuse of the personal name Yahweh and the substitution for it of more general and abstract terms like God and Lord.

(b) **Skepticism:**

Not only an exaggerated awe, but also an element of skepticism, entered into the disuse of the proper name, a sense of the inadequacy of any name.
In the Wisdom literature, God’s incomprehensibility and remoteness appear for the first time as a conscious search after Him and a difficulty to find Him (Job 16:18-21; 23:3,8,9; Proverbs 30:2-4). Even the doctrine of immortality developed with the sense of God’s present remoteness and the hope of His future nearness (Psalm 17:15; Job 19:25). But Jewish theology was no cold Epicureanism or rationalistic Deism. Men’s religious experiences apprehended God more intimately than their theology professed.

(c) Immanence:

By a “happy inconsistency” (Montefiore) they affirmed His immanence both in Nature (Psalm 104; The Wisdom of Solomon 8:1; 12:1,2) and in man’s inner experience (Proverbs 15:3,11; 1 Chronicles 28:9; 29:17,18). Yet that transcendence was the dominating thought is manifest, most of all, in the formulation of a number of mediating conceptions, which, while they connected God and the world, also revealed the gulf that separated them.

(5) Logos, Memra’ and Angels:

This process of abstraction had gone farthest in Alexandria, where Jewish thought had so far assimilated Platonic philosophy, that Philo and Wisdom conceive God as pure being who could not Himself come into any contact with the material and created world. His action and revelation are therefore mediated by His Powers, His Logos and His Wisdom, which, as personified or hypostatized attributes, become His vicegerents on earth. But in Palestine, too many mediating agencies grew up between God and man. The memra’, or word of God, was not unlike Philo’s Logos. The deified law partly corresponded to Alexandrian Wisdom. The Messiah had already appeared in the Prophets, and now in some circles He was expected as the mediator of God’s special favor to Israel. The most important and significant innovation in this connection was the doctrine of angels. It was not entirely new, and Babylonian and Persian influences may have contributed to its development; but its chief cause lay in the general scheme of thought. Angels became intermediaries of revelation (Zec 1:9,12,19; 3:1 ff), the instruments of God’s help (Daniel 3:28; 2 Macc 11:6), and of His punishment (Apoc Baruch 21:23). The ancient gods of the nations became their patron angels (Daniel 10:13-20); but Israel’s hatred of their Gentile enemies often led to their transforming the latter’s
deities into demons. Incidentally a temporary solution of the problem of evil was thus found, by shifting all responsibility for evil from Yahweh to the demons. The unity and supremacy of God were maintained by the doubtful method of delegating His manifold, and especially His contradictory, activities to subordinate and partially to hostile spirits, which involved a new Polytheism. The problem of the One and the Many in ultimate reality cannot be solved by merely separating them. Hebrew Monotheism was unstable; it maintained its own truth even partially by affirming contradictories, and it contained in itself the demand for a further development. The few pluralistic phrases in the Old Testament (as Genesis 1:26; 3:22; 11:7; Isaiah 6:8, and ‘Elohim) are not adumbrations of the Trinity, but only philological survivals. But the Messianic hope was an open confession of the incompleteness of the Old Testament revelation of God.

**III. THE IDEA OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

1. **Dependence on the Old Testament:**

The whole of the New Testament presupposes and rests upon the Old Testament. Jesus Christ and His disciples inherited the idea of God revealed in the Old Testament, as it survived in the purer strata of Jewish religion. So much was it to them and their contemporaries a matter of course, that it never occurred to them to proclaim or enforce the idea of God. Nor did they consciously feel the need of amending or changing it. They sought to correct some fallacious deductions made by later Judaism, and, unconsciously, they dropped the cruder anthropomorphisms and limitations of the Old Testament idea. But their point of departure was always the higher teaching of the prophets and Psalms, and their conscious endeavor in presenting God to men was to fulfill the Law and the Prophets (Matthew 5:17). All the worthier ideas concerning God evolved in the Old Testament reappear in the New Testament. He is One, supreme, living, personal and spiritual, holy, righteous and merciful. His power and knowledge are all-sufficient, and He is not limited in time or place. Nor can it be said that any distinctly new attributes are ascribed to God in the New Testament. Yet there is a difference. The conception and all its factors are placed in a new relation to man and the universe, whereby their meaning is transformed, enhanced and enriched. The last trace of particularism, with its tendency to Polytheism, disappears. God can no longer bear a proper name to associate Him with Israel, or to distinguish Him from other gods,
for He is the God of all the earth, who is no respecter of persons or nations. Two new elements entered men’s religious thought and gradually lifted its whole content to a new plane — Jesus Christ’s experience and manifestation of the Divine Fatherhood, and the growing conviction of the church that Christ Himself was God and the full and final revelation of God.

2. Gentile Influence:

Greek thought may also have influenced New Testament thought, but in a comparatively insignificant and subordinate way. Its content was not taken over bodily as was that of Hebrew thought, and it did not influence the fountain head of New Testament ideas. It did not color the mind and teaching of Jesus Christ. It affected the form rather than matter of New Testament teaching. It appears in the clear-cut distinction between flesh and spirit, mind and body, which emerges in Paul’s Epistles, and so it helped to define more accurately the spirituality of God. The idea of the Logos in John, and the kindred idea of Christ as the image of God in Paul and He, owe something to the influence of the Platonic and Stoic schools. As this is the constructive concept employed in the New Testament to define the religious significance of Christ and His essential relation to God, it modifies the idea of God itself, by introducing a distinction within the unity into its innermost meaning.

3. Absence of Theistic Proofs:

Philosophy never appears in the New Testament on its own account, but only as subservient to Christian experience. In the New Testament as in the Old Testament, the existence of God is taken for granted as the universal basis of all life and thought. Only in three passages of Paul’s, addressed to heathen audiences, do we find anything approaching a natural theology, and these are concerned rather with defining the nature of God, than with proving His existence. When the people of Lystra would have worshipped Paul and Barnabas as heathen gods, the apostle protests that God is not like men, and bases His majesty upon His creatorship of all things (Acts 14:15). He urges the same argument at Athens, and appeals for its confirmation to the evidences of man’s need of God which he had found in Athens itself (Acts 17:23-31). The same natural witness of the soul, face to face with the universe, is again in Romans made the ground of universal responsibility to God (Acts 1:18-21). No formal proof of
God’s existence is offered in the New Testament. Nor are the metaphysical attributes of God, His infinity, omnipotence and omniscience, as defined in systematic theology, at all set forth in the New Testament. The ground for these deductions is provided in the religious experience that finds God in Christ all-sufficient.

4. Fatherhood of God:

The fundamental and central idea about God in New Testament teaching is His Fatherhood, and it determines all that follows. In some sense the idea was not unknown to heathen religions. Greeks and Romans acknowledged Father Zeus or Jupiter as the creator and preserver of Nature, and as standing in some special relation to men. In the Old Testament the idea appears frequently, and has a richer content. Not only is God the creator and preserver of Israel, but He deals with her as a father with his child. “Like as a father pitieth his children, so Yahweh pitieth them that fear Him” (Psalm 103:13; compare Deuteronomy 1:31; 6; Jeremiah 3:4, 19; 31:20; Isaiah 63:16; Hosea 11:1; Malachi 3:17). Even His chastisements are “as a man chasteneth his son” (Deuteronomy 8:5; Isaiah 64:8). The same idea is expressed under the figure of a mother’s tender care (Isaiah 49:15; 66:13; Psalm 27:10), and it is embedded in the covenant relation. But in the Old Testament the idea does not occupy the central and determinative position it has in New Testament, and it is always limited to Israel.

(1) In the Teaching of Jesus Christ:

God is preeminently the Father. It is his customary term for the Supreme Being, and it is noteworthy that Jesus’ usage has never been quite naturalized. We still say “God” where Jesus would have said “the Father.” He meant that the essential nature of God, and His relation to men, is best expressed by the attitude and relation of a father to his children; but God is Father in an infinitely higher and more perfect degree than any man. He is “good” and “perfect,” the heavenly Father, in contrast with men, who, even as fathers, are evil (Matthew 5:48; 7:11). What in them is an ideal imperfectly and intermittently realized, is in Him completely fulfilled. Christ thought not of the physical relation of origin and derivation, but of the personal relation of love and care which a father bestows upon his children. The former relation is indeed implied, for the Father is ever working in the world (John 5:17), and all things lie in His power (Luke 22:42). By His preserving power, the least as well as the greatest creature lives
Matthew 6:26; 10:29). But it is not the fact of God’s creative, preserving and governing power, so much as the manner of it, that Christ emphasizes. He is absolutely good in all His actions and relations (Matthew 7:11; Mark 10:18). To Him men and beasts turn for all they need, and in Him they find safety, rest and peace (Matthew 6:26,32; 7:11). His goodness goes forth spontaneously and alights upon all living things, even upon the unjust and His enemies (Matthew 5:45). He rewards the obedient (Matthew 6:1; 7:21), forgives the disobedient (Matthew 6:14; compare 18:35) and restores the prodigal (Luke 15:11 ff). “Fatherhood is love, original and underived, anticipating and undeserved, forgiving and educating, communicating and drawing to his heart” (Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, I, 82). To the Father, therefore, should men pray for all good things (Matthew 6:9), and He is the ideal of all perfection, to which they should seek to attain (Matthew 5:48). Such is the general character of God as expressed in His Fatherhood, but it is realized in different ways by those who stand to Him in different relations.

(a) Its Relation to Himself:

Jesus Christ knows the Father as no one else does, and is related to Him in a unique manner. The idea is central in His teaching, because the fact is fundamental in His experience. On His first personal appearance in history He declares that He must be about His Father’s business (Luke 2:49), and at the last He commends His spirit into His Father’s hands. Throughout His life, His filial consciousness is perfect and unbroken. “I and the Father are one” (John 10:30). As He knows the Father, so the Father knows and acknowledges Him. At the opening of His ministry, and again at its climax in the transfiguration, the Father bears witness to His perfect sonship (Mark 1:11; 9:7). It was a relation of mutual love and confidence, unalloyed and infinite. “The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand” (John 3:35; 5:20). The Father sent the Son into the world, and entrusted Him with His message and power (Matthew 11:27). He gave Him those who believed in Him, to receive His word (John 6:37,44,45; 17:6,8). He does the works and speaks the words of the Father who sent Him (John 5:36; 8:18,29; 14:24). His dependence upon the Father, and His trust in Him are equally complete (John 11:41; 12:27 f; 17). In this perfect union of Christ with God, unclouded by sin, unbroken by infidelity, God first became for a human life
on earth all that He could and would become. Christ’s filial consciousness was in fact and experience the full and final revelation of God. “No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him” (Matthew 11:27). Not only can we see in Christ what perfect sonship is, but in His filial consciousness the Father Himself is so completely reflected that we may know the perfect Father also. “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father” (John 14:9; compare 8:19). Nay, it is more than a reflection: so completely is the mind and will of Christ identified with that of the Father, that they interpenetrate, and the words and works of the Father shine out through Christ. “The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth his works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me” (John 14:10,11). As the Father, so is the Son, for men to honor or to hate (John 5:23; 15:23). In the last day, when He comes to execute the judgment which the Father has entrusted to Him, He shall come in the glory of the Father (Matthew 16:27; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26). In all this Jesus is aware that His relation to the Father is unique. What in Him is original and realized, in others can only be an ideal to be gradually realized by His communication. “I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me” (John 14:6). He is, therefore, rightly called the “only begotten son” (John 3:16), and His contemporaries believed that He made Himself equal to God (John 5:18).

(b) To Believers:

Through Christ, His disciples and hearers, too, may know God as their Father. He speaks of “your Father,” “your heavenly Father.” To them as individuals, it means a personal relation; He is “thy Father” (Matthew 6:4,18). Their whole conduct should be determined by the consciousness of the Father’s intimate presence (Matthew 6:1,4). To do His will is the ideal of life (Matthew 7:21; 12:50). More explicitly, it is to act as He does, to love and forgive as He loves and forgives (Matthew 5:45); and, finally, to be perfect as He is perfect (Matthew 5:48). Thus do men become sons of their Father who is in heaven. Their peace and safety lay in their knowledge of His constant and all-sufficient care (Matthew 6:26,32). The ultimate goal of men’s relation to Christ is that through Him they should come to a relation with the Father like His relation both to the
Father and to them, wherein Father, Son, and believers form a social unity (John 14:21; 17:23; compare 17:21).

(c) To All Men:

While God’s fatherhood is thus realized and revealed, originally and fully in Christ, derivatively and partially in believers, it also has significance for all men. Every man is born a child of God and heir of His kingdom (Luke 18:16). During childhood, all men are objects of His fatherly love and care (Matthew 18:10), and it is not His will that one of them should perish (Matthew 18:14). Even if they become His enemies, He still bestows His beneficence upon the evil and the unjust (Matthew 5:44,45; Luke 6:35). The prodigal son may become unworthy to be called a son, but the father always remains a father. Men may become so far unfaithful that in them the fatherhood is no longer manifest and that their inner spirits own not God, but the devil, as their father (John 8:42-44). So their filial relation to God may be broken, but His nature and attitude are not changed. He is the Father absolutely, and as Father is He perfect (Matthew 5:48). The essential and universal Divine Fatherhood finds its eternal and continual object in the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father. As a relation with men, it is qualified by their attitude to God; while some by faithlessness make it of no avail, others by obedience become in the reality of their experience sons of their Father in heaven.

See CHILDREN OF GOD.

(2) In Apostolic Teaching:

In the apostolic teaching, although the Fatherhood of God is not so prominently or so abundantly exhibited as it was by Jesus Christ, it lies at the root of the whole system of salvation there presented. Paul’s central doctrine of justification by faith is but the scholastic form of the parable of the Prodigal Son. John’s one idea, that God is love, is but an abstract statement of His fatherhood. In complete accord with Christ’s teaching, that only through Himself men know the Father and come to Him, the whole apostolic system of grace is mediated through Christ the Son of God, sent because “God so loved the world” (John 3:16), that through His death men might be reconciled to God (Romans 5:10; 8:3). He speaks to men through the Son who is the effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance (Hebrews 1:2,3). The central position assigned to Christ involves the central position of the Fatherhood.
As in the teaching of Jesus, so in that of the apostles, we distinguish three different relationships in which the fatherhood is realized in varying degrees:

(a) Father of Jesus Christ:

Primarily He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Romans 15:6; 2 Corinthians 1:3). As such He is the source of every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ (Ephesians 1:3). Through Christ we have access unto the Father (Ephesians 2:18).

(b) Our Father:

He is, therefore, God our Father (Romans 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:3). Believers are sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:26). “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God” (Romans 8:14). These receive the spirit of adoption whereby they cry, Abba, Father (Romans 8:15; Galatians 4:6). The figure of adoption has sometimes been understood as implying the denial of man’s natural sonship and God’s essential Fatherhood, but that would be pressing the figure beyond Paul’s purpose.

(c) Universal Father:

The apostles’ teaching, like Christ’s, is that man in sin cannot possess the filial consciousness or know God as Father; but God, in His attitude to man, is always and essentially Father. In the sense of creaturehood and dependence, man in any condition is a son of God (Acts 17:28). And to speak of any other natural sonship which is not also morally realized is meaningless. From God’s standpoint, man even in his sin is a possible son, in the personal and moral sense; and the whole process and power of his awakening to the realization of his sonship issues from the fatherly love of God, who sent His Son and gave the Spirit (Romans 5:5,8). He is “the Father” absolutely, “one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all. But unto each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ” (Ephesians 4:6,7).

5. God is King:

After the Divine Fatherhood, the kingdom of God (Mark and Luke) or of heaven (Matthew) is the next ruling conception in the teaching of Jesus. As the doctrine of the Fatherhood sets forth the individual relation of men to
God, that of the kingdom defines their collective and social condition, as determined by the rule of the Father.

(1) The Kingdom of God:

Christ adopted and transformed the Old Testament idea of Yahweh’s rule into an inner and spiritual principle of His gospel, without, however, quite detaching it from the external and apocalyptic thought of His time. He adopts the Jewish idea in so far as it involves the enforcing of God’s rule; and in the immediate future He anticipates such a reorganization of social conditions in the manifestation of God’s reign over men and Nature, as will ultimately amount to a regeneration of all things in accordance with the will of God (Mark 9:1; 13:30; Matthew 16:28; 19:28). But He eliminated the particularism and favoritism toward the Jews, as well as the non-moral, easy optimism as to their destiny in the kingdom, which obtained in contemporary thought. The blessings of the kingdom are moral and spiritual in their nature, and the conditions of entrance into it are moral too (Matthew 8:11; 21:31,43; 23:37,38; Luke 13:29). They are humility, hunger and thirst after righteousness, and the love of mercy, purity and peace (Matthew 5:3-10; 18:1,3; compare Matthew 20:26-28; 25:34; 7:21; John 3:3; Luke 17:20,21). The king of such a kingdom is, therefore, righteous, loving and gracious toward all men; He governs by the inner communion of spirit with spirit and by the loving coordination of the will of His subjects with his own will.

(2) Its King:

But who is the king?

(a) God:

Generally in Mark and Lk, and sometimes in Matthew, it is called the kingdom of God. In several parables, the Father takes the place of king, and it is the Father that gives the kingdom (Luke 12:32). God the Father is therefore the King, and we are entitled to argue from Jesus’ teaching concerning the kingdom to His idea of God. The will of God is the law of the kingdom, and the ideal of the kingdom is, therefore, the character of God.

(b) Christ:
But in some passages Christ reveals the consciousness of his own Kingship. He approves Peter’s confession of his Messiahship, which involves Kingship (Matthew 16:16). He speaks of a time in the immediate future when men shall see “the Son of man coming in his kingdom” (Matthew 16:28). As judge of all men, He designates Himself king (Matthew 25:34; Luke 19:38). He accepts the title king from Pilate (Matthew 27:11,12; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:3; John 18:37), and claims a kingdom which is not of this world (John 18:36). His disciples look to Him for the restoration of the kingdom (Acts 1:6). His kingdom, like that of God, is inner, moral and spiritual.

(c) Their Relation:

But there can be only one moral kingdom, and only one supreme authority in the spiritual realm. The coordination of the two kingships must be found in their relation to the Fatherhood. The two ideas are not antithetical or even independent. They may have been separate and even opposed as Christ found them, but He used them as two points of apperception in the minds of His hearers, by which He communicated to them His one idea of God, as the Father who ruled a spiritual kingdom by love and righteousness, and ordered Nature and history to fulfill His purpose of grace. Men’s prayer should be that the Father’s kingdom may come (Matthew 6:9,10). They enter the kingdom by doing the Father’s will (Matthew 7:21). It is their Father’s good pleasure to give them the kingdom (Luke 12:32). The Fatherhood is primary, but it carries with it authority, government, law and order, care and provision, to set up and organize a kingdom reflecting a Father’s love and expressing His will.

And as Christ is the revealer and mediator of the Fatherhood, He also is the messenger and bearer of the kingdom. In his person, preaching and works, the kingdom is present to men (Matthew 4:17,23; 12:28), and as its king He claims men’s allegiance and obedience (Matthew 11:28,29). His sonship constitutes His relation to the kingdom. As son He obeys the Father, depends upon Him, represents Him to men, and is one with Him. And in virtue of this relation, He is the messenger of the kingdom and its principle, and at the same time He shares with the Father its authority and Kingship.
Apostolic Teaching:

In the apostolic writings, the emphasis upon the elements of kingship, authority, law and righteousness is greater than in the gospels. The kingdom is related to God (Galatians 21; Colossians 4:11; 1 Thessalonians 2:12; 2 Thessalonians 1:5), and to Christ (Colossians 1:13; 2 Timothy 4:1,18; 2 Peter 1:11), and to both together (Ephesians 5:5; compare 1 Corinthians 15:24). The phrase “the kingdom of the Son of his love” sums up the idea of the joint kingship, based upon the relation of Father and Son.

6. Moral Attributes:

The nature and character of God are summed up in the twofold relation of Father and King in which He stands to men, and any abstract statements that may be made about Him, any attributes that may be ascribed to Him, are deductions from His royal Fatherhood.

1. Personality:

That a father and king is a person needs not to be argued, and it is almost tautology to say that a person is a spirit. Christ relates directly the spirituality of God to His Fatherhood. “The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is Spirit” (John 4:23,14 margin). Figurative expressions denoting the same truth are the Johannine phrases, ‘God is life’ (1 John 5:20), and “God is light” (1 John 1:5).

2. Love:

Love is the most characteristic attribute of Fatherhood. It is the abstract term that most fully expresses the concrete character of God as Father. In John’s theology, it is used to sum up all God’s perfections in one general formula. God is love, and where no love is, there can be no knowledge of God and no realization of Him (1 John 4:8,16). With one exception (Luke 11:42), the phrase “the love of God” appears in the teaching of Jesus only as it is represented in the Fourth Gospel. There it expresses the bond of union and communion, issuing from God, that holds together the whole spiritual society, God, Christ and believers (John 10; 14:21). Christ’s mission was that of revelation, rather than of interpretation, and what in person and act He represents before men as the living Father, the apostles describe as almighty and universal love. They saw and realized this
love first in the Son, and especially in His sacrificial death. It is “the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Romans 8:39). “God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5:8; compare Ephesians 2:4). Love was fully made known in Christ’s death (1 John 3:16). The whole process of the incarnation and death of Christ was also a sacrifice of God’s and the one supreme manifestation of His nature as love (1 John 4:9,10; compare John 3:16). The love of God is His fatherly relation to Christ extended to men through Christ. By the Father’s love bestowed upon us, we are called children of God (1 John 3:1). Love is not only an emotion of tenderness and beneficence which bestows on men the greatest gifts, but a relation to God which constitutes their entire law of life. It imposes upon men the highest moral demands, and communicates to them the moral energy by which alone they can be met. It is law and grace combined. The love of God is perfected only in those who keep the word of Jesus Christ the Righteous (“For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments” (1 John 5:3). It is manifested especially in brotherly love (1 John 4:12,20). It cannot dwell with worldliness (1 John 2:15) or callous selfishness (1 John 3:17). Man derives it from God as he is made the son of God, begotten of Him (1 John 4:7).

(3) Righteousness and Holiness:

Righteousness and holiness were familiar ideas to Jesus and His disciples, as elements in the Divine character. They were current in the thought of their time, and they stood foremost in the Old Testament conception. They were therefore adopted in their entirety in the New Testament, but they stand in a different context. They are coordinated with and even subordinated to, the idea of love. As kingship stands to fatherhood, so righteousness and holiness stand to love.

(a) Once we find the phrase “Holy Father” spoken by Jesus (John 17:11; compare 1 Peter 1:15,16). But generally the idea of holiness is associated with God in His activity through the Holy Spirit, which renews, enlightens, purifies and cleanses the lives of men. Every vestige of artificial, ceremonial, non-moral meaning disappears from the idea of holiness in the New Testament. The sense of separation remains only as separation from sin. So Christ as high priest is “holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners” (Hebrews 7:26). Where it dwells, no uncleanness must be (1 Corinthians 6:19). Holiness is not a legal
or abstract morality, but a life made pure and noble by the love of God shed abroad in men’s hearts (Romans 5:5). “The kingdom of God is ... righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit” (Romans 14:17).

(b) Righteousness as a quality of character is practically identical with holiness in the New Testament. It is opposed to sin (Romans 6:13,10) and iniquity (2 Corinthians 6:14). It is coupled with goodness and truth as the fruit of the light (Ephesians 5:9; compare 1 Timothy 6:11; 2 Timothy 2:22). It implies a rule or standard of conduct, which in effect is one with the life of love and holiness. It is brought home to men by the conviction of the Holy Spirit (John 16:8). In its origin it is the righteousness of God (Matthew 6:33; compare John 17:25). In Paul’s theology, “the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe” (Romans 3:22) is the act of God, out of free grace, declaring and treating the sinner as righteous, that he thereby may become righteous, even as “we love, because he first loved us” (1 John 4:19). The whole character of God, then, whether we call it love, holiness or righteousness, is revealed in His work of salvation, wherein He goes forth to men in love and mercy, that they may be made citizens of His kingdom, heirs of His righteousness, and participators in His love.

7. Metaphysical Attributes:

The abstract being of God and His metaphysical attributes are implied, but not defined, in the New Testament. His infinity, omnipotence and omniscience are not enunciated in terms, but they are postulated in the whole scheme of salvation which He is carrying to completion. He is Lord of heaven and earth (Matthew 11:25). The forces of Nature are at His command (Matthew 5:45; 6:30). He can answer every prayer and satisfy every need (Matthew 7:7-12). All things are possible to Him (Mark 10:27; 14:36). He created all things (Ephesians 3:9). All earthly powers are derived from Him (Romans 13:1). By His power, He raised Christ from the dead and subjected to Him “all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion” in heaven and on earth (Ephesians 1:20,21; compare Matthew 28:18). Every power and condition of existence are subordinated to the might of His love unto His saints (Romans 8:38,39). Neither time nor place can limit Him: He is the eternal God (Romans 16:26). His knowledge is as infinite as His power; He knows
what the Son and the angels know not (Mark 13:32). He knows the hearts of men (Luke 16:15) and all their needs (Matthew 6:8,32). His knowledge is especially manifested in His wisdom by which He works out His purpose of salvation, “the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Ephesians 3:10,11). The teaching of the New Testament implies that all perfections of power, condition and being cohere in God, and are revealed in His love. They are not developed or established on metaphysical grounds, but they flow out of His perfect fatherhood. Earthly fathers do what good they can for their children, but the Heavenly Father does all things for the best for His children — “to them that love God all things work together for good” — because He is restricted by no limits of power, will or wisdom (Matthew 7:11; Romans 8:28).

8. The Unity of God:

It is both assumed through the New Testament and stated categorically that God is one (Mark 12:29; Romans 3:30; Ephesians 4:6). No truth had sunk more deeply into the Hebrew mind by this time than the unity of God.

(1) The Divinity of Christ:

Yet it is obvious from what has been written, that Jesus Christ claimed a power, authority and position so unique that they can only be adequately described by calling Him God; and the apostolic church both in worship and in doctrine accorded Him that honor. All that they knew of God as now fully and finally revealed was summed up in His person, “for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (Colossians 2:9). If they did not call Him God, they recognized and named Him everything that God meant for them.

(2) The Holy Spirit:

Moreover, the Holy Spirit is a third term that represents a Divine person in the experience, thought and language of Christ and His disciples. In the Johannine account of Christ’s teaching, it is probable that the Holy Spirit is identified with the risen Lord Himself (John 14:16,17; compare 14:18), and Paul seems also to identify them in at least one passage: “the Lord is the Spirit” (2 Corinthians 3:17). But in other places the three names are
ranged side by side as representing three distinct persons (Matthew 28:19; 2 Corinthians 13:14; Ephesians 4:4-6).

(3) The Church’s Problem:

But how does the unity of God cohere with the Divine status of the Son and the distinct subsistence of the Holy Spirit? Jesus Christ affirmed a unity between Himself and the Father (John 10:30), a unity, too, which might be realized in a wider sphere, where the Father, the Son and believers should form one society (John 17:21,23), but He reveals no category which would construe the unity of the Godhead in a manifoldness of manifestation. The experience of the first Christians as a rule found Christ so entirely sufficient to all their religious needs, so filled with all the fullness of God, that the tremendous problem which had arisen for thought did not trouble them. Paul expresses his conception of the relation of Christ to God under the figure of the image. Christ “is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation” (Colossians 1:15; 2 Corinthians 4:4). Another writer employs a similar metaphor. Christ is “the effulgence of (God’s) glory, and the very image of his substance” (Hebrews 1:3). But these figures do not carry us beyond the fact, abundantly evident elsewhere, that Christ in all things represented God because He participated in His being. In the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, the doctrine of the Word is developed for the same purpose. The eternal Reason of God who was ever with Him, and of Him, issues forth as revealed thought, or spoken word, in the person of Jesus Christ, who therefore is the eternal Word of God incarnate. So far and no farther the New Testament goes. Jesus Christ is God revealed; we know nothing of God, but that which is manifest in Him. His love, holiness, righteousness and purpose of grace, ordering and guiding all things to realize the ends of His fatherly love, all this we know in and through Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit takes of Christ’s and declares it to men (John 16:14). The problems of the coordination of the One with the Three, of personality with the plurality of consciousness, of the Infinite with the finite, and of the Eternal God with the Word made flesh, were left over for the church to solve. The Holy Spirit was given to teach it all things and guide it into all the truth (John 16:13). “And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world” (Matthew 28:20).

See JESUS CHRIST; HOLY SPIRIT; TRINITY.
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GOD, CHILDREN OF

See CHILDREN OF GOD.

GOD, IMAGE OF

In Genesis 1:26,27, the truth is declared that God created man in His own “image” (tselem), after His “likeness” (demuth). The two ideas denote the same thing — resemblance to God. The like conception of man, tacit or avowed, underlies all revelation. It is given in Genesis 9:6 as the ground of the prohibition of the shedding of man’s blood; is echoed in Psalm 8; is reiterated frequently in the New Testament (1 Corinthians 11:7; Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10; Isaiah 3:9). The nature of this image of God in man is discussed in other articles — see especially ANTHROPOLOGY. It lies in the nature of the case that the “image” does not consist in bodily form; it can only reside in spiritual qualities, in man’s mental and moral attributes as a self-conscious, rational, personal agent, capable of self-determination and obedience to moral law. This gives man his position of lordship in creation, and invests his being with the sanctity of personality. The image of God, defaced, but not entirely lost through
sin, is restored in yet more perfect form in the redemption of Christ. See the full discussion in the writer’s work, God’s Image in Man and Its Defacement; see also Dr. J. Laidlaw, The Bible Doctrine of Man.

James Orr

GOD, NAMES OF

I. INTRODUCTION:

To an extent beyond the appreciation of modern and western minds the people of Biblical times and lands valued the name of the person. They always gave to it symbolical or character meaning.

While our modern names are almost exclusively designatory, and intended merely for identification, the Biblical names were also descriptive, and often prophetic. Religious significance nearly always inhaled in the name, a parent relating his child to the Deity, or declaring its consecration to the Deity, by joining the name of the Deity with the service which the child should render, or perhaps commemorating in a name the favor of God in the gracious gift of the child, e.g. Nathaniel (“gift of God”); Samuel (“heard of God”); Adonijah (“Yahweh is my Lord”), etc. It seems to us strange that at its birth, the life and character of a child should be forecast by its parents in a name; and this unique custom has been regarded by an unsympathetic criticism as evidence of the origin of such names and their attendant narratives long subsequent to the completed life itself; such names, for example, as Abraham, Sarah, etc. But that this was actually done, and that it was regarded as a matter of course, is proved by the name given to Our Lord at His birth: “Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people” (Matthew 1:21). It is not unlikely that the giving of a character name represented the parents’ purpose and fidelity in the child’s training, resulting necessarily in giving to the child’s life that very direction, which the name indicated. A child’s name, therefore, became both a prayer and a consecration, and its realization in character became often a necessary psychological effect. Great honor or dishonor was attached to a name. The Old Testament writings contain many and varied instances of this. Sometimes contempt for certain reprobate men would be most expressively indicated by a change of name, e.g. the change of Esh-baal, “man of Baal,” to Ish-bosheth, “man of shame” (2 Samuel 2:8 ff), and the omission of Yahweh from the name of the apostate king, Ahaz (2 Kings 15:38, etc.). The name of the last king of Judah was
most expressively changed by Nebuchadnezzar from Mattaniah to Zedekiah, to assure his fidelity to his overlord who made him king (2 Kings 24:17).

See NAMES, PROPER.

1. The Phrase “His Name”:

Since the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament are essentially for purposes of revelation, and since the Hebrews laid such store by names, we should confidently expect them to make the Divine name a medium of revelation of the first importance. People accustomed by long usage to significant character indications in their own names, necessarily would regard the names of the Deity as expressive of His nature. The very phrase “name of Yahweh,” or “His name,” as applied to the Deity in Biblical usage, is most interesting and suggestive, sometimes expressing comprehensively His revelation in Nature (Psalm 8:1; compare 138:2); or marking the place of His worship, where men will call upon His name (Deuteronomy 12:5); or used as a synonym of His various attributes, e.g. faithfulness (Isaiah 48:9), grace (Psalm 23:3), His honor (Psalm 79:9), etc. “Accordingly, since the name of God denotes this God Himself as He is revealed, and as He desires to be known by His creatures, when it is said that God will make a name for Himself by His mighty deeds, or that the new world of the future shall be unto Him for a name, we can easily understand that the name of God is often synonymous with the glory of God, and that the expressions for both are combined in the utmost variety of ways, or used alternately” (Schultz, Old Testament Theology, English translation, I, 124-25; compare Psalm 72:19; Isaiah 63:14; also Davidson, Old Testament Theol., 37-38).

2. Classification:

From the important place which the Divine name occupies in revelation, we would expect frequency of occurrence and diversity of form; and this is just that which we find to be true. The many forms or varieties of the name will be considered under the following heads:

(1) Absolute or Personal Names,

(2) Attributive, or Qualifying Names, and
Names of God in the New Testament. Naturally and in course of time attributive names tend to crystallize through frequent use and devotional regard into personal names; e.g. the attributive adjective qadhosh, “holy,” becomes the personal, transcendental name for Deity in Job and Isaiah. For fuller details of each name reference may be made to separate articles.

II. ABSOLUTE OR PERSONAL NAMES OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

1. ‘Elohim:

The first form of the Divine name in the Bible is [μ yh l θ] ‘Elohim], ordinarily translated “God” (Genesis 1:1). This is the most frequently used name in the Old Testament, as its equivalent [θεός, theos], is in the New Testament, occurring in Genesis alone approximately 200 t. It is one of a group of kindred words, to which belong also ‘El and ‘Eloah.

(1) Its form is plural, but the construction is uniformly singular, i.e. it governs a singular verb or adjective, unless used of heathen divinities (Psalm 96:5; 97:7). It is characteristic of Hebrew that extension, magnitude and dignity, as well as actual multiplicity, are expressed by the plural. It is not reasonable, therefore, to assume that plurality of form indicates primitive Semitic polytheism. On the contrary, historic Hebrew is unquestionably and uniformly monotheistic.

(2) The derivation is quite uncertain. Gesenius, Ewald and others find its origin in [l yßl, ‘ul], “to be strong,” from which also are derived ‘ayil, “ram,” and ‘elah, “terebinth”; it is then an expanded plural form of ‘el; others trace it to [H l a, ‘alah], “to terrify,” and the singular form is found in the infrequent [H wDl] ‘eloah], which occurs chiefly in poetical books; BDB inclines to the derivation from [H l a; ‘alah], “to be strong,” as the root of the three forms, ‘El, ‘Eloah and ‘Elohim, although admitting that the whole question is involved in uncertainty (for full statement see BDB, under the word H l a); a somewhat fanciful suggestion is the Arabic root ‘ul, “to be in front,” from which comes the meaning “leader”; and still more fanciful is the suggested connection with the preposition [l a, ‘el], signifying God as the “goal” of man’s life and aspiration. The origin must always lie in doubt, since the derivation is prehistoric, and the name, with
its kindred words ‘El and ‘Eloah, is common to Semitic languages and religions and beyond the range of Hebrew records.

(3) It is the reasonable conclusion that the meaning is “might” or “power”; that it is common to Semitic language; that the form is plural to express majesty or “all-mightiness,” and that it is a generic, rather than a specific personal, name for Deity, as is indicated by its application to those who represent the Deity ( Judges 5:8; Psalm 82:1) or who are in His presence (1 Samuel 28:13).

2. ‘Eloah:

The singular form of the preceding name, [‘Eloah], is confined in its use almost exclusively to poetry, or to poetic expression, being characteristic of the Book of Job, occurring oftener in that book than in all other parts of the Old Testament. It is, in fact, found in Job oftener than the elsewhere more ordinary plural ‘Elohim. For derivation and meaning see above under 1 (2). Compare also the Aramaic form, [‘elah], found frequently in Ezra and Daniel.

3. ‘El:

In the group of Semitic languages, the most common word for Deity is El ([‘el]), represented by the Babylonian ilu and the Arabic ‘Allah. It is found throughout the Old Testament, but oftener in Job and Psalms than in all the other books. It occurs seldom in the historical books, and not at all in Leviticus The same variety of derivations is attributed to it as to ELOHIM (which see), most probable of which is [‘ul], “to be strong.” BDB interprets ‘ul as meaning “to be in front,” from which came ‘ayil, “ram” the one in front of the flock, and ‘elah, the prominent “terebinth,” deriving ‘El from ‘alah, “to be strong.” It occurs in many of the more ancient names; and, like ‘Elohim, it is used of pagan gods. It is frequently combined with nouns or adjectives to express the Divine name with reference to particular attributes or phases of His being, as ‘El ‘Elyon, ‘El-Ro’i, etc. (see below under III, “Attributive Names”).

4. ‘Adhon, ‘Adhonay:

An attributive name, which in prehistoric Hebrew had already passed over into a generic name of God, is [‘Adhon], [‘Adhonay], the latter formed from the former, being the construct plural, ‘adhone, with the
1st person ending -ay, which has been lengthened to ay and so retained as characteristic of the proper name and distinguishing it from the possessive “my Lord.” the King James Version does not distinguish, but renders both as possessive, “my Lord” (Judges 6:15; 13:8), and as personal name (Psalm 2:4); the Revised Version (British and American) also, in Psalm 16:2, is in doubt, giving “my Lord,” possessive, in text and “the Lord” in the margin. ‘Adhonay, as a name of Deity, emphasizes His sovereignty (Psalm 2:4; Isaiah 7:7), and corresponds closely to Kuriós of the New Testament. It is frequently combined with Yahweh (Genesis 15:8; Isaiah 7:7, etc.) and with ‘Elohim (Psalm 86:12). Its most significant service in Massoretic Text is the use of its vowels to point the unpronounceable tetragrammaton ויהי, indicating that the word “‘Adhonay” should be spoken aloud instead of “Yah-weh.” This combination of vowels and consonants gives the transliteration “Yahweh,” adopted by the American Standard Revised Version, while the other English Versions of the Bible, since Coverdale, represents the combination by the capitals LORD. Septuagint represents it by Κυρίος.

5. Yahweh (Yahweh):

The name most distinctive of God as the God of Israel is ([יהי] Yahweh), a combination of the tetragrammaton with the vowels of ‘Adhonay, transliterated as Yehowah, but read aloud by the Hebrews ‘adhonay). While both derivation and meaning are lost to us in the uncertainties of its ante-Biblical origin, the following inferences seem to be justified by the facts:

(1) This name was common to religions other than Israel’s, according to Friedr. Delitzsch, Hommel, Winckler, and Guthe (EB, under the word), having been found in Babylonian inscriptions. Ammonite, Arabic and Egyptian names appear also to contain it (compare Davidson, Old Testament Theol., 52 f); but while, like ‘Elohim, it was common to primitive Semitic religion, it became Israel’s distinctive name for the Deity.

(2) It was, therefore, not first made known at the call of Moses (Exodus 3:13-16; 6:2-8), but, being already known, was at that time given a larger revelation and interpretation: God, to be known to Israel henceforth under the name “Yahweh” and in its fuller significance, was the One sending Moses to deliver Israel; “when I shall say unto them,
The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said .... I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE .... say .... I WILL BE hath sent me” (Exodus 3:13,14 margin). The name is assumed as known in the narrative of Genesis; it also occurs in pre-Mosaic names (Exodus 6:20; 1 Chronicles 2:25; 7:8).

(3) The derivation is from the archaic [hwj, chawah], “to be,” better “to become,” in Biblical Hebrew hayah; this archaic use of w for y appears also in derivatives of the similar [hyj; chayah], “to live,” e.g. chawwah in Genesis 3:20.

(4) It is evident from the interpretative passages (Exodus 3; 6) that the form is the fut. of the simple stem (Qal) and not future of the causative (Hiph`il) stem in the sense “giver of life” — an idea not borne out by any of the occurrences of the word. The fanciful theory that the word is a combination of the future, present and perfect tenses of the verb, signifying “the One who will be, is, and was,” is not to be taken seriously (Stier, etc., in Oehler’s Old Testament Theology, in the place cited.).

(5) The meaning may with some confidence be inferred from Origen’s transliteration, Iao, the form in Samaritan, Iabe, the form as combined in Old Testament names, and the evident signification in Exodus 3 and other passages, to be that of the simple future, [hwj y” , yahweh], “he will be.” It does not express causation, nor existence in a metaphysical sense, but the covenant promise of the Divine presence, both at the immediate time and in the Messianic age of the future. And thus it became bound up with the Messianic hope, as in the phrase, “the Day of Yahweh,” and consequently both it and the Septuagint translation Kurios were applied by the New Testament as titles of Christ.

(6) It is the personal name of God, as distinguished from such generic or essential names as ‘El, ‘Elohim, Shadday, etc. Characteristic of the Old Testament is its insistence on the possible knowledge of God as a person; and Yahweh is His name as a person. It is illogical, certainly, that the later Hebrews should have shrunk from its pronunciation, in view of the appropriateness of the name and of the Old Testament insistence on the personality of God, who as a person has this name. the American Standard Revised Version quite correctly adopts the
transliteration “Yahweh” to emphasize its significance and purpose as a personal name of God revealed.

6. Tsur (Rock):

Five times in the “Song” of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:4,15,18,30,31) the word [r וָק, tsur], “Rock,” is used as a title of God. It occurs also in the Psalms, Isaiah and poetical passages of other books, and also in proper names, Elizur, Zuriel, etc. Once in the King James Version (Isaiah 44:8) it is translated “God,” but “Rock” in the American Standard Revised Version and the American Revised Version, margin. The effort to interpret this title as indicating the animistic origin of Old Testament religion is unnecessary and a pure product of the imagination. It is customary for both Old Testament and New Testament writers to use descriptive names of God: “rock,” “fortress,” “shield,” “light,” “bread,” etc., and is in harmony with all the rich figurativeness of the Scriptures; the use of the article in many of the cases cited further corroborates the view that the word is intended to be a descriptive title, not the name of a Nature-deity. It presents the idea of God as steadfast: “The appellation of God as tsur, ‘rock,’ ‘safe retreat,’ in Deuteronomy refers to this” (Oehler, Old Testament Theology). It often occurs, in a most striking figure, with the pers. suffix as “my rock,” “their rock,” to express confidence (Psalm 28:1).

7. Kadhosh:

The name ([וֹדֵק q; qadhosh], “holy”) is found frequently in Isaiah and Psalms, and occasionally in the other prophets. It is characteristic of Isaiah, being found 32 times in that book. It occurs often in the phrase [וֹדֵק לַאֵל qedhosh yisra’el], “Holy One of Israel.” The derivation and meaning remain in doubt, but the customary and most probable derivation is from qadhash, “to be separate,” which best explains its use both of man and of the Deity. When used of God it signifies:

(1) His transcendence, His separateness above all other beings, His aloneness as compared to other gods;

(2) His peculiar relation to His people Israel unto whom He separated Himself, as He did not unto other nations. In the former sense Isaiah used it of His sole deity (40:25), in the latter of His peculiar and unchanging covenant-relation to Israel (43:3; 48:17), strikingly,
expressed in the phrase “Holy One of Israel.” Qadhosh was rather attributive than personal, but became personal in the use of such absolute theists as Job and Isaiah. It expresses essential Deity, rather than personal revelation.

8. Shadday:

In the patriarchal literature, and in Job particularly, where it is put into the mouths of the patriarchs, this name appears sometimes in the compound [yD” v ” l a e ‘el shadday], sometimes alone. While its root meaning also is uncertain, the suggested derivation from [d d” v ; shadhadh], “to destroy,” “to terrify,” seems most probable, signifying the God who is manifested by the terribleness of His mighty acts. “The Storm God,” from [a d v ; shadha’], “to pour out,” has been suggested, but is improbable; and even more so the fanciful [v , she], and [yD” , day], meaning “who is sufficient.” Its use in patriarchal days marks an advance over looser Semitic conceptions to the stricter monotheistic idea of almightiness, and is in accord with the early consciousness of Deity in race or individual as a God of awe, or even terror. Its monotheistic character is in harmony with its use in the Abrahamic times, and is further corroborated by its parallel in Septuagint and New Testament, [παντοκρατόρ, pantokrator], “all-powerful.”

III. ATTRIBUTIVE, OR QUALIFYING NAMES:

It is often difficult to distinguish between the personal and the attributive names of God, the two divisions necessarily shading into each other. Some of the preceding are really attributive, made personal by usage. The following are the most prominent descriptive or attributive names.

1. ‘Abhir:

This name ([r yb à ; ‘abhir]), translated in English Versions of the Bible “Mighty One,” is always combined with Israel or Jacob; its root is [r b” a ; ‘abhar], “to be strong” from which is derived the word [r b a e ‘ebher], “pinion,” used of the strong wing of the eagle (Isaiah 40:31), figuratively of God in Deuteronomy 32:11. It occurs in Jacob’s blessing (Genesis 49:24), in a prayer for the sanctuary (Psalm 132:2,5), and in Isaiah (1:24; 49:26; 60:16), to express the assurance of the Divine strength in behalf of the oppressed in Israel (Isaiah 1:24), or in behalf of
Israel against his oppressors; it is interesting to note that this name was first used by Jacob himself.

2. ‘El-’Elohe-Israel:

The name ‘El is combined with a number of descriptive adjectives to represent God in His various attributes; and these by usage have become names or titles of God. For the remarkable phrase ‘EL-’ELOHE-ISRAEL (Genesis 33:20), see separate article

3. ‘Elyon:

This name (‘elyon, “highest”) is a derivative of hl; , “to go up.” It is used of persons or things to indicate their elevation or exaltation: of Israel, favored above other nations (Deuteronomy 26:19), of the aqueduct of “the upper pool” (Isaiah 7:3), etc. This indicates that its meaning when applied to God is the “Exalted One,” who is lifted far above all gods and men. It occurs alone (Deuteronomy 32:8; Psalm 18:13), or in combination with other names of God, most frequently with El (Genesis 14:18; Psalm 78:35), but also with Yahweh (Psalm 7:17; 97:9), or with Elohim (Psalm 56:2 the King James Version; 78:56). Its early use (Genesis 14:18 f) points to a high conception of Deity, an unquestioned monotheism in the beginnings of Hebrew history.

4. Gibbor:

The ancient Hebrews were in constant struggle for their land and their liberties, a struggle most intense and patriotic in the heroic days of Saul and David, and in which there was developed a band of men whose great deeds entitled them to the honorable title “mighty men” of valor ([G, gibborim]). These were the knights of David’s “Round Table.” In like manner the Hebrew thought of his God as fighting for him, and easily then this title was applied to God as the Mighty Man of war, occurring in David’s psalm of the Ark’s Triumphant Entry (Psalm 24:8), in the allegory of the Messiah-King (Psalm 45:3), either alone or combined with [El] (Isaiah 9:6; Jeremiah 32:18), and sometimes with Yahweh (Isaiah 42:13).

5. ‘El-Ro’i:

When Hagar was fleeing from Sarah’s persecutions, Yahweh spoke to her in the wilderness of Shur, words of promise and cheer. Whereupon “she
called the name of Yahweh that spake unto her, Thou art El roi’” (Genesis 16:13 margin). In the text the word [ya r o ro’i], deriv. of ra’ah, “to see,” is translated “that seeth,” literally, “of sight.” This is the only occurrence of this title in the Old Testament.

6. Tsaddiq:

One of the covenant attributes of God, His righteousness, is spoken of so often that it passes from adjective to substantive, from attribute to name, and He is called “Righteous” ([q yDk” , tsaddiq]), or “the Righteous One.” The word is never transliterated but always translated in English Versions of the Bible, although it might just as properly be considered a Divine name as `Elyon or Qadhosh. The root [q d” x ; tsadhaq], “to be straight” or “right,” signifies fidelity to a standard, and is used of God’s fidelity to His own nature and to His covenant-promise (Isaiah 41:10; 42:6; compare Hosea 2:19); it occurs alone (Psalm 34:17), with El (Deuteronomy 32:4), with Elohim (Ezr 9:15; Psalm 7:9; 116:5), but most frequently with Yahweh (Psalm 129:4, etc.). In Exodus 9:27 Pharaoh, in acknowledging his sin against Yahweh, calls Him `Yahweh the Righteous,’ using the article. The suggestive combination, “Yahweh our Righteousness,” is the name given to David’s “righteous Branch” (Jeremiah 23:6) and properly should be taken as a proper noun — the name of the Messiah-King.

7. Kanna:

Frequently in the Pentateuch, most often in the 3 versions of the Commandments (Exodus 20:5; 34:14; Deuteronomy 5:9), God is given the title “Jealous” ([a Nq” , qanna’]), most specifically in the phrase “Yahweh, whose name is Jealous” (Exodus 34:14). This word, however, did not bear the evil meaning now associated with it in our usage, but rather signified “righteous zeal,” Yahweh’s zeal for His own name or glory (compare Isaiah 9:7, “the zeal of Yahweh,” [h a Nq i qin’ah]; also Zec 1:14; 8:2).

8. Yahweh Tsebha’-oth:

Connected with the personal and covenant name Yahweh, there is found frequently the word Sabaoth ([t wOb x ] tsebha’oth], “hosts”). Invariably in the Old Testament it is translated “hosts” (Isaiah 1:9; Psalm 46:7,11,
etc.), but in the New Testament it is transliterated twice, both in the Greek and English (Romans 9:29; Jas 5:4). The passage in Roman is a quotation from Isaiah 1:9 through Septuagint, which does not translate, but transliterates the Hebrew. Origin and meaning are uncertain. It is used of heavenly bodies and earthly forces (Genesis 2:1); of the army of Israel (2 Samuel 8:16); of the Heavenly beings (Psalm 103:21; 148:2; Daniel 4:35). It is probable that the title is intended to include all created agencies and beings, of which Yahweh is maker and leader.

9. “I Am That I Am”:

When God appeared to Moses at Sinai, commissioning him to deliver Israel; Moses, being well aware of the difficulty of impressing the people, asked by what name of God he should speak to them: “They shall say to me, What is his name?” Then “God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM .... say .... I AM hath sent me unto you” (Exodus 3:14). The name of the Deity given here is similar to Yahweh except that the form is not 3rd person future, as in the usual form, but the 1st person (‘ehyeh), since God is here speaking of Himself. The optional reading in the American Revised Version, margin is much to be preferred: “I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE,” indicating His covenant pledge to be with and for Israel in all the ages to follow. For further explanation see above, II, 5.

IV. NEW TESTAMENT NAMES OF GOD.

The variety of names which characterizes the Old Testament is lacking in the New Testament, where we are all but limited to two names, each of which corresponds to several in the Old Testament. The most frequent is the name “God” (Theos) occurring over 1,000 t, and corresponding to El, Elohim, etc., of the Old Testament.

1. God:

It may, as [‘Elohim], be used by accommodation of heathen gods; but in its true sense it expresses essential Deity, and as expressive of such it is applied to Christ as to the Father (John 20:28; Romans 9:5).

2. Lord:

Five times “Lord” is a translation of despotes (Luke 2:29; Acts 4:24; 2 Peter 2:1 the King James Version; Jude 1:4; Revelation 6:10 the King James Version). In each case there is evident
emphasis on sovereignty and correspondence to the ‘Adhon of the Old Testament. The most common Greek word for Lord is [Κύριος, Kurios], representing both Yahweh and ‘Adhonai of the Old Testament, and occurring upwards of 600 times. Its use for Yahweh was in the spirit of both the Hebrew scribes, who pointed the consonants of the covenant name with the vowels of Adhonay, the title of dominion, and of the Septuagint, which rendered this combination as Kurios. Consequently quotations from the Old Testament in which Yahweh occurs are rendered by Kurios. It is applied to Christ equally with the Father and the Spirit, showing that the Messianic hopes conveyed by the name Yahweh were for New Testament writers fulfilled in Jesus Christ; and that in Him the long hoped for appearance of Yahweh was realized.

3. Descriptive and Figurative Names:

As in the Old Testament, so in the New Testament various attributive, descriptive or figurative names are found, often corresponding to those in the Old Testament. Some of these are: The “Highest” or “Most High” [ὑψιστός, hupsistos]), found in this sense only in Luke (1:32,35,76; 2:14, etc.), and Equivalent to ‘Elyon (see III, 3, above); “Almighty,” [Παντοκράτωρ, Pantokrator] (2 Corinthians 6:18; Revelation 1:8, etc.), corresponding to Shadday (see II, 8 above; see also ALMIGHTY); “Father,” as in the Lord’s Prayer, and elsewhere (Matthew 6:9; 11:25; John 17:25; 2 Corinthians 6:18); “King” (1 Timothy 1:17); “King of kings” (1 Timothy 6:15); “King of kings,” “Lord of lords” (Revelation 17:14; 19:16); “Potentate” (1 Timothy 6:15); “Master” (Kurios, Ephesians 6:9; 2 Peter 2:1; Revelation 6:10); “Shepherd,” “Bishop” (1 Peter 2:25).
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GOD, SON (SONS) OF

See SONS OF GOD (OLD TESTAMENT); SONS OF GOD (NEW TESTAMENT).
GOD, THE FATHER

See FATHER, GOD THE.

GOD, THE UNKNOWN

See UNKNOWN.

GODDESS

〈god’-es〉 ([μ yh | θ] ‘elohim, [θεά, thea]): There is no separate word for “goddess” in the Old Testament. In the only instance in which the word occurs in English Versions of the Bible (〈1 Kings 11:5,33), the gender is determined by the noun — “Ashtoreth, the god (goddess) of the Sidonians.” In the New Testament the term is applied to Diana of Ephesus (〈Acts 19:27,35,37).

GODHEAD

〈god’-hed〉: The word “Godhead” is a simple doublet of the less frequently occurring “Godhood.” Both forms stand side by side in the Ancren Riwle (about 1225 AD), and both have survived until today, though not in equally common use. They are representatives of a large class of abstract substantives, formed with the suffix “-head” or “-hood”, most of which formerly occurred in both forms almost indifferently, though the majority of them survive only, or very preponderatingly (except in Scottish speech), in the form -hood. The two suffixes appear in Middle English as “-hede” and “-hod”, and presuppose in the Anglo-Saxon which lies behind them a feminine “haeda” (which is not actually known) by the side of the masculine had. The Anglo-Saxon word “was originally a distinct substantive, meaning `person, personality, sex, condition, quality, rank’ “ (Bradley, in A New English Dict. on a Historical Basis, under the word “-hood”), but its use as a suffix early superseded its separate employment. At first “-hede” appears to have been appropriated to adjectives, “-hod” to substantives; but, this distinction breaking down and the forms coming into indiscriminate use, “-hede” grew obsolete, and remains in common use only in one or two special forms, such as “Godhead,” “maidenhead” (Bradley, as cited, under the word “-head”).

The general elimination of the forms in -head has been followed by a fading consciousness, in the case of the few surviving instances in this form, of the
qualitative sense inherent in the suffix. The words accordingly show a
tendency to become simple denotatives. Thus, “the Godhead” is frequently
employed merely as a somewhat strong synonym of “God” although
usually with more or less emphasis upon that in God which makes Him
God. One of its established usages is to denote the Divine essence as such,
in distinction from the three “hypostases” or “persons” which share its
common possession in the doctrine of the Trinity. This usage is old:
Bradley (op. cit.) is able to adduce instances from the 13th century. In this
usage the word has long held the rank of a technical term, e.g. the Thirty-
Nine Articles of the Church of England, 1571, Art. I: “And in the unity of
this Godhead, there be three persons” (compare the Irish Articles of 1615,
and the Westminster Confession, II, 3); Westminster Shorter Catechism, Q.
6: “There are three persons in the Godhead.” Pursuant to the fading of the
qualitative sense of the word, there has arisen a tendency, when the
qualitative consciousness is vivid, to revive the obsolescent “Godhood,” to
take its place; and this tendency naturally shows itself especially when the
contrast with humanity is expressed. Carlyle, for example (French
Revolution, III, Book vi, chapter iv, section 1), speaking of the
posthumous reaction against Marat, writes: “Shorter godhood had no
divine man”; and Phillips Brooks (Sermons, XIII, 237) speaks of Christ
bridging the gulf “between the Godhood and the manhood.” “Godhood”
seems, indeed, always to have had a tendency to appear in such contrasts,
as if the qualitative consciousness were more active in it than in
“Godhead.” Thus, it seems formerly to have suggested itself almost as
inevitably to designate the Divine nature of Christ, as “Godhead” did to
designate the common Divine essence of the Trinity. Bradley cites
instances from 1563 down.

The fundamental meaning of “Godhead” is, nevertheless, no less than that
of “Godhood,” the state, dignity, condition, quality, of a god, or, as
monotheists would say, of God. As manhood is that which makes a man a
man, and childhood that which makes a child a child, so Godhead is that
which makes God, God. When we ascribe Godhead to a being, therefore,
we affirm that all that enters into the idea of God belongs to Him.
“Godhead” is thus the Saxon equivalent of the Latin “Divinity,” or, as it is
now becoming more usual to say, “Deity.” Like these terms it is rendered
concrete by prefixing the article to it. As “the Divinity,” “the Deity,” so
also “the Godhead” is only another way of saying “God,” except that when
we say “the Divinity,” “the Deity,” “the Godhead,” we are saying “God”
more abstractly and more qualitatively, that is with more emphasis, or at least with a more lively consciousness, of the constitutive qualities which make God the kind of being we call “God.”

The word “Godhead” occurs in the King James Version only 3 times (Acts 17:29; Romans 1:20; Colossians 2:9), and oddly enough it translates in these 3 passages, 3 different, though closely related, Greek words, [τὸ θεἰόν, to theion] [θειότης, theiotes], [θεότης, theotes]. To theion means “that which is Divine,” concretely, or, shortly, “the Deity.” Among the Greeks it was in constant use in the sense of “the Divine Being,” and particularly as a general term to designate the Deity apart from reference to a particular god. It is used by Paul (Acts 17:29) in an address made to a heathen audience, and is inserted into a context in which it is flanked by the simple term “God” (ὁ θεός, he Theos) on both sides. It is obviously deliberately chosen in order to throw up into emphasis the qualitative idea of God; and this emphasis is still further heightened by the direct contrast into which it is brought with the term “man.” “Being, then, the offspring of God, we ought not to think that it is to gold or silver or stone graven by art and device of man that the Godhead is like.” In an effort to bring out this qualitative emphasis, the Revised Version, margin suggests that we might substitute for “the Godhead” here the periphrastic rendering, “that which is Divine.” But this seems both clumsy and ineffective for its purpose. From the philological standpoint, “the Godhead” is very fair equivalent for to theion, differing as it does from the simple “God” precisely by its qualitative emphasis. It may be doubted, however, whether in the partial loss by “Godhead” of its qualitative force in its current usage, one of its synonyms, “the Divinity” (which is the rendering here of the Rhemish version) or “the Deity,” would not better convey Paul’s emphasis to modern readers.

Neither of these terms, “Divinity,” “Deity,” occurs anywhere in the King James Version, and “Deity” does not occur in the Revised Version (British and American) either; but the Revised Version (British and American) (following the Rhemish version) substitutes “Dignity” for “Godhead” in Romans 1:20. Of the two, “Dignity” was originally of the broader connotation; in the days of heathendom it was applicable to all grades of Divine beings. “Deity” was introduced by the Christian Fathers for the express purpose of providing a stronger word by means of which the uniqueness of the Christians’ God should be emphasized. Perhaps “Divinity” retains even in its English usage something of its traditional
weaker connotation, although, of course, in a monotheistic consciousness the two terms coalesce in meaning. There exists a tendency to insist, therefore, on the “Deity” of Christ, rather than his mere “Divinity,” in the feeling that “Divinity” might lend itself to the notion that Christ possessed but a secondary or reduced grade of Divine quality. In Acts 17:29 Paul is not discriminating between grades of Divinity, but is preaching monotheism. In this context, then, to theion does not lump together “all that is called God or is worshipped,” and declare that all that is in any sense Divine should be esteemed beyond the power of material things worthily to represent. Paul has the idea of God at its height before his mind, and having quickened his hearers’ sense of God’s exaltation by his elevated description of Him, he demands of them whether this Deity can be fitly represented by any art of man working in dead stuff. He uses the term to theion, rather than he theos, not merely in courteous adoption of his hearers’ own language, but because of its qualitative emphasis. On the whole, the best English translation of it would probably be “the Deity.” “The Godhead” has ceased to be sufficiently qualitative: “the Godhood” is not sufficiently current: “the Divine” is not sufficiently personal: “the Divinity” is perhaps not sufficiently strong: “Deity” without the article loses too much of its personal reference to compensate for the gain in qualitatively: “the Deity” alone seems fairly to reproduce the apostle’s thought.

The Greek term in Romans 1:20 is theiotes, which again, as a term of quality, is not unfairly rendered by “Godhead.” What Paul says here is that “the everlasting power and Godhead” of God “are clearly perceived by means of His works.” By “Godhead” he clearly means the whole of that by which God is constituted what we mean by “God.” By coupling the word with “power,” Paul no doubt intimates that his mind is resting especially upon those qualities which enter most intimately into and constitute the exaltation of God; but we must beware of limiting the connotation of the term — all of God’s attributes are glorious. The context shows that the thought of the apostle was moving on much the same lines as in Acts 17:29; here, too, the contrast which determines the emphasis is with “corruptible man,” and along with him, with the lower creatures in general (Romans 1:23). How could man think of the Godhead under such similitudes — the Godhead, so clearly manifested in its glory by its works! The substitution for “Godhead” here of its synonym “Divinity” by the Revised Version (British and American) is doubtless due in part to a desire to give distinctive renderings to distinct terms, and in part to a wish to
emphasize, more strongly than “Godhead” in its modern usage emphasizes, the qualitative implication which is so strong in theiotes. Perhaps, however, the substitution is not altogether felicitous. “Divinity,” in its contrast with “Deity,” may have a certain weakness of connotation clinging to it, which would unsuit it to represent theiotes here. It is quite true that the two terms, “Divinity” and “Deity,” are the representatives in Latin Patristic writers respectively of the Greek theiotes and theotes. Augustine (The City of God, VII, 1; compare X, 1) tells us that “Deity” was coined by Christian writers as a more accurate rendering of the Greek theotes than the current “Divinity.” But it does not follow that because “Deity” more accurately renders theotes, therefore “Divinity” is always the best rendering of theiotes. The stress laid by the Greek Fathers on the employment of theotes to express the “Deity” of the Persons of the Trinity was in sequence to attempts which were being made to ascribe to the Son and the Spirit a reduced “Divinity”; and it was the need the Latin Fathers felt in the same interests which led them to coin “Deity” as a more accurate rendering, as they say, of theotes. Meanwhile theiotes and “Divinity” had done service in the two languages, the former as practically, and the latter as absolutely, the only term in use to express the idea of “Deity.” Theotes is very rare in classical Greek, “Deity” non-existent in classical Latin. To represent theiotes uniformly by “Divinity,” if any reduced connotation at all clings to “Divinity,” would therefore be to represent it often very inadequately. And that is the case in the present passage. What Paul says is clearly made known by God’s works, is His everlasting power and all the other everlasting attributes which form His Godhead and constitute His glory. It is theotes which occurs in Colossians 2:9. Here Paul declares that “all the fullness of the Godhead” dwells in Christ “bodily.” The phrase “fullness of the Godhead” is an especially emphatic one. It means everything without exception which goes to make up the Godhead, the totality of all that enters into the conception of Godhood. All this, says Paul, dwells in Christ “bodily,” that is after such a fashion as to be manifested in connection with a bodily organism. This is the distinction of Christ: in the Father and in the Spirit the whole plenitude of the Godhead dwells also, but not “bodily”; in them it is not manifested in connection with a bodily life. It is the incarnation which Paul has in mind; and he tells us that in the incarnate Son, the fullness of the Godhead dwells. The term chosen to express the Godhead here is the strongest and the most unambiguously decisive which the language affords. Theiotes may mean all that theotes can mean; on monotheistic lips it does mean just what theotes means; but theotes must
mean the utmost that either term can mean. The distinction is, not that *theotes* refers to the essence and *theiotes* to the attributes; we cannot separate the essence and the attributes. Where the essence is, there the attributes are; they are merely the determinants of the essence. And where the attributes are, there the essence is; it is merely the thing, of the kind of which they are the determinants. The distinction is that *theotes* emphasizes that it is the highest stretch of Divinity which is in question, while *theiotes* might possibly be taken as referring to Deity at a lower level. It it not merely such divinity as is shared by all the gods many and lords many of the heathen world, to which “heroes” might aspire, and “demons” attain, all the plenitude of which dwells in Christ as incarnate; but that Deity which is peculiar to the high gods; or, since Paul is writing out of a monotheistic consciousness, that Deity which is the Supreme God alone. All the fullness of supreme Deity dwells in Christ bodily. There is nothing in the God who is over all which is not in Christ. Probably no better rendering of this idea is afforded by our modern English than the term “Godhead,” in which the qualitative notion still lurks, though somewhat obscured behind the individualizing implication, and which in any event emphasizes precisely what Paul wishes here to assert — that all that enters into the conception of God, and makes God what we mean by the term “God,” dwells in Christ, and is manifested in Him in connection with a bodily organism.

*Benjamin B. Warfield*

**GODLESS**

*<god’-les>*: This word is not found in the text of the King James Version. It is found, however, in Apocrypha (2 Macc 7:34, “O godless (the Revised Version (British and American) “unholy”) man”). the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes the word “godless” for the word “hypocrite” in the following passages: Job 8:13; 13:16; 15:34; 17:8; 20:5; 27:8; 34:30; 36:13; Proverbs 11:9, Isaiah 33:14. the Revised Version (British and American) does not seem to be consistent in carrying out the idea of “godless” for “hypocrite,” for in Isaiah 9:17; 10:6; Psalm 35:16 this same Hebrew word *chaneph* is translated “profane.” The principal idea lying at the root of the word is that of pollution and profanity; a condition of not merely being without God but assuming an attitude of open and blatant opposition toward God. The godless man is not merely the atheistic, unbelieving or even irreligious, but the openly impious, wicked and profane man. Indeed it can hardly be rightly claimed
that the idea of hypocrisy is involved in the meaning of the word, for the “godless” man is not the one who professes one thing and lives another, but the one who openly avows not only his disbelief in, but his open opposition to, God. Doubtless the idea of pollution and defilement is also to be included in the definition of this word; see Jeremiah 3:9; Numbers 35:33; Daniel 11:31.

William Evans

GODLINESS; GODLY

〈god’-li-nes〉, 〈god’-li〉 ([ἐυσεβεία, eusebeia], [ἐυσεβής, eusebes], [ἐυσεβῶς, eusebos]): In the Old Testament the word rendered “godly” in Psalm 4:3; 32:6 ([דָּעָן; chacidh]) is literally, “kind,” then “pious” (the Revised Version, margin renders it in the former passage, “one that he favoreth”). Sometimes in both the Old Testament and the New Testament a periphrasis is employed, “of God,” “according to God” (e.g. “godly sorrow,” 2 Corinthians 7:10). Godliness, as denoting character and conduct determined by the principle of love or fear of God in the heart, is the summing up of genuine religion. There can be no true religion without it: only a dead “form” (2 Timothy 3:5). The term is a favorite one in the Pastoral Epistles. The incarnation is “the mystery of godliness” (1 Timothy 3:16).

James Orr

GODS

([םיה | א] ‘elohim]; [θεοὶ, theoi]):

The Hebrew plural ‘elohim is generally known as the plural of “majesty” and is the ordinary name for God. The meaning of the plural seems to be “plenitude of powers.” It denotes the fullness of those attributes of power which belonged to the Divine Being. Thus it is usually translated in the singular, “God,” when referring to the God of Israel. When reference is made to the gods of the other nations the word is translated in the plural, “gods.” The heathen nations usually had a plurality of gods. Among the Semites it was customary for one nation or tribe to have its own particular god. Often there were many tribes, or families, or communities, in one nation, each having a particular god. Thus, even among Semites a nation may have many gods and be polytheistic. Among the other nations, Iranian, Hamitic, etc., there were always a number of deities, sometimes a
multitude. There are many references to these in the Old Testament. In a few cases where the plural is used, the singular would be better, e.g. Genesis 3:5 the King James Version; Exodus 32:4,8,23; Ruth 1:15 the King James Version; Judges 17:5; 18:24; 1 Samuel 17:43. This, however, might be disputed.

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Superhuman Beings (God and Angels):

The following are the more important usages of the word in the Old Testament: The translation of Psalm 8:5 is disputed. The Septuagint and the King James Version translate it “angels,” the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, “God,” with “angels” in the margin. The Epistle to the He has the word “angels.” This seems to be more in keeping with the Old Testament ideas of the relation between God, men and angels. Genesis 1:26 has the plural “us,” but it is not certain to whom it refers, most probably to the angels or mighty ones which surrounded the throne of God as servants or counselors; compare Job 38:7, and see SONS OF GOD. In Psalm 97:7 the expression “worship him, all ye gods,” may possibly refer to the gods of the nations, but more probably to the angels or mighty ones.

2. Judges, Rulers:

 Judges, rulers, are regarded “either as Divine representatives at sacred places, or as reflecting Divine majesty and power” (see BDB, under the word). Exodus 21:6 might better be translated as in the margin, “the judges.” These were men appointed to represent God and adjudicate on important matters of law. Septuagint has “Criterion of God.” In Exodus 22:8 the word is used in the same sense, and 22:9 would also be better translated “the judges”; 22:28 likewise. See also 1 Samuel 2:25; Psalm 82:1,6, where the reference is to those who act as judges.

3. Gods of the Nations:

(1) The ancestors of Israel “beyond the River” had their gods (Joshua 24:14 f). While there is no mention of idolatry before the Deluge, the ancestors and kindred of Abraham were idolaters. Ur of the Chaldees was the center for the worship of Sin, the Moon-god. Many others were worshipped in the various cities of Babylon.
See BABYLONIA.

(2) The gods of Laban and his family (Genesis 31:30,32; 35:2,4) were household gods or [teraphim], and were stolen by Rachel and carried off in her flight with Jacob.

See TERAPHIM.

(3) Gods of Egypt: For many centuries before the time of Abraham there had been numerous objects of worship in Egypt. Many of these were animals, birds and natural objects. Horus, the hawk, was one of the earliest of all. The cat, the bull, etc., were worshipped at times. The plagues of Egypt were specially directed against these wretched deities (Numbers 33:4; Exodus 12:12). Yahweh took vengeance on all the gods of Egypt. These terrible events showed that “Yahweh is greater than all gods” (Exodus 18:11). He redeemed His people from the nations and its gods (2 Samuel 7:23). Jeremiah predicted the time when Yahweh should destroy the gods of Egypt (Jeremiah 43:12 f; 46:25).

(4) Of the gods of the Amorites (Judges 6:10) no names are given, but they probably were the same as the gods of the Canaanites.

(5) The gods of the Canaanites were Nature-gods, and their worship was that of the productive and chiefly reproductive powers of Nature. Their service was perhaps the most immoral and degrading of all. The high places and altars of the different Baals, Ashtoreths, etc., were numerous throughout Canaan. These deities were always represented by images and Moses makes frequent reference to them with warnings against this seductive worship (Deuteronomy 7:25; 12:3,10,31; 13:7; 20:18; 29:18; 32:16, etc.).

See also IDOLATRY; BAAL; ASHTORETH; ASHERAH, etc.

(6) Gods of the Philis: The champion Goliath cursed David by his gods (1 Samuel 17:43). Perhaps it would be better rendered “god.” Saul’s and his son’s armor was put into the house of their gods (1 Chronicles 10:10).

See also DAGON; BAALZEBUB.

(7) The two golden calves erected by Jeroboam at Daniel and Bethel to keep the people from going to Jerusalem to worship are called gods (1 Kings 12:28; 2 Chronicles 13:8 f).
See CALF, GOLDEN.

(8) The gods of Damascus: Ben-hadad was accustomed to worship in the house of the god Rimmon (2 Kings 5:18). No other names are mentioned, but from 2 Chronicles 28:23 it is clear that there were many gods in Syria.

See RIMMON.

(9) Solomon’s many wives worshipped their own gods, and he provided the means for their worship. Chief among these were Chemosh of Moab and Molech of Ammon (1 Kings 11:2,4,8).

See CHEMOSH; MOLECH.

(10) The mixed peoples transplanted into Samaria by Sargon had their various gods and mingled their service with that of Yahweh, after being taught by a priest of Yahweh. The names of some of these gods were Succoth-benoth, Nergal, Ashima, Nibhaz, Tartak, Adrammelech (2 Kings 17:29,30,31,33). See separate articles.

(11) Of the gods of Seir, which were brought to Jerusalem by Amaziah, the names are not given (2 Chronicles 25:14).


(13) Gods of Moab are mentioned in Ruth 1:15; 1 Kings 11:1,7. Possibly Ruth 1:15 should be translated “god.”

See CHEMOSH.

(14) Gods of Babylon: The graven images of her gods referred to in Isaiah 21:9; 42:17; Bel and Nebo mentioned in Isaiah 46:1; other gods of silver and gold (Ezr 1:7; Daniel 4:8,9,18; 5:4,11,14,23).

(15) Nineveh’s gods are merely referred to in Nahum 1:14. Sennacherib was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god when slain by his sons (2 Kings 19:37).
(16) The coastlands or borders and peninsulas of the Aegean Sea had numerous idol gods, shrines and devotees. Isaiah challenges them to prove that they are gods (Isaiah 41:22 f).

Yahweh was “greater than all gods” (Exodus 15:11; 18:11); “God of gods, and Lord of lords” (Deuteronomy 10:14,17); “The Mighty One” (Joshua 22:22); “to be feared above all gods” (1 Chronicles 16:25; 2 Chronicles 2:5; Psalm 96:4 f);

4. Superiority of Yahweh to Other Gods:

“King above all gods” (Psalm 95:3; 97:7,9; 86:8; 135:5; 136:2; 138:1; Jeremiah 10:11; Zephaniah 2:11; Daniel 2:18,47). Jeremiah advances so far toward a pure and well-defined monotheism that he speaks of all other gods as “not gods.” They have no existence to him (Jeremiah 2:11; 5:7; 16:20). A similar position is taken in Isaiah 41; 43, etc.

5. Regulations Regarding the Gods of the Nations:

The laws of Moses give no uncertain sound concerning them. The Decalogue begins: “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” Whatever may be the exact meaning of this, it is perfectly clear that Israel was to have nothing to do with any God but Yahweh (Exodus 20:3; Deuteronomy 5:7). No images shall be made of them (Exodus 20:4,23; 34:17; Leviticus 19:4; Deuteronomy 5:8 f). No mention shall be made of them (Exodus 23:13; Joshua 23:7). They are not to be worshipped but destroyed (Exodus 23:24). They are to make no covenant with the people or their gods would be a snare to them (Exodus 23:32; Deuteronomy 6:14; 7:4,25). A curse will follow any defection from Yahweh to them (Deuteronomy 11:28; 28:14 ff; 12:3,10; 13:7; 20:18; 29:17). These gods are an abomination to Yahweh (Deuteronomy 12:31; 20:18; 29:17; 32:37; Ezekiel 7:20; 1 Kings 11:5; 2 Kings 23:13). They are to be as foreign gods to Israel (1 Samuel 7:3 f; Joshua 24:20,23; Judges 10:16; 2 Chronicles 14:3; 33:15).

6. Israel’s Tendency to Idolatry:

The constant tendency of Israel to go after other gods was first made manifest at Sinai (Exodus 32:1,4,8,23,11; 34:15). Hosea says (11:2), “The more the prophets called them, the more they went from them.”
Ezekiel declares (16:3), “The Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was a Hittite,” referring doubtless to the idolatrous taint in the blood of Israel. The tendency manifested itself also at Baal-peor where Israel was led into the licentious rites of the Moabites (Numbers 25:2 f). Moses saw the taint in the blood, foresaw the danger and repeatedly warned them (Deuteronomy 17:3; 18:20; 29:26; 30:17; 31:18). Perhaps the most striking passages in Deuteronomy are chapters 13; 28; 30, where are pictured the consequences of going after other gods. Joshua also warns them (23:7), and the history of the period of the Judges is the story of their periodical defection from Yahweh and the punishment resulting therefrom (Judges 2:12, 17, 19; 5:8; 10:6 f; 1 Samuel 8:8). Solomon himself gave an impetus in that direction (1 Kings 11:5-8). After the disruption, the religion of the Northern Kingdom became very corrupt (1 Kings 14:9; 2 Chronicles 13:8 f). The golden calves of Jeroboam opened the door for an inrush of idols and other gods. Ahab’s marriage to Jezebel threatened to wipe out Yahweh-worship and substitute Baal-worship, and, but for the powerful ministry of Elijah and Elisha, might have effected such a result. Partly checked for a time, the evil broke out in other forms, and even the preaching of Amos and Hosea failed to turn the tide of idolatry. The result was the destruction of the kingdom (2 Kings 22:17 ff; Jeremiah 3:6-8; 1 Chronicles 5:25). The Southern Kingdom fared better. Other gods were countenanced by Rehoboam, Abijah, Athaliah, Jehoram, Ahaz, Amon, Manasseh, Jehoiakim, etc. Reform movements were attempted by Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah, but did not wholly avail. In the reign of Manasseh the nation plunged into the worship of other gods. The ministries of Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc., availed not to stop the tide (2 Chronicles 34:25; Jeremiah 11:13; 5:19; 2 Kings 22:17; Jeremiah 1:16; 19:4; 7:6; 13:10; 16:11; 44:5,8). The nation was carried into exile because of its going after other gods (2 Kings 22:17; Deuteronomy 29:25 f). The captivity had its desired effect. The Israel that returned and perpetuated the nation never again lapsed into the worship of other gods.

II. IN THE APOCRYPHA.

The Apocrypha reiterates much of the Old Testament teaching: the defection of Israel (2 Esdras 1:6); the gods of the nations (Judith 3:8; 8:18); the gods which their fathers worshipped (Judith 5:7 f); the sin of Israel (Additions to Esther 14:7). The Book of The Wisdom of Solomon
refers to the “creatures which they supposed to be gods” (12:27; 13:2,3,10; 15:15). Mention is made of the gods of Babylon (Baruch 1:22; 6:6-57 passim; Bel and the Dragon 1:27).

III. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The expression “gods” occurs in six places in the New Testament:

(1) Jesus, in reply to the Pharisees, who questioned His right to call Himself the son of God, quoted Psalm 82:6: “I said, Ye are gods.” He argues from this that if God Himself called them gods to whom the word of God came, i.e. the judges who acted as representatives of God in a judicial capacity, could not He who had been sanctified and sent into the world justly call Himself the Son of God? It was an argumentum ad hominem (John 10:34-37).

(2) When Paul and Barnabas preached the gospel in Lystra they healed a certain man who had been a cripple from birth. The Lycaonians, seeing the miracle, cried out in their own dialect, “The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men. And they called Barnabas, Jupiter; and Paul, Mercury” (Acts 14:11 f). Their ascription of deity to the apostles in such times shows their familiarity with the Greek pantheon.

(3) As Paul preached Jesus and the resurrection at Athens the people said he seemed to be a setter forth of strange gods. The conception of only one God seemed to be wholly foreign to them (Acts 17:18).

(4) In 1 Corinthians 8:5 Paul speaks of “gods many, and lords many,” but the context shows that he did not believe in the existence of any god but one; “We know that no idol is anything in the world.”

(5) While at Ephesus, Paul was said to have “persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they are no gods, that are made with hands” (Acts 19:26).

(6) The Galatians had been “in bondage to them that by nature are no gods” (Galatians 4:8). Indirect references are also found in Acts 17:16, where Paul observed the city full of idols. Likewise in Romans 1:22 f,25 ff. Paul refers to the numerous gods of the heathen world. These were idols, birds, four-footed beasts and creeping things. The results of this degrading worship are shown in the verse following.

See also IDOLATRY; GOD, NAMES OF.

J. J. Reeve
GOD(S), STRANGE

<stranj>: The word “strange,” as used in this connection in the Old Testament, refers to the fact that the god or gods do not belong to Israel, but are the gods which are worshipped by other families or nations. In several cases a more exact translation would give us the “gods of the stranger” or foreigner. So in Genesis 35:2,4; Joshua 24:2; Judges 10:16; Deuteronomy 31:16; 32:12, etc. In a few passages like Deuteronomy 32:16; Psalm 44:20; 81:9; Isaiah 43:12, the word is an adjective, but the idea is the same: the gods are those which are worshipped by other peoples and hence are forbidden to Israel, which is under obligation to worship Yahweh alone (compare 2 Esdras 1:6).

In the New Testament the phrase occurs only once, in the account of Paul’s experiences in Athens ( Acts 17:18), when some of his auditors said, “He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods” ( xena daimonia). Here the thought is clearly that by his preaching of Jesus he was regarded as introducing a new divinity, that is one who was strange or foreign to the Athenians and of whom they had never heard before. Like the Romans of this period the Athenians were doubtless interested in, and more or less favorable to, the numerous new cults which were coming to their attention as the result of the constant intercourse with the Orient. See preceding article.

Walter R. Betteridge

GODSPEED

<god'-sped> ([χαίρω, chairo]): “Godspeed” occurs only in 2 John 1:10,11 the King James Version as the translation of chairein, the infin. of chairo, and is rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) “greeting.” It means “rejoice,” “be of good cheer,” “be it well with thee”; chaire, chairete, chairein, were common forms of greeting, expressive of good-will and desire for the person’s prosperity, translated in the Gospels, “Hail!” “All Hail!” ( Matthew 26:49; 27:29; 28:9, etc.); chairein is the Septuagint for shalom ( Isaiah 48:22; 57:21; compare 2 Macc 1:10). “Godspeed” first appears in Tyndale’s version; Wycliffe had “heil!” Rheims “God save you.”

In the passage cited Christians are forbidden thus to salute false teachers who might come to them. The injunction does not imply any breach of charity, since it would not be right to wish anyone success in advocating
what was believed to be false and harmful. We should be sincere in our
greetings; formal courtesy must yield to truth, still courteously, however,
and in the spirit of love.

W. L. Walker

**GOEL**

<go’el> ([l a םגוי, “redeemer”]: Goel is the participle of the Hebrew
word ga’al (“to deliver,” “to redeem”) which aside from its common usage
is frequently employed in connection with Hebrew law, where it is the
technical term applied to a person who as the nearest relative of another is
placed under certain obligations to him.

(1) If a Jew because of poverty had been obliged to sell himself to a
wealthy “stranger or sojourner,” it became the duty of his relatives to
redeem him. Compare Leviticus25:47 ff and the article JUBILEE.

(2) The same duty fell upon the nearest kinsman, if his brother, being
poor, had been forced to sell some of his property. Compare
Leviticus25:23 ff; Ruth 4:4 ff, and the article JUBILEE.

(3) It also devolved upon the nearest relative to marry the ú childless
widow of his brother (Ruth 3:13; Tobit 3:17).

(4) In Numbers 5:5 ff a law is stated which demands that restitution
be made to the nearest relative, and after him to the priest, if the injured
party has died (Leviticus6:1 ff).

(5) The law of blood-revenge (Blut-Rache) made it the sacred duty of
the nearest relative to avenge the blood of his kinsman. He was called
the [ךד ח”ל a םגוי el ha-dam], “the avenger of blood.” This law was
based upon the command given in Genesis 9:5 f: “Whoso sheddeth
man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed,” and was carried out even
if an animal had killed a man; in this case, however, the payment of a
ransom was permitted (Exodus 21:28 ff). A clear distinction was
made between an accidental and a deliberate murder. In both cases the
murderer could find refuge at the altar of the sanctuary; if, however,
the investigation revealed presumptuous manslaughter, he was taken
from the altar to be put to death (Exodus 21:12 ff; 1 Kings 1:50;
2:28). In Numbers 35:9 ff definite regulations as to the duties of the
Goel are given. Six cities were to be appointed as “cities of refuge,”
three on each side of the Jordan. The congregation has judgment over the murderer. There must be more than one witness to convict a man. If he is found guilty, he is delivered to the Goel; if murder was committed by accident he is permitted to live within the border of the city of refuge; in case the manslayer leaves this city before the death of the high priest, the avenger of blood has a right to slay him. After the death of the high priest the murderer may return to his own city. Ransom cannot be given for the life of a murderer; no expiation can be made for a murder but by the blood of the murderer (Deuteronomy 19:4 ff; Joshua 20; 2 Samuel 14:6 ff). According to the law the children of a murderer could not be held responsible for the crime of their father (Deuteronomy 24:16; 2 Kings 14:6), but see 2 Samuel 21:1 ff. The order in which the nearest relative was considered the Goel is given in Leviticus 25:48 f: first a brother, then an uncle or an uncle’s son, and after them any other near relative. This order was observed in connection with

(1) above, but probably also in the other cases except (4).

For the figurative use of Goel (‘redeemer’) see Psalm 119:154; Proverbs 23:11; Job 19:25; Isaiah 41:14b.

See also AVENGE; MURDER; REFUGE, CITIES OF.

Arthur L. Breslich

GOG

<gog> ([gωγ] gogh]; [Γούγ, Goug]):

(1) A son of Joel, and descendant of the tribe of Reuben (1 Chronicles 5:4).

(2) The prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal (Ezekiel 38:2 f; 39:1-16). His territory was known as the land of Magog, and he was the chief of those northern hordes who were to make a final onslaught upon Israel while enjoying the blessings of the Messianic age. He has been identified with Gagi, ruler of Sakhi, mentioned by Ashurbanipal, but Professor Sayce thinks the Hebrew name corresponds more closely to Gyges, the Lydian king, the Gugu of the cuneiform inscriptions. According to Ezekiel’s account Gog’s army included in its numbers Persia, Cush, Put, Gomer or the Cimmerians, and Togarmah, from the extreme North. They are
represented as a vast mixed horde from the far-off parts of the North, the limits of the horizon, completely armed and equipped for war. They were to come upon the mountains of Israel and cover the land like a cloud. Their purpose is plunder, for the people of Israel are rich and dwell in towns and villages without walls. His coming, which had been prophesied by the seers of Israel, shall be accompanied by a theophany and great convulsions in Nature. A panic shall seize the hosts of Gog, rain, hailstones, pestilence, fire and brimstone shall consume them. Their bodies shall be food for the birds, their weapons shall serve as firewood for seven years and their bones shall be buried East of the Jordan in Hamon-gog and thus not defile the holy land. The fulfillment of this strange prophecy can never be literal. In general it seems to refer to the last and desperate attempts of a dying heathenism to overturn the true religion of Yahweh, or make capital out of it, profiting by its great advantages.

(3) In Revelation 20:7 Satan is let loose and goes to the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to muster his hosts for the final struggle against God. In Ezekiel the invasion of Gog occurs during the Messianic age, while in Revelation it occurs just at the close of the millennium. In Ezekiel, Gog and Magog are gathered by Yahweh for their destruction; in Revelation they are gathered by Satan. In both cases the number is vast, the destruction is by supernatural means, and is complete and final.

See MAGOG.

J. J. Reeve

GOIIM

〈goyim〉: This word, rendered in the King James Version “nations,” “heathen,” “Gentiles,” is commonly translated simply “nations” in the Revised Version (British and American). In Genesis 14:1 where the King James Version has “Tidal, king of nations,” the Revised Version (British and American) retains in the text the Hebrew “Goiim” as a proper name. Some identify with Gutium. The Hebrew word is similarly retained in Joshua 12:23.

GOING; GOINGS

〈go’-ing〉, 〈go’-ingz〉: Besides, occasionally, forms of the common words for “go” (see Go), for “going” and “goings,” the Hebrew has ḥāb’,”'
‘ashshur] (‘ashur, ‘ashur), “step,” [a x 两个维护, motsa’], [t 两个维护 x 两个维护, totsa’oth], “goings out,” “outgoings.” The word “goings” is sometimes used literally, as in Numbers 33:2, “Moses wrote their goings out” (Hebrew motsa’). “Going up,” ma`aleh, is in many passages rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (as in Numbers 34:4; 2 Samuel 15:30 the King James Version) “ascent,” as e.g. Joshua 15:7; Judges 1:36; Nehemiah 12:37 (the American Standard Revised Version only). In Ezekiel 44:5, the American Standard Revised Version substitutes “egress” (way out or place of exit) for “going forth.” “The goings out (place of exit; hence, boundary) of it” (Numbers 34:4,5,9,12 the King James Version) occurs frequently. The verbal forms bo’, mabho’, also me`al (Daniel 6:14), are used of the sunset, “the going down of the sun.” Thus Joshua 8:29 the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version “as soon as the sun was down.”

In the New Testament, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes “going out” for “gone out” (shennumi) (Matthew 25:8); “going up” for “ascending” (Luke 19:28); “going in” for “coming in” (Acts 9:28); “going about” for “wandering” (1 Timothy 5:13); “seeking” for “going about” (Romans 10:3).

Metaphorically: “Goings” is used for a man’s ways or conduct (Psalm 17:5, the Revised Version (British and American) “steps”; Psalm 40:2; Proverbs 14:15, etc.). In Psalm 17:5 “Hold up my goings in thy paths, that my footsteps slip not” becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) “My steps have held fast to thy paths, my feet have not slipped”; Proverbs 5:21, “He pondereth all his goings,” is in the Revised Version (British and American) “He maketh level all his paths,” in “weigheth carefully”; conversely, in Psalm 37:23, the Revised Version (British and American) has “goings” for “steps”; in Jas 1:11 “goings” for “ways.” In the important prophetic passage, Micah 5:2, it is said of the Ruler from Bethlehem, “whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting,” the Revised Version (British and American) “are from of old, from everlasting,” margin “from ancient days.” Of God it is said in Habakkuk 3:6 “His ways are everlasting,” the Revised Version (British and American) “His goings were as of old,” margin “His ways are everlasting.”

W. L. Walker
GOLAN; GAULONITIS

<go'-lan> ([^l yQ golan]), ([Γαυλανίτις, Gaulanitis]): Golan was a city in the territory allotted to Manasseh in Bashan, the most northerly of the three cities of refuge East of the Jordan (Deuteronomy 4:43; Joshua 20:8); assigned with its “suburbs” to the Gershonite Levites (Joshua 21:27; 1 Chronicles 6:71). It must have been a great and important city in its day; but the site cannot now be determined with any certainty. It was known to Josephus (Ant., XIII, xv, 3). Near Golan Alexander was ambushed by Obodas, king of the Arabians; and his army, crowded together in a narrow and deep valley, was broken in pieces by the multitude of camels (BJ, I, iv, 4). This incident is located at Gadara in Ant, XIII, xiii, 5. Later, Golan was destroyed by Alexander. It had already given its name to a large district, Gaulonitis (BJ, III, in, 1, 5; IV, i, 1). It formed the eastern boundary of Galilee. It was part of the tetrarchy of Philip (Ant., XVII, viii, 1; XVIII, iv, 6). The city was known to Eusebius as “a large village,” giving its name to the surrounding country (Onomasticon, under the word [Γαυλόν, Gaulon]). This country must have corresponded roughly with the modern Jaulan, in which the ancient name is preserved. The boundaries of the province today are Matthew Hermon on the North, Jordan and the Sea of Galilee on the West, Wady Yarmuk on the South, and Nahr `Allan on the East. This plateau, which in the North is about 3,000 ft. high, slopes gradually southward to a height of about 1,000 ft. It is entirely volcanic, and there are many cone-like peaks of extinct volcanoes, especially toward the North. It affords good pasturage, and has long been a favorite summer grazing-ground of the nomads. Traces of ancient forests remain, but for the most part today it is treeless. To the East of the Sea of Galilee the soil is deep and rich. Splendid crops of wheat are grown here, and olives flourish in the hollows. The country is furrowed by deep valleys that carry the water southwestward into the Sea of Galilee. This region has not yet been subjected to thorough examination, but many important ruins have been found, which tell of a plentiful and prosperous population in times long past. The best description of these, and of the region generally, will be found in Schumacher’s The Jaulan, and Across the Jordan. To him also we owe the excellent maps which carry us eastward to the province of el-Chauran.

Schumacher inclines to the belief that the ancient Golan may be represented by Sahm el-Jaulan, a large village fully 4 miles East of Nahr.
'Allan, and 4 miles Southeast of Tsil. The extensive ruins probably date from early in the Christian era. The buildings are of stone, many of them of Spacious dimensions, while the streets are wide and straight. The inhabitants number not more than 280. The surrounding soil is rich and well watered, bearing excellent crops. The present writer, after personal examination, corroborates Dr. Schumacher’s description. Standing in the open country, it would be seen from afar; and it was easily accessible from all directions.

W. Ewing

GOLD

\(<gold>\) ([bh; z; zahabh]; [χρυσός, chrusos]):

1. TERMS:

No metal has been more frequently mentioned in Old Testament writings than gold, and none has had more terms applied to it. Among these terms the one most used is zahabh. The Arabic equivalent, dhahab, is still the common name for gold throughout Palestine, Syria and Egypt. With zahabh frequently occur other words which, translated, mean “pure” (Exodus 25:11), “refined” (1 Chronicles 28:18), “finest” (1 Kings 10:18), “beaten” (1 Kings 10:17), “Ophir” (Psalm 45:9).

Other terms occurring are: [zP; paz], “fine gold” (Job 28:17; Psalm 19:10; 21:3; 119:127; Proverbs 8:19; Song of Solomon 5:11,15; Isaiah 13:12; Lamentations 4:2); [6W j; charuts] (Psalm 68:13; Proverbs 3:14; 8:10,19; 16:16; Zec 9:3); [μ t K, kethem], literally, “carved out” (Job 28:16,19; 31:24; Proverbs 25:12; Lamentations 4:1; Daniel 10:5); [r wgs] ceghor (1 Kings 6:20; 7:50; Job 28:15); [r x B, betser] (in the King James Version only: Job 22:24; the Revised Version (British and American) “treasure”).

2. SOURCES:

Sources definitely mentioned in the Old Testament are: Havilah (Genesis 2:11,12); Ophir (1 Kings 9:28; 10:11; 22:48; 1 Chronicles 29:4; 2 Chronicles 8:18; 9:10; Job 22:24; 28:16; Psalm 45:9; Isaiah 13:12); Sheba (1 Kings 10:2,10; 2 Chronicles 9:1,9; Psalm 72:15; Isaiah 60:6; Ezekiel 27:22;
38:13); Arabia (2 Chronicles 9:14). We are not justified in locating any of these places too definitely. They probably all refer to some region of Arabia.

The late origin of the geological formation of Palestine and Syria precludes the possibility of gold being found in any quantities (see METALS), so that the large quantities of gold used by the children of Israel in constructing their holy places was not the product of mines in the country, but was from the spoil taken from the inhabitants of the land (Numbers 31:52), or brought with them from Egypt (Exodus 3:22). This gold was probably mined in Egypt or India (possibly Arabia), and brought by the great caravan routes through Arabia to Syria, or by sea in the ships of Tyre (Kings 10:11,22; Ezekiel 27:21,22). There is no doubt about the Egyptian sources. The old workings in the gold-bearing veins of the Egyptian desert and the ruins of the buildings connected with the mining and refining of the precious metal still remain. This region is being reopened with the prospect of its becoming a source of part of the world’s supply. It might be inferred from the extensive spoils in gold taken from the Midianites (100,000 HDB, under the word) that their country (Northwestern Arabia) produced gold. It is more likely that the Midianites had, in turn, captured most of it from other weaker nations. The tradition that Northwestern Arabia is rich in gold still persists. Every year Moslem pilgrims, returning from Mecca by the Damascus route, bring with them specimens of what is supposed to be gold ore. They secure it from the Arabs at the stopping-places along the route. Samples analyzed by the writer have been iron pyrites only. No gold-bearing rock has yet appeared. Whether these specimens come from the mines mentioned by Burton (The Land of Midian Revisited) is a question.

3. FORMS:

Gold formed a part of every household treasure (Genesis 13:2; 24:35; Deuteronomy 8:13; 17:17; Joshua 22:8; Ezekiel 28:4). It was probably treasured

(a) in the form of nuggets (Job 28:6 the Revised Version, margin),

(b) in regularly or irregularly shaped slabs or bars (Numbers 7:14,20,84,86; Joshua 7:21,24; 2 Kings 5:5), and
in the form of dust (Job 28:6). A specimen of yellow dust, which the owner claimed to have taken from an ancient jar, unearthed in the vicinity of the Hauran, was once brought to the writer’s laboratory. On examination it was found to contain iron pyrites and metallic gold in finely divided state. It was probably part of an ancient household treasure. A common practice was to make gold into jewelry with the dual purpose of ornamentation and of treasuring it. This custom still prevails, especially among the Moslems, who do not let out their money at interest. A poor woman will save her small coins until she has enough to buy a gold bracelet. This she will wear or put away against the day of need (compare Genesis 22:22, 53). It was weight and not beauty which was noted in the jewels (Exodus 3:22; 11:2; 12:35). Gold coinage was unknown in the early Old Testament times.

4. USES:

(1) The use of gold as the most convenient way of treasuring wealth is mentioned above.

(2) Jewelry took many forms: armlets (Numbers 31:50), bracelets (Genesis 24:22), chains (Genesis 41:42), crescents (Judges 8:26), crowns (2 Samuel 12:30; 1 Chronicles 20:2), earrings (Exodus 32:2, 3; Numbers 31:50; Judges 8:24, 26), rings (Genesis 24:22; 41:42; Jas 2:2).

(3) Making and decorating objects in connection with places of worship: In the description of the building of the ark and the tabernacle in Exodus 25 ff, we read of the lavish use of gold in overlaying wood and metals, and in shaping candlesticks, dishes, spoons, flagons, bowls, snuffers, curtain clasps, hooks, etc. (one estimate of the value of gold used is $90,000; see HDB). In 1 Kings 6 ff; 1 Chronicles 28 f; 2 Chronicles 1 ff are records of still more extensive use of gold in building the temple.

(4) Idols were made of gold (Exodus 20:23; 32:4; Deuteronomy 7:25; 29:17; 1 Kings 12:28; Psalm 115:4; 135:15; Isaiah 30:22; Revelation 9:20).

(5) Gold was used for lavish display. Among the fabulous luxuries of Solomon’s court were his gold drinking-vessels (1 Kings 10:21), a throne of ivory overlaid with gold (1 Kings 10:18), and golden
chariot trimmings (<1 Chronicles 28:18). Sacred treasure saved from votive offerings or portions dedicated from booty were principally gold (<Exodus 25:36; Numbers 7:14,20,84,86; 31:50,52,54; Joshua 6:19,24; 1 Samuel 6:8,11,15; 2 Samuel 8:11; 1 Chronicles 18:7,10,11; 22:14,16; Matthew 23:17). This treasure was the spoil most sought after by the enemy. It was paid to them as tribute (<1 Kings 15:15; 2 Kings 12:18; 14:14; 16:8; 18:14-16; 23:33,15), or taken as plunder (<2 Kings 24:13; 25:15).

5. FIGURATIVE:
Gold is used to symbolize earthly riches (<Job 3:15; 22:24; Isaiah 2:7; Matthew 10:9; Acts 3:6; 20:33; Revelation 18:12). Finer than gold, which, physically speaking, is considered non-perishable, typifies incorruptibility (<Acts 17:29; 1 Peter 1:7,18; 3:3; Jas 5:3). Refining of gold is a figure for great purity or a test of (<Job 23:10; Proverbs 17:3; Isaiah 1:25; Malachi 3:2; 1 Peter 1:7; Revelation 3:18). Gold was the most valuable of metals. It stood for anything of great value (<Proverbs 3:14; 8:10,19; 16:16,22; 25:12), hence was most worthy for use in worshipping Yahweh (Exodus 25 ff; Revelation 1:12,13,10, etc.), and the adornment of angels (<Revelation 15:6) or saints (Psalm 45:13). The head was called golden as being the most precious part of the body (<Song of Solomon 5:11; Daniel 2:38; compare “the golden bowl,” Ecclesiastes 12:6). “The golden city” meant Babylon (<Isaiah 14:4), as did also “the golden cup,” sensuality (<Jeremiah 51:7). A crown of gold was synonymous with royal honor (<Nehemiah 2:17; 6:8; Job 19:9; Revelation 4:4; 14:14). Wearing of gold typified lavish adornment and worldly luxury (<Jeremiah 4:30; 10:4; 1 Timothy 2:9; 1 Peter 3:3; Revelation 17:4). Comparing men to gold suggested their nobility (<Lamentations 4:1,2; 2 Timothy 2:20).

James A. Patch

GOLDEN, CALF

<gold’-’n>: Probably a representation of the sun in Taurus.

See ASTROLOGY, 7; CALF, GOLDEN.
GOLDEN, CITY

<gold’-’-n>: The translation “golden city” (Isaiah 14:4) is an attempt to render the received text ([h b h d m” , madhhebhah]), but can hardly be justified. Almost all the ancient versions read ([h b h e m” , marhebhah]), a word which connotes unrest and insolence, fitting the context well.

GOLDEN NUMBER

<gold’-’-n num’-ber>: Used in the regulation of the ecclesiastical calendar, in the “Metonic cycle” of 19 years, which almost exactly reconciles the natural month and the solar year.

See ASTRONOMY, I, 5.

GOLDSMITH

<gold’-smith> ([t r , tsreph]: Goldsmiths are first mentioned in connection with the building of the tabernacle (Exodus 31:4; 36:1). Later, goldsmiths’ guilds are mentioned (Nehemiah 3:8,32). The art of refining gold and shaping it into objects was probably introduced into Palestine from Phoenicia (see CRAFTS). Examples of gold work from the earliest Egyptian periods are so numerous in the museums of the world that we do not have to draw on our imaginations to appreciate the wonderful skill of the ancient goldsmiths. their designs and methods were those later used by the Jews. The goldsmiths’ art was divided into

(1) the refining of the impure gold (Job 28:1; Proverbs 17:3; 25:4; 27:21; Isaiah 1:25; Malachi 3:3);

(2) shaping of objects,

(a) casting idols (Numbers 33:52; Hosea 13:2),

(b) making graven images (2 Chronicles 34:3,4; Jeremiah 10:14; Nahum 1:14),

(c) the making of beaten or turned work (Exodus 25:18),

(d) plating or overlaying (Exodus 25:11; 1 Kings 6:20),

(e) soldering (Isaiah 41:7),
(f) making of wire (Exodus 28:6; 39:3). Most of these processes are carried on in Bible lands today. In Damascus there is a goldsmiths’ quarter where the refining, casting and beating of gold are still carried on, probably in much the same way as in Solomon’s time. Jews are found among the goldsmiths. In Beirut, it is a Jew who is especially skilled in making refiners’ pots. Daily, one can see the gold being refined, cast into lumps, beaten on an anvil, rolled between rollers into thin sheets, cut into narrow strips (wire), and wound on bobbins ready for the weaver. are houses in Damascus and Aleppo still possessing beautiful gold overlaid work on wooden walls and ceilings, the work of goldsmiths of several centuries ago.

James A. Patch

GOLGOTHA

<gol’-go-tha> ([Γολγόθα, Golgotha], from Aramaic [א ת ג ג ג gulgalta], “a skull”): In three references (Matthew 27:33; Mark 15:22; John 19:17) it is interpreted to mean [κρανίου τόπος, kraniou topos], “the place of a skull.” In Luke 23:33 the King James Version it is called “Calvary,” but in the Revised Version (British and American) simply “The skull.” From the New Testament we may gather that it was outside the city (Hebrews 13:12), but close to it (John 19:20), apparently near some public thoroughfare (Matthew 27:39), coming from the country (Mark 15:21). was a spot visible, from some points, from afar (Mark 15:40; Luke 23:49).

1. THE NAME:

Four reasons have been suggested for the name Golgotha or “skull”:

(1) That it was a spot where skulls were to be found lying about and probably, therefore, a public place of execution. This tradition apparently originates with Jerome (346-420 AD), who refers to (3), to condemn it, and says that “outside the city and without the gate there are places wherein the heads of condemned criminals are cut off and which have obtained the name of Calvary — that is, of the beheaded.” This view has been adopted by several later writers. Against it may be urged that there is no shadow of evidence that there was any special place for Jewish executions in the 1st century, and that, if there were, the corpses could have been allowed burial (Matthew 27:58;
(2) That the name was due to the skull-like shape of the hill — a modern popular view. No early or Greek writer suggests such an idea, and there is no evidence from the Gospels that the Crucifixion occurred on a raised place at all. Indeed Epiphanius (4th century) expressly says: “There is nothing to be seen on the place resembling this name; for it is not situated upon a height that it should be called (the place) of a skull, answering to the place of the head in the human body.” It is true that the tradition embodied in the name Mons Calvary appears as early as the 4th century, and is materialized in the traditional site of the Crucifixion in the church of the Holy Sepulcher, but that the hill was skull-like in form is quite a modern idea. Guthe combines (2) and (3) and considers that a natural skull-like elevation came to be considered, by some folklore ideas, to be the skull of the first man. One of the strangest ideas is that of the late General Gordon, who thought that the resemblance to a skull lay in the contours of the ground as laid down in the ordinance survey map of Jerusalem.

(3) That the name is due to an ancient pre-Christian tradition that the skull of Adam was found there. The first mention of this is by Origen (185-253 AD), who himself lived in Jerusalem 20 years. He writes: “I have received a tradition to the effect that the body of Adam, the first man, was buried upon the spot where Christ was crucified,” etc. This tradition was afterward referred to by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Basil of Caesarea, Chrysostom and other later writers. The tomb and skull of Adam, still pointed out in an excavated chamber below the traditional Calvary, marks the survival of this tradition on the spot. This is by far the most ancient explanation of the name Golgotha and, in spite of the absurdity of the original tradition about Adam, is probably the true one.

(4) The highly improbable theory that the Capitolium of AElia Capitolina (the name given by Hadrian to his new Jerusalem) stood where the Church of the Holy Sepulcher now is, and gave rise to the name Golgotha, is one which involves the idea that the site first received the name Golgotha in the 2nd century, and that all the references in the Gospels were inserted then. This is only mentioned to be dismissed as incompatible with history and common sense.
2. THE SITE:

With regard to the position of the site of the Crucifixion (with which is bound up the site of the Tomb) the New Testament gives us no indication whatever; indeed, by those who abandon tradition, sites have been suggested on all sides of the city — and West Two views hold the field today:

(1) that the site of the Crucifixion, or at any rate that of the Tomb itself, is included within the precincts of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher; and

(2) that a prominent, rounded, grassy hill above the so-called “Grotto of Jeremiah,” Northeast of the Modern Damascus Gate, has at least a very high probability of being the true site. It is impossible here to go into the whole question, which requires minute and long elaboration, but excellent review of the whole evidence may be consulted in “Golgotha and the Holy Sepulcher,” by the late Sir Charles W. Wilson, of PEF. Here only a few points can be touched upon.

(1) For the traditional view it may be said that it seems highly improbable that so sacred a spot as this, particularly the empty tomb, could have been entirely forgotten. Although it is true that Jews and Christians were driven out of Jerusalem after the second great revolt (130-33 AD), yet Gentile Christians were free to return, and there was no break long enough to account for a site like this being entirely lost. Indeed there are traditions that this site was deliberately defiled by pagan buildings to annoy the Christians. Eusebius, at the time of Constantine, writes as if it were well known that a Temple of Aphrodite lay over the tomb.

He gives an account of the discovery of the spots still venerated as the Golgotha and the Tomb, and of the erection of churches in connection with them (Life of Constantine, III, 25-40). From the time of Constantine there has been no break in the reverence paid to these places. Of the earlier evidence Sir C. Wilson admits (loc. cit.) that “the tradition is so precarious and the evidence is undoubtedly so unsatisfactory as to raise serious doubts.”

The topographical difficulties are dealt with in the JERUSALEM. It is difficult for the visitor to Jerusalem sufficiently to realize that the center of gravity of the city has much changed; once it was on the Hill Ophel, and
the southern slopes, now bare, were in Christ’s time crammed with houses; in later times, from the 4th century, it was the Church of the Holy Sepulcher round which the city tended to center. There is no insurmountable difficulty in believing that the site of the Crucifixion may be where tradition points out. As Sir C. Wilson says at the end of his book, “No objection urged against the sites (i.e. Golgotha and the Tomb) is of such a convincing nature that it need disturb the minds of those who accept, in all good faith, the authenticity of the places which are hallowed by the prayers of countless pilgrims since the days of Constantine” (loc. cit.).

(2) The so-called “Skull Hill” or “Green Hill” appears to have appealed first to Otto Thenius (1842), but has received its greatest support through the advocacy of the late Colossians. Conder and of the late Dr. Selah Merrill, U.S.A. consul at Jerusalem. The arguments for this site are mainly:

(a) its conspicuous and elevated position — a position which must impress every reverent pilgrim as strikingly suitable for an imaginary reconstruction of the scene. The very greenness of the hill — it is the first green spot in the neighborhood of the city — may influence the subconsciousness of those who have been brought up from childhood to think of the “green hill far away,” as the popular hymn puts it. When, however, we consider the question historically, there is not the slightest reason to expect that the crucifixion of Jesus, one of many hundreds, should have been dramatically located in a setting so consonant with the importance with which the world has since learned to regard the event. There is no evidence whatever that the crucifixion was on a hill, much less on such a conspicuous place.

(b) The supposed resemblance to a human skull strikes many people, but it may be stated without hesitation that the most arresting points of the resemblance, the “eyeholes” and the rounded top, are not ancient; the former are due to artificial excavations going back perhaps a couple of centuries. Probably the whole formation of the hill, the sharp scarp to the South and the 10 or more feet of earth accumulated on the summit are both entirely new conditions since New Testament times.

(c) The nearness of the city walls and the great North road which make the site so appropriate today are quite different conditions from those in New Testament times. It is only if the present North wall can be
proved to be on the line of the second wall that the argument holds good. On this see JERUSALEM.

(d) An argument has been based upon a supposed tradition that this spot was the Jewish place of stoning. This so-called tradition is worthless, and not a trace of it can be found outside interested circles, and even if it were the “place of stoning,” it would be no argument for its being “Golgotha.” To the Oriental, with his great respect for traditional sites, the church of the Holy Sepulcher, covering at once the Tomb, the Calvary, and other sacred spots, will probably always appeal as the appropriate spot: to the western tourist who wishes to visualize in the environs of Jerusalem in an appropriate setting the great world’s tragedy, such a site as this “Skull Hill” must always make the greater appeal to his imagination, and both may find religious satisfaction in their ideas; but cold reason, reviewing the pro’s and con’s, is obliged to say “not proven” to both, with perhaps an admission of the stronger case for the traditional spot.

E. W. G. Masterman

GOLIATH

<go-li’-ath> ([t yl ἴ, golyath]; [Γολιάθ, Goliath]):

(1) The giant of Gath, and champion of the Philistine army (1 Samuel 17:4-23; 21:9; 22:10; 2 Samuel 21:19; 1 Chronicles 20:5 ff). He defied the armies of Israel, challenging anyone to meet him in single combat while the two armies faced each other at Ephesdammim. He was slain by the youthful David. Goliath was almost certainly not of Philistine blood, but belonged to one of the races of giants, or aboriginal tribes, such as the Anakim, Avvim, Rephaim, etc. The Avvim had lived at Philistia, and most probably the giant was of that race. His size was most extraordinary. If a cubit was about 21 inches, he was over 11 feet in height; if about 18 inches, he was over 9 feet in height. The enormous weight of his armor would seem to require the larger cubit. This height probably included his full length in armor, helmet and all. In either case he is the largest man known to history. His sword was wielded by David to slay him and afterward carried about in his wanderings, so it could not have been excessively heavy. The story of his encounter with David is graphic, and the boasts of the two champions were perfectly in keeping with single combats in the Orient.
(2) The Goliath of 2 Samuel 21:19 is another person, and quite probably a son of the first Goliath. He was slain by Elhanan, one of David’s mighty men. The person mentioned in 1 Chronicles 20:5 is called Lachmi, but this is almost certainly due to a corruption of the text. “The brother of Goliath” is the younger Goliath and probably a son of the greater Goliath, who had four sons, giants, one of them having 24 fingers and toes.

See ELHANAN; LAHMI.

J. J. Reeve

GOMER (1)

<go’-mer> ([r mὄ gomer]): Given in Genesis 10:2 f; 1 Chronicles 1:5 f as a son of Japheth. The name evidently designates the people called Gimirra by the Assyrians, Kimmerians by the Greeks. They were a barbaric horde of Aryans who in the 7th century BC left their abode in what is now Southern Russia and poured through the Caucasus into Western Asia, causing serious trouble to the Assyrians and other nations. One division moved eastward toward Media, another westward, where they conquered Cappadocia and made it their special abode. They fought also in other parts of Asia Minor, conquering some portions. The Armenian name for Cappadocia, Gamir, has come from this people. In Ezekiel 38:6 Gomer is mentioned as one of the northern nations.

George Ricker Berry

GOMER (2)

<go’-mer> ([r mὄ gomer]; Γαμέρ, Gamer]): Wife of Hosea. Hosea married Gomer according to Divine appointment, and this was the beginning of God’s word to him (Hosea 1:3; 3:1-4). She was to be a wife of whoredom and they were to have children of whoredom. This need not mean that at the time of marriage she was thus depraved, but she had the evil taint in her blood, had inherited immoral instincts. These soon manifested themselves, and the unfaithful, depraved wife of the prophet went deeper into sin. She seems to have left him and become the slave of her paramour (Hosea 3:1). Hosea is now commanded by Yahweh to buy her back, paying the price of the ordinary slave. The prophet keeps her in confinement and without a husband for some time. This experience of
the prophet was typical of Israel’s unfaithfulness, of Israel’s exile, and of God bringing her back after the punishment of the exile.

See HOSEA.

J. J. Reeve.

GOMORRAH

<go-mor’-a> ([h r məb] `amorah]; Septuagint and New Testament [Γομόρρα, Gomorra], or [Γόμορρα, Gomorra]; Arabic Ghamara, “to overwhelm with water”): One of the CITIES OF THE PLAIN (which see) destroyed by fire from heaven in the time of Abraham and Lot (<b>Genesis 19:23-29</b>). It was located probably in the plain South of the Dead Sea, now covered with water. See ARABAH; CITIES OF THE PLAIN; DEAD SEA. De Saulcy, however, with others who place the Cities of the Plain at the North end of the Dead Sea, fixes upon Khumran (or Gumran), marked on the Survey Map of Palestine North of Ras Feshkeh, where there are ruins about a mile from the Dead Sea. But there is nothing to support this view except the faint resemblance of the name and the inconclusive arguments placing the Cities of the Plain at that end of the sea.

George Frederick Wright

GOOD

<good> ([b wō, Tobh], [b W, Tubh], [b " y, yaTabh]; [ἀγαθός, agathos], [ἀγαθόν, agathon], [καλός, kalos], [καλόν, kalon]): In English “good” is used in various senses, most of which are represented in the Bible.

(1) In the Old Testament the commonest word is Tobh, occurring very frequently and translated in a great variety of ways. Of the different shades of meaning, which frequently run into each other, the following may be distinguished:

(a) Possessing desirable qualities, beneficial, agreeable, e.g. “good for food” (<b>Genesis 2:9</b>); “We will do thee good” (<b>Numbers 10:29</b>); Who will show us any good?” (<b>Psalm 4:6</b>); “good tidings of good” (<b>Isaiah 52:7</b>).

(b) Moral excellence, piety: “to know good and evil” (<b>Genesis 3:22</b>); “that which is right and good” (<b>Deuteronomy 6:18a</b>; 1 Samuel 12:23); “good and bad” (<b>1 Kings 3:9</b>, the Revised Version
(British and American) “evil”); “Depart from evil and do good” (Psalm 37:27); “a good man” (Proverbs 12:2); compare Isaiah 5:20; Micah 6:8, etc.

(c) Kind, benevolent: “The men were very good unto us” (1 Samuel 25:15); “Give thanks unto Yahweh; for he is good” (1 Chronicles 16:34); “the good Yahweh” (2 Chronicles 30:18); “God is good to Israel” (Psalm 73:1); “Yahweh is good to all” (Psalm 145:9), etc.

(d) Serviceable, adequate, sufficient: “saw the light that it was good” (Genesis 1:4; so 1:10,12 etc.); “not good that the man should be alone” (Genesis 2:18); in the frequent phrase, “if it seem good” (1 Chronicles 13:2; Nehemiah 5:4, etc.), sometimes rendered, “if it please” (Nehemiah 2:5,7; Nehemiah 1:19, etc.).

(e) Not small or deficient (full, complete): “a good old age” (Genesis 15,15; 25:8); “a good dowry” (Genesis 30:20); “good ears,” “years,” “kine” (Genesis 41:24,26,35); “good understanding” (1 Samuel 25:3); “good trees — “land” (2 Kings 3:19,25), etc.

(f) Not blemished, fair, honorable: “tender and good” (Genesis 18:7); “good kids” (Genesis 27:9); “good report” (1 Samuel 2:24; compare 2 Kings 20:3; Jeremiah 24:2); and the renderings “fair” (Genesis 26:7, etc.), “beautiful” (2 Samuel 11:2), “pleasant” (2 Kings 2:19), etc.

(g) Pleasure-giving, happy: “glad of heart” (1 Kings 8:66; Nehemiah 5:9); sometimes in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) translated “merry” (Judges 16:25; 1 Samuel 25:36; 2 Samuel 13:28; Proverbs 15:15, the Revised Version (British and American) “cheerful”), etc.

Changes that may be noted in the Revised Version (British and American) are such as, “good” for “ready” (Isaiah 41:7); “I have no good beyond thee” for “My goodness extendeth not to thee” (Psalm 16:2); “goodly” for “good” (Psalm 45:1); “good” for “goodness” (Psalm 107:9); “good” for “well” (Zec 8:15).
Tubh means something good, e.g. “the good of the land” (<sup>Genesis 45:18,20</sup>; <sup>Deuteronomy 6:11</sup>; <sup>Job 21:16</sup>, the Revised Version (British and American) “prosperity”).

YaTabh, “to do good,” occurs several times, as, I will surely do thee good” (<sup>Genesis 32:12</sup>); “to do good” (Leviticus 5:4); “Make your ways and your doings good,” the Revised Version (British and American) “amend” (<sup>Jeremiah 18:11</sup>; <sup>Zephaniah 1:12</sup>, etc.).

Numerous other Hebrew words are rendered “good” in various verbal connections and otherwise, as “to bring good tidings” (<sup>2 Samuel 4:10</sup>; <sup>Isaiah 40:9</sup>, etc.); “take good heed” (<sup>Deuteronomy 2:4; 4:15</sup>; <sup>Joshua 23:11</sup>); “make good” (<sup>Exodus 21:34</sup>, etc.); “good will” (ratson, <sup>Deuteronomy 33:16</sup>; <sup>Malachi 2:13</sup>); “what good?” the Revised Version (British and American) “what advantages?” (<sup>kishron</sup>, <sup>Ecclesiastes 5:11</sup>); “good for nothing,” the Revised Version (British and American) “profitable” (<sup>tsaleah</sup>, <sup>Jeremiah 13:10</sup>, etc.). In <sup>Jeremiah 18:4</sup>, “as seemed good to the potter,” the word is [yahsar], which means literally, “right.”

(2) In the New Testament the words most frequently translated “good” are agathos and kalos. The former, agathos, denotes good as a quality, physical or moral. Thus, “He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good” (<sup>Matthew 5:45</sup>); “good gifts” (<sup>Matthew 7:11</sup>); “Good Master (the Revised Version (British and American) “Teacher”).... Why callest thou me good? none is good save one” (<sup>Mark 10:17 f</sup>; <sup>Luke 18:18 f</sup>; compare <sup>Matthew 19:16</sup> f); “they that have done good” (<sup>John 5:29</sup>). Sometimes it is equivalent to “kind” (thus <sup>Titus 2:5</sup> the Revised Version (British and American)); to agathon is “that which is good” (<sup>Luke 6:45</sup>; <sup>Romans 7:13</sup>; <sup>1 Thessalonians 5:15</sup>; <sup>1 Peter 3:13</sup>, etc.; “that which is honest,” the Revised Version (British and American) “honorable “ (<sup>2 Corinthians 13:7</sup>); “meet” (<sup>Matthew 15:26</sup>; <sup>Mark 7:27</sup>); “worthy,” the Revised Version (British and American) “honorable” (Jas 2:7); agathon is “a good thing,” as “good things to them that ask him” (<sup>Matthew 7:11</sup>); Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?” (<sup>John 1:46</sup>, etc.; agathoergeo (<sup>1 Timothy 6:18</sup>), and agathopoioeo (<sup>Mark 3:4</sup>; <sup>Acts 14:17</sup>, etc., “to do good.”

Kalos is properly, “beautiful,” “pleasing,” “useful,” “noble,” “worthy” in a moral sense, e.g. “that they may see your good works” (<sup>Matthew 5:16</sup>); “She hath wrought a good work on me” (<sup>Matthew 26:10</sup>; Mark 14,6);
“the good shepherd” (John 10:11,14); “Many good works have I showed you” (John 10:32); “good and acceptable before God” (1 Timothy 5:4; the Revised Version (British and American) omits “good”); “the good fight” (2 Timothy 4:7); “good works” (Titus 2:7); “the good word of God” (Hebrews 6:5). But it is often practically equivalent to *agathos*, e.g. “good fruit” (Matthew 3:10); “good ground” (Matthew 13:23); “good seed” (Matthew 13:24); but the idea of useful may underlie such expressions; to *kalon* is properly “that which is beautiful.” It occurs in Romans 7:18,21; 1 Thessalonians 5:21, “Hold fast that which is good.” In Romans 7 it seems to be used interchangeably with to *agathon*. In Romans 5:7, “the good man” (*he agathos*) is distinguished from “a righteous man” (*dikaios*): “For the good man some one would even dare to die” (compare Romans 7:16; Hebrews 5:14; Jas 4:17); *kalos*, “well,” “pleasantly,” is translated “good” (*Luke* 6:27; Jas 2:3); *kalodidaskalos* (Titus 2:3), “teachers of good things,” the Revised Version (British and American) “of that which is good.”

“Good” occurs in the rendering of many other Greek words and phrases, as *eudokia*, “good pleasure” (Ephesians 1:9); “good will” (Luke 2:14; Philippians 1:15); *sumphero*, “to bear together,” “not good to marry” (Matthew 19:10), the Revised Version (British and American) “expedient”; *philagathos*, “a lover of good” (Titus 1:8); *chrestologia*, “good words” (Romans 16:18, the Revised Version (British and American) “smooth speech,” etc.).

The following changes in the Revised Version (British and American) may be noted. In Luke 2:14 for “men of good will” (*eudokia*) the Revised Version (British and American) reads “in whom he is well pleased,” margin “good pleasure among men, Greek men of good pleasure.” The meaning is “men to whom God is drawing nigh in goodwill or acceptance”; compare Luke 4:19, “the acceptable year of the Lord”; 4:43, “Preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God.” In Matthew 11:5; Luke 4:43; 7:22; 1 Peter 1:25 and (American Standard Revised Version) Revelation 14:6 “the gospel” is changed into “good tidings.” In Matthew 18:8 f; Mark 9:43,15,47; Luke 5:39, good is substituted for “better”; on the last passage in notes “Many authorities read `better’ “; in 1 Corinthians 9:15 “good .... rather” for “better”; “good” is substituted in Luke 1:19; 8:1 and Acts 13:32 for “glad”; in Acts 6:3 for “honest”; in Hebrews 13:9 for “a good thing.” In 2 Thessalonians 1:11, all the
good pleasure of his goodness” becomes “every desire of goodness” (m “Gr good pleasure of goodness”); in 1 Timothy 3:2, “good” (kosmios) becomes “orderly.” There are many other instances of like changes.

See GOODNESS; GOOD, CHIEF.

W. L. Walker

GOOD, CHIEF

What this consisted in was greatly discussed in ancient philosophy. Varro enumerated 288 answers to the question. By Plato “the good” was identified with God.

In the Old Testament while the “good” of the nation consisted in earthly well-being or prosperity (Deuteronomy 28 etc.), that of the individual was to be found only in God Himself (Psalm 16:2 the Revised Version (British and American), “I have no good beyond thee”; Psalm 41:1-5; 43:5; 73:25-28; Jeremiah 31:33 f; Habakkuk 3:17-19). This implied godly conduct (Micah 6:8, etc.), and led to the experience described as “blessedness” (Psalm 1, etc.; Jeremiah 17:7, etc.). It is the “Wisdom” extolled in Proverbs 1:20; 8:1 f (compare Ecclesiasticus 1:1 f; 5:1 f), elsewhere described as “the fear of Yahweh.” That God alone can be the true “good” of man is implied in the fact that man was created in the image of God (Genesis 1:27).

In the New Testament the true “good” is placed by Jesus in “the kingdom of God” (Matthew 6:33; 13:44 f, etc.). This means nothing earthly merely (Matthew 6:19), but heavenly and eternal. It implies the Old Testament conception that God is the true “good”; for to seek the Kingdom supremely means whole-hearted devotion to God as our heavenly Father and to His righteousness. It was also spoken of by Jesus, as sonship to the heavenly Father (Matthew 5:45, etc.). This “good” is not something merely to be given to men, but must be sought after and won through taking up a right attitude toward God and our fellows, cherishing the Love that God is, and acting it out in kindness and righteousness, in resemblance to our God and Father (Matthew 5:43-48; here Genesis 1:27 is implied).

In some of the epistles Christ is represented as the true “good” (Philippians 3:8 f; Colossians 3:1-4,11). This is because in Him God was manifested in His Truth and Grace; in Him “the Kingdom” was
present; through His cross the world is so reconciled to God that men can find acceptance and rest in Him as their “good”; Christ Himself in the Spirit is our Life; in Him we have “God with us.” Having God as our “good,” nothing but good, in the truest and highest sense, can come to us. Even the most seemingly adverse things are turned into good “to them that love God” (Romans 8:28).

Our true “good” is found thus in God even in this present life; but its fullness can be realized only in the eternal life beyond. Placing our “good” in God leads to such life in devotion to the “good” that God is, as tends to bring all that is best to this present world. It is men’s failure to do this that is the source of our misery (Jeremiah 2:13, etc.). The ultimate ideal is that God shall be “all in all” (1 Corinthians 15:28).

W. L. Walker

GOODLINESS

<good’li-nes>: This word is found in Isaiah 40:6 as the translation of [checedh], commonly translated “mercy,” “kindness,” etc.: “All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness (beauty, charm, comeliness) thereof is as the flower of the field.” The rendering is retained by the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version as appropriate in this place; checedh is frequently translated goodness.’ In Isaiah 40:6 Septuagint has doxa, “glory” (so also 1 Peter 1:24), which also fitly expresses the idea of the passage.

GOODLY

<good’li>: In the Old Testament various words are translated “goodly,” the most of them occurring only once; Tobh (the common word for “good”) is several times translated “goodly,” chiefly in the sense of form or appearance e.g. “a goodly child” (Exodus 2:2); “that goodly mountain” (Deuteronomy 3:25); yapheh (“fair”) is similarly translated in Genesis 39:6, the Revised Version (British and American) “comely,” and mar’oh in 2 Samuel 23:21. Other words, such as ‘addir imply excellence, honor, etc., e.g. Ezekiel 17:23, “bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar”; hodh, “his goodly horse” (Zec 10:3); others imply beauty, ornament, such as peer “goodly bonnets,” the Revised Version (British and American) “headtires” (Exodus 39:28); shaphar (“bright,” “fair”), “a goodly heritage”
Psalm 16:6); once ‘El (“God of might”) is employed, the Revised Version (British and American) “cedars of God,” margin “goodly cedars” (Psalm 80:10); renanim (“joyous soundings or shoutings”) is translated in Job 39:13 “goodly wings,” probably from the sound made in flying or flapping; the English Revised Version has “The wing of the ostrich rejoiceth,” the American Standard Revised Version (wings) “wave proudly.” For “goodly castles” (Numbers 31:10) the Revised Version (British and American) has “encampments”; “goodly vessels” (2 Chronicles 32:27) for “pleasant jewels”; “goodly” is substituted for “good” (Psalm 45:1; Song of Solomon 1:3); “goodly things” for “all the goods” (Genesis 24:10); “goodly frame,” the American Standard Revised Version for “comely proportion” (Job 41:12).


“Goodly” occurs in Apocrypha, 1 Esdras 4:18; Judith 8:7 (horaios); 2 Macc 9:16, “goodly gifts,” kallistos, the Revised Version (British and American) “goodliest.”

W. L. Walker

GOODLY TREES

([r d h ; 6[ eyr P] peri`ets hadhar], “the fruit (the King James Version “boughs”) of goodly (= beautiful or noble) trees”). One of the four species of plants used in the Feast of Tabernacles (Leviticus 23:40). In the Talmud (Cukkdh 35a) this is explained to be the citron (Citrus medica) known in Hebrew as ‘ethrogh. This tradition is ancient, at least as old as the Maccabees. Josephus (Ant., XIII, xiii, 5) records that Alexander Janneus, while serving at the altar during this feast, was pelted by the infuriated Jews with citrons. This fruit also figures on coins of this period. It is probable that the citron tree (Malum Persica) was imported from Babylon by Jews returning from the captivity. A citron is now carried in the synagogue by every orthodox Jew in one hand, and the lalabh (of myrtle,
willow, and palm branch) in the other, on each day of the Feast of Tabernacles.

Originally the “goodly trees” had a much more generic sense, and the term is so interpreted by the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

*See FEASTS AND FASTS; BOOTH.*

**GOODMAN**

<good’-man> ([ν ια ἴσχ; [οἶκος ἔσποτης, oikodespotes]): The word occurs once in the Old Testament and is a translation of the ordinary word for “man,” ἴσχ (Proverbs 7:19). “The goodman is not at home,” so the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), but the American Standard Revised Version, more correctly, “The man is not at home”; i.e. the husband is not at home; the Geneva and Douay versions have “My husband is not at home”: so Wycliffe; while the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has “There is not a man in her house.” In the New Testament “goodman” is a translation of oikodespotes. This word occurs 12 times in the Synoptists, and nowhere else. the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have 3 translations of the word, the American Standard Revised Version 2. In 4 places the King James Version has “goodman” while the American Standard Revised Version has “householder” or “master of the house” (Matthew 20:11; 24:43; Luke 12:39; 22:11). In all the other places, it is translated “householder” or “master of the house.” the Revised Version (British and American) retains “goodman” in Mark 14:14 and Luke 22:11. The word literally means “master of the house,” or “husband.” The adjective is a mark of respect, and is used somewhat as our word “Mr.,” an appellative of respect or civility. Relationship by marriage was distinguished by this epithet, as “good-father,” “good-sister,” both in England and Scotland. Later the adjective lost its distinguishing force and was swallowed up in the word.
GOODNESS

<good’-nes>: This word in the Old Testament is the translation of Tobh (Exodus 18:9; Psalm 16:2, the Revised Version (British and American) “good”; 23:6), etc.; of Tubh (Exodus 33:19; Psalm 31:19; Jeremiah 31:14; Hosea 3:5), etc.; of checedh (Exodus 34:6), “abundant in goodness,” the English Revised Version “plenteous in mercy,” the American Standard Revised Version “abundant in loving kindness”; “The goodness of God endureth continually,” the Revised Version (British and American) “mercy,” the American Standard Revised Version “loving kindness” (Psalm 52:1), etc.

In the New Testament it is the translation of chrestotes (“usefulness,” benignity); “the riches of his goodness” (Romans 2:4; 11:22, thrice); of chrestos (“useful,” “benign,” “kind,” in Luke 6:35); “The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance” (Romans 2:4); of agathosune (found only in the New Testament and Septuagint and writings based thereon), “full of goodness.” (Romans 15:14); “gentleness, goodness, faith” (Galatians 5:22); “in all goodness and righteousness and truth” (Ephesians 5:9); “all the good pleasure of his goodness,” the Revised Version (British and American) “every desire of goodness.” (2 Thessalonians 1:11).

The thought of God as good and the prominence given to “good” and “goodness” are distinctive features of the Bible. In the passage quoted above from Galatians 5:22, “goodness” is one of the fruits of the indwelling Spirit of God, and in that from Ephesians 5:9 it is described as being, along with righteousness and truth, “the fruit of the light” which Christians had been “made” in Christ. Here, as elsewhere, we are reminded that the Christian life in its truth is likeness to God, the source and perfection of all good. 2 Thessalonians 1:11 regards God Himself as expressing His goodness in and through us.

See GOOD; GOOD, CHIEF.

W. L. Walker

GOODS

<goodz> ([v Wr ] rekhush], [b W , Tubh]; [tā ὑπάρχοντα, ta huparchonta]): In the Old Testament rekhush (“substance”) is most frequently translated “goods,” as in Genesis 14:11,12,16,21, etc.; Tubh
is also 3 times so translated in the King James Version (Genesis 24:10, the Revised Version (British and American) “goodly things,” margin “all the goods”; Nehemiah 9:25, the Revised Version (British and American) “good things”; Job 20:21, the Revised Version (British and American) “prosperity”). Other words, are ‘on Job 20:10, the Revised Version (British and American) “wealth”); Chayil (“force,” Numbers 31:9; Zephaniah 1:13, the Revised Version (British and American) “wealth”); Tobh (Deuteronomy 28:11, the Revised Version (British and American) “for good”; Ecclesiastes 5:11); melak’khah (“work,” Exodus 22:8,11); nikhcin (Aramaic “riches,” Ezr 6:8; 7:26); Qinyan, “getting” (Ezekiel 38:12 f). We have ta huparchonta (literally, “the things existing”) in Matthew 24:47, “ruler over all his goods,” the Revised Version (British and American) “all that he hath,” etc. Agathos is translated “goods” in Luke 12:18 f; skeuos (“instrument”) in Matthew 12:29; Mark 3:27; ta sa (“the things belonging to thee”) in Luke 6:30; ousia (“substance”) in Luke 15:12, the Revised Version (British and American) “substance”; huparxis (“existence,” “substance”) in Acts 2:45; plouteo (“to be rich”) in Revelation 3:17, the Revised Version (British and American) “have gotten riches.” In the Revised Version (British and American) “goods” stands instead of “carriage” (Judges 18:21), of “stuff” (Luke 17:31), of “good” (1 John 3:17). “Goods” was used in the sense of “possessions” generally; frequently in this sense in Apocrypha (1 Esdras 6:32); ta huparchonta (Tobit 1:20); Ecclesiasticus 5:1, “Set not thy heart upon thy goods” (chrema), etc.

**Gopher Wood**

<go'-fer wood> [(]rp yx ́atse ghopher): The wood from which Noah’s ark was made (Genesis 6:14). Gopher is a word unknown elsewhere in Hebrew or allied languages. Lagarde considered that it was connected with [t yr ́gophrith], meaning “brimstone,” or “pitch,” while others connect it with [r p ́kopher], also meaning “pitch”; hence, along both lines, we reach the probability of some resinous wood, and pine, cedar, and cypress have all had their supporters. A more probable explanation is that which connects gopher with the modern Arabic kufa, a name given to the boats made of interwoven willow branches and palm leaves with a coating of bitumen outside, used today on the rivers and

**W. L. Walker**
canals of Mesopotamia. In the Gilgames story of the flood it is specially mentioned that Noah daubed his ark both inside and out with a kind of bitumen.

See DELUGE OF NOAH.

E. W. G. Masterman

GORE

<gor> ([ג" n; naghach]): “Gore” occurs only three times in the King James Version, namely, Exodus 21:28,31 bis, “if an ox gore a man or a woman,” etc.; in 21:29,32,36, the King James Version has “push” (with his horn), the Revised Version (British and American) “gore.” The same verb in Piel and Hithpael is elsewhere translated “push” and “pushing” (Deuteronomy 33:17, “He shall push the peoples,” the Revised Version, margin “gore”; 1 Kings 22:11; Psalm 44:5; Ezekiel 34:21; Daniel 8:4; 11:40, the Revised Version (British and American) “contend,” margin “Hebrew push at,” as an ox pushes with his horns so should the king fight — a fitting description of warfare).

GORGEOUS; GORGEOUSLY

<gor'-jus>, <gor'-jus-li> ([וֹדֵק תְּנִי mikhlon]; [λαμπρός, lampros]: Mikhlon occurs twice in the Old Testament, translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “most gorgeously” (Ezekiel 23:12); in Ezekiel 38:4, the King James Version translates “all sorts” (of armor), the Revised Version (British and American) “clothed in full armor.” Lampros (“shining,” “bright”), is only once translated “gorgeous” (Luke 23:11); “Herod .... arrayed him in a gorgeous robe,” the Revised Version (British and American) “gorgeous apparel.” We have also in Luke 7:25, “They that are gorgeously appareled (endoxos, “splendid,” “glorious”) .... are in kings’ courts.” They were scarcely to be looked for among the prophets, or in the new community of Jesus.

W. L. Walker

GORGET

<gor'-jet>: Appears only once in the King James Version (1 Samuel 17:6), being placed in the margin as an alternative to “target (of brass)” in...
the description of the armor worn by Goliath of Gath. The Hebrew word thus translated (אֲכִידוֹנ [kidhon]) really means a “javelin,” and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version here and in 1 Samuel 17:45 (“Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a javelin”). See ARMOR, I, 4, (3). Gorget, though so rarely used in Scripture and now displaced in our revised versions, occurs not infrequently and in various senses in English literature. In the meaning of “a piece of armor for the gorge or throat” which seems to have been in the mind of King James’s translators, it is found in early English writers and down to recent times. Spenser has it in Faerie Queene, IV, in, 12:

“His weasand-pipe it through his gorget cleft”;

Scott, Marmion, V, ii:

“Our brigantines and gorgets light”;

and Prescott, Ferdinand and Isabella, III, 47: “The gorget gave way and the sword entered his throat.”

T. Nicol.

GORGIAS

<gor'ji-as> ([Γοργίας, Gorgias]): A general in the service of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 3:38; 2 Macc 8:9). Lysias, who had been left as regent during the absence of Antiochus in Persia, appointed Gorgias to take the command against Judea in 166 BC. In 1 Macc 4:1-24 is recorded a night attack by Gorgias with 5,000 foot and 1,000 horse upon the camp of Judas Maccabeus in the neighborhood of Emmaus, in which Judas was completely victorious. The victory was all the more striking as the force of Judas was considerably smaller in number and had “not armor nor swords to their minds” (1 Macc 4:6). Later on (164 BC) he held a garrison in Jamnia, and gained a victory over the forces of Joseph and Azarias who, envying the glory of Judas and Jonathan, in direct disobedience to the orders of Judas, attacked Gorgias and were defeated.

Jamnia as given in Josephus, Ant, XII, viii, 6, is probably the correct reading for Idumaea in 2 Macc 12:32. The doings of Gorgias in 2 Macc are recorded with some confusion. He was regarded with special hostility by the Jews. In 2 Macc 12:35 he is described as “the accursed man.”
GORTYNA

<gor-ti’-na> ([Гορτύνα, Gortunai]): A city in Crete, next in importance to Gnossus. It is mentioned in 1 Macc 15:23.

See CRETE.

GOSHEN (1)

<go’-shen> ([γόσην, goshen]; [Γεσέμ, Gesem]):

1. MEANING OF NAME:
The region where the Hebrews dwelt in Egypt. If the Septuagint reading Gesem be correct, the word, which in its Hebrew form has no known meaning, may mean “cultivated” — comparing the Arabic root jashima, “to labor.” Egyptologists have suggested a connection with the Egyptian word <\textit{qas}>, meaning “inundated land” because Goshen was apparently the same region, called by the Greeks the “Arabian nome,” which had its capital at Phakousa representing the Egyptian Pa-qas (Brugsch, Geog., I, 298), the name of a town, with the determinative for “pouring forth.” Van der Hardt, indeed, more than a century ago (see Sayce, Higher Criticism, 235), supposed the two words to be connected. Dr. Naville in 1887 found the word as denoting the vicinity of Pi-sopt (now Saft el Henneh), 6 miles East of Zagazig — in the form Q-s-m. He concludes that this was the site of Phakousa, but the latter is usually placed at Tell el Faqus, about 15 miles South of ZOAN (which see), and this appears to be the situation of the “City of Arabia” which Silvia, about 385 AD, identifies with Gesse or Goshen; for she reached it in her journey from Heroopolis, through Goshen to Tathnis or Taphnis (Daphnai), and to Pelusium.

2. SITUATION:
It is generally agreed that Goshen was the region East of the Bubastic branch of the Nile; and in <\textit{Psalm 78:12,43}>, it seems to be clearly identified with the “field (or pastoral plain) of Zoan,” which was probably also the “land of Rameses” mentioned (<\textit{Genesis 47:11}) as possessed by Jacob’s family (see RAAMSES; ZOAN). Where first mentioned (<\textit{Genesis 45:10}), Goshen is promised by Joseph to Jacob as a land fit for flocks, and the Septuagint here reads, “Gesem of Arabia,” probably referring to the
Arabian nome which took its name from the “desert” which defended the East border of Egypt. In the second notice (Genesis 46:28 f), the boundary of the land of Goshen, where Joseph met his father, is called in the Septuagint Heroo(n)-polis, and also (Genesis 46:28) “the land of Ramesse(s)”; so that in the 3rd century BC Goshen seems to have been identified with the whole region of the Arabian nome, as far South as Heroopolis which (see PITHOM) lay in Wady Tumeilat. Goshen included pastoral lands (Genesis 46:34; 47:1,4,6,27; 50:8) and was still inhabited by the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus (Exodus 8:22; 9:26), after which it is unnoticed in the Old Testament. The name, however, applied to other places which were probably “cultivated” lands, including a region in the South of Palestine (Joshua 10:41; 11:16), “all the country of Goshen Septuagint Gosom), even unto Gibeon,” and a city of Judah (Joshua 15:51) in the mountains near Beersheba. These notices seem to show that the word is not of Egyptian origin.

3. DESCRIPTION:

The region thus very clearly indicated was not of any great extent, having an area of only about 900 square miles, including two very different districts. The western half, immediately East of the Bubastic branch of the Nile, stretches from Zoan to Bubastis (at both of which cities records of the Hyksos ruler Apepi have been found), or a distance of about 35 miles North and South. This region is an irrigated plain which is still considered to include some of the best land in Egypt. The description of the land of Rameses (see RAAMSES), in the 14th century BC, shows its fertility; and Silvia says that the land of Goshen was 16 miles from Heroopolis, and that she traveled for two days in it “through vineyards, and balsam plantations, and orchards, and tilled fields, and gardens.” The region narrows from about 15 miles near the seashore to about 10 miles between Zagazig and Tell el Kebir on the Southeast of this, a sandy and gravelly desert lies between the Nile plain and the Suez Canal, broadening southward from near Daphnai (Tell Defeneh) to Wady Tumeilat, where it is 40 miles across East and West. South of this valley an equally waterless desert stretches to Suez, and from the Bitter Lakes on the East to the vicinity of Heliopolis (Southeast of Cairo) on the West. Thus, Wady Tumeilat, which is fertilized by the Nile waters (see PI-HAHIROTH), and contains villages and corn fields, is the only natural route for a people driving with their flocks and herds by which the vicinity of the Red Sea can be reached, the road leading
from the South end of the “field of Zoon” near Bubastis, and 40 miles
eastward to the “edge of the wilderness” (see ETHAM) and the head of the
Bitter Lakes. This physical conformation is important in relation to the
route of the Israelites (see EXODUS); and Wady Tumeilat may very
possibly be intended to be included in Goshen, as the Septuagint translators
supposed.

C. R. Conder

GOSHEN (2)

<go’-shen> ([גַּשֶּן, goshen]):

(1) Mentioned as a country ([גַּן, erets]) in the South of Judah distinct
from the “hill country,” the Negeb and the Shephelah (Joshua 10:41;

(2) A town in the Southwest part of the hill country of Judah (Joshua
15:51), very probably connected in some way with the district (1).

(3) See preceding article.

GOSPEL

<gosp’-pel> ([τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, to euaggelion]): The word gospel is derived
from the Anglo-Saxon word which meant “the story concerning God.” In
the New Testament the Greek word euaggelion, means “good news.” It
proclaims tidings of deliverance. The word sometimes stands for the record
of the life of our Lord (Mark 1:1), embracing all His teachings, as in
Acts 20:24. But the word “gospel” now has a peculiar use, and
describes primarily the message which Christianity announces. “Good
news” is its significance. It means a gift from God. It is the proclamation of
the forgiveness of sins and sonship with God restored through Christ. It
means remission of sins and reconciliation with God. The gospel is not only
a message of salvation, but also the instrument through which the Holy
Spirit works (Romans 1:16).

The gospel differs from the law in being known entirely from revelation. It
is proclaimed in all its fullness in the revelation given in the New
Testament. It is also found, although obscurely, in the Old Testament. It
begins with the prophecy concerning the `seed of the woman’ (Genesis
3:15), and the promise concerning Abraham, in whom all the nations
should be blessed (Genesis 12:3; 15:5) and is also indicated in Acts 10:43 and in the argument in Romans 4.

In the New Testament the gospel never means simply a book, but rather the message which Christ and His apostles announced. In some places it is called “the gospel of God,” as, for example, Romans 1:1; Thessalonians 2:2,9, 1 Timothy 1:11. In others it is called “the gospel of Christ” (Mark 1:1; Romans 1:16; 15:19; 1 Corinthians 9:12,18; Galatians 1:7). In another it is called “the gospel of the grace of God” (Acts 20:24); in another “the gospel of peace” (Ephesians 6:15); in another “the gospel of your salvation” (Ephesians 1:13); and in yet another “the glorious gospel” (2 Corinthians 4:4 the King James Version). The gospel is Christ: He is the subject of it, the object of it, and the life of it. It was preached by Him (Matthew 4:23; 11:5; Mark 1:14; Luke 4:18 margin), by the apostles (Acts 16:10; Romans 1:15; 2:16; 1 Corinthians 9:16) and by the evangelists (Acts 8:25).

We must note the clear antithesis between the law and the gospel. The distinction between the two is important because, as Luther indicates, it contains the substance of all Christian doctrine. “By the law,” says he, “nothing else is meant than God’s word and command, directing what to do and what to leave undone, and requiring of us obedience of works. But the gospel is such doctrine of the word of God that neither requires our works nor commands us to do anything, but announces the offered grace of the forgiveness of sin and eternal salvation. Here we do nothing, but only receive what is offered through the word.” The gospel, then, is the message of God, the teaching of Christianity, the redemption in and by Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, offered to all mankind. And as the gospel is bound up in the life of Christ, His biography and the record of His works, and the proclamation of what He has to offer, are all gathered into this single word, of which no better definition can be given than that of Melanchthon: “The gospel is the gratuitous promise of the remission of sins for Christ’s sake.” To hold tenaciously that in this gospel we have a supernatural revelation is in perfect consistency with the spirit of scientific inquiry. The gospel, as the whole message and doctrine of salvation, and as chiefly efficacious for contrition, faith, justification, renewal and sanctification, deals with facts of revelation and experience.

David H. Bauslin
I. INTRODUCTORY.

1. Scope of Article:

The present article is confined to the consideration of the relations and general features of the first 3 Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke) — ordinarily named “the Synoptic Gospels,” because, in contrast with the Fourth Gospel, they present, as embodying a common tradition, the same general view of the life and teaching of Jesus during His earthly ministry, and of His death and resurrection. The Fourth Gospel, in itself and in its relation to the Synoptics, with the Johannine literature and theology generally, are treated in special articles.

See JOHN, GOSPEL OF; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, etc.

2. The Gospels in Church Tradition:

The place of the Gospels in church tradition is secure. Eusebius places the 4 Gospels among the books that were never disputed in the church (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25). It is acknowledged that by the end of the 2nd century these 4 Gospels, and none else, ascribed to the authors whose names they bear, were in universal circulation and undisputed use throughout the church, stood at the head of church catalogues and of all
VSS, were freely used, not only by the Fathers of the church (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, etc.), but by pagans and heretics, and by these also were ascribed to the disciples of Christ as their authors. Justin Martyr, in the middle of the century, freely quotes from “Memoirs of the Apostles,” “which are called Gospels,” “composed by the apostles and those that followed them” (1 Apol. 66-67; Dial. with Trypho, 10, 100, 103). What these Gospels were is made apparent by the Diatessaron, or Harmony of Four, of his disciple Tatian (circa 170), constructed from the 4 Gospels we possess. The first to mention Matthew and Mark by name is Papias of Hierapolis (circa 120-30; in Euseb., HE, III, 39). Dr. Sanday is disposed to carry back the extracts from Papias to about 100 AD (Fourth Gospel, 151); Dr. Moffatt likewise says, “These explanations of Matthew and Mark must have been in circulation by the end of the 1st century” (Introduction to Lit. of New Testament, 187). The gist of the testimony of Papias is: “Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though he did not record in order, that which was either said or done by Christ”; “Matthew composed the Oracles (Logia) in Hebrew (Aramaic), and each one interpreted them as he was able.” Eusebius evidently took what he quotes about Matthew and Mark from Papias to refer to our present Gospels, but a problem arises as to the relation of the Aramaic “Logia” said to be composed by Matthew to our canonical Greek Gospel, which was the only Gospel of Matthew known to the early Fathers. There is no ground for the supposition that the Jewish-Christian GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS (which see) was the original of the Greek Matthew; it was on the other hand derived from it. The Gnostic Marcion used a mutilated Luke. Compare further, below on dating, and for details see special articles on the respective Gospels; also BIBLE; CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

II. THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

1. Nature of the Problem:

Arising from their peculiar nature, there has always been a Synoptic problem, ever since the 3 Gospels appeared together in the Canon of the New Testament. No one could read these Gospels consecutively with attention, without being aware of the resemblances and differences in their contents. Each writer sets forth his own account without reference to the other two, and, with the partial exception of Luke (1:1-4), does not tell his readers anything about the sources of his Gospel. A problem thus arose as
to the relations of the three to one another, and the problem, though it approaches a solution, is not yet solved. A history of the Synoptic problem will be found in outline in many recent works; the most elaborate and best is in Zahn’s Introduction, III. In it Zahn briefly indicates what the problem was as it presented itself to the church in the earlier centuries, and gives in detail the history of the discussion from the time of Lessing (1778) to the present day. It is not possible within the limits of this article to refer otherwise than briefly to these discussions, but it may be remarked that, as the discussion went on, large issues were raised; every attempt at solution seemed only to add to the difficulty of finding an adequate one; and at length it was seen that no more complex problem was ever set to literary criticism than that presented by the similarities and differences of the Synoptic Gospels.

2. Proposed Solutions:

Of the hypotheses which seek to account for these resemblances and differences, the following are the most important.

(1) **Oral Gospel:**

The hypothesis of oral tradition: This theory has rather fallen into disfavor among recent critics. Dr. Stanton, e.g., says, “The relations between the first 3 Gospels cannot be adequately explained simply by the influence of oral tradition” (Gospels as Historical Documents, II, 17; similarly Moffatt, in the work quoted 180 ff). Briefly stated, theory is this. It assumes that each of the evangelists wrote independently of the others, and derived the substance of his writing, not from written sources, but from oral narratives of sayings and doings of Jesus, which, through dint of repetition, had assumed a relatively fixed form. The teaching of the apostles, first given in Jerusalem, repeated in the catechetical schools (compare Luke 1:4, the Revised Version (British and American)), and entrusted to the trained memories of the Christian converts, is held to be sufficient to account for the phenomena of the 3 Gospels. The oral Gospel took its essential form in Palestine, and written editions of it would by and by appear in more or less complete form (Luke 1:1). The first distinguished advocate of the oral hypothesis was Gieseler (1818). It was upheld in Britain by Alford and Westcott, and is today advocated, with modifications, by Dr. A. Wright in his Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek (2nd edition, 1908).
(2) **Mutual Use:**

As old as Augustine, this hypothesis, which assumes the use of one of the Gospels by the other two, has been frequently advocated by scholars of repute in the history of criticism. There have been many variations of theory. Each of the 3 Gospels has been put first, each second, and each third, and each in turn has been regarded as the source of the others. In fact, all possible permutations (6 in number) have been exhausted. As the hypothesis has few advocates at the present day, it is not necessary to give a minute account of these permutations and combinations. Two of them which may be regarded as finally excluded are

(a) those which put Luke first; and

(b) those which put Mark last (the view of Augustine; in modern times, of F. Baur and the Tubingen school).

(3) **Hypothesis of Sources:**

This is theory which may be said to hold the field at the present time. The tendency in criticism is toward the acceptance of two main sources for the Synoptic Gospels.

(a) One source is a Gospel like, if not identical with, the canonical Gospel of Mark. As regards this 2nd Gospel there is a consensus of opinion that it is prior to the other two, and the view that the 2nd and 3rd used it as a source is described as the one solid result of literary criticism. Eminent critics of various schools of thought are agreed on this point (compare W.C. Allen, Matthew, Pref. vii; F.C. Burkitt, Gospel History and Its Transmission, 37). It has been shown that most of the contents of Mark have been embodied in the other two, that the order of events in Mark has been largely followed by Matthew and Luke, and that the departures from the style of Mark can be accounted for by the hypothesis of editorial amendment.

(b) The other source (now commonly named Q) is found first by an examination of the matter not contained in the 2nd Gospel, which is common to Matthew and Luke. While there are differences as to the extent and character of the 2nd source, there is something like general agreement as to its existence. It is not agreed as to whether this source contained narratives of events, as well as sayings, or whether it was a
book of sayings alone (the former is thought to be the more probable view), nor is it agreed as to whether it contained an account of the Passion week (on the differing views of the extent of Q, see Moffatt, op. cit., 197 ff); but while disagreement exists as to these and other points, the tendency, as said, is to accept a “two-source” theory in some form as the only sufficient account of the phenomena of the Gospels.

(4) Other Sources:

To make the source-theory probable, some account must be taken of other sources beyond the two enumerated above. Both the 1st and the 3rd Gospels contain material not borrowed from these sources. There is the fore-history of Matthew 1:2, which belongs to that Gospel alone, with other things likewise recorded by Matthew (9:27-34; 12:22; 14:28-33; 17:24 ff, etc.). Then not only has Luke a fore-history (chapters 1; 2), but a large part of his Gospel consists of material found nowhere else (e.g. 7:11-16,36-50; 10:25 ff; parables in chapters 15; 16; 18:1-14, etc.). This Sondergut of Matthew and Luke will be more appropriately treated in the articles which deal with these Gospels respectively. Here it is sufficient to point out that the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels is not complete till it has found a probable source

(a) for what is common to them all,

(b) for what is common to any two of them, and

(c) for what is peculiar to each. The literature on the subject is so voluminous that only a few references can be given. In addition to those named, the following works may suffice to set forth the present condition of the Synoptic problem: B. Weiss, Introduction to New Testament, and other works; Harnack, Luke the Physician, The Sayings of Jesus, The Acts of the Apostles, Date of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Synoptic Gospels (English translations); Wellhausen, Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, and works on each of the Synoptic Gospels, especially Studies in the Synoptic Problem, edited by Dr. Sanday.
III. LITERARY ANALYSIS AND ORAL TRADITION.

1. The Problem Not Solely a Literary One:

Looked at merely as a problem of literary analysis, it is scarcely possible to advance farther than has been done in the works of Harnack, of Sanday and his co-adjutors, and of Stanton, referred to above. The work done has been of the most patient and persevering kind. No clue has been neglected, no labor has been spared, and the interrelations of the three Gospels have been almost exhaustively explored. Yet the problem remains unsolved. For it must not be forgotten that the materials of the Synoptic Gospels were in existence before they assumed a written form. Literary analysis is apt to forget this obvious fact, and to proceed by literary comparison alone. The Gospel was confessedly at first and for some years a spoken Gospel, and this fact has to be taken into account in any adequate attempt to understand the phenomena. It is not enough to say with Dr. Stanton that “the relations of the first three Gospels cannot be adequately explained simply by the influence of oral tradition”; for the question arises, Can the relations between the first three Gospels be explained simply by the results of literary analysis, be it as exhaustive and thorough as it may? Let it be granted that literary analysis has accomplished a great deal; that it has almost compelled assent to the two-source hypothesis; that it has finally made good the priority of Mk; that it has made out a probable source consisting mainly of sayings of Jesus, yet many problems remain which literary analysis cannot touch, at least has not touched. There is the problem of the order of events in the Gospels, which is so far followed by all three. How are we to account for that sequence? Is it sufficient to say, as some do, that Mark set the style of the Gospel narrative, and that the others so far followed that style? All Gospels must follow the method set by Mark, so it is affirmed. But if that is the case, how did Matthew and Luke depart from that copy by writing a fore-history? Why did they compile a genealogy? Why did they give so large a space to the sayings of Jesus, and add so much not contained in the Gospel which, on the hypothesis, set the pattern of what a Gospel ought to be? These questions cannot be answered on the hypothesis that the others simply followed a fashion set by Mark. Sometimes the 2nd Gospel is described as if it were suddenly launched on the Christian world; as if no one had ever heard of the story contained in it before Mark wrote it. From the nature of the case, it is obvious that the church had knowledge of many of the facts in the life of Christ, and was in possession of much of His teaching before any of the
Gospels were written. So much is plain from the Epistles of Paul. How many facts about Jesus, and how much of His teaching may be gathered from these epistles, we do not inquire at present. But we do learn much from Paul about the historical Jesus.

2. Influence of Oral Instruction:

The Christian church in its earlier form arose out of the teaching, example and influence of the apostles at Jerusalem. It was based on apostolic testimony as to the life, character, teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. That testimony told the church what Jesus had done, what He had taught, and of the belief of the apostles as to what He was, and what He continued to be. We read that the early church “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ teaching and fellowship” (Acts 2:42). The “teaching” consisted of reminiscences of the Lord, of interpretations of the facts about Jesus and of agreements between these and the Old Testament. The first instruction given to the church was oral. Of this fact there can be no doubt. How long oral teaching continued we may not say, but it is likely that it continued as long as the apostles dwelt together at Jerusalem. To them an appeal could constantly be made. There was also the strictly catechetical teaching given to the converts, and this teaching would be given after the manner to which they had been accustomed in their earlier education. It consisted mainly in committing accurately to memory, and in repetition from memory (see CATECHIST; CATECHUMEN). There would thus be a stricter tradition, as it was taught in the catechetical classes, and a looser tradition which consisted of as much as the people could carry with them from the preaching of the apostles at the weekly assemblies. Those, besides, who were present at the day of Pentecost, and others present at the feasts at Jerusalem, who had passed under Christian influence, would carry with them on their return to their homes some knowledge of the life and death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. It may have been a meager Gospel that these carried with them to Antioch, to Rome, or to other cities in which the diaspora dwelt. But that they did carry a Gospel with them is plain, for from their testimony arose the church at Antioch, where the Christians had without question a knowledge of the Gospel, which informed their faith and guided their action.
IV. ORDER OF EVENTS AND TIME OF HAPPENINGS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

1. Range of Apostolic Witness:

It is known from Acts that the main topic of the preaching of the apostles was the resurrection of the Lord. “With great power gave the apostles their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus” (Acts 4:33). It is evident, however, that the apostolic witness would not be limited to the events of the Passion week, or to the fact of the resurrection. There would arise a thirst for information regarding the life of Jesus, what He had done, what He had said, what manner of life He had lived, and what teaching He had given. Accounts of Him and of His work would be given by the apostles, and once these accounts were given, they would continue to be given in the same form. Tell a story to a child and he will demand that it be always given in the form in which he first knew it. Hearers of a story are impatient of variations in the subsequent telling of it. Memory is very tenacious and very conservative.

2. Bearing on Order:

It is clear that the first lessons of the apostles were accounts of the Passion week, and of the resurrection. But it went backward to events and incidents in the life of Jesus, and as we read the Synoptic Gospels, we soon see that the order was dictated by the events themselves. They are grouped together for no other reason than that they happened so. Most of the incidents are hung on a geographical thread. In the 2nd Gospel, which seems to preserve most faithfully the traditional order, this is obvious to every attentive reader; but in all the 3 Gospels many of the narratives go in well-established cycles. To take only one illustration, where many might be instanced, the healing of the woman with the issue of blood is represented as occurring in the course of the walk to the house of Jairus (Mark 5:21 ff). The only explanation is that this was the actual mode of its happening. Events happened, incidents arose, in the course of the journeys of Jesus and His disciples, words were also spoken, and in the memories of the disciples, when the journey was recalled, there arose also what had happened in the course of the journey. In fact, as we follow the journey through Galilee, to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, through Samaria, down the valley of the Jordan, through Jericho to Jerusalem, we find that the grouping of the material of the Gospels is determined by the facts. Most of what is recorded happened in the course of the journeys, and was borne in
the memories of the disciples in the order of its happening. The order, then, is not arbitrary, nor is it the product of reflection; it is the outcome of the facts. It is true that in pursuance of their several plans, Luke sometimes, Matthew frequently, deserts the order of Mark, but it is noteworthy that they never do so together. As Professor Burkitt says, “Matthew and Luke never agree against Mark in transposing a narrative. Luke sometimes deserts the order of Mark, and Matthew often does so; but in these cases Mark is always supported by the remaining Gospel” (op. cit., 36). In Matthew, after 19:1, the events follow each other quite as in Mark.

3. Time of Happenings:

When one studies the rather kaleidoscopic political geography of Palestine in the first 40 years of our era, he will find many confirmations of the historic situation in the Synoptic Gospels. The birth of Jesus was in the time of Herod the Great, when the whole of Palestine was under one government. After the death of Herod, Palestine was under several rulers. Archelaus had possession of Judea until the year 9 AD. Galilee was under Herod Antipas until the year 37, and the tetrarchy of Philip had a distinct government of its own. About the year 40 Palestine was again under one government under Herod Agrippa. Now it is clear that the events of the Gospels happened while Herod Antipas ruled in Galilee and Perea, and while Pilate was procurator in Judea (see CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, and JESUS CHRIST). Nor is the significance of this environment exhausted by the reference to the time. As Professor Burkitt has shown (op. cit., in his chapter entitled “Jesus in Exile”), in the itinerary recorded in Mark 5, the parts avoided are the dominions of Herod Antipas. It is simply noted by Mark, and on it the evangelist makes no remark. But the conspiracy had a great effect on the work of Jesus. A little later we find Jesus no more in any of the synagogues. He devotes Himself to the training of the Twelve, and is outside of the dominions of Herod Antipas. It is not to be forgotten that during these months Jesus is an exile from His own land, and it was during that period of exile that the issue of His work became clear to Him, and from the time of the great confession at Caesarea-Philippi He began to tell His disciples of the decease that He should accomplish at Jerusalem (Matthew 16:13 ff parallel).
V. DATING OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

1. Return to Earlier Dating:

The question as to the dates at which the Synoptic Gospels appear in a published form may more suitably be dealt with in connection with the articles on the separate Gospels. It need only be observed here that opinion is tending toward much earlier dates than were common till lately. By all but extreme writers it is now admitted that the first 3 Gospels fall well within the limits of the apostolic age. In the Preface to his work on Luke (1906), Harnack reminded his readers that 10 years before he had told them that “in the criticism of the sources of the oldest Christianity we are in a movement backward to tradition.” The dates he formerly favored were, for Mark between 65 and 70 AD, for Matthew between 70 and 75, for Luke between 78 and 23. Harnack’s more recent pronouncement as to the date of Acts, which he states with all the emphasis of italics, “It seems now to be established beyond question that both books of this great historical work were written while Paul was yet alive” (Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels, 124, English translation), must have a determining influence on critical opinion. If Acts were written during the lifetime of Paul (compare <Hyp>Acts 28:30 f), then the 3rd Gospel must have been written earlier. It is likely that Luke had all his material in hand during the imprisonment of Paul at Caesarea. If he made use of the 2nd Gospel, then Mark must have had a still earlier date, and the whole problem of the dating of the Gospels is revolutionized. The essential thing is that the 3 Gospels were probably written and published before the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD). There is nothing in their contents that makes this view untenable.

2. The Material Still Older:

It is still to be remembered, however, that the materials of which the Gospels are composed existed before they were put into a written form. Every discussion must take note of that fact. The literature of the New Testament presupposes just such accounts of the life of Jesus as we find in the Synoptic Gospels, and readers of the Gospels have a right to rest on their veracity and sufficiency as accounts of Jesus, of what He was, what He said, and what He did. They are their own best witnesses.
VI. THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN ITS BEARINGS ON HISTORICITY OF THE GOSPELS.

1. The Jewish and the Christian Messiah:

In a striking passage in his Das Evangelium Marci (65, 66), Wellhausen vividly sets forth the significant contrast between the Jewish and the Christian conceptions of the Messiah. We quote the words, notwithstanding the fact that Wellhausen does not regard the passage, Mark 8:31 ff, as historical. With him what is set forth there is not the figure of the historical Jesus, but a picture of the persecuted church.

“The confession of Peter, `Thou art the Messiah,’ affords,” he says, “the occasion for the setting forth of what up to this time was latent. He has elicited the confession and accepted it. Nevertheless, He accepts it with a correction; a correction that follows as a matter of course. He is not the Messiah who will restore the kingdom of Israel, but another Messiah altogether. Not to set up the kingdom does He go to Jerusalem, but He goes in order to be crucified. Through sorrow and death He goes into glory, and only by this way can others also enter. The kingdom of God is no Judaistic kingdom; the kingdom is destined only for some chosen individuals, for disciples. The thought of the possibility of a metanoia of the people has wholly disappeared. Into the place of a command to repent addressed to all steps the command to follow, and that can be obeyed only by a very few. The conception of following loses now its proper forces and takes a higher meaning. It does not mean what it meant up to this time, namely, to accompany and to follow Him during His lifetime; it overflows that meaning; one is to follow Him even unto death. The following is an imitatio possible only after His death, and this is to be attained only by a very few. One must bear his cross after Him. .... The situation of the oldest congregation and its tone is here foreshadowed by Jesus as He goes to meet his fate.”

A similar passage occurs in the Einleitung, which ends with the significant sentence, “All these are noteworthy signs of the time in which He takes His standpoint” (81).

2. Originality of the Christian Conception:

Elsewhere Wellhausen admits that the sections of the Gospels following the scene at Caesarea-Philippi contain what was known as the distinctive
Gospel of the apostolic church. But this Gospel owed its origin to the apostolic church itself. It is a question of the highest importance, and the answer cannot be determined by mere literary criticism: Is the Christian conception of the Messiah due to Jesus? or is it due to the reflection of the church? Which is the more probable? It is agreed, Wellhausen being witness, that the Christian conception was subversive of the Jewish outlook, that the two were in contradiction in many ways. One can understand the Christian conception, and its triumph over the Jewish among the Christian people, if it had been set forth by the Master; but it is unintelligible as a something which originated in the congregation itself. The conception of a crucified Messiah, of a suffering Savior, was a conception which was, during the years of His earthly ministry, in the mind of Jesus alone. It was not in the minds of the disciples, until He had risen from the dead. And it was not in the minds of His contemporaries. But it was the ruling conception in the Jerusalem church as it is in the Epistles of Paul. No: the conception of the suffering Savior was not the invention of the church, nor did it rise from her thought of her own needs; it was a gift to her from the suffering and risen Lord. Not without a great impulse, nor without a strong source of persuasion, do men displace notions which they have cherished for generations, and substitute notions which are contradictory and subversive of those fiercely and firmly held.

We take these chapters therefore as historical, and as descriptive of the historical Jesus. If we can do so, then the matter is intelligible, not otherwise. It is also to be observed in this relation that the needs of the church are new needs. There is no provision in the New Testament for the needs of the natural man. The critical view often puts the cart before the horse, and this is one illustration of the fact. The needs of the church are the creation of Christ. They are new needs, or needs only imperfectly felt by humanity before Jesus came.

3. The Messianic Hope:

Be the needs of the church as great as they may, they are not creative; they are only responsive to the higher call. Nor is it a possible hypothesis that lies at the basis of the criticism of Wellhausen and of many others. Since the time of Baur it has often been said or assumed that it was the Messianic hope that gave concreteness to Christianity; that through the prevalence of the Messianic hope, Christianity was enabled to enter on its career of victory. This is another case of the *husteron proteron*. It is the historical
Jesus that has given concreteness and definiteness to the Messianic conceptions which were current in His time. Because at the heart of the Christian conception there was this concrete gracious figure, and because of the commanding influence of Jesus Christ, this form of Messianism entered into human life, flourished and endured, and is with us today. Other forms of Messianism have only an antiquarian value. They may be discussed as of literary interest, but their practical significance is as nothing. No doubt Messianic categories were ransacked by the church to see if they could be used in order more fully to set forth the significance of Jesus Christ. But the essence of the matter did not lie in them but in Him, whom they had known, loved and served. It is time that a newer critical assumption should be found than the obsolete, worn-out one that the church invented the Christ. We know a little of the early church, and we know its immaturity and its limitations. We have learned something, too, of the Jews at the time of our Lord, and we note that in the Gospels their limitations have been transcended, their immaturity has been overcome, and how? By the fact of Christ. He is so great that He must be real.

VII. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN ITS BEARING ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

It is always to be remembered that the Old Testament was the Bible of the early Christians. They accepted it as the Word of God, and as authoritative for the guidance of life and conduct. It is one thing to admit and assert this; it is another thing to say that the story of the Old Testament molded and directed the story of Jesus as it is in the Synoptic Gospels. This has been widely asserted, but without adequate proof. As a matter of fact Christianity, when it accepted the Old Testament as the word of God, interpreted it in a fashion which had not been accented before. It interpreted it in the light of Jesus Christ. Tendencies, facts, meanings, which had been in the Old Testament came into light, and the Bible of the Christians was a Bible which testified of Christ. That on which the Jews laid stress passed into the background, and that which they had neglected came into prominence. This view is set forth by Paul: “Unto this day, whenever Moses is read, a veil lieth upon their heart” (2 Corinthians 3:15). Or as it is put in Luke, “O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?” (24:25 f). In the Christian interpretation stress was laid on meanings which Jewish readers had
neglected, and so the church read the Old Testament in the new light, and things formerly hidden leaped into view. So the suffering servant of Yahweh became for them the keystone of the Old Testament, and the ritual sacrifices and ceremonies of the Old Testament obtained a new meaning. The story of Israel and of its patriarchs, lawgivers, priests, kings and prophets, became full of significance for the new religion, and its psalms and prophecies were searched because they testified of Christ. This is not the place to inquire into the truth of the Christian interpretation, but the fact is undeniable. The inference is that the Old Testament did not, as it was understood by the Jews, influence the conceptions which the church had of Christ; rather the influence of Christ, His commanding personality, and His history gave a new meaning to the Old Testament, a meaning undreamed of before. The Epistle to the Hebrews might have as an alternative title, “How to find Christ in the Old Testament.” So powerful was the impression made on the disciples by the personality of Jesus, by His whole demeanor, by His teaching, His life, death and resurrection, that they saw all things in the light of it. The difficulty we have in justifying the references to prophecy, in the light of historical criticism, is a testimony to the fact that the prophecy did not dictate the fact; it was the fact that dictated the accommodation of the prophecy. In this relation also, the supreme fact is the personality of Jesus.

VIII. THE JESUS OF THE GOSPELS AS THINKER.

1. The Ethics of Jesus:

Turning from the conception of the suffering Savior in the Synoptics, we come to the aspect of Jesus as teacher and thinker, and here also we find abundant evidence of the historical character of the Gospel presentation. As the ethics of Jesus are treated in another article, it is sufficient to say here that the conception of the ethical man and His conduct set forth in His teaching is of unusual breadth, and when worked out in detail, yields an ideal of man in himself, and in relation to others, which transcends all other ethical teaching known to mankind. This, too, we must trace to His unique personality, and not to the reflection of the church.

2. Jesus as Thinker:

A glance may be taken at Jesus under His more general aspect as thinker. As thinker, Jesus stands alone. He speaks with authority, and whoever understands must obey. The Synoptic Gospels, in this respect, are unique.
There is nothing like them in literature. Not even in the Bible is there anything to compare with them. Even in the other books of the New Testament we do not find anything like the attitude of Jesus to the common things of life. The world’s literature shows no parallel to the parables of the Gospels. Here, at any rate, we are on safe ground in saying that these are not due to the reflection of the church. They have an individual stamp which accredits them as the product of one mind. But a great deal more may be said on the characteristic features of the thinking of Jesus. He is the only thinker who goes straight from the common things of daily life and daily experience into the deepest mysteries of life. The deepest thoughts which man can think are suggested to Him by what everybody sees or does. It is not easy within reasonable limits to do justice to this feature of the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus is at home amid the common things and common occupations of life, because He discerns the Father’s presence in them all. What a series of pictures of the world, and of occupations of men, could be gathered from these Gospels! This feature of them was neglected until men under the teaching of poets and painters returned into sympathy with external Nature. We are only beginning to see what wealth, from this point of view, is in the Gospels. Poetic sympathy with Nature is a comparatively modern attainment, yet it is in the Gospels. Wind and weather, mountain and valley, seedtime and harvest, summer and winter, sowing and reaping, buying and selling, all are there, transfigured into higher meanings, and made vocal of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. Other thinkers rise gradually, and by many steps, from common experience, into what they have to describe of the higher thought and wider generalizations through which they seek to interpret the mystery of life and of the universe. But this thinker needs no middle terms. He sees, e.g., a woman preparing bread for the use of the family, and in this process perceives the mystery of the kingdom of heaven. Whenever He touches on these common things, immediately they are transfigured. They become luminous with the presence of the spiritual world, and earth becomes full of heaven, and every bush is aflame with God.

We note these things because they have a close bearing on the origin and character of the Synoptic Gospels. They bear the stamp of a unique, a creative personality. Be the processes through which the materials of the Gospels have passed what they may, yet these have not obliterated nor blurred the essential characteristics of that unique personality. When the comparisons of the similarities and differences of the Gospels have been
exhausted, the problem of their origin remains, and that problem can be solved only by the recognition of a creative personality who alike by word and work was unlike any other that the world has ever seen.

IX. THE PROBLEM OF THE GOSPELS.

The Jesus of the Gospels is the Son of God. Stated in its highest form, the problem which the evangelists had in hand was how to represent a Divine being under human conditions, and to set Him forth in such a way that in that presentation there should be nothing unworthy of the Divine, and nothing inconsistent with the human conditions under which He worked and lived. This was the greatest problem ever set to literature, and how the evangelists presented and solved it is found in the Gospels. There it has been solved. Even a writer like Bousset admits: “Already for Mark is Jesus not only the Messiah of the Jewish people, but the miraculous eternal Son of God, whose glory shone in the world. .... For the faith of the community, which the oldest evangelist already shares, Jesus is the miraculous Son of God, in whom men believe, whom men put wholly on the side of God” (Was wissen wir von Jesus? 54, 57). The contrast between the Jesus of the Synoptics and the Pauline and Johannine Christ, so often emphasized, thus begins to disappear. The purpose of the Synoptics, as of John, is to lead men to “believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,” that, believing, they “may have life in his name” (John 20:31).

LITERATURE.
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James Iverach

GOTHIC, VERSION

<goth’-ik>.

See VERSIONS.

GOTHOLIAS

<goth-o-li’-as> ([Γοθολίας, Gotholias]): Father of Josias, one of the sons of Elam who returned from Babylon with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:33). The name corresponds to Athaliah, the Greek Gotholias being substituted for the Hebrew guttural `ayin, as in Gomorrah, Gaza, etc. Taken with 2 Kings 11:1, the name would seem to have been used for both men and women.

GOTHONIEL

<go-tho’-ni-el> ([Γοθονείλ, Gothoniel]): The same as Othniel, father of Chabris who was one of the governors of the city of Bethulia (Judith 6:15).

GOURD

<gord>, <goord> ([חֹד, qiqayon]): The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has hedera ("ivy"), which is impossible. Philologically qiqayon appears to be connected with [κικί, kiki], which was the Egyptian name for the castor oil plant (Ricinus communis). This grows plentifully all over the Orient, and under favorable conditions may reach a height of 10 to 15 ft.; its larger leaves afford a grateful shade. The requirements of the narrative in Jonah 4:6 ff are, however, much more suitably met by the “bottle gourd” (Cucurbita lagenaria), the Arab qar`ah. This is a creeping, vinelike plant which may frequently be seen trained over the rough temporary sun-shelters erected in fields or by the roadside in Palestine and Mesopotamia.

E. W. G. Masterman
GOURD, WILD

<wild> ([ḥ d ẓ ; t [ Q Θ ’ , paqqu`oth sadheh], 2 Kings 4:39): The root [[ q ” P ; paqa`], means “to split” or “burst open,” and on this ground these “wild gourds” have been identified with the fruit of the squirting cucumber (Ecballium elaterium). This little gourd, 1 1/2 to 2 inches long, when fully ripe falls suddenly when touched or shaken, the bitter, irritating juice is squirted to a considerable distance, and the seeds are thrown all around. It is exceedingly common in Palestine, and its familiar poisonous properties, as a drastic cathartic, made it unlikely that under any circumstances its fruit could be mistaken for any edible gourd; it is, too, in no way vinelike (“wild vine,” 2 Kings 4:39) in appearance; the stem is stiff and upright, and there are no tendrils. The traditional plant, Cucumis prophetarium, which grows in the desert, and has very small “gourds,” has nothing really to recommend it. By far the most probable plant is the Colocynth (Citrullus colocynthis), belonging like the last two, to Natural Order, Cucurbitaceae. This view has the support of the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) It is a vinelike plant which spreads over the ground or attaches itself by its spiral tendrils to other plants. The rounded “gourds” are 3 inches or more in diameter, and contain a pulp intensely bitter and, in any but minute quantities, extremely poisonous.

E. W. G. Masterman

GOVERNMENT

<guv’-ern-ment>: The government of the Hebrews varied at different periods, of which we may distinguish seven:

(1) the nomadic period, from the Exodus to the entrance into Palestine;
(2) the period of transition from nomadic to civil life;
(3) the monarchy;
(4) the period of subjection to other oriental nations;
(5) the period from Ezra to the Greeks;
(6) Greek rule;
(7) Roman rule.
1. THE NOMADIC PERIOD:

The government of the primitive period is that proper to nomadic tribes composed of families and clans, in no wise peculiar to the Hebrews, but shared in its essential features by the most diverse peoples at a corresponding stage of civilization. Though we might draw illustrations from many sources, the government of the Bedouins, Semitic nomads inhabiting the steppes of Arabia, affords the most instructive parallel. In the patriarchal state the family is the household (including slaves and concubines) of the father, who is its head, having power of life and death over his children (Genesis 22; Judges 11:31 ff). A clan is a collection of families under a common chieftain, chosen for his personal qualifications, such as prowess and generous hospitality. The composition of the clan was essentially shifting, subject, according to circumstances, to the loss or accession of individuals and families. Although the possession of the same grazing-grounds doubtless played a large part in determining the complexion of the clan, the fiction of descent from a common ancestor was maintained, even when kinship was established by the blood covenant. In all probability community of worship, which cemented the tribe, served as the most effective bond of union also in the clan. Vestiges of such clan cults are still to be detected (1 Samuel 20:5 ff; Judges 18:19). The familiar tradition of the twelve tribes must not be allowed to blind us to the evidence that the tribe also was not constant. Mention of the Kenites (Judges 1:16) and the list of tribes in the Song of Solomon of Deborah (Judges 5) remind us that such organizations vanished. In the readjustment incident to the change from the pastoral life of the nomad to that of the settled agricultural population of Palestine, many units were doubtless shifted from one tribe to another, and the same result may be assumed as following from the endless strife between the tribes before and during the period of the kings. The large and powerful tribe of Judah seems to have originated comparatively late. The union of the tribes under the leadership of Moses was essentially similar to the formation of a new tribe out of a group of clans actuated by a desire to accomplish a common end. Many such temporary aggregations must have originated, only to succumb to the centrifugal forces of jealousy and conflicting interests. Even after the entrance of the Hebrews into Palestine, their history for long is that of kindred tribes, rather than that of a nation. The leadership of Moses rested on personal, not on constitutional, authority, and was rendered precarious by the claims of family and of clan, as in the case of Korah, Dathan, and
Abiram (Numbers 16). The authority of Moses naturally extended to the administration of justice, as well as to matters pertaining to war and religion. He appointed officers to assist him in this judicial function (Exodus 18:21 ff), but the laws according to which they rendered judgment were those of custom and usage, not those of a written code. As among the tribal chieftains, important matters were referred to the leader, who, in cases of doubt or in default of recognized custom, resorted to the lot or to the oracle.

2. THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION:

When the nomad tribes settled in Palestine to become an agricultural people, there ensued a period of unrest due to the necessity for readjustment to changed conditions. The old tribal organization, admirably adapted to the former, ill suited the new requirements. These may be summed up in the demand for the substitution of local organization, based on the rights of individuals, for the tribal government, which had regard solely to the interests of family, clan and tribe. Such readjustment did not, of course, at once ensue, but came piecemeal in answer to the gradually realized wants of the community. Nor was the development entirely from within, but was unquestionably in large measure influenced by the institutions existing among the Canaanite population, only a part of which had been expelled by the invaders. Although the tribes still clung to the fiction of descent from a common ancestor, which was embodied in the accepted genealogies with their filiation of clans into tribes and of tribes into a nation, that which henceforth passed as a “tribe” was less an aggregation of kindred units than a geographical unit or group of units. The times were turbulent, disturbed by contending elements within and by foes without the tribes. Then it was that there arose a class of chieftains of strongly marked character, called by a new name. The “judge” (shophet) was not the ruler of a nation, but the chieftain of a tribe, winning and maintaining his authority by virtue of his personal prowess. The cases of Gideon and Abimelech (Judges 8, 9) show that the authority of the “judge” was not hereditary. Agreeably to the generally changed conditions, the “elders” (zeqenim), who were formerly heads of families or kindreds, now came, possibly under the influence of the Canaanites, to be constituted an aristocratic upper class, with certain functions as administrative officers and councilors. Cities also grew and acquired importance, so that the adjacent hamlets were subordinated to them,
probably even ruled from them as executive centers. In all this there is a
certain similarity to the process by which, in the period just preceding the
beginning of real history, Athens became the metropolis of Attica, and
conventional tribes supplanted those based on kinship, while the rise of the
purely local organization of the demos led speedily to the appearance of the
“tyrants.” The high places of clans and tribes continued to be frequented,
and certain “seers” (1 Samuel 9:6 ff) enjoyed considerable prestige by
virtue of their peculiar relation to the tribal god.

3. THE MONARCHY:

While the succession of tribal chieftains and of the “judges” depended on
personal qualifications, the principle of heredity is essential to the
institution of monarchy, which originated in the desire to regulate the
succession with a view to having an assured authoritative leadership. This
principle could not, of course, be invoked in the appointment of Saul, the
first king (1 Samuel 9:6 ff), who won this distinction in virtue of his
personal prowess, supported by the powerful influence of the “seer,”
Samuel. His son Ishbosheth ruled two years over Israel, but lost his throne
through the disaffection of his subjects (2 Samuel 2 through 4). The
accession of David, king of Judah, to the throne of all Israel was likewise
exceptional, owing as much to the character of the heir presumptive as to
his own qualifications. Solomon, as the choice of his father David,
succeeded by right of heredity with the support of the military and religious
leaders. In the Southern Kingdom of Judah, heredity was henceforth
observed because of its homogeneity and the consequent absence of
internal discord; whereas the principle often failed in the turbulent
Northern Kingdom of Israel, which was distracted by tribal jealousies. But
even when not effectually operative, heredity was recognized as
constituting a claim to the succession, although the popular voice, which
had been supreme in the institution of the monarchy, was a power always
to be reckoned with.

(1) Royal Prerogatives.

The history and functions of monarchy defined the prerogatives and duties
of the king. Just as the head of the family, or the chieftain of a tribe,
functioned as representative of those subject to him in matters of religion,
war, and the administration of justice, so also was it with the king. In all
these spheres he was supreme, exercising his authority either personally or
through representatives who thus became part of the royal establishment. It is to be noted that the sacerdotal or sacral character of the king, which was merely an extension of his privileges as individual and head of a household, was not emphasized among the Hebrews to a like extent as among other oriental peoples; and the priests whom he appointed were perhaps in the first instance court chaplains, though in time they came to assume greater authority. The responsibility of the king for the public safety carried with it the obligation to guard the state treasures, to which the treasures of the temples were felt to belong; and it was his privilege to use them when necessary for defense. The levying of taxes, also, and the collection and use of revenues from various sources likewise fell of necessity to the king and his representatives.

(2) Officers.

In regard to the constitution of the king’s court under Saul and David we learn comparatively little; even touching that of Solomon we are not fully informed, although we know that it must have been far removed from the original simplicity. We may classify the known officers as follows:

(a) religious: priests (2 Samuel 8:17; 20:23 ff);

(b) household: cupbearer (1 Kings 10:5); master of the vestry (2 Kings 10:22); master of the household (1 Kings 4:6), who probably was a eunuch (1 Kings 22:9 m; 2 Kings 8:6 m; 9:32);

(c) state: scribe or clerk (2 Samuel 8:17; 20:25, etc.); recorder, or prompter (1 Kings 4:3); king’s counselor (2 Samuel 15:12); and, perhaps, the king’s friend (2 Samuel 15:37; 16:16); overseer of taskwork (2 Samuel 20:24);

(d) military: commander-in-chief of the army (2 Samuel 8:16); commander of the king’s guards (?) (2 Samuel 8:18; 20:23).

(3) Fiscal Institutions.

The simplicity of Saul’s rule was such as to make slight demands upon the resources of the people. He lived in the manner of a tribal chieftain on his ancestral estate, receiving from his subjects voluntary gifts (1 Samuel 10:27; 16:20), and also, without doubt, his due share of the booty. Whether he instituted a regular tax (compare 1 Samuel 17:25) is not certain. With the growth and prosperity of the nation, David changed the
character of the court, imitating in a measure the state of other oriental potentates. It is not clear whether he levied a regular tax, although it may be surmised that he had it in view, together with the regulation of taskwork, in ordaining the census taken in his time (2 Samuel 24:1 ff). We know that he received his portion of the booty (2 Samuel 8:11; 12:30). The increasing luxury of Solomon’s court required the imposition of additional taxes. It is probable that some income was derived from the enforced cultivation of crown lands (1 Samuel 8:12), although the taskwork, which became extremely burdensome and subsequently provoked the secession of the Northern Kingdom, was chiefly applied to public works. The tribute of subject peoples (1 Kings 4:21) was considerable (1 Kings 10:14). We now for the first time hear of taxes upon caravans and merchants, although it was in all probability a source of income even in the time of the nomad chieftains; there was also revenue from the carrying trade of his merchant fleet (1 Kings 10:11,22) and from the trade in horses and chariots carried on with Egypt (1 Kings 10:28 ff). Solomon also divided his kingdom into twelve provinces commanded by prefects, who should provide victuals for the king and his household: each prefect had to make provision for a month in the year (1 Kings 4:7 ff). It does not appear whether Judah, which is not included in the list of provinces, was as a mark of special favor exempted from this tax, or whether the omission is to be otherwise explained. The seizure of the vineyard of Naboth by Ahab (1 Kings 21) makes it seem not improbable that the property of persons condemned on certain charges was confiscate to the king.

(4) Administration of Justice.

The king, like the tribal chieftain of the steppes, still sat in judgment, but chiefly in matters of moment; less important cases were decided by the prefects of provinces and other officers. Under the earlier kings there was no code except the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20 through 23), but judgment was rendered on the basis of the law of custom or usage, the function of the judge being essentially that of an arbiter. For the later code see Deuteronomy.
(5) Religion.

The king was regarded as the natural representative of his people before God; but while he did exercise certain sacerdotal functions in person, such offices were generally performed by the priest whom he had appointed.

(6) Secular Administration.

The authority of the king in matters of state was exercised partly by him in person, partly through his ministers, the “princes” (1 Kings 4:2 ff). Among these functions are to be classed the communication with subject and foreign princes and the direction of the taskwork, which was employed for public improvements, partly military, as in the fortification of cities, partly religious, as in the building of the temple. Local affairs had always been left largely to the tribes and their subdivisions, but, with the gradual increase of royal authority, the king sought to exercise it more and more in the conduct of the village communities. Conversely, the “elders of the people,” as the (albeit aristocratic) representatives of the communes, occasionally had a voice even in larger matters of state.

4. ISRAEL UNDER ORIENTAL POTENTATES:

The principle of local autonomy; was widely observed in the oriental states, which concerned themselves chiefly about political and military organization and about the collection of revenues. Hence, there is no occasion for surprise on finding that the Jews enjoyed a large measure of autonomy during the period of their subjection to other oriental powers and that even during the exile they resorted, in matters of dispute, to their own representatives for judgment. Under Persian rule Palestine formed part of the satrapy lying West of the Euphrates and had, for a time, its own governor.

5. AFTER THE RESTORATION:

Ezra and Nehemiah endeavored to introduce a new code, which, after a period of perhaps two centuries, established a dual form of government subject to the supreme authority of the suzerain power. By the new code the secular officers were subordinated to the high priest, who thus virtually assumed the position of a constitutional prince, ruling under the Law. The “prince,” however, as the representative of the tribes, and the “elders of the
people,” as the representatives of the communes, continued to exercise a certain limited authority.

6. THE GREEKS:

Under the Greek rulers of Egypt and Syria the Jews continued to enjoy a large measure of autonomy, still maintaining in general the type of internal government formulated under Ezra and Nehemiah. We now hear of a council of “elders” presided over by the high priest. The latter, appointed by the kings, was recognized as ethnarch by both Ptolemies and Seleucids and held accountable for the payment of the tribute, for the exaction of which he was, of course, empowered to levy taxes. The brief period of political independence under the Hasmonaens (see ASMONEANS) did not materially alter the character compare the government, except that the high who had long been a prince in everything but in name, now openly so styled himself. The council of the “elders” survived, although with slightly diminished authority. In other respects the influence of Greek institutions made itself felt.

7. THE ROMANS:

When Pompey terminated the reign of the Hasmonaens, the government still continued with little essential change. Following the example of the Greek kings, the Romans at Romans first appointed the high priest to the “leadership of the nation.” He was soon, however, shorn for a time of his political dignity, the country being divided into five districts, each governed by its “synod”; but Caesar once more elevated the high priest to the office of ethnarch. Under Herod, the high priest and the synedrium (Sanhedrin), appointed or deposed at will as his interests seemed to require, lost much of their former prestige and power. After the death of Herod the land was again divided, and a procurator, subordinate to the governor of Syria, ruled in Judea, having practical independence in his sphere. In their internal affairs the Jews now, as under former masters, enjoyed a large measure of freedom. The high priest no longer exercising any political authority, the synedrium, of which he was a member, now gained in influence, being in fact an aristocratic council in many respects not unlike the Roman senate. It combined judicial and administrative functions, limited in the exercises of its authority only by the provision that its decisions might be reviewed by the procurator. (See GOVERNOR.) Naturally the outlying jurisdictions were organized on the same model, each with its synedrium competent in
local matters. The synedrium at Jerusalem served also as a governing board for the city.

William Arthur Heidel

GOVERNOR

<guv’-er-ner>: The word “governor” is employed in English Versions of the Bible in rendering a great variety of Hebrew and Greek words. In certain cases strict consistency is neither observed nor possible.

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

In the rendering of Hebrew terms account has naturally been taken of the translations offered in Septuagint, which, being the work of different hands, is both uneven in quality and inconsistent. But there are inherent difficulties which can never be entirely overcome. First and most important, there is the difficulty arising from our ignorance of many details of the government of the oriental nations to which the terms apply. Hardly less is the embarrassment occasioned by the vague employment of words in indiscriminate reference to persons of superior rank and somehow exercising authority. There is consequently much confusion in the use of titles such as “deputy,” “duke,” “judge,” “lawgiver,” “overseer” “prince” “ruler” etc. for which the student may consult the special articles.

(1) [t 𐤁 a ” , alluwph] or [t 𐤁 a ” , `alluph], “governor” (the Revised Version (British and American) “chieftain”) in Judah (Zec 9:7; 12:5 f).

(2) [q q ] , choqeq (Judges 5:9; 5:14, the King James Version margin”or lawgivers”). The word is variously rendered with “ruler” or “lawgiver” in English Versions of the Bible of Genesis 49:10; Deuteronomy 33:21; Isaiah 33:22.

(3) [l w m, moshel], participle of [l v ” m; mashal], “to be master,” “to rule” (Genesis 45:26, the Revised Version (British and American) “ruler”).

(4) [a yc h; nasi’] (2 Chronicles 1:2, the Revised Version (British and American) “prince”).

(5) [g ; caghan] (Daniel 3:2 f; Jeremiah 51:23, the Revised Version, margin “or lieutenants”; 51:28,57; Ezekiel 23:6,12,23). The
same word is rendered “rulers” or “deputies” (Isaiah 41:25; Ezr 9:2; Nehemiah 2:16; 5:7; 7:5; 12:40).

(6) [h j P, pechah], is variously used:

(a) of the military governor of a province among the Assyrians (Isaiah 36:9);

(b) among the Chaldees (Ezekiel 23:6,23; Jeremiah 51:23,18,57);

(c) among the Persians (Nehemiah 3:12; 8:9; 9:3);

(d) of the governor-general of the province beyond the River (Euphrates) (Ezr 8:36; Nehemiah 2:7:9);

(e) of Nehemiah as subordinate “governor in the land of Judah” under him (Nehemiah 5:14 ff);

(f) of Zerubbabel as “governor of Judah” (Haggai 1:1,14; 2:2,21);

(g) of Solomon’s governors (1 Kings 10:15; 20:24 (in Syria)).

(7) [d yq P, paqidh] (Jeremiah 20:1, the Revised Version (British and American) “chief officer”). Elsewhere it is rendered “overseer” or “officer” (compare Genesis 41:34; 2 Kings 25:19; Nehemiah 11:9,22).

(8) [r c ”, sar] “governor of the city” (1 Kings 22:26). Elsewhere commonly rendered “prince.”

(9) [f yL v ”, shalliT] (Genesis 42:6). Elsewhere rendered “ruler” or “captain.”

(10) [a t y r ] tirshatha’) the Revised Version (British and American) “the governor,” the King James Version “the Tirshatha” (Ezr 2:63; Nehemiah 7:70).

See TIRSHATHA.

2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The word “governor” in English Versions of the Bible represents an almost equal variety of Greek words. Here again the usage is for the most part lax
and untechnical; but since reference is chiefly had to officers of the Roman imperial administration, concerning which we possess ample information, no embarrassment is thereby occasioned. The words chiefly in use for “governor” are derived from root *ag-*, “drive,” “lead”:

1. [ἡγεμόνας, hegeomai], “lead” (Matthew 2:6; of Joseph as grand vizier of Egypt, Acts 7:10).
2. [ἡγεμόν, hegemon], “leader” (Matthew 10:18; 1 Peter 2:14; of Pilate, Matthew 27:2, 11, 14, 15, 21, 27; of Felix, Acts 23:24, 26, 33; of Festus, Acts 24:1, 10; 26:30).

To these are added terms of more specific meaning:

4. [ἐθνάρχης, ethnarches], “ethnarch” or “ruler of a nation” (2 Corinthians 11:32).

See *GOVERNMENT*, 6, 7.

5. [ἐὐθύνω, euthuno] “direct,” “guide” (Jas 3:4). Here the Revised Version (British and American) properly render it “steersman.”

6. [ἄρχιτρίκλινος, architrikinos], “president of a banquet” (John 2:8 f, the American Standard Revised Version “ruler of the feast “).

7. [οἰκονόμος, oikonomos], “steward,” “manager of a household or estate” (Galatians 4:2, the Revised Version (British and American) “stewards”).

It is thus seen that in the New Testament “governor” in the political sense occurs chiefly in reference to the Roman procurators of Judea — Pilate, Felix, and Festus. See *PILATE; FELIX; FESTUS*. It remains for us here to speak briefly of the government of Roman provinces.

Latin provincia signifies a magistrate’s sphere of duty or authority, either

(a) judicially or legally, defining the scope of his competence, or

(b) geographically, designating the territorial limits within which he may exercise authority. It is in the latter sense that we are now considering the word. When, in the 3rd century BC, Rome began to rule conquered lands outside Italy, each territory was set under the
authority of a single magistrate, and hence came to be called a “province.” Conquered territories left under the rule of native princes or kings were not so designated, although their government was practically directed by Rome. At first provinces were governed by proconsuls or proprietors (i.e. ex-consuls or ex-praetors); but with the steady multiplication of provinces various expedients became necessary in order to provide governors of suitable rank and dignity. Thus, the number of praetors was largely augmented, and the term of possible service as governor was extended. Under Augustus the provinces were parceled out between the emperor and the senate, the former reserving for himself such as seemed to require the maintenance of a considerable armed force. In these the emperor was himself proconsul. Early in the Empire imperial provinces of a different type appear, in which the emperor, regarded as sovereign proprietor, governs by a viceroy (praefectus) or steward (procurator). In some of these, tributary kings or princes ruled with the emperor’s representative — a legatus or a procurator — by their side, much as England now rules Egypt. Among the provinces so ruled were Egypt and Judea, partly, no doubt, because of their strategic position, partly because of the temper of their inhabitants.

William Arthur Heidel

GOYIM

<goi’-yim>.

See GOIIM.

GOZAN

<go’-zan> ([^
Q, gozan]; [Γωζάν, Gozan], Codex Vaticanus, Gozar in 2 Kings 17:6, Chozar in 1 Chronicles 5:26): A place in Assyria to which Israelites were deported on the fall of Samaria (2 Kings 17:6; 18:11; 1 Chronicles 5:26). It is also mentioned in a letter of Sennacherib to Hezekiah (2 Kings 19:12; Isaiah 37:12). The district is that named Guzana by the Assyrians, and Gauzanitis by Ptolemy, West of Nisibis, with which, in the Assyrian geographical list (WAI, II, 53, 50:43), it is mentioned as the name of a city (alu Guzana; alu Nasibina). It became an Assyrian province, and rebelled in 759 BC, but was again reduced to subjection.
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See HABOR; HALAH.

James Orr

GRABA

<gra'-ba>

See AGGABA.

GRACE

<gras>

1. THE WORD CHARIS:

In the English New Testament the word “grace” is always a translation of [χάρις, (charis)], a word that occurs in the Greek text something over 170 times (the reading is uncertain in places). In secular Greek of all periods it is also a very common word, and in both Biblical and secular Greek it is used with far more meanings than can be represented by any one term in English. Primarily

(a) the word seems to denote pleasant external appearance, “gracefulness” “loveliness”; compare the personification in the Graces.” Such a use is found in Luke 4:22, where ‘wondered at the charm of his words’ is a good translation; and similarly in Colossians 4:6.

(b) Objectively, charis may denote the impression produced by “gracefulness,” as in 3 John 1:4 ‘greater gratification have I none than this’ (but many manuscripts read chara, “joy,” here).

(c) As a mental attribute charis may be translated by “graciousness,” or, when directed toward a particular person or persons, by “favor.” So in Luke 2:52, “Jesus advanced .... in favor with God and men.”

(d) As the complement to this, charis denotes the emotion awakened in the recipient of such favor, i.e. “gratitude.” So Luke 17:9 reads literally, `Has he gratitude to that servant?’ In a slightly transferred sense charis designates the words or emotion in which gratitude is expressed, and so becomes “thanks” (some 10 t, Romans 6:17, etc.).’
Concretely, charis may mean the act by which graciousness is expressed, as in 1 Corinthians 16:3, where the King James Version translates by “liberality,” and the Revised Version (British and American) by “bounty.” These various meanings naturally tend to blend into each other, and in certain cases it is difficult to fix the precise meaning that the writer meant the word to convey, a confusion that is common to both New Testament and secular Greek. And in secular Greek the word has a still larger variety of meanings that scarcely concern theologian.

2. GRACE AS POWER:

Naturally, the various meanings of the word were simply taken over from ordinary language by the New Testament writers. And so it is quite illegitimate to try to construct on the basis of all the occurrences of the word a single doctrine that will account for all the various usages. That one word could express both “charm of speech” and “thankfulness for blessings” was doubtless felt to be a mere accident, if it was thought of at all. But none the less, the very elasticity of the word enabled it to receive still another — new and technically Christian — meaning. This seems to have originated in part by fusing together two of the ordinary significances. In the first place, as in (e) above, charis may mean “a gift.” In 1 Corinthians 16:3; 2 Corinthians 8:19 it is the money given by the Corinthians to the Jerusalemites. In 2 Corinthians 9:8 it is the increase of worldly goods that God grants for charitable purposes. In 2 Corinthians 1:15 it is the benefit received by the Corinthians from a visit by Paul. In a more spiritual sense charis is the endowment for an office in the church (Ephesians 4:7), more particularly for the apostolate (Romans 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; 1 Corinthians 3:10; Ephesians 3:2,7). So in 1 Corinthians 1:4-7 margin charis is expanded into “word and all knowledge,” endowments with which the Corinthians were especially favored. In 1 Peter 1:13 charis is the future heavenly blessedness that Christians are to receive; in 3:7 it is the present gift of “life.” In the second place, charis is the word for God’s favor, a sense of the term that is especially refined by Paul (see below). But God’s favor differs from man’s in that it cannot be conceived of as inactive. A favorable “thought” of God’s about a man involves of necessity the reception of some blessing by that man, and “to look with favor” is one of the commonest Biblical paraphrases for “bestow a blessing.” Between “God’s favor” and “God’s
favors” there exists a relation of active power, and as charis denoted both the favor and the favors, it was the natural word for the power that connected them. This use is very clear in 1 Corinthians 15:10, where Paul says, “not I, but the grace of God which was with me” labored more abundantly than they all: grace is something that labors. So in 2 Corinthians 12:9, “My grace is sufficient for thee: for my power is made perfect in weakness”; compare 2 Timothy 2:1, “strengthened in the grace,” and 1 Peter 4:10, “stewards of the manifold grace.” Evidently in this sense “grace” is almost a synonym for the Spirit (see HOLY SPIRIT), and there is little real difference between “full of the Holy Spirit” and “full of grace and power” in Acts 6:5,8, while there is a very striking parallel between Ephesians 4:7-13 and 1 Corinthians 12:4-11, with “gifts of grace” in the one passage, and “gifts of the Spirit” in the other. And this connection between grace and the Spirit is found definitely in the formula “Spirit of grace” in Hebrews 10:29 (compare Zec 12:10). And, as is well known, it is from this sense of the word that the Catholic doctrine of grace developed.

3. GRACE IN JUSTIFICATION:

This meaning of charis was obtained by expanding and combining other meanings. By the opposite process of narrowly restricting one of the meanings of the word, it came again into Christian theology as a technical term, but this time in a sense quite distinct from that just discussed. The formation of this special sense seems to have been the work of Paul. When charis is used with the meaning “favor,” nothing at all is implied as to whether or not the favor is deserved. So, for instance, in the New Testament, when in Luke 2:52 it is said that “Jesus advanced .... in favor with God and men,” the last possible thought is that our Lord did not deserve this favor. Compare also Luke 2:40 and Acts 2:47 and, as less clear cases, Luke 1:30; Acts 7:46; Hebrews 4:16; 12:15,28. But the word has abundant use in secular Greek in the sense of unmerited favor, and Paul seized on this meaning of the word to express a fundamental characteristic of Christianity. The basic passage is Romans 11:5,6, where as a definition is given, “If it is by grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace.” That the word is used in other senses could have caused no 1st-century reader to miss the meaning, which, indeed, is unmistakable. “Grace” in this sense is an attitude on God’s part that proceeds entirely from within Himself, and that is
conditioned in no way by anything in the objects of His favor. So in Romans 4:4. If salvation is given on the basis of what a man has done, then salvation is given by God as the payment of a debt. But when faith is reckoned for what it is not, i.e. righteousness, there is no claim on man’s part, and he receives as a pure gift something that he has not earned. (It is quite true that faith involves moral effort, and so may be thought of as a sort of a “work”; it is quite true that faith does something as a preparation for receiving God’s further gifts. But it simply clouds the exegetical issue to bring in these ideas here, as they certainly were not present in Paul’s mind when the verses were being written.) “Grace” then, in this sense is the antinomy to “works” or to “law”; it has a special relation to the guilt of sin (Romans 5:20; 6:1), and has almost exactly the same sense as “mercy.” Indeed, “grace” here differs from “mercy” chiefly in connoting eager love as the source of the act. See JUSTIFICATION. Of course it is this sense of grace that dominates Romans 3 through 6, especially in thesis 3:24, while the same use is found in Galatians 2:21; Ephesians 2:5,8; 2 Timothy 1:9. The same strict sense underlies Galatians 1:6 and is found, less sharply formulated, in Titus 3:5-7. (Galatians 5:4 is perhaps different.) Outside of Paul’s writings, his definition of the word seems to be adopted in John 1:17; Acts 15:11; Hebrews 13:9, while a perversion of this definition in the direction of antinomianism is the subject of the invective in Jude 1:4. And, of course, it is from the word in this technical Pauline sense that an elaborate Protestant doctrine of grace has been developed.

4. SPECIAL USES:

A few special uses of the word may be noted. That the special blessing of God on a particular undertaking (Acts 14:26; 15:40) should be called a “grace” needs no explanation. In Luke 6:32-34, and 1 Peter 2:19,20, charis seems to be used in the sense of “that which deserves the thanks of God,” i.e. a specifically Christian act as distinguished from an act of “natural morality.” “Grace for grace” in John 1:16 is a difficult phrase, but an almost exact parallel in Philo (Poster. Cain, 43) may fix the sense as “benefit on benefit.” But the tendency of the New Testament writers is to combine the various meanings the word can have, something that is particularly well illustrated in 2 Corinthians 8; 9. In these two chapters the word occurs 10 t, but in so many different senses as to suggest that Paul is consciously playing with the term. Charis is the money given to the Jerusalemites by the Corinthians (2 Corinthians 8:19), it is the increase
of goods that God will grant the Corinthians (2 Corinthians 9:8), it is the disposition of the givers (2 Corinthians 8:6), it is the power of God that has wrought this disposition (2 Corinthians 8:1; 9:14), it is the act of Christ in the Incarnation (2 Corinthians 8:9; contrast the distinction between “God’s grace” and “Christ’s act” in Hebrews 2:9), it is the thanks that Paul renders (2 Corinthians 9:15). That all a Christian is and all that he has is God’s gift could have been stated of course without the use of any special term at all. But in these two chapters Paul has taught this truth by using for the various ideas always the same term and by referring this term to God at the beginning and the end of the section. That is, to the multiplicity of concepts there is given a unity of terminology, corresponding to the unity given the multiple aspects of life by the thought of entire dependence on God. So *charis*, “grace,” becomes almost an equivalent for “Christianity,” viewed as the religion of dependence on God through Christ. As one may think of entering Christianity, abiding in it, or falling from it, so one may speak of entering into (Romans 5:2), abiding in (Acts 13:43), or falling from (Galatians 5:4) grace; compare 1 Peter 5:12. So the teaching of Christianity may be summed up as word or gospel of grace (Acts 14:3; 20:24,32). So “grace be with you” closes the Epistles as a sufficient summary of all the blessings that can be wished Christian readers. At the beginning of the Epistles the words “and peace” are usually added, but this is due only to the influence of the Jewish greeting “peace be with you” (Luke 10:5, etc.), and not to any reflection on “grace” and “peace” as separate things. (It is possible that the Greek use of *chairein*, “rejoice,” as an epistolary salutation (so in Jas 1:1) influenced the Christian use of charis. But that “grace and peace” was consciously regarded as a universalistic combination of Jewish and Gentile custom is altogether unlikely.) The further expansion of the introductory formula by the introduction of “mercy” in 1 and 2 Timothy is quite without theological significance.

5. TEACHING OF CHRIST:

In the Greek Gospels, charis is used in the words of Christ only in Luke 6:32-34; 17:9. As Christ spoke in Aram, the choice of this word is due to Luke, probably under the influence of its common Christian use in his own day. And there is no word in our Lord’s recorded sayings that suggests that He employed habitually any especial term to denote grace in any of its senses. But the ideas are unambiguously present. That the pardon of sins is a free act on God’s part may be described as an essential in Christ’s
teaching, and the lesson is taught in all manner of ways. The prodigal knowing only his own wretchedness (Luke 15:20), the publican without merit to urge (Luke 18:13), the sick who need a physician (Mark 2:17), they who hunger and thirst after righteousness (Matthew 5:6), these are the ones for whom God’s pardon is inexhaustible. And positive blessings, be they temporal or spiritual, are to be looked for from God, with perfect trust in Him who clothes the lilies and knows how to give good gifts to His children (Matthew 7:11; here Luke 11:13 has “Holy Spirit” for “gifts,” doubtless a Lukan interpretation, but certainly a correct one). Indeed, it is not too much to say that Christ knows but one unpardonable sin, the sin of spiritual self-satisfaction — “That which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God” (Luke 16:15; compare Luke 17:7-10; Matthew 20:1-16).

6. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

There is no word in Hebrew that can represent all the meanings of charis, and in the Septuagint charis itself is used, practically, only as a translation of the Hebrew חֵן, “favor,” this restriction of meaning being due to the desire to represent the same Hebrew word by the same Greek word as far as possible. And חֵן, in turn, is used chiefly only in the phrase “find favor” (Genesis 6:8, etc.), whether the reference is to God or men, and without theological importance. Much nearer Paul’s use of charis is ρατσών, “acceptance,” in such passages as Isaiah 60:10, “In my favor have I had mercy on thee”; Psalm 44:3, “not .... by their own sword .... but .... because thou wast favorable unto them.” Perhaps still closer parallels can be detected in the use of חסד, “kindness,” “mercy,” as in Exodus 20:6, etc. But, of course, a limitation of the sources for the doctrine to passages containing only certain words would be altogether unjust. The main lines seem to be these:

(1) Technically, salvation by grace in the New Testament is opposed to an Old Testament doctrine of salvation by works (Romans 4:4; 11:6), or, what is the same thing, by law (Romans 6:14; John 1:17); i.e men and God are thought of as parties to a contract, to be fulfilled by each independently. Most of the legislation seems to presuppose some idea of man as a quantity quite outside of God, while Deuteronomy 30:11-14 states explicitly that the law is not too hard nor too far off for man.
Yet even this legalism is not without important modifications. The keeping of the law is man’s work, but that man has the law to keep is something for which God only is to be thanked. Psalm 119 is the essence of legalism, but the writer feels overwhelmed throughout by the greatness of the mercy that disclosed such statutes to men. After all, the initial (and vital!) act is God’s not man’s. This is stated most sharply in Ezekiel 23:1-4 — Oholibah and her sister became God’s, not because of any virtue in them, but in spite of most revolting conduct. Compare Deuteronomy 7:7, etc. 

But even in the most legalistic passages, an absolute literal keeping of the law is never (not even in such a passage as Numbers 15:30,31) made a condition of salvation. The thought of transgression is at all times tempered with the thought of God’s pardon. The whole sacrificial system, in so far as it is expiatory, rests on God’s gracious acceptance of something in place of legal obedience, while the passages that offer God’s mercy without demanding even a sacrifice (Isaiah 1:18; Micah 7:18-20, etc.) are countless. Indeed, in Ezekiel 16; 20; 23, mercy is promised to a nation that is spoken of as hardly even desiring it, a most extreme instance.

But a mere negative granting of pardon is a most deficient definition of the Old Testament idea of God’s mercy, which delights in conferring positive benefits. The gift to Abraham of the land of Canaan, liberation from Egypt, food in the wilderness, salvation from enemies, deliverance from exile — all of Israel’s history can be felt to be the record of what God did for His people through no duty or compulsion, grateful thanksgiving for such unmerited blessings filling, for instance, much of the Psalter. The hearts of men are in God’s keeping, to receive from Him the impulse toward what is right (1 Chronicles 29:18, etc.). And the promise is made that the God who has manifested Himself as a forgiving Father will in due time take hold of His children to work in them actual righteousness (Isaiah 1:26; 4:3,1; 32:1-8; 33:24; Jeremiah 31:33,14; Ezekiel 36:25,26; Zec 8; Daniel 9:24; Psalm 51:10-12) With this promise — for the Old Testament always a matter of the future — the Old Testament teaching passes into that of the New Testament.
7. SUMMARY:

Most of the discussions of the Biblical doctrine of grace have been faulty in narrowing the meaning of “grace” to some special sense, and then endeavoring to force this special sense on all the Biblical passages. For instance, Roman scholars, starting with the meaning of the word in (say) 2 Corinthians 12:9, have made Romans 3:24 state that men are justified by the infusion of Divine holiness into them, an interpretation that utterly ruins Paul’s argument. On the other hand, Protestant extremists have tried to reverse the process and have argued that grace cannot mean anything except favor as an attitude, with results that are equally disastrous from the exegetical standpoint. And a confusion has resulted that has prevented men from seeing that most of the controversies about grace are at cross-purposes. A rigid definition is hardly possible, but still a single conception is actually present in almost every case where “grace” is found — the conception that all a Christian has or is, is centered exclusively in God and Christ, and depends utterly on God through Christ. The kingdom of heaven is reserved for those who become as little children, for those who look to their Father in loving confidence for every benefit, whether it be for the pardon so freely given, or for the strength that comes from Him who works in them both to will and to do.

LITERATURE.

All the Biblical theologies contain full discussions of the subject; for the New Testament the closest definitions are given by Bernard Weiss. But for the meaning of “grace” in any particular place the commentaries must be consulted, although the student may be warned against discussions that argue too closely from what may seem to be parallel passages.

Burton Scott Easton

GRACIOUS

\(<\text{gra’-shus}\>\) ([\(^{\prime}n\); chanan]; [\(\chi\acute{a}\rho\iota\varsigma,\ charis\]): In general, the word means “to favor,” “to show kindness” to an inferior and “to be compassionate.” All Old Testament passages are derived from the same root, and yet there are two evident shades of meaning derived from it.

(1) As above, “favorable” or, causative, “to cause to be gracious,” as “Yahweh make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee”
“And the Lord was gracious unto them” (Numbers 6:25); “The Lord is gracious and full of compassion” (Psalm 145:8 the King James Version).


The word is used once in the New Testament from root of Greek word [χρηστός, chrestos], meaning “useful” as a benefit: “if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious” (1 Peter 2:3).

In the main, however, the adjective is applied in the Old Testament to Yahweh, as indicative of His favor and mercy, His long-suffering and general inclination of favor and kindness.

Walter G. Clippinger

GRAECIA

See GREECE.

GRAFT

([ἐγκεντρίζω, egkentrizo]; the Revised Version (British and American) “graft”; the King James Version, “graff”): The word occurs 6 times in Romans 11. Paul assumed that those living about Rome were familiar with the process of grafting olive trees, for olive culture had been adopted by the Greeks and Romans in Paul’s time. The wild olive trees (Arabic colloquial, zeitun berri) are cut back, slits made on the freshly sawed branch ends, and two or three grafts from a cultivated olive (Arabic colloquial, zeitun jouwi) are inserted in such a way that the bark of the scion and of the branch coincide. The exposed ends are smeared with mud made from clay, and then bound with cloth or date straw, which is held by thongs made from the bark of young mulberry branches. The fruit thus obtained is good. Wild olives cannot be made cultivated olives by engrafting, as Paul implies (Romans 11:24), but a wild olive branch thus
grafted would thrive. So Gentiles would flourish spiritually when grafted into the fullness of God’s mercy, first revealed to the world through Israel.

*James A. Patch*

**GRAIN**

<gran>.  

*See AGRICULTURE; GARNER.*

**GRANARY**  

<gran’-a-ri>.  

*See GARNER; STORE-HOUSES.*

**GRAPES**

<graps>.  

*See VINE.*

**GRAPES, WILD**

([µ yv à B ] be’ushim], <230502>Isaiah 5:2,4): A word closely allied to [h v a B; bo’shah], <183140>Job 31:40, translated “cockle” (which see). It implies something noisome or worthless, but no particular fruit.

**GRASP**

<grasp>: The word [áρπαγμός, harpagmos] (<501706>Philippians 2:6), is rendered by the King James Version “robbery,” by the Revised Version (British and American) “a prize,” and by the American Standard Revised Version “a thing to be grasped.” By derivation the term may denote either an act of seizing or the aim or result of the action. In the context Paul is discussing, not Christ’s opinion of His equality with God, but His amazing self-sacrifice in laying aside His equally for our sakes. He but laid it aside for us. It is better to render with the Revised Version (British and American) “a prize.”
GRASS

<gras>:

(1) [ר יָּמֶ֑ה ; chatsir], from a root meaning “greenness”; compare Arabic Khudra, which includes grasses and green vegetables (1 Kings 18:5; 2 Kings 19:26; Job 40:15; Psalm 104:14, etc.). Isaiah 15:6 is translated in the King James Version “have,” the Revised Version (British and American) “grass”; Proverbs 27:25, English Versions of the Bible “hay,” margin “Hebrew grass”; Numbers 11:5 English Versions of the Bible translates “leeks.” It is a term for herbage in general.

(2) [א ו ד', deshe’], from root meaning “to sprout abundantly.” Generally translated “tender grass” (Genesis 1:11 f; 2 Samuel 23:4; Job 6:5; Isaiah 15:6; 66:14; Jeremiah 14:5, etc.); translated “grass” (Job 6:5; Jeremiah 14:5); translated “herb” (2 Kings 19:26; Psalm 27:2, Isaiah 37:27; 66:14). In Jeremiah 50:11 we have “heifer at grass” (deshe’) in the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin, but in the Revised Version (British and American) “heifer that treadeth out the grain.” (א Và ד', dethe’), the Aramaic form, occurs in Daniel 4:15,23, and is translated “tender grass.”

(3) [ט ו כ '] chashash], probably “dry” or “cut grass”; compare Arabic chashesh, “dry fodder” or “cut grass” (Isaiah 5:24, the King James Version “chaff,” the Revised Version (British and American) “dry grass”; Isaiah 33:11, English Versions of the Bible “chaff”).

(4) [ו ק ת ] ēlegesh], from root meaning “to come late,” hence used in Amos 7:1 for the “latter growth” of grass after mowing.

(5) [ח ר י, yereq], literally, “green thing” (Numbers 22:4, elsewhere translated “herb”).

(6) [ב כ ע `esebh] (Deuteronomy 11:15, etc.), generally translated “herb” (for (5) and (6) see HERB).

(7) [χόρτος, chortos] (Matthew 6:30; 14:19; Mark 6:39; Luke 12:28; John 6:10; Jas 1:10,11; 1 Peter 1:24; Revelation 8:7; 9:4); translated “blade” (Matthew 13:26 Mark 4:28); translated “hay” (1 Corinthians 3:12).
There are 243 species of true grasses (Natural Order, Gramineae) in Palestine, but Hebrew, like modern Arabic, does not discriminate between these and other herbs which together make up herbage. Actual turf is practically unknown in Palestine, and grass seed is not artificially sown; young green barley is used in the neighborhood of towns as fresh fodder for horses and cattle. It is not the native custom to cut herbage for hay, though the writer has seen many carloads of sweet-smelling hay being carried from the land by Circassian settlers, East of the Jordan.

The “grass upon the house tops” (Psalm 129:6; Isaiah 37:27), the growth which springs from the seeds mingled with the mud of which the roof is made, springs up quickly with the rains, but as quickly dries up before it reaches half its normal height — or not infrequently is set on fire.

Dew, rain or showers upon the grass are mentioned (Deuteronomy 32:6; Proverbs 19:12; Micah 5:7; Psalm 72:6, “rain upon the mown grass,” i.e. the grass eaten short by cattle).

E. W. G. Masterman

GRASSHOPPER

See LOCUST.

GRATE; GRATING

(Gras’-hop-er). See LOCUST.

(Grat>, <grat’-ing> ([rı́ b k š mikhbar], [t v r, resheth]; the King James Version Grate): This “grating of network of brass” (Exodus 27:4; 38:4), called also “the net” (Exodus 27:4 f), and “grating of brass” (Exodus 38:4), was that reticulated casting or wrought work of bronze which, in the tabernacle system, formed an element of the altar of sacrifice. Its position is well defined: “Thou shalt put it under the ledge round the altar beneath, that the net may reach halfway up the altar” (Exodus 27:5; compare 38:4). The altar being a hollow box — “hollow with planks” (Exodus 27:8) — 3 cubits high, overlaid with brass, and presumably filled with stones, there appears to have been a ledge round about it halfway from the base, from which depended vertically this grating of bronze. On the grating were four rings through which the staves were passed by which the altar was borne (Exodus 27:4,7). If the ledge was for the priests to stand on while handling the sacrifices on the altar, the
grating need be thought of only as an ornamental support for the ledge. Others ascribe to it different uses.

W. Shaw Caldecott

**GRAVE (1)**

<grav>.

*See BURIAL.*

**GRAVE (2)**

(Adj.).

*See GRAVITY.*

**GRAVE; GRAVING**

<grav’-ing>.

*See CRAFTS; ENGRAVING.*

**GRAVEL**

<grav’-el> ([6x j ; chatsats], from root [6x ” j ; chatsats], “to divide.” Kindred roots have the meaning of “to cut,” “to hew,” “to sharpen,” hence [6j echets], “arrow” (2 Kings 13:17; Psalm 64:7 and often); compare Arabic chacca, “to fall to the lot of,” chiccah, “portion”): In Proverbs 20:17, we have:

>“Bread of falsehood is sweet to a man; But afterwards his mouth shall be filled with gravel.”

And in Lamentations 3:16:

>“He hath also broken my teeth with gravel stones; he hath covered me with ashes.”

The only other occurrence of the word is in Psalm 77:17, where it is the equivalent of [chets], “arrow” (see supra):

>“The clouds poured out water; The skies sent out a sound: Thine arrows also went abroad.”
Proverbs 20:17 and Lamentations 3:16 both suggest the frequent occurrence of grit in the coarse bread, the source of the grit being not necessarily the grindstone, but possibly even small stones originally mingled with the wheat and never properly separated from it.

Alfred Ely Day

GRAVITY

<grav’-i-ti> ([σεμνότης, semnotes]): The word, meaning properly “venerableness,” “sanctity,” is used in 2 Macc 3:12 of the “sanctity” of the temple. In 1 Timothy 3:4 the writer declares that a characteristic of a bishop should be that he has “his children in subjection with all gravity.” Titus is enjoined (2:7 f) in his “doctrine” (teaching) to show “uncorruptness, gravity, sound speech (Revised Version), that cannot be condemned” (compare 1 Timothy 3:8). In 1 Timothy 2:2 the same word is translated “honesty” (the Revised Version (British and American) “gravity”), “that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity.” A better rendering of semnotes might be “dignity” or “dignified seriousness” (Olshausen), which quality is necessary, both on the part of parents in relation to their children, if they are to be properly trained, and on the part of preachers and teachers, if their “doctrine” is to be worthily represented. All mere lightness of demeanor (the opposite of gravity) tells against the great trusts committed to both parents and teachers (compare 1 Timothy 3:11; Titus 2:2). Such “gravity” or “dignified seriousness” ought indeed to characterize Christian demeanor in general, as in 1 Timothy 2:2 above.

W. L. Walker

GRAY

<gra>.

See COLORS; HOARY.

GREASE

<gres> ([בּ יָשֵׁלеб], “fat,” “suet”): The word occurs once in the metaphorical sense “prosperous,” then dull, gross, brutal: “Their heart is as fat as grease” (Psalm 119:70; compare Isaiah 6:10, and see FAT).
GREAT; GREATNESS

<grt>, <grt’-nes>: “Great” occurs very often in Scripture. The chief words so translated are [רָם gadhol], [רָב " , rabh]; [μέγας, megas], [πολύς, polus].

(1) In the Old Testament many other terms are employed:

(a) gadhol is used to express greatness in various senses, chiefly of magnitude, including excellence, e.g. “great lights” (Genesis 1:16); “the great city” (Genesis 10:12); “a great nation” (Genesis 12:2); “a great sight” (Exodus 3:3); “Moses was very great” (Exodus 11:3); “the great God” (Deuteronomy 10:17; Nehemiah 1:5); “great is Yahweh” (Psalm 48:1). It is sometimes translated by “mighty” (Deuteronomy 4:37; 7:21, “a mighty God,” the Revised Version (British and American) “great”). It is also used to designate the high priest (literally, “great,” Leviticus 21:10; Zec 3:1, etc.); also to express the “elder” of a family, e.g. Genesis 27:1, “Esau his eldest son,” the Revised Version (British and American) “elder”; probably also of great stature: “a great man among the Anakims,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the greatest” (Joshua 14:15).

(b) rabh denotes, rather, quantity, number, therefore, often, “many” (Genesis 21:34, etc.; Exodus 2:23 the Revised Version (British and American), etc.); “abundant” (Exodus 34:6, the English Revised Version “plenteous”), and similar terms; thus we have “a great people” (Joshua 17:14); “His mercies are great,” the Revised Version, margin “many” (2 Samuel 24:14, 1 Chronicles 21:13); “Great was the company,” the Revised Version (British and American) “a great host” (Psalm 68:11); “great reward” (Psalm 19:11); “Mine iniquity .... is great” (Psalm 25:11); “exceedingly” (Psalm 123:3). In the Septuagint rabh is, for the most part, translated by polus. But it is used for “great” in other senses, e.g. “the great (God)” (Proverbs 26:10), the Revised Version (British and American) “as an archer,” margin “master worker; Hebrew text obscure”; “a savior, and a great one,” the Revised Version (British and American) “defender,” margin “or a mighty one” (Isaiah 19:20); “Great shall be the peace” (Isaiah 54:13), etc. It is sometimes translated “mighty” (Psalm 89:50, the Revised Version, margin “many”; Isaiah 63:1).
(c) Other words thus translated are kabhedh, “heavy,” e.g. “so great a people,” the Revised Version (British and American) “thy great people,” margin “heavy” (1 Kings 3:9); me’odh, implying force, might, e.g. “with all his might” (2 Kings 23:25). ‘El and ‘Elohim are sometimes used to express greatness. In Psalm 36:6, we have “Thy righteousness is like the great (‘El) mountains,” the Revised Version (British and American) “mountains of God”; in Genesis 30:8, “with great (‘Elohim) wrestlings,” the Revised Version (British and American) “mighty,” margin “wrestlings of God”; and in 1 Samuel 14:15 “a very great (‘Elohim) trembling,” the Revised Version (British and American) “exceeding great,” margin “a trembling of God.”

(2)

(a) Megas denotes magnitude, in its various aspects, physical, moral, etc., e.g. “great joy” (Matthew 2:10); “a great light” (Matthew 4:16); “the great King” (Matthew 5:35); “great in the kingdom” (Matthew 5:19, etc.); “Great is thy faith” (Matthew 15:28); “The greatest is charity” (love), the Revised Version, margin “greater” (1 Corinthians 13:13); “a great high priest” (Hebrews 4:14); “the great shepherd” (Hebrews 13:20); “a great voice” (Revelation 1:10); in Revelation megas is very frequent.

(b) Polus denotes properly number, multitude, e.g. “great multitudes” (Matthew 4:25); “a great company” (Luke 5:29, the Revised Version (British and American) “a great multitude”; frequent in the Gospels); “great possessions” (Mark 10:22). But also “great” in the sense of magnitude, e.g. “great plainness of speech,” the Revised Version (British and American) “boldness” (2 Corinthians 3:12; 7:4); “a great trial of affliction,” the Revised Version (British and American) “much proof” (2 Corinthians 8:2); “great love” (Ephesians 2:4).

(c) Among other terms we have telikoutos, “so great” (in degree), “so great a salvation” (Hebrews 2:3); tosoutos, “so great” (in quantity), “so great faith” (Matthew 8:10; Luke 7:9); “so great a cloud of witnesses” (Hebrews 12:1); hosos, “how great” (in quantity) (Mark 3:8; 5:19 f); helikos, “how great” (in degree) (Colossians 2:1; Jas 3:5, “how great a matter,” the Revised Version (British and American) “how much wood,” margin “how great a forest”); pelikos,
“how great” (in degree) (Hebrews 7:4); posos, “how great” (in quantity) (Matthew 6:23), etc.

(3) In His person and teaching, Jesus introduced into the world a new conception of greatness. It was to be found in humility and self-forgetting service: “Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister (the Revised Version, margin “servant”); and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant (the Revised Version, margin “(Greek) bond-servant”): even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many” (Matthew 20:26-28; compare also Matthew 18:1-4; 23:11; Philippians 2:5-11).

W. L. Walker

GREAVES

grez

See ARMOR, ARMS, IV, 4.

GRECIAIANS; GREEKS

grez Shanze, greks: In the Old Testament the word “Grecians” occurs but once (Joel 3:6). For references to Greece in the Old Testament see JAVAN. In the King James Version of the Old Testament Apocrypha “Grecians” and “Greeks” are used without distinction, e.g. 1 Macc 1:10; 6:2; 8:9; 2 Macc 4:15,36. Thus, in 1 Macc 1:1, Alexander the Great is spoken of as king of Greece, and in 1 Macc 1:10 the Macedonian empire is called “the kingdom of the Greeks” ([basileia Ellinon, basileia Hellenon]). In 2 Macc 13:2 the army of Antiochus, king of Syria, is called “Grecian” ([dynamis Hellenike]), and in 2 Macc 6:8 the “Greek cities” ([poleis Hellenides]) are Macedonian colonies. Reference is made in 2 Macc 6:1 to an aged Athenian who was sent by Antiochus the king charged with the duty of Hellenizing the Jews; in 2 Macc 9:15 Antiochus vows that he will make the Jews equal to the Athenians; in 1 Macc 12 through 14, reference is made to negotiations of Jonathan, the high priest, with the Spartans, whom he calls brethren, seeking the renewal of a treaty of alliance and amity against the Syrians. With the spread of Greek power and influence, everything not specifically Jewish was called Greek; thus in 2 Macc 4:36; 11:2; 3 Macc
3:3,1 the “Greeks” contrasted with the Jews are simply non-Jews, so called because of the prevalence of Greek institutions and culture, and “Greek” even came to be used in the sense of “and-Jewish” (2 Macc 4:10,15; 6:9; 11:24).

In Isaiah 9:12 the Septuagint reads [τοὺς Ἑλληνας, tous Hellenas], for [µῦτν | Π] Pelishtim], “Philistines”; but we are not therefore justified in assuming a racial connection between the Philistines and the Greeks. Further light on the ethnography of the Mediterranean basin may in time show that there was actually such a connection; but the rendering in question proves nothing, since “the oppressing sword” of Jeremiah 46:16 and 50:16 is likewise rendered in the Septuagint with “the sword of the Greeks” ([µάχαιρα, machaira Hellenike]). In all these cases the translators were influenced by the conditions existing in their own day, and were certainly not disclosing obscure relations long forgotten and newly discovered.

In the New Testament, English Versions of the Bible attempts to distinguish between ([Ἑλληνες, Hellenes]), which is rendered “Greeks,” and ([ἲληνισταί, Hellenistai]), which is rendered “Grecians” or “Grecian Jews,” or in the Revised Version, margin “Hellenists,” e.g. Acts 6:1; 9:29. These latter were Jews of the Dispersion, who spoke Greek (see HELLENISM; HELLENIST), as distinguished from Palestinian Jews; but since many of the latter also spoke Greek by preference, the distinction could in no sense be absolute. Indeed in John 7:35, “the Dispersion among (the Revised Version, margin, Greek “of”) the Greeks,” can hardly refer to any but “Grecian Jews” (Hellenistai), although Hellenes is used, and in John 12:20 the “Greeks” (Hellenes)) who went up to worship at the feast of the Passover were almost certainly “Grecian Jews” (Hellenistai). Thus, while English Versions of the Bible consistently renders Hellenes with “Greeks,” we are not by that rendering apprised of the real character of the people so designated. This difficulty is aggravated by the fact, already noted in connection with the Old Testament Apocrypha, that, in consequence of the spread of Hellenism, the term Hellenes was applied not only to such as were of Hellenic descent, but also to all those who had appropriated the language of Greece, as the universal means of communication, and the ideals and customs collectively known as Hellenism. The latter were thus in the strict sense Hellenists, differing from the “Grecians” of English Versions of the Bible only in that they were not
of Jewish descent. In other words, \textit{Hellenes} (except perhaps in John 7:35 and 12:20, as noted above) is, in general, equivalent to \textit{ta ethne}, “Gentiles” (\textit{see GENTILES}). The various readings of the manuscripts (and hence the difference between the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) in \textit{I Corinthians 1:23} well illustrate this. There is consequently much confusion, which it is quite impossible, with our limited knowledge of the facts in particular cases, to clear up. In general, it would seem probable that where “Greeks” are comprehensively contrasted with “Jews,” the reference is to “Gentiles,” as in Acts 14:1; 17:4; 18:4; 19:10,17; 20:21; Romans 1:16; 10:12; \textit{I Corinthians 1:22-24} (the Revised Version (British and American) “Gentiles,” representing \textit{\[\text{\varepsilon\theta\nu\varepsilon\sigma\iota\nu\, ethnesin}\]}; Galatians 3:28; Colossians 3:11. In Mark 7:26 the woman of Tyre, called “a Greek (the Revised Version, margin “Gentile”) a Syrophoenician,” was clearly not of Hellenic descent. Whether Titus (Galatians 2:3) and the father of Timothy; (Acts 16:1,3) were in the strict sense “Greeks,” we have no means of knowing. In Romans 1:14, “I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians,” there is an undoubted reference to Greeks strictly so called; possibly, though by no means certainly, the “Greeks” of Acts 21:28, alluding to Trophimus the Ephesian (Acts 21:29), are to be taken in the same sense. References to the Greek language occur in Acts 19:20 (Luke 23:38 is properly omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)); Acts 21:37; Revelation 9:11. In Acts 11:20 the manuscripts vary between \textit{\[\text{\varepsilon\llη\nu\ι\sigma\tau\alpha\v-z, Hellenistas}\]}, and \textit{\[\text{\varepsilon\llη\nu\alpha\z, Hellenas}\]} (the King James Version “Grecians,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Greeks”), with the preponderance of authority in favor of the former; but even if one adopts the latter, it is not clear whether true Greeks or Gentiles are intended.

\textit{William Arthur Heidel}

\textbf{GREECE; GRAECIA}

\texttt{<gres>, <gre'-sha>};

\textbf{1. NAME:}

In the earliest times there was no single name universally and exclusively in use either of the people or of the land of Greece. In Homer, three appellations, (\textit{\[\text{\varepsilon\chi\alpha\io\i, Achaioi}\]}, ([\Delta\alpha\nu\alpha\io\i, Danaoi]), ([\text{\varepsilon\pi\gamma\varepsilon\io\i, \varepsilon\pi\gamma\nu\varepsilon\io\i, Achei})
Argeioi), were with no apparent discrimination applied to all the Greeks. By the Orientals they were called Ionians. See JAVAN. The name (["Ελληνες, Hellenes]), which in historical times came into general use as a collective appellation, was applied in Homer to a small tribe in Thessaly. But the corresponding name ([Ελλάς, Hellas]) was not primarily a geographical term, but designated the abode of the Hellenes wherever they had their own states or cities. In the 4th century BC many felt, as did Isocrates, that even “Hellene” stood not so much for a distinction in race, as for preeminence of culture, in contrast to the despised “Barbarian.” Hence, there was much dispute as touching certain peoples, as, e.g. the Epirotes, Macedonians, and even the Thessalians, whether they should be accounted Hellenes and as included in Hellas. The word ([Γραικοί, Graikoi], Latin Graeci) occurs in Aristotle, who says that it was an older name for those who were later called Hellenes. The meaning and truth of this statement are alike in doubt; but he probably refers only to the tribe inhabiting the vicinity of Dodona, in Epirus. At any rate, Graeci and Graecia owed their introduction practically to the Romans after their contact with the Greeks in the war with Pyrrhus, and in consequence they included (what “Hellenes” and “Hellas” did not) Epirus and Macedonia.

2. LOCATION AND AREA:

“Hellas,” as the land of the Hellenes, is used in a broad sense to include not only Greece proper, but also the islands of the Ionian and Aegean seas, the seaboard of the Hellespont, of the Pontus, and of Asia Minor, the flourishing colonial regions of Magna Grecia and Sicily, Crete, and occasionally Cyprus, Cyrene, and the scattered colonies dotting the shore of the Mediterranean, almost to the Pillars of Hercules. “Grecia,” however, was used in a more restricted sense as applying to “Continuous” (or continental) Greece, which forms the southern extremity of the Balkan peninsula. While the Romans included Macedonia and Epirus, it will be well for us to limit Greece to the territory lying roughly below 40 degrees, and extending almost to 36 degrees North latitude, and ranging between 17 degrees and 23 degrees East longitude. If, as is proper, we include the immediately adjacent islands, its greatest length, from Matthew Olympus in the North to Cythera in the South, is about 280 miles; its greatest breadth, from Cephallenia in the West to Euboea in the East, is about 240 miles. The area, however, owing to the great irregularity of its contour, is far less than one might expect, amounting to about 30,000 square miles. With an
area, therefore, considerably less than that of Portugal, Greece has a coastline exceeding in length that of Spain and Portugal combined. In Greece the ratio of coastline to area is 1:3 1/4, whereas that of the Iberian peninsula is 1:25.

3. MOUNTAIN STRUCTURE:

The northern boundary of Greece is formed by an irregular series of mountain chains, beginning on the West with the Acroceraunian range and ending in Matthew Olympus (now, Elymbos, 9,790 ft.) on the East. Intersecting this line, the lofty Pindus range, forming the backbone of Northern Greece, extends southward to Matthew Tymphrestus (now, Velouchi, 7,610 ft.) in Aetolia, at which point spurs radiate through Central Greece. The highest peaks are Matthew Corax (now, Vardusia, 8,180 ft.) in Aetolia, Matthew Oeta (7,060 ft.), Parnassus (now, Lyakoura, 8,070 ft.), Helicon (now, Paleo Vouno, 5,740 ft.), Cithaeron (now, Elatias, 4,630 ft.), lying on the boundary between Boeotia and Attica, Matthew Geranea (now, Makri Plaghi, 4,500 ft.), North of the Isthmus, and, in Attica, Parnes (now, Ozea, 4,640 ft.), Pentelicon (now, Mendeli, 3,640 ft.) and Hymettus (now Trelovouni, 3,370 ft.). Along the eastern coast extends a broken range of mountains, the highest peaks of which are Ossa (now, Kissavos, 6,400 ft.), Pelion (now, Plessidi, 5,310 ft.); and, in Euobea, which virtually belongs to this range, Dirphys (now, Delphi, 5,730 ft.) and Ocha (now, Elias, 4,610 ft.). Southern Greece, or the Peloponnesus, is united to Central Greece only by a narrow isthmus (now cut by a canal 4 miles long), with a minimum altitude of about 250 ft. In the northern portion, a confused mass of mountains rises to great heights in Cyllene (now, Ziria, 7,790 ft.), Erymanthus (now, Olonos, 7,300 ft), Maenalus (now, Apano Chrepa, 6,500 ft.), all in Arcadia, Panachaicus (now, Voidia, 6,320 ft.), in Achaia; and, running southward through Laconia, the two important ranges called Taygetus (now, Pentedaktylo, 7,900 ft.) and Parnon (now, Malevo, 6,430 ft.). Minor ranges jut seaward in Argolis, Laconia and Messenia.

4. RIVERS AND LAKES:

The rainfall in Greece is not abundant and is confined largely to late autumn and winter. Whether the present rainfall differs much in amount from that of antiquity is a matter in dispute, although it seems reasonable to assume that the progressive denudation of the mountains since the 5th
century AD has entailed a corresponding loss in humidity. Even in antiquity, however, the rivers of Greece were much like the arroyos of the Southwest portion of the U.S.A., which are in winter raging mountain torrents, and in summer dry channels. Owing to the proximity of the sea to all points in Greece, the rivers are short, and the scarcity of springs makes them dependent upon the direct and immediate rainfall. Among the more considerable rivers may be enumerated, in Northern Greece, the Peneius, with its tributaries, in Thessaly; Central Greece, the Achelous and the Evenus, in Aetolia; the Spercheius, flowing between Oeta and Othrys into the Maliac Gulf; the storied, but actually insignificant, Ilyssus and Cephissus, of the Attic plain; in Southern Greece, the Alpheius, rising in Arcadia and flowing westward through Elis, and the Eurotas, which drains Laconia. Eastern Greece consists of a series of somewhat considerable basins, which become lakes in winter and are pestilent marshes in summer, except where Nature or man has afforded an outlet. The former is the case with the Peneius, which has cut a channel through the celebrated Vale of Tempe. Lake Copais, in Boeotia, affords an example of man’s activity. The Minyae, in prehistoric times, are credited with enlarging the natural outlets, and so draining the basin for a time; in recent times the same undertaking has again been brought to a successful issue. Similar basins occur at Lake Boebeis, in Thessaly, and at Lake Stymphalus, in Arcadia, besides others of less importance. Western Greece has relatively few such basins, as at Lake Pambotis, in Epirus, and at Lake Trichonis, in Aetolia. In many cases, where there is no surface outlet to these basins, subterranean channels (called by the Greeks Katavothrae) are formed in the calcareous rock, through which the waters are drained and occasionally again brought to the surface at a lower level.

5. CLIMATE:

The climate of Greece was probably much the same in ancient times as it is today, except that it may have been more salubrious when the land was more thickly populated and better cultivated. Herodotus says that of all countries, Greece possessed the most happily tempered seasons; and Hippocrates and Aristotle commend it for the absence of extremes of heat and cold, as favorable for intelligence and energy. But owing to the inequalities of its surface, to the height of its mountains and the depth of its valleys, the climate varies greatly in different districts. In the highlands of the interior the winter is often cold and severe, the snow lying on the
ground until late in the spring, while in the lowlands near the sea there is rarely any severe weather, and snow is almost unknown. The following data for Athens may be taken as a basis for comparison: humidity 41 per cent, rainfall 13.1 inches, distributed over 100 days; mean temperature, Jan. 48.2 degrees F., July 80.6 degrees F. Greece lies open to the northern winds which, during certain seasons, prevail and give a bracing quality to the air not always present in places of the same latitude.

6. GEOLOGY:

The western half of Greece, in which the mountain ranges run generally from North to South, consists of a formation of grayish and yellowish-white compact limestone, while the eastern half — Macedonia, Thessaly, Euboea, Cyllene, and the mountains from Artemision to Cape Malea and Taygetus — together with the greater part of Attica and of the Cyclades, consists of mica-schist and crystalline-granular limestone (marble) Tertiary formations occur in narrow strips on the North and Northwest slopes of the ranges in the Peloponnesus and in the valley of the Eurotas, in Boeotia and Euboea. Volcanic action is evidenced both in the parallel elevations of similar or contemporary formation, and in the earthquakes frequent in all ages, especially in Southern and Central Greece, and in the islands of the Aegean. Perennially active volcanoes are nowhere found in Greece, but new formations due to volcanic action are most clearly seen on the island of Them among the Cyclades, where they have occurred within the last half-century. The solfatara between Megara and Corinth, and the abundant hot springs at widely scattered points in Greece also bear witness to the volcanic character of the region. Many an ancient site, venerated for its sanctity in antiquity, like those of Delphi and Olympia, in their ruined temples offer mute testimony to the violence of the earthquakes; and history records repeated instances of cities engulfed by tidal waves of appalling height.

7. TOPOGRAPHY:

Mention has already been made of the sinuous coastline of Greece, and the land has been spoken of as consisting of three divisions. Northern Greece, to which Epirus and Thessaly belong, is marked off from Central Greece by the deep indentations of the Ambracian Gulf on the West and the Maliac Gulf on the East. The Pegasean Gulf, virtually continued by Lake Boebeis, reaches far into Thessaly, and divides it from Magnesia, which lies to the
eastward. The land of the Dolopians really belongs to Northern Greece.
Central Greece consists of Acarnania and Aetolia on the West, and of
Phocis, Boeotia and Attica (with the adjacent island of Euboea) on the
East, separated by a group of lesser states, Aenis, Oetaea, Doris, Locris
and Phocis. Southern Greece is separated from Central Greece by the
Corinthian and Saronic Gulfs, which almost meet at the Isthmus of
Corinth, and are now, after repeated efforts, dating from the time of Julius
Caesar, united by a sea-level canal. Megaris, which, by its position, belongs
to Central Greece, is here, in accordance with its political affinities and
predilections, classed with Corinth, the keeper of the isthmus, as belonging
to Southern Greece. Facing the Corinthian Gulf, Achaia forms the northern
division of the Peloponnesus, touching Elis, Arcadia and Argolis, which
belt the peninsula in this order from West to East Arcadia is the only
political division which does not have access to the sea, occupying as it
does the great central plateau intersected by lesser ranges of varying
height. The southernmost divisions, Messenia and Laconia, are deeply
indented by the Messeniac and Laconic Gulfs, and Laconia is separated
from the peninsula of Argolis by the Argolic Gulf, all of which head
somewhat West of North of the subjacent islands, which a reasonable view
must include in the boundaries of Greece, Euboea has already been
mentioned; but we should add the group of great islands lying in the Ionian
Sea, namely, Corycyra (now, Corfu), Leukas, Ithaca, Cephallenia (now,
Cephalonia), Zacynthus (now, Zante), and Cythera (now, Cerigo), at the
mouth of the Laconic Gulf, as well as Salamis and Aegina in the Saronic
Gulf.

Greece was never, in ancient times, a united state, but consisted of a large
number of separate states. These were essentially of two types,

(a) city-states, in which a city dominated the adjacent territory whose
free population constituted its citizenship, or

(b) confederacies, in which neighboring cities or districts combined
into political organizations which we may call federal states. These
matters cannot, however, be discussed except in connection with the
history of Greece, for which the reader must consult the standard
works. It may be advisable here, however, to name the principal cities
of Greece. Northern Greece had no great cities which developed as
commercial centers. Aegina was the first to attain to special
importance, then Corinth and Athens; Chalcis and Eretria, in Euboea,
were for a time rich and prosperous, and Megara, in Megarid, and Argos, in Argolis, became formidable rivals of Athens. Sparta, though never a commercial center, early won and long maintained the hegemony of Greece, for a while disputed by Athens, in virtue of her power as the home of the militant Dorian aristocracy, which was disastrously defeated by the Beotians under Epaminondas, when Thebes, for a time, assumed great importance. Megalopolis, in Arcadia, enjoyed a brief prominence at the time of the Achean League, and Corcyra flourished in the 5th and 4th centuries BC. We should also not fail to mention three great centers of Greek religion: Olympia, in Elis, as the chief sanctuary of Zeus; Delphi, in Phocis, as the oracular seat of Apollo; and Eleusis, in Attica, as the pilgrim-shrine to which all Greeks resorted who would be initiated in the mysteries of Demeter and Cora. Argos also possessed a far-famed shrine of Hera, and Thermopile and Calauria were the centers at which met the councils of influential amphictyones. Epidaurus was famous for her sanctuary of Asclepius. Delos, a little island in mid-Aegean, celebrated as a sanctuary of Apollo and as the meeting-place of a most influential amphictyony, falls without the limits of Greece proper; but Dodona, in Southern Epirus, should be mentioned as the most ancient and venerable abode of the oracle of Zeus. The Greeks, incorrigibly particularistic in politics, because of the almost insuperable barriers erected by Nature between neighboring peoples in the lofty mountain ranges, were in a measure united by their religion which, like the sea, another element making for intercourse and union, touched them at nearly every point.

For Greece in the Old Testament, see JAVAN. In the New Testament “Greece” occurs but once — Acts 20:2 — where it is distinguished from Macedonia.

William Arthur Heidel

GREECE, RELIGION IN ANCIENT

I. THE GREEK GODS.

1. Greek Myths:

The gods of ancient Greece are well known to our western civilization through the myths which have found so large a place in our literature. In Greece itself, fancy had free play in dealing with these divine beings, and
the myths were the main treasure-house from which the poet drew; the same myths and the same gods, under different names, reappear in Rome; and Rome passed them on, a splendid heritage of imagination, to the literatures of later Europe. It is characteristic of myths that they deal with persons, not so different from men in their nature, but with more than human powers. Gods, nymphs and satyrs, noble “heroes” or evil spirits have superhuman powers in varying degree, but they remain persons with a human interest because of their human type. And, further, as men are organized in families, cities and states, so there is a tendency to organize the beings of myth into social groups, and even to bring men, heroes and gods together into one large social organism, the universe of persons.

These Greek myths, the story of Athena’s birth full-armed from the brain of Zeus, of Circe’s magic potion, of Poseidon’s chariot on the waves, and of Apollo’s shafts are familiar to us from childhood. To regard them as expressing the content of Greek religion is as natural as it is false. Very few myths have any religious meaning at all, in spite of the large part the gods play in them. A little comparison with the facts of worship serves to show that here the gods are quite different from the gods of story.

2. Mythology Distinguished from Religion:

Some of the gods hardly appear in myths, and some of the beings of myth are not worshipped; in worship, each god is for the time being the only god thought of, not a member of the hierarchy established in myth; moreover in myth the gods are treated as universal, while the gods of worship are most closely attached, each to one shrine. Along with these external differences goes the one essential difference between a being of story and an object of worship. The failure to recognize the deep meaning of Greek religion results from the superficial assumption that myths constitute a peculiar kind of theology, when in reality they teach but little, and that, indirectly, about religion proper.

3. Local Shrines:

The essential fact about the gods of Greek religion is that each god was worshipped in a unique form at one or another particular shrine by a group of worshippers more or less definite. The group might include the state, the dwellers in one locality or simply the family; whatever its limits, it included those connected with the god by a social-religious tie, and the fundamental purpose of the worship was to strengthen this tie. In a city like Athens
there were hundreds of such shrines, varying in importance, each the place
where one particular phase of a god was worshipped at specified times.
The particular form of the god was ordinarily indicated by an epithet
attached to his name, Zeus Olympios, Dionysus Eleutherios, Athena Nike.
This epithet might refer to the locality of the worship (Aphrodite of the
Gardens), to the center from which the worship was brought (Artemis
Brauronia), to some local spirit identified with the greater god (Poseidon
Erechtheus), or to the nature of the god himself (Apollo Patroos).

4. Epithets of the Gods:

Each of the many shrines in Athens had thus its unique god, its group of
worshippers connected with the god, its particular form of worship and
times of worship, its own officials. While the state exercised general
supervision over all the shrines, they were not organized in a hierarchy
under any distinctly religious officials, but remained as independent units.
Religious worship in a given city meant the aggregation of independent
worships at the different local shrines.

5. Nature of the Gods of Worship:

The god of worship, then, was the god of a local shrine whose blessing and
favor were sought at certain times by those who had the right to worship
there. As in myth the gods were drawn after human types, that is, with
human virtues and human frailties, and bodies almost human, except that
they were not made to die; so in worship the gods were persons not unlike
men in their nature. Worship proceeds on the assumption that gods are like
human rulers, in that men honor the gods by games and processions, seek
to please them by gifts, and ask them to share banquets made in their
honor. Only the humanness of the gods in worship is something more
subtle, more intimate than in myth. No stress is laid on human form or the
vagaries of human character in the gods of worship; in form they remain
spirits more or less vague, but spirits who care for men, who may be
approached as a man approaches his ruler, spirits bound to man by close
social ties which it is his duty and pleasure to strengthen. Zeus is father of
gods and men, a father not untouched by the needs of his children; Athena
cares for the city of Athens as her special pride; each family worships gods
which are all but akin to the family; in the gymnasion, Apollo or Hermes is
represented as the patron and ideal of the youths who exercise there; the
drama is part of the service of Dionysus; in a word each form of human
activity, be it work or pleasure, was a point of contact with the gods. The real forces at work in the world were first men, and secondly beings with a nature like man’s, but with powers superior to man’s; worship was the attempt to ally the gods more closely to man by social-religious ties, in order that as both worked together the ends of life might be successfully attained. This conception of the gods as higher members of society is the keynote of Greek religion. In some ethnic religions the gods seem to be evil beings whose desire for mischief man must overcome; in others they are beings to be avoided as much as possible; or again they are rulers who delight in man’s abject servitude; or again by cultivating the friendship of one god, man may hope to win blessing and avoid harm from the others. In Greece all the gods of worship were essentially friendly to man, because they were akin to him and a part of the society in which he lived.

6. Relation of Greek Gods to Nature:

The relation of the gods to Nature is not so simple as might at first appear. Within certain limits the forces of Nature were subject to the will of the gods. From the Greek point of view, however, the relation is much more intimate, in that the forces in the world, at least in so far as they affect man, are personal activities, activities that express the will of divine beings. We say that Poseidon personifies the sea, Gaia the earth, Helios the sun; and the origin of religion has been sought in man’s awe before the forces of Nature. The truer statement is that the Greek world, including the physical world, was made up of spiritual beings, not of physical forces. “The fire, as useful as it is treacherous, is the province of Hephaestus; all the dangers and changeableness of the sea are reflected in Poseidon and his followers; an Artemis is there to guide the hunter, a Demeter to make the grain sprout, a Hermes or Apollo to watch over the herds; Athena is the spirit of wisdom, Hermes of shrewdness, Ares of tumultuous war. .... In a word the Greek gods are in the world, not above the world, superior beings who embody in personal form all the forces that enter into human life.” The contrast between such a personal point of view and the mechanical view of modern science is as marked as the contrast between it and the Hebrew conception of a universe brought into being and controlled by a God quite distinct from the physical world.
7. The Greater Gods of Greece:

Of the particular gods, little need be said. The five greater gods, Zeus, Hera, Athena, Apollo and Artemis, are not closely connected with any one phenomenon of Nature or human life, though Zeus has to do with the sky, and Apollo and Artemis acquire a connection with the sun and moon. The most important worship of Zeus was at Olympia, where the pan-Hellenic games were held in his honor. Elsewhere he was worshipped mainly in connection with the weather and the changing seasons. Apparently much of his preeminence in Greek thought was due to myth. Hera was worshipped with Zeus on mountain tops, but her special place in worship was as the goddess of marriage. Athena, the maiden goddess of war and of handicrafts, was worshipped especially in Northern Greece. War dances found a place in her worship, and she was rarely represented without aegis, spear and helmet. All the arts, agriculture, handicrafts, even the art of government, were under her care. Apollo was worshipped widely as the protector of the crops, and of the shepherd’s flocks. In this aspect his festivals included purifications and rites to ward off dangers. He was also the god of music and of prophecy. At Delphi his prophetic powers won great renown, but the Pythian games with their contests in music, in rhythmic dancing, and in athletic sports were hardly less important. Artemis, in myth the chaste sister of Apollo, was worshipped as the queen of wild creatures and the mother of life in plants as well as in animals. She was the patron and the ideal of young women, as was Apollo of young men.

8. Nature Gods:

The gods most closely associated with Nature were not so important for religion. Gain, mother earth, received sacrifices occasionally as the abode of the dead. Rhea in Crete, Cybele in Asia Minor, also in origin forms of the earth mother, received more real worship; this had to do primarily with the birth of vegetation in the spring, and again with its destruction by drought and heat. Rivers were honored in many places as gods of fertility, and springs as nymphs that blessed the land and those who cultivated it. Poseidon was worshipped that he might bless fishing and trade by sea; inland he was sometimes recognized as the “father of waters,” and a god of fertility; and where horses were raised, it was under the patronage of Poseidon. The heavenly bodies marked the seasons of worship, but were
rarely themselves worshipped. In general, the phenomena of Nature seem to have been too concrete to rouse sentiments of worship in Greece.

9. Gods of Human Activity and Emotions:

A third class of gods, gods of human activities and emotions, were far more important for religion. Demeter, once no doubt a form of the original earth-goddess, was the goddess of the grain, worshipped widely and at many seasons by an agricultural people. Dionysus, god of souls, of the inner life, and of inspiration by divine power, was worshipped by all who cultivated the vine or drank wine. The Attic drama was the most important development of his worship. Hermes was quite generally honored as the god of shepherds and the god of roads. As the herald, and the god of trade and gain, he found a place in the cities. Aphrodite was perhaps first the goddess of the returning life of the spring; in Greece proper she was rather the goddess of human love, of marriage and the family, the special patron of women. Ares, the Thracian god of war, was occasionally worshipped in Greece, but more commonly the god of each state was worshipped to give success in battle to his people. Hephaestus, pictured as himself a lame blacksmith working at the art which was under his protection, was worshipped now as the fire, now as the patron of cunning work in metal. Asclepius received men’s prayers for relief from disease.

II. REVELATION: INSPIRATION.

For the Greeks revelation was a knowledge of the divine will in special circumstances, and inspiration was evinced by the power to foresee the divine purpose in a particular case. There is no such thing as the revelation of the divine nature, nor any question of universal truth coming to men through an inspired teacher; men knew a god through his acts, not through any seer or prophet. But some warning in danger or some clue to the right choice in perplexity might be expected from gods so close to human need as were the Greek gods. The Homeric poems depicted the gods as appearing to men to check them, to encourage them or to direct them. In Homer also men might be guided by signs; while in later times divine guidance came either from signs or from men who were so close to the gods as to foresee something of the divine purpose.
1. Omens:

The simplest class of signs were those that occurred in Nature. In the Iliad the thunderbolt marked the presence of Zeus to favor his friends or check those whose advance he chose to stop. The Athenian assembly adjourned when rain began to fall. Portents in Nature — meteors, comets, eclipses, etc. — claimed the attention of the superstitious; but there was no science of astrology, and superstition had no great hold on the Greeks. In the Homeric poems, birds frequently denoted the will of the gods, perhaps because their place was in the sky beyond any human control, perhaps because certain birds were associated with particular gods. The presence of an eagle on the right hand (toward the East) was favorable, especially when it came in answer to prayer. At times, the act of the bird is significant, as when the eagle of Zeus kills the geese eating grain in Odysseus’ hall — portent of the death of the suitors. In later Greek history there are but few references to signs from birds. The theory of these signs in Nature is very simple: all Nature but expresses the will of the gods, and when the gods wish to give men some vague hint of the future, it is necessary only to cause some event not easily explained to attract man’s attention.

2. Divination by Sacrifice:

From the 5th century on, divination by means of sacrificial victims took the place ordinarily of signs such as have just been described. In the presence of the enemy or before some important undertaking, animals were sacrificed to the gods. If they came willingly to the altar, if the inward parts, especially the liver, were sound and well shaped and of good color, if the sacrifice burned freely and without disturbing the arrangement on the altar, success might be expected. The theory was very simple: if the gods were pleased and accepted the sacrifice, their favor was assured; but if the sacrifice deviated in any way from the normal, it would not please the gods. Thus any sacrifice might have prophetic significance, while sacrifices offered before important undertakings had special meaning. The practice arose of repeating sacrifices before a battle until a favorable one was obtained, and at length, as religion began to lose its hold, the time came when a general might disregard them completely.
3. Dreams:

An important means of learning the will of the gods was through dreams, when the ordinary channels of perception were closed and the mind was free to receive impressions from the gods. The treacherousness of dreams was fully recognized, even in the Homeric poem; students of natural science came to recognize that dreams arose from natural causes; none the less they were generally regarded as a source of knowledge about the future, and gradually a science for interpreting dreams was evolved. For Pindar and for Plato the soul was more free when the body slept, and because the soul was the divine part of man’s nature it could exercise the power of divination in sleep. Many of the recorded dreams are signs which came to the mind in sleep, like the dreams of Joseph and of Pharaoh, signs that needed later interpretation.

See DIVINATION; DREAMS.

Prophets and seers were not as important in Greece as among many peoples. The blind Teiresias belongs to the realm of myth, though there were great families of seers, like the Iamidae at Olympia, who were specially gifted to interpret dreams, or signs from sacrifices. Ordinarily it was the “chresmologist,” the man with a collection of ancient sayings to be applied to present events, whose advice was sought in time of need; or else men turned to the great oracles of Greece.

4. Oracles:

The most important oracle was that of Apollo at Delphi. Hither came envoys of nations as well as individuals, and none went away without some answer to their questions. After preliminary sacrifices, the priestess purified herself and mounted the tripod in the temple; the question was propounded to her by a temple official, and it was his function also to put her wild ravings into hexameter verse for the person consulting the oracle. A considerable number of these answers remain to us, all, of course, somewhat vague, many of them containing shrewd advice on the question that was brought to the oracle. The honor paid to the oracle and its influence, on the whole an influence making for high ethical standards and wise statesmanship, must be recognized. The early Christian Fathers held that the Pythian priestess was inspired by an evil spirit; later critics have treated the whole institution as a clever device to deceive the people; but in view of the respect paid to the oracle through so many generations, it is
hard to believe that its officials were not honest in their effort to discover and make known the will of the god they served.

III. FORMS OF WORSHIP.

1. Shrines:

It has already been pointed out that Greek religion centered about local shrines. While in early times the shrine consisted of an altar with perhaps a sacred grove, and later it might be no more than a block of stone on which offerings were laid, the more important shrines consisted of a plot of land sacred to the god, a temple or home for the god, and an altar for sacrifices. The plot of land, especially in the case of shrines outside a city, might be very large, in which case it often was used as a source of income to the shrine, being cultivated by the priests or leased under restrictions to private persons.

2. Temples:

In this precinct stood the temple, facing toward the East, so that the morning sun would flood its interior when it was opened on a festival day. With one or two exceptions, the temple was not a place of assembly for worship, but a home for the god. It contained some symbol of his presence, after the 5th century BC ordinarily an image of the god; it served as the treasure-house for gifts brought to the god; worship might be offered in it by the priests, while the people gathered at the sacrifice outside. And as a home for the god, it was adorned with all the beauty and magnificence that could be commanded. The images of the gods, the noblest creation of sculpture in the 5th and 4th centuries, were not exactly “idols”; that is, the images were not themselves worshipped, even though they were thought to embody the god in some semblance to his true form. In Greece men worshipped the gods themselves, grateful as they were to artists who showed them in what beautiful form to think of their deities.

3. Priests:

Each of these shrines was directly in the hands of one or more officials, whose duty it was to care for the shrine and to keep up its worship in due form. Occasionally the priesthood was hereditary and the office was held for life; quite as often priests were chosen for a year or a term of years; but it was exceptional when the duties of the office prevented a man from engaging in other occupations. In distinction from the priests of many other
forms of religion, the Greek priest was not a sacred man set apart for the service of the gods; the office may be called sacred, but the office was distinct from the man. The result was important, in that the priests in Greece could never form a caste by themselves, nor could they claim any other powers than were conferred on them by the ritual of the shrine. Thus Greek religion remained in the possession of the people, and developed no esoteric side either in dogma or in worship.

4. Seasons of Worship: Festivals:

The seasons of worship varied with each particular shrine. While the state observed no recurring sabbath, it recognized a certain number of religious festivals as public holidays; thus at Athens the number of religious holidays in the year was somewhat larger than our fifty-two Sundays. The tradition of each shrine determined whether worship should be offered daily or monthly or yearly, and also what were the more important seasons of worship. The principle of the sacred days was that at certain seasons the god was present in his temple expecting worship; just as it was the principle of sacred places that the temple should be located where the presence of the god had been felt and therefore might be expected again. Neither the location of the temple nor the seasons of worship were determined primarily by human convenience.

5. Elements of Worship:

The elements of worship in Greece were

(1) prayers, hymns, and votive offerings,

(2) the sacrificial meal,

(3) propitiatory sacrifice and purification, and

(4) the processions, musical contests and athletic games, which formed part of the larger festivals. The heroes of Homer prayed to the gods at all times, now a word of prayer in danger, now more formal prayers in connection with a sacrifice; and such was doubtless the practice in later times.

6. Prayer:

In the more formal prayers, it was customary to invoke the god with various epithets, to state the petition, and to give the reason why a
favorable answer might be expected — either former worship by the petitioner, or vows of future gifts, or former answers to prayer, or an appeal to the pity of the god. Sometimes a prayer reads as if it were an attempt to win divine favor by gifts; more commonly, if not always, the appeal is to a relationship between man and his god, in which man’s gifts play a very subordinate part. Thanksgiving finds small place in prayer or in sacrifice, but it was rather expressed in votive offerings. In every temple these abounded, as in certain Roman Catholic shrines today; and as is the case today they might be of value in themselves, they might have some special reference to the god, or they might refer to the human need in which the giver had found help. So far as the great public festivals are concerned, the prayer seems to have been merged with the hymn of praise in which the element of petition found a small place.

7. Burnt Offering or Sacrificial Meal:

The most common form of worship consisted of the sacrificial meal, like the meat offering or meal offering of the Hebrews. The sacrifice consisted of a domestic animal, selected in accordance with the ritual of the shrine where it was to be offered. First the animal was led to the altar, consecrated with special rites and killed by the offerer or the priest while hymns and cries of worship were uttered by the worshippers. Then some of the inward parts were roasted and eaten by priests and worshippers. Finally the remainder of the creature was prepared, the thigh bones wrapped in fat and meat to be burned for the god, the balance of the meat to be roasted for the Worshippers; and with libations of wine the whole was consumed. The religious meaning of the act is evidently found in the analogy of a meal prepared for an honored guest.

8. Meaning of the Sacrifice:

The animal, an object valuable in itself, is devoted to this religious service; the god and his worshippers share alike this common meal; and the god is attached to his worshippers by a closer social bond, because they show their desire to honor and commune with him, while he condescends to accept the gift and to share the meal they have prepared. (Possibly the animal was once thought to have been made divine by the act of consecration, or the god was believed to be present in his flesh, but there is no evidence that such a belief existed in the 5th century BC, or later.) The simple, rational character of this worship is characteristic of Greek religion.
9. Propitiatory Sacrifice:

When men felt that the gods were displeased or in circumstances where for any reason their favor was doubtful, a different form of sacrifice was performed. A black animal was selected, and brought to a low altar of earth; the sacrifice was offered toward evening or at night, and the whole animal was consumed by fire. While in general this type of sacrifice may be called propitiatory, its form, if not its meaning, varied greatly. It might be worship to spirits of the earth whose anger was to be feared; it might be offered when an army was going into battle, or when the crops were in danger of blight, or of drought; or again it was the normal form of worship in seasons of pestilence or other trouble. Sometimes the emphasis seems to be laid on the propitiation of anger by an animal wholly devoted to the god, while at other times there is the suggestion that some evil substance is removed by the rite.

10. Purification:

The later conception is clearer in rites of purification, where, by washing, by fire, or by the blood of an animal slain for the purpose, some form of defilement is removed. In the sacrifice of a pig to Demeter for this purpose, or of a dog to Hecate, some mystic element may exist, since these animals were sacred to the respective goddesses.

These various elements of worship were combined in varying degree in the great religious festivals. These lasted from a day to a fortnight. After purification of the worshippers, which might be simple or elaborate, and some preliminary sacrifice, there was often a splendid procession followed by a great public sacrifice.

11. The Great Religious Festivals:

In the greater festivals, this was followed by athletic games and horse races in honor of the god, and sometimes by contests in music and choral dancing, or, in the festivals of Dionysus at Athens, by the performance of tragedy and comedy in theater. In all this, the religious element seems to retreat into the background, though analogies may be found in the history of Christianity. The religious mystery plays were the origin of our own drama; and as for the horse races, one may still see them performed as a religious function, for example, at Siena. The horse races and the athletic games were performed for the gods as for some visiting potentate, a means
of affording them pleasure and doing them honor. The theatrical performances apparently originated in ceremonies more essentially religious, in which men acted some divine drama depicting the experiences attributed to the gods themselves.

12. Mysteries at Eleusis:

This last feature is most evident in the mysteries at Eleusis, where the experiences of Demeter and Persephone were enacted by the people with the purpose of bringing the worshippers into some more intimate connection with these goddesses, such that their blessing was assured not only for this world, but for the life after death.

13. Absence of Magic and Mystery:

In all the forms of Greek worship perhaps the most striking feature was the absence of magic or superstition, almost the absence of mystery. Men approached the gods as they would approach superior men, bringing them petitions and gifts, making great banquets for their entertainment, and performing races and games for their pleasure, although this was by no means the whole of Greek religion, a phase of religion far more highly developed in the rational atmosphere of Greek thought than among other races. As the Greek gods were superior members of the social universe, so Greek worship was for the most part social, even human, in its character.

IV. THE FUTURE LIFE.

1. Funeral Rites:

Greek thought of the life after death was made up of three elements which developed successively, while the earlier ones never quite lost their hold on the people in the presence of the later. The oldest and most permanent thought of the future found its expression in the worship of ancestors. Whether the body of the dead was buried or burned, the spirit was believed to survive, an insubstantial shadowy being in the likeness of the living man. And rites were performed for these shades to lay them to rest and to prevent them from injuring their survivors, if not to secure their positive blessing. As at other points in Greek religion, the rites are fairly well known, while the belief must be inferred from the rites. The rites consisted first of an elaborate funeral, including sometimes animal sacrifices and even athletic games, and secondly of gifts recurring at stated intervals, gifts of water for bathing, of wine and food, and of wreaths and flowers. The
human wants and satisfaction of the spirit are thus indicated. And the purpose is perhaps to keep the spirit alive, certainly to keep it in good humor so that it will not injure the survivors and bring on them defilement which would mean the wrath of the gods. At the same time, any contact with death demands purification before one can approach the gods in worship.

2. Future Life in the Homeric Poems:

The second element in Greek thought of the future life appears in the Homeric poems, and through the epic exerted a wide influence on later periods. Here the separateness of the souls of the dead from the human life is emphasized. Once the bodies of the dead are burned, the souls go to the realm of Hades, whence there is no return even in dreams, and where (according to one view) not even consciousness remains to them. It would seem that the highly rational view of the world in the epic, a point of view which laid stress on the greater Olympian gods, banished the belief in souls as akin to the belief in sinister and magic influences. We might almost say that the thought of the greater gods as personal rulers tended to drive out the thought of lesser and more mystic spiritual influences, and made a place for souls only as shades in the realm of Hades. Certainly the result for Greek religion was to render far less vivid any idea of a real life after death.

3. Later Beliefs in Immortality:

The third element was associated with the worship of the gods of the lower world, and in particular Demeter and Persephone. In this worship, particularly at Eleusis, the fact of life after death was assumed, a fact that the Greeks never had denied; but the reality of the future life, the persistence of human relationship after death, and the kindly rule of Persephone as Queen of Souls were vividly impressed on the worshippers. In part through the influence of the Orphic sect, the actual divinity of the soul was believed by many thinkers, a doctrine which was formulated by Plato in a manner which profoundly affected early Christian thought. If the epic emphasis on the greater gods made the souls mere shades in Hades, it was again a religious movement, namely the worship of gods like Persephone and Dionysus, which taught to some Greeks the divine reality of the soul and its hope for a blessed life in communion with the gods.

This development in Greece is the more interesting because there are indications of the same thing in Hebrew history. In the Old Testament
there are found traces of an old worship of souls, practiced by races akin to the Hebrews if not by the Hebrews themselves; this worship was brought to an end under the clarifying power of the worship of Yahweh; and finally the later prophets perceived the truth that while souls were not to be worshipped, the dead who died in the Lord did not become mere shades, but continued to live as the objects of His Divine love.

V. SIN, EXPIATION, AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE.

1. Greek Idea of Sin:

The ancient Hebrew religion made much of sin, and of the remedy for sin which God, in loving mercy to His people, had provided; in Greece the thought of sin found no such place in the religious life, though of course it was not absent altogether. If sin is defined as that which causes divine displeasure and wrath, it appears in Greek thought in three forms:

(1) as the transgression of moral law,

(2) as neglect of the gods and consequent presumption, and

(3) as pollution. The cause of sin is traced to human folly, either some passion like envy or anger or desire for gain, or to undue self-reliance which develops into presumption; and once a man has started in the wrong direction, his sin so affects judgment and will that he is all but inevitably led on into further sin. According to the simple Greek theodicy, the transgression of moral law brings its penalty, nor can any sacrifice induce the gods to intervene on behalf of the transgressor. All that expiation can accomplish is to set right the spirit of the transgressor so that he will not be led into further sin. Neglect of the gods — the second type of sin — brings its penalty in the results of divine wrath, but in this case, prompt repentance and submission to the gods may appease the wrath and therefore change its results. Pollution, the third cause of divine displeasure, often cannot be called sin; the failure to remove pollution, however, especially before one approaches the gods, is a just cause of divine anger. In general the Greek thought of sin centers about the idea of undue self-reliance and presumption, (hubris), which is the opposite of the characteristic Greek virtue, (sophrosune), namely that temperate mode of life in which everything is viewed in right proportion. Inasmuch as the
Greek gods are righteous rulers, the nature of sin lies in its opposition to divine justice, not in unholiness or in the rejection of divine love.

2. Religious Ideals:

The demands of the religious life in Greece were relatively simple. To avoid acts of impiety such as are mentioned above, to perform the ordinary acts of worship regularly and punctiliously, were all that was required, though the religious man might find many opportunities for worship beyond what was expected of everyone. Little is said of the spirit of worship which underlay the outward acts. Nor does the command, “Be ye therefore holy, even as I am holy,” find an echo in Greece. At the same time the fact that the gods so definitely represented human ideals of life, must have meant that in a way men aimed to make their lives conform to divine ideals. The essential feature of the religious life was the true recognition of human dependence on the gods, a dependence which showed itself in obedience to the divine rule, in trustful confidence that the gods would bless their worshippers, in resignation when misfortune came, and particularly in the belief in the loving care and protection of the divine rulers. In Greece, the religious man looked to the gods not so much for salvation from evil, as for positive blessings.

VI. THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK RELIGION ON CHRISTIANITY.

1. Greek Philosophy and Christian Theology:

This is not the place to speak of the decadence of Greek religion, of its ameliorating influence on the Alexandrian world, or of the control it exercised over the Roman state. Its most permanent effect is found rather in Christianity. And here its shaping influence is first noted in Christian theology beginning with Paul and the Apostle John. For although Greek religion was more free from dogma or anything that could be called theology than are most religions, it furnished the religious content to the greatest philosophical systems we know; and all through the centuries the leaders of Christian thought have been trained in the religious philosophy of Plato and of Aristotle. Our Christian conceptions of the nature of God and the soul, of the relation of God to the physical universe, and of God’s government of the world, have been worked out along the lines laid down by these Greek thinkers. And while the debt is primarily to Greek philosophy, it should never be forgotten that Greek philosophy formulated
these conceptions out of the material which Greek religion furnished; indeed one may believe that it was the religious conceptions formulated by centuries of thoughtful worshippers which found final expression in the Greek philosophic systems.

2. Greek Influence on Christian Liturgy:

Again, the organization of the early Christian church and its form of government was quite as much Greek as it was Hebrew in origin. Here the influence of Greek religion as such was less marked; still it must be remembered that every form of Greek organization had its religious side, be it family, or school, or state; and further, that some phases of religion in Greece were quite thoroughly organized in a manner that was adapted without much difficulty to the conditions of the new religion. Moreover the thought of the Greek priest as not a sacred man, but a man appointed by the community to a sacred office, was naturally adopted by the nascent Christian communities. Even in the organization of worship, in the prayers and hymns and liturgy which gradually developed from the simplest beginnings, it is not difficult to trace the influence of what the Greek converts to Christianity had been brought up to regard as worship of the gods.

3. Greek Influence on the Sacraments:

The most striking case of the effect of the old religion on the new is found in the method of celebrating the Christian sacraments. In the 2nd century AD, the baptismal bath took place after a brief period of instruction, and at the common meal the bread and wine were blessed in commemoration of the Master. Three centuries passed and this simplicity had given way to splendid ceremony. Baptism ordinarily was performed only on the “mystic night,” the night before Easter. Almost magic rites with fasting had exorcised evil from the candidate; ungirded, with loose hair and bare feet, he went down into the water, and later was anointed with oil to signify the gift of the Holy Spirit; then the candidates, dressed in white, wearing crowns, and carrying torches, proceeded to their first communion in which a mixture of honey and milk might take the place of wine. The whole ceremony had been assimilated to what Greek religion knew as an initiation, in which the baptized underwent some essential change of nature. They were said to have “put on the dress of immortality.”
The Lord’s Supper was carefully limited to those who had been through this initiation, and even among these, at length, degrees of privilege arose. The ceremony came to be known as a mystery, the table as an altar, the officiating priest as a “hierarch,” and the result as a blessed “vision” of sacred things by which the resurrection life was imparted. In its formal character and the interpretation of its meaning, as well as in the terms used to describe it, the effect of the Greek mysteries may be seen.

Yet during these three centuries Christianity had been waging a life-and-death struggle with the old religion. It is indeed impossible to believe that converts to Christianity should intentionally copy the forms of a worship which they had often at much cost to themselves rejected as false. The process must have been slow and quite unconscious. As the language of heathen philosophy was used in forming a Christian theology, so the conceptions and practices which had developed in Greek religion found their way into the developing Christian ritual. Much of this ritual which had no essential place in Christianity was later rejected; some still remains, the contribution of the religious life of Greece to the forms of worship in our world religion.
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GREECE, SONS OF

“I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and will make thee as the sword of a mighty man” (Zec 9:13). The passage doubtless refers to the captive Hebrews who are held by the Greeks. The exhortation is to insurrection against the Greeks. Although bearing a striking similarity to the passage in Joel 3:6, there is evidently no connection between the two. In the first, there was conflict between the nations; in the second, simply a reflection upon Tyre and Sidon for having sold into Greece certain Jewish captives. From a Jewish standpoint the Maccabean wars were really between Jews and Greeks.
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<gren>.

See COLOR.

GREETING

<gret'-ing> ([l " v ; sha'-al]; [χαίρω, chairo], [ἀσπασμός, aspasmos], [ἀσπάζομαι, aspazomai]):

(1) Sha'-al means “to ask,” “to inquire of anyone respecting welfare,” hence, “to greet.” In the Old Testament the word “greet” occurs only once in the King James Version or the Revised Version (British and American), namely, in 1 Samuel 25:5, “Go to Nabal, and greet him in my name.” But it is implied in other places where shalom (“well,” “prosperity,”
“peace”), the common Hebrew greeting, is used; e.g. in Genesis 37:4, it is said of Joseph that “his brethren could not speak peaceably unto him,” i.e. could not give him the common friendly greeting of “Peace!” “Peace be to thee!” So, in Genesis 43:27, the Revised Version (British and American) “He asked them of their welfare” (King James Version margin “peace”); Exodus 18:7, “They asked each other of their welfare” (King James Version, margin “peace”); 2 Samuel 11:7, “how Joab did, and how the people did” (the Revised Version (British and American) “faresd,” the King James Version margin “of the peace of”); Joab said to Amasa (2 Samuel 20:9), the Revised Version (British and American) “Is it well with thee, my brother?” (Hebrew “Art thou in peace, my brother?”); Boaz greeted his reapers with “Yahweh be with you,” and they answered, “Yahweh bless thee” (Ruth 2:4; compare Psalm 129:8, “The blessing of Yahweh be upon you; we bless you in the name of Yahweh”). For the king, we have, the King James Version and the English Revised Version God save the king (m “Let the king live,” the American Standard Revised Version “(Long) live the king”) (1 Samuel 10:24, etc.); “Let my lord king David live for ever” (1 Kings 1:31; see also Nehemiah 2:3; Daniel 2:4, etc.). In Ecclesiasticus 6:5 it is said “a fair-speaking tongue will increase kind greetings,” the Revised Version (British and American) “multiply courtesies” (euprosegora).

(2) When Jesus sent forth His disciples to proclaim the kingdom, they were to “salute” the house they came to (Matthew 10:12), saying (Luke 10:5), “Peace (eirene) be to this house!”; if it was not worthy, the blessing should return to themselves. After His resurrection He greeted His disciples saying, “Peace be unto you” (Luke 24:36; John 20:19,21,26); He left His “peace” with them as His parting blessing (John 14:27) — “not as the world giveth,” in a formal way. A frequent form of greeting in the New Testament is chairo (“to rejoice,” imperative and infinitive, chaire, chairete, “Joy to thee,” “Joy to you,” translated “Hail!” and “All hail!” Matthew 26:49; 27:29; 28:9; Mark 15:18; Luke 1:28; John 19:3), “Rejoice!” (Philippians 3:1; the English Revised Version, margin “farewell”). Another word for greeting is aspasmos, “greetings in the markets” (the King James Version Matthew 23:7; Mark 12:38, “salutations”; Luke 11:43, “greetings,” Luke 20:46; also Luke 1:29,41,44; 1 Corinthians 16:21; Colossians 4:18; 2 Thessalonians 3:17; in all these places the Revised Version (British and American) has “salutation”).
(3) Of epistolary greetings we have examples in Ezr 4:17, “Peace” (shelam), etc.; 5:7; Daniel 4:1; 6:25. These are frequent in the Apoc: 1 Esdras 6:7, “to King Darius greeting” (chairo); 8:9; 1 Macc 10:18, etc.; 2 Macc 1:10, “greeting, health,” etc. We have the same form in Acts 15:23; 23:26. In 3 John 1:14 it is, “Peace (be) unto thee. The friends salute thee.” Paul opens most of his epistles with the special Christian greeting, “Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” (Romans 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:3, etc.). Also at the close, “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you” (1 Corinthians 16:23; 2 Corinthians 13:14, etc.). He directs greetings to be given to various persons, and sends greetings from those who are with him (Romans 16:5-23; 1 Corinthians 16:19 f; 2 Corinthians 13:13; Philippians 4:21 f; Colossians 4:10, etc.). In those cases the word is aspazomai, and the Revised Version (British and American) translates “salute,” etc. (compare Jas 1:1; 1 Peter 1:2; 5:14; 2 Peter 1:2; 2 John 1:3,13; Jude 1:2).

See GODSPEED; KISS.

W. L. Walker

GREYHOUND

<graˈ-hound>.

See DOG.

GRIEF; GRIEVE

<greʃ>, <grev>: There are some 20 Hebrew words translated in the King James Version by “grief,” “grieve,” “to be grieved,” etc. Among the chief are [h ʃ j ; chalah], [y l j ] choli], [w ʃ y; yagon], [s ʃ K” , kaˈac], [b ʃ X” ; atsabh]. They differ, partly, in their physical origin, and partly, in the nature and cause of the feeling expressed. the Revised Version (British and American) in several instances gives effect to this.

(1) Chalah, choli express the sense of weakness, sickness, pain (e.g. Samson, in Judges 16:7,11,17, “Then shall I become weak (chalah), and be as another man”); Isaiah 17:11 the King James Version, “a heap in the day of grief”; Isaiah 53:3,1, “a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief,” “He hath borne our griefs” (choli), the Revised Version, margin Hebrew “sickness, sicknesses”; 53:10, “He hath put him to grief,”
the Revised Version, margin “made him sick” (*chalah*) (translated by Dillmann and others, “to crush him incurably”); compare *Micah 6:13; Nahum 3:19*; *yaghon*, perhaps from the pain and weariness of toil (*Psalm 31:10*), “For my life is spent with grief,” the Revised Version (British and American) “sorrow”; “The Lord added grief to my sorrow,” the Revised Version (British and American) “sorrow to my pain” (*Jeremiah 45:3*); *ka`ac* implies provocation, anger, irritation; thus Hannah said to Eli (the King James Version), “Out of the abundance of my complaint and my grief (the Revised Version (British and American) “provocation”) have I spoken” (*1 Samuel 1:16*). *Psalm 6:7; 31:9*, “grief”; *Proverbs 17:25*, “A foolish son is a grief to his father” (i.e. source of provocation; the same word is rendered “wrath” in 12:16, the King James Version “a fool’s wrath,” the Revised Version (British and American) “vexation”; so also *Proverbs 27:3*); *Job 6:2*, “Oh that my grief were thoroughly weighed,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Oh that my vexation were but weighed” (in 5:2 the King James Version the same word is translated “wrath,” the Revised Version (British and American) “vexation”); *ke`ebh*, is “sorrow,” “pain,” properly “to hurt.” It occurs in *Job 2:13* “His grief (the Revised Version, margin “or pain”) was very great”; also 16:6 the Revised Version (British and American), “grief”; *makh’obh* “sorrows,” “pain,” “suffering” (*2 Chronicles 6:29*, the Revised Version (British and American) “sorrow”; *Psalm 69:26*, the Revised Version, margin “or pain”; *Isaiah 53:3*, “a man of sorrows”; 53:4, “Surely he hath carried our sorrows”); *marah* and *marar* indicate “bitterness” (*Genesis 26:35; 49:23; 1 Samuel 30:6; Ruth 1:13*); *puqah* implies staggering, or stumbling, only in *1 Samuel 25:31*, “This shall be no grief unto thee,” the Revised Version, margin Hebrew “cause of staggering”; *ra`* (a common word for “evil”) denotes an evil, a calamity, only once in the King James Version translated “grief,” namely, of Jonah’s gourd, “to deliver him from his grief,” the Revised Version (British and American) “from his evil case” (*Jonah 4:6*); *yara`*, “to be evil,” *Deuteronomy 15:10*, the Revised Version (British and American) “Thy heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him” (also *1 Samuel 1:8; Nehemiah 2:10; 13:8*; several times translated “grievous”); *charah*, “to burn,” “to be wroth” (e.g. *Genesis 4:6*, “Why art thou wroth?”), is translated “grieved” in *Genesis 45:5*, and *1 Samuel 15:11* the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) “Samuel was wroth”); the same word is often used of the kindling of anger; *la’ah*, “to be
weary,” “tired,” “faint” (Proverbs 26:15), the King James Version “The slothful hideth his hand in his bosom, it grieveth him to bring it again to his mouth,” the Revised Version (British and American) “wearieth”; also Job 4:2; atsabh, “to grieve,” “to be vexed,” occurs in Genesis 6:6; 34:7; 45:5, etc.; Psalm 78:40, “How oft did they .... grieve him in the desert.” Of other words sometimes translated “grief” may be mentioned quT, “to weary of,” “to loathe” (Psalm 95:10), “Forty long years was I grieved with that generation”; in 119:158; 139:21, the Revised Version, margin “loathe”; chamets, implying to be bitterly or violently moved, sour (often translated “leavened”), only in Psalm 73:21, the Revised Version (British and American) “For my soul was grieved,” margin, Hebrew “was in a ferment.”

(2) In the New Testament “grief,” “grieve,” etc., are infrequent. The commonest words are lupe (1 Peter 2:19), the Revised Version (British and American) “griefs,” elsewhere translated “sorrow”; lupeo, “to grieve,” “afflict” (Mark 10:22, the Revised Version (British and American) “sorrowful”; John 21:17 “Peter was grieved”; Romans 14:15; 2 Corinthians 2:4, the Revised Version (British and American) “made sorry”; 2:5, “caused sorrow”; Ephesians 4:30, “Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God”); diaponeomai, literally, “to labor through,” “to grieve self” occurs twice (Acts 4:2; 16:18 the Revised Version (British and American) “sore troubled”); stenazo, “to groan, or sigh,” once only translated “grief” (Hebrews 13:17), the Revised Version, margin “groaning”; prosochthizo, “to be indignant,” etc., twice (Hebrews 3:10,17, the Revised Version (British and American) “displeased”). The reference is to Psalm 95:10, where the Septuagint by this Greek word translates quT (see above).

The less frequency in the New Testament of words denoting “grief” is significant. Christ came “to comfort all that mourn — to give a garland for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness.” Christians, however, cannot but feel sorrow and be moved by grief, and it is to be noted that in both the Old Testament and New Testament, God Himself is said to be susceptible to grief.

W. L. Walker
GRIEVANCE

<grev'-ans> ([m ; `amal]): Occurs only in the King James Version as a translation of "Habakkuk 1:3, “Why dost thou show me iniquity, and cause me to behold grievance?” (the Revised Version (British and American) “look upon perverseness”); `amal is also translated “perverseness” by the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) in Numbers 23:21, “perverseness in Israel”; Isaiah 10:1, the King James Version “grievousness,” the Revised Version (British and American) “perverseness.” In Habakkuk 1:13, the King James Version translates the same word “iniquity” (margin “grievance”), “Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil and canst not look on iniquity” (margin “grievance”), the Revised Version (British and American) “perverseness.” The word means originally “toil,” “labor” with sorrow, misery, etc., as the consequence, and is often so translated. It is the word in Isaiah 53:11, “He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.”

W. L. Walker

GRIEVOUS; GRIEVOUSLY; GREIEVOUSNESS

<grev'-us>; <grev'-us-li>; <grev'-us-nes>: In addition to several of the words mentioned under GRIEF (which see), we have kabhedh (“heavy”) 8t, e.g. Genesis 12:10, “The famine was grievous in the land,” the Revised Version (British and American) “sore”; marats (“powerful”), “a grievous curse” (1 Kings 2:8); cur, “to turn aside” (Jeremiah 6:28), “grievous revolters”; qasheh, “to make sharp” (1 Kings 12:4; 2 Chronicles 10:4); tachalu’im (Jeremiah 16:4), “They shall die grievous deaths,” the Revised Version, margin “deaths of sicknesses”; `athaq (Psalm 31:18), “which speak grievous things proudly,” the Revised Version (British and American) “against the righteous insolently”; cheT, “sin” (Lamentations 1:8), “Jerus hath grievously sinned” (literally, “hath sinned a sin”); ma`al, “trespass” (Ezekiel 14:13), “trespassing grievously” (literally, “trespassing a trespass”) the Revised Version (British and American) “committing a trespass”; kobhedh, “weight” (Isaiah 21:15), “grievousness”; barus, “heavy,” “grievous wolves” (Acts 20:29), “grievous charges” (Acts 25:7), “His commandments are not grievous” (1 John 5:3); okneros, the Revised Version (British and American) “irksome” (Philippians 3:1); poneros, “evil” (Revelation
16:2), “a grievous sore”; *dusbastian*os, “grievous to be borne” (Matthew 23:4; Luke 11:46); *deinos*, “greatly,” “grievously tormented” (Matthew 8:6); *kakos*, “badly,” “grievously vexed” (Matthew 15:22).

W. L. Walker

**GRINDER**

<grin’-der>.

See MILL.

**GRINDING**

<grind’-ing>.

See CRAFTS.

**GRISLED; GRIZZLED**

<griz’-’ld>.

See COLORS.

**GROAN**

<gron> ([q a” n; na’aq], [q n” a; ‘anaq]; [στενάζω, stenazo], [ἔμβριμαομαί, embrimaomai]): The English word, noun and verb, is an attempt to imitate the vocal sound which is expressive of severe pain or distress, physical or mental. It is cognate with the Scottish dialect word girn, and with grin in its original obsolete sense, as used in the Anglican Prayer-book version of Psalm 59:6,14, “grin like a dog and go about the city”; here “grin” is a translation of *hamah*, and means the sound of the nightly howling of the pariah dogs in Jerusalem and other oriental cities. It is used in the Old Testament:

(1) To denote the expression accompanying physical suffering, as in the case of the Israelites in Egypt oppressed by Pharaoh’s taskmasters (Exodus 2:24; 6:5), or in Palestine under the yoke of the Canaanites (Judges 2:18, *neqaqah*). It is also used in Job’s description of the sufferings and wretchedness of the poor (Job 24:12) as well as in his complaint concerning his own suffering when smitten by the hand of God
Job 23:2). The Psalmist speaks of groaning when fever-stricken and remorseful, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) “roaring all the day long” (Psalm 32:3; 38:9; 102:5; 22:1).

(2) The expression of suffering on the part of beasts, hungry and thirsty in drought (Joel 1:18).

(3) The manifestation of mental and spiritual distress as in Psalm 6:6; 102:20 (the Revised Version (British and American) “sighing”).

(4) Metaphorically groaning is the despairing note of Egypt in the prophecy of her overthrow by Babylon, the sound being that uttered by a deadly wounded man (Ezekiel 30:24; similarly in the prophecy of the Persian conquest the misery of Babylon is thus represented by Jeremiah 51:52); and the misery of Tyre when taken by Babylon is similarly described (Ezekiel 26:15, the King James Version “cry”).

The word for “sigh” (‘anachah) is closely allied, and the meanings are sufficiently akin, so that the terms seem interchangeable. A sigh is physically a sign of respiratory distress due to depressed action of the heart; sighing is consequently the indication of physical weakness or mental disquietude, as Psalm 12:5; 31:10; 79:11; Isaiah 21:2; 24:7; 35:10; Jeremiah 45:3.

Na’aq is the crying of persons dying or starving, as in Ezekiel 30:24; Job 24:12. A somewhat similar word, haghah, means the complaining sound like that of the cooing of doves (Isaiah 59:11; Nahum 2:7). Nehi is the sound of lamentation of the dead (Jeremiah 9:10; 31:15; Amos 5:16).

In the New Testament “groaning” is used for the expression of mental distress. In John 11:33,15 the word used is part of the verb embrimaomai, which conveys the idea of deep and earnest emotion. The same word in two other passages is translated “strictly charged,” and indicates the emphasis of the charge (Matthew 9:30; Mark 1:43). Elsewhere “sighing” and “groaning” are renderings of words derived from the verb stenazo, as in Romans 8:23; 2 Corinthians 5:2,4; Mark 7:34; 8:12. Stephen calls the groaning of Israel in Egypt stenagmos (Acts 7:34), and the united wail of the travailing creation is expressed by Paul by the word sunstenazei (Romans 8:22). The sigh is a characteristic sign of woe in Isaiah 21:2; 24:7; Jeremiah 45:3;
Lamentations 14,8,11,12; Ezekiel 9:4; 21:6 f.

Alexander Macalister

**GROSS**


See GREASE.

**GROUND; GROUNDED**

<ground>, <ground’-ed> ([h m d a ] ‘adhamah], [6 r a , ‘erets]; [γῆ, ge]):

(1) “Ground” is in the King James Version the translation of ‘adhamah, “the soil,” the ground so called from its red color, frequently also translated “earth” and “land” (Genesis 2:5 f, etc.; Exodus 3:5; 8:21, etc.); it is more often the translation of ‘erets, which means rather the earth, most often translated “earth” and “land” (Genesis 18:2; Psalm 74:7; Isaiah 3:26, etc.); other words are chelqah, “portion,” “field” (2 Samuel 23:12, the Revised Version (British and American) “plot”); charish, “ploughing” (1 Samuel 8:12); sadheh, “a plain,” “a field” (1 Chronicles 11:13, the Revised Version (British and American) “plot of ground”); for other special words see DRY; FALLOW; PARCHED.

(2) In the New Testament the common word for “ground” is ge, “earth,” “soil,” “land” (Matthew 13:8; Acts 7:33, “holy ground,” etc.); other words are agros, “field” (Luke 14:18, “I have bought a piece of ground” the Revised Version (British and American) “field”); chorion, “spot,” “place” (John 4:5, “parcel of ground”).

(3) As past participle of “to grind,” “ground” appears as the translation of riphoth, pounded grain (2 Samuel 17:19, the Revised Version (British and American) “bruised”); “ground” is also the translation of Tachan (Exodus 32:20; Numbers 11:8; Deuteronomy 9:21, the Revised Version (British and American) “grinding”).

(4) “Ground,” as the basis or foundation of anything, occurs in 1 Timothy 3:15 as the translation of hedraiomata (from edaphos), “the pillar and ground of the truth,” the Revised Version, margin “stay.”
“Grounded” is used in the sense of founded, based, fixed in (Isaiah 30:32), “and in every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him,” the King James Version margin “Hebrew every passing of the rod founded,” the Revised Version (British and American) “and every stroke (margin “Hebrew passing”) of the appointed staff (margin “Or staff of doom (Hebrew foundation)”), which Yahweh shall lay upon him”; following, Isaiah 30:31, “with his rod will he (Yahweh) smite him”; Delitzsch, “every stroke of the rod of destiny which Yahweh causes to fall upon Asshur”; the word is mucadahah, from yacadh, “to place,” “to found,” “to appoint,” “to ordain,” hence, “appointed rod (of punishment),” seems the simplest rendering.

In Ephesians 3:17 we have “rooted and grounded in love,” and in Colossians 1:23, “if ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled,” the Revised Version (British and American) “steadfast,” both themelioo, “to lay a foundation.” In Ecclesiasticus 18:6 “ground” is used for the “bottom of things,” but the Revised Version (British and American) has “to track them out” (exichneuo), “to trace out.”

(5) Figurative uses of “ground” are as representing the heart in relation to its reception of words of truth and righteousness (Jeremiah 4:3; Hosea 10:12, “Break up your fallow ground”); to the word of the kingdom as preached by Christ (Matthew 13:8,23); dry, parched, thirsty ground stands for a poor condition (Psalm 107:33,15; Isaiah 35:7; 44:3; 53:2; Ezekiel 19:13).

W. L. Walker

**GROVE**

<grov>:

(1) [h r v a] ‘asherah].

See ASHERAS.

(2) [l v a e ‘eshel] (Genesis 21:33 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “a tamarisk tree”).

See TAMARISK.
"Grudge" (perhaps a mimetic word, compare Greek gru) is "to grumble" or "murmur" at any person or thing, to entertain an envious or covetous feeling, to do or give anything unwillingly, etc. It occurs in the King James Version as the translation of naTar, "to keep (anger)" (Leviticus 19:18, "Thou shalt not .... bear any grudge against the children of thy people"); in Psalm 59:15, as the translation, in text, of Hebrew lun or lin, "to pass the night," "to tarry," Niphal, "to show oneself obstinate," "to murmur or complain" (of the enemies who were hunting David like dogs), "Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied," margin "If they be not satisfied then will they stay all night," the Revised Version (British and American) "And tarry all night if they be not satisfied"; but see Exodus 15:24; 16:2; Numbers 14:2; Joshua 9:18, etc., where the translation is "murmur"; may not the meaning be "and growl (or howl) if they be not satisfied"? "Grudge" formerly implied open expression of discontent, etc., e.g. Wyclif has in Luke 15:2, "The farisies and scribis grucchiden seiynge," etc.

In Jas 5:9, stenazo, "to groan," "to complain" (from affliction or from impatience or ill-humor), is translated "grudge," "Grudge not one against another, brethren," the Revised Version (British and American) "murmur not"; goggusmos, "a murmuring" (compare John 7:12 f; Acts 6:1), is rendered "grudging" (1 Peter 4:9), "Use hospitality one to another without grudging," the Revised Version (British and American) "murmuring"; compare Philippians 2:14; me ek lapes, "not out of grief," is "without grudging" (2 Corinthians 9:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "not grudging" margin, Greek "of sorrow"); in Ecclesiasticus 10:25 we have "will not grudge" (gogguzo), the Revised Version (British and American) "murmur."

"Grudge" was frequent in the earlier VSS, but is changed in the King James Version for the most part into "murmur"; the Revised Version (British and American) completes the change, except Leviticus 19:18, and text of 2 Corinthians 9:7.

W. L. Walker
GUARD

<gard>:

(1) [µ yj B f " h" r c", sar ha-Tabbachim], “captain of the guard,” literally, “slaughterers” (Genesis 37:36; 39:1; 40:3,1; 41:10,12); [µ yj B f " Ab r" , rabh Tabbachim] (2 Kings 25:8,11,20; Jeremiah 39:9, etc.); [h Yj " B f " b r" , rabh tabbachayyah] (Daniel 2:14); [µ yx r ; ratsim], “guard,” the King James Version “footmen” (1 Samuel 22:17); sare ha-ratsim, “chief of the guard” the King James Version “captains of the guard” (1 Kings 14:27); ta’ ha-ratsim, “guard-chamber” (1 Kings 14:28; compare Ezekiel 40:21, etc., where “lodges” are “guardrooms”; see A.B. Davidson at the place).

(2) [ r my f m mishmar], “guard,” a defense to a point of danger (Nehemiah 4:22 f; Ezekiel 38:7).

(3) [t [ f m" v f m mishma’ath], “guard” (2 Samuel 23:23, where the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin have “council,” the body over which Benaiah was set by David and whose functions were perhaps those of consultation).

(4) [Σπεκουλάτωρ, spekoulator], “guard” (Mark 6:27, “a man of Herod’s guard,” where, as in one or two other cases, Mark, writing for Romans, simply transliterates the Latin speculator “a scout,” “an executioner,” as in loc.).

(5) [Στρατοπεδάρχες, stratopedarches], “captain of the guard” the King James Version, “captain of the praetorian guard” the Revised Version, margin. Acts 28:16. See CAPTAIN.


1. ROYAL BODY-GUARD:

An oriental monarch’s body-guard consisted of picked men attached to his person and ready to fulfill his pleasure in important and confidential concerns. At the courts of Egypt and Babylon the members of the guard were known as “slaughterers,” “executioners” (Genesis 37:36 King
James Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin, where Potiphar is called their captain); 2 Kings 25:8, where Nebuzaradan is called their captain (King James Version margin “chief marshal”). Whether it had ever been the function of the body-guard to kill meat for the royal table there is little directly to show; that they acted as executioners can be well understood. In Israel they were known as “the footmen” (1 Samuel 22:17 the King James Version, the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin “runners”) who acted as royal messengers or couriers from the time of Saul onward (2 Kings 10:25; 11:6); and this designation connects them with the couriers of the kings of Persia (Nehemiah 3:13,15; 8:14, where our versions render “posts,” though the Hebrew is ratsim).

2. COMPOSED OF FOREIGNERS:

The men of the royal body-guard were usually foreigners like the janissaries of oriental monarchs down to modern times, who prefer to have around their persons warriors uninfluenced by family connection with the people of the land. Rameses II had such a body-guard whose commanders ranked with the great officers of the crown (Maspero, Struggle of the Nations, 766). David’s body-guard of 600, known also as the gibborim or “mighty men,” consisted of Cherethites, Pelethites, and Gittites (2 Samuel 15:18; 20:23), and we read of Carites (2 Kings 11:19), who may have been Carians or Cretans, as forming part of the guard at the coronation of King Jehoash.

3. CONNECTION WITH THE TEMPLE:

That this guard had duties in connection with the temple as well as the king’s house seems clear. That they were employed as slaughterers of the sacrifices before the Levites were entrusted with the office is unlikely, inasmuch as this guard is not said to have been composed of “slaughterers” but of “runners.” But they accompanied King Rehoboam when he visited the temple (1 Kings 14:28), and to their captains were committed the shields of brass which took the place of the shields of gold which Solomon had hung up in the temple; Jehoiada employed their captains to put Athaliah to death and to exterminate the worshippers of Baal who had fled to the temple precincts (2 Kings 11:4 ff); the temple gate leading to the palace was called “the gate of the guard” (2 Kings 11:19). At this time, and for this occasion, at least, the royal body-guard were the temple
guards; and when Ezekiel drew up his plans for the temple which he conceived to replace the temple destroyed by Nebuchadrezzar, the “lodges” or “little chambers” were rooms for the accommodation of the temple guard (Ezekiel 40:7,10,21,33, etc.).

**LITERATURE.**

Robertson Smith, OTJC, 262, and note.

*T. Nicol.*

**GUARDIAN**

<gar'-di-an>.

See FAMILY; ANGEL.

**GUDGODAH**

<gud-go'-da> ([ḥ d ḫ gudhgodhah]): A place in the wilderness journeyings (Deuteronomy 10:7), corresponding to Hor-haggidgad in Numbers 33:32. Septuagint in each case renders (Γαδγαδ, Gadgad]. The site cannot now be identified; but there may be an echo of the ancient name in that of Wady Gudaghid, a confluent of Wady Jerafeh, which comes down from et Tih into the `Arabah nearly due West of Petra. There are difficulties, however, as the consonants do not correspond.

**GUEST**

<gest> ([a r q ; qara’]; [ἀνάκειμαι, anakeimai]): Oriental customs growing out of a nomadic life demand a greater abandon and freedom with respect to the relation of host and guest than are permitted by the conventionalities of western life. A householder is expected to entertain a traveler, and in turn the traveler may accept with perfect ease the hospitality shown without any obligation to pay. See HOSPITALITY. The significance of the word is that of one who is called or invited. A certain sacredness, unknown to modern western society, was attached to the guest, so that a special apartment was set aside for the guests. See GUEST-CHAMBER. In the Old Testament only 3 times is the word itself used, with reference to the guests of Adonijah (1 Kings 1:41,49), of the foolish woman (Proverbs 9:18), and of Yahweh (Zephaniah 1:7). In the New Testament, 3 times (Matthew 22:10 f; Luke 19:7 the King
James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “to lodge”). Though but few actual uses of the word occur, there are abounding illustrations of the guest relation in both Old Testament and New Testament. Especially is this manifest in the striking social attitudes of Jesus on occasions. Notable among these are the hospitality of Matthew (Luke 5:29 ff); Jesus’ relation to Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38 ff), and His entrance into the home of Zaccheus (Luke 19:1 ff). Likewise Jesus spoke frequently of the relation which should exist between the guest and his host (see Luke 7:44-46; Matthew 25:35; 10:40).

**Walter G. Clippinger**

**GUEST-CHAMBER**

*<gest’-cham-ber>: The translation of*

1. ([הָּקִּי לֵי לִשְׁכָּה] (1 Samuel 9:22, the King James Version “parlor”), and


   The lishkah was probably a room in which the sacrificial feasts were held. Kataluma is derived from kataluo, which means “to slacken,” i.e. the ropes of the beasts of burden, and hence, “to lodge.” Kataluma has accordingly often the sense of “inn,” but as used in Mark and Luke it has the narrower meaning of a room in which to eat.

**GUIDE**

*<gid> ([תָּלַע, ‘alluph], [יַע, nachal], [הָּיִל, nachah]; [ὁδηγός, hodegos], [ὁδηγεω, hodegeo]): “Guide” (noun) is the translation of ‘alluph, “an intimate,” “a friend,” the leader of a family or tribe: Psalm 55:13, “a man mine equal, my guide,” the Revised Version (British and American) “my companion”; Proverbs 2:17, “the guide of her youth,” the Revised Version (British and American) “friend,” margin “or guide”; Jeremiah 3:4, “My father, thou (art) the guide of my youth,” the Revised Version, margin “companion”; Micah 7:5, “Put ye not confidence in a guide,” the American Standard Revised Version “in a friend,” margin “confidant” (which the context shows to be the meaning), the English Revised Version “guide,” margin “familiar friend”; once of katsin, “a judge,” “a military leader or commander” (compare Joshua 10:24; Daniel 11:18); Proverbs 6:7, the Revised Version (British and
American) “chief,” margin “judge”; once nahagh, “to lead,” is translated “guide” (Psalm 48:14). In the New Testament hodegos, “a way-leader,” is translated “guide” (Matthew 23:16, “ye blind guides”; 23:24; Romans 2:19); “to guide” is the translation of nachah, “to lead forth” (Job 38:32; Psalm 73:24); once of ‘ashar, Piel, “to guide” or “lead straight” (Proverbs 23:19); of ya’ats, “to command,” “to give counsel” (“I will guide thee with mine eye,” the Revised Version (British and American) “I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee,” Psalm 32:8); of kul, “to contain,” “to sustain” (Psalm 112:5, “He will guide his affairs with discretion,” the Revised Version (British and American) “He shall maintain his cause in judgment”); of nahagh, “to drive,” “to lead” (Psalm 78:52); of hodegeo, “to show the way,” “guide” (John 16:13, “He shall guide you into all truth,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the truth”; Acts 8:31); oikodespoteo is translated “to guide the house” the Revised Version (British and American) “rule the household” (1 Timothy 5:14); the word means literally, to be a house-master (the head of the house).

The Revised Version (British and American) has “guide” for “lead” (Psalm 25:5; Matthew 15:14; Luke 6:39; Revelation 7:17); “a guide to” for “more excellent than” (Proverbs 12:26); “guided” for “brought in” (Psalm 78:26); “guideth” for “maketh” (2 Samuel 22:33), for “leadeth” (Psalm 23:3); “my heart yet guiding me,” margin “holding its course,” for “yet acquainting mine heart” (Ecclesiastes 2:3).

“Guide-posts” is substituted for “high heaps” (Jeremiah 31:21).

W. L. Walker

GUILE

caught you with guile” 1 Thessalonians 2:3; 1 Peter 2:1; 2:22; 3:10, quoted from Psalm 34:13, Revelation 14:5, “In their mouth was found no guile,” the Revised Version (British and American) after corrected text, “no lie”).

Paul’s words in 2 Corinthians 12:16 have sometimes been quoted in justification of “guile” in religious work, etc.; but he is not describing his actual procedure; but that which the Corinthians might have attributed to him; the lips of the Christian must be kept free from all guile (Psalm 34:13; 1 Peter 2:1, etc.; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:5 “A holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit” (dolos), the Revised Version (British and American) “A holy spirit”). “Guile” does not appear in Apocrypha; dolos is frequently rendered “deceit.”

The Revised Version (British and American) has “guile” for “subtilty” (Genesis 27:35; Acts 13:10); “cover itself with guile” for “is covered by deceit” (Proverbs 26:26); “with guile” for “deceitfully” (Genesis 34:13); “spiritual milk which is without guile” for “sincere milk of the word,” the English Revised Version, margin “reasonable,” the American Revised Version, margin, Greek “belonging to the reason” (compare Romans 12:1; 1 Peter 2:2); “guileless” for “harmless” (Hebrews 7:26).

**GUILT**

The Christian idea of guilt involves three elements: responsibility (Greek aitia, “cause,” depending upon a man’s real freedom), blameworthiness (Latin reatus culpeae, depending upon a man’s knowledge and purpose) and the obligation to make good through punishment or compensation (Latin reatus poenae; compare Greek opheilema, “debt,” Matthew 6:12). In other words, in thinking of guilt we ask the questions of cause, motive and consequence, the central idea being that of the personal blameworthiness of the sinner.

**I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.**

1. The Ritualistic and Legalistic Conception:

Not all of this is found at once in the Old Testament. The idea of guilt corresponds to that of righteousness or holiness. When these are ritual and legal, instead of ethical and spiritual, they will determine similarly the idea
of guilt. This legalistic and ritualistic conception of guilt may first be noted. Personal blameworthiness does not need to be present. “If any one sin, and do any of the things which Yahweh hath commanded not to be done; though he knew it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity” (Leviticus 5:17). The man is guilty, not because he might or should have known; he may merely have touched unwittingly the body of an unclean beast (Leviticus 5:2,3). The guilt is here because the law has been transgressed and must be made good (compare Leviticus 5:15,16; 4:2,3,13,12,27; see also 5:2,3,4,17).

Moreover, the element of personal responsibility is sometimes lacking where guilt is assigned. The priest may sin “so as to bring guilt on the people” (Leviticus 4:3). One man’s wrongdoing may “cause the land to sin” (Deuteronomy 24:4). Israel has sinned in Achan’s greed and therefore suffers. Even when the guilty man is found, his children and his very cattle must bear the guilt and punishment with him, though there is no suggestion of their participation or even knowledge (Joshua 7; compare 2 Samuel 24). Here the full moral idea of sin and guilt is wanting because the idea of personality and personal responsibility has not come to its own. The individual is still merged here in the clan or nation.

The central idea in all this is not that of the individual, his responsibility, his motive, his blame. It is that of a rule and the transgression of it, which must be made good. For this reason we see the ideas of sin and guilt and punishment constantly passing over into each other. This may be seen by noting the use of the words whose common root is ‘-shm, the distinctive Hebrew term for guilt. In Leviticus 5 to 7 in the adjective form it is rendered “guilty,” in the noun as “trespass offering.” In Hosea 5:15 it seems to mean punishment (see margin, “have borne their guilt,” and compare Ezekiel 6:6), while in Numbers 5:7,8 the idea is that of compensation (rendered “restitution for guilt”).

2. Prophetic Teaching:

With the prophets, the ideas of sin and righteousness come out more clearly as ethical and personal, and so we mark a similar advance in the conception of guilt. It is not ritual correctness that counts with God, incense and sacrifices and new moons and Sabbaths, but to cease to do evil, to learn to do well (Isaiah 1). Thus the motive and the inner spirit come in (Micah 6:8; Isaiah 57:15; 58:1-12), and guilt gains a new
depth and quality. At the same time the idea of personal responsibility comes. A man is to bear his own sins. The children’s teeth are not to be set on edge because the fathers have eaten sour grapes (Jeremiah 31:29,30; Ezekiel 18:29-32; 2 Kings 14:6; compare 2 Samuel 24:17).

II. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. With Jesus:

Here as elsewhere Jesus came to fulfill. With Him it is the inner attitude of the soul that decides. It is the penitent publican who goes down justified, not the Pharisee with his long credit account (Luke 18:9-14). That is why His attitude is so kindly toward some notorious sinners and so stern toward some religious leaders. The Pharisees are outwardly correct, but their spirit of bigotry and pride prevents their entering the kingdom of heaven, while the penitent harlots and publicans take it by storm.

Because it is not primarily a matter of the outward deed but of the inner spirit, Jesus marks different degrees of guilt as depending upon a man’s knowledge and motive (Luke 11:29-32; 12:47,48; 23:34). And yet Jesus does not lighten the sense of guilt but rather deepens it. The strength of the Old Testament thought lay in this, that it viewed all transgression as a sin against God, since all law came from Him. This religious emphasis remains with Jesus (Luke 15:21; compare Psalm 51:4). But with Jesus God is far more than a giver of rules. He gives Himself. And so the guilt is the deeper because the sin is against this love and mercy and fellowship which God offers us. Jesus shows us the final depth of evil in sin. Here comes the New Testament interpretation of the cross, which shows it on the one hand as the measure of God’s love in the free gift of His Son, and on the other as the measure of man’s guilt whose sin wrought this and made it necessary.

2. With Paul:

Paul also recognizes differences of degree in guilt, the quality of blameworthiness which is not simply determined by looking at the outward transgression (Acts 17:30; Ephesians 4:18; Romans 2:9; 3:26; 5:13; 7:13). He, too, looks within to decide the question of guilt (Romans 14:23). But sin is not a matter of single acts or choices with Paul. He sees it as a power that comes to rule a man’s life and that rules in the race. The question therefore arises, Does Paul think of guilt also as
native, as belonging to man because man is a part of the race? Here it can
merely be pointed out that Romans 5:12-21 does not necessarily
involve this. Paul is not discussing whether all men committed sin in
Adam’s fall, or whether all are guilty by virtue of their very place in a race
that is sinful. It is not the question of guilt in fact or degree, but merely the
fact that through one man men are now made righteous as before through
one sin came upon them all. This no more involves native guilt as a non-
ethical conception than it does the idea that the righteousness through
Christ is merely forensic and non-ethical. Paul is simply passing over the
other elements to assert one fact. Romans 1 suggests how Paul looked at
universal sin as involving guilt because universal knowledge and choice
entered in.

See also SIN.
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GUILT OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

GUILTLESS

The primary meaning of the Hebrew word is “to be clean.” Sometimes the meaning is “freedom from blame,” at other times to be “free
from punishment,” these two ideas running over into each other as with the
word “guilt.” The latter meaning seems to predominate in Exodus 20:7;
Deuteronomy 5:11; 2 Samuel 14:9; 1 Kings 2:9. The other
meaning holds in Numbers 32:22; Joshua 2:19; 2 Samuel 3:28;
Matthew 12:5,7.

GUILTY

In addition to the general discussion under GUILT (which see),
several New Testament passages demand special notice because the word
“guilty” is not used in the principal sense of blameworthy, but with one of
the two lesser meanings noted above which go to make up the complete
idea. In 3 of these passages the King James Version renders “guilty” and the Revised Version (British and American) gives another rendering. In Matthew 26:66 the King James Version, Jesus’ foes declare he is “guilty of death” ([ἐνοχος, enochos], “liable to”). Here “guilty” simply means the one who is legally held, and the reference is not to the blame but to the consequence. This is a true use of the word in the lower and legal sense. It does not correspond with our higher usage, and so we have it in the Revised Version (British and American) “worthy of death.” So in Romans 3:19, “guilty” is changed to “under the judgment,” and in Matthew 23:18, to “debtor.”

In Jas 2:10 and 1 Corinthians 11:27, the word “guilty” is also used in the lesser or more primitive sense, not primarily as involving blame but as involving the sinner’s authorship or responsibility. This is the first element suggested in the definition of guilt given above, just as the preceding passages illustrate the third element. The man who stumbles in one point is “guilty” of the whole law. James does not refer here to the degree of blameworthiness. “Guilty of” means transgressor of, and he has transgressed the whole because the law is one. So in 1 Corinthians 11:27, those “guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord” are those who have transgressed in the matter of the body and the blood of the Lord.

Harris Franklin Rall

GULF

([χασμα, chasma], “a chasm,” “vent,” “a gaping opening”—a great interval; from [χαινω, chaino], “to gape” or “yawn”): Occurs only in Luke 16:26, “Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed” (compare “afar off” in 16:23). This is very different from, though it probably reflects, the rabbinical conception of the separation between the two compartments of Hades (Sheol) by “a hand’s breadth,” “a wall,” or even, later, “a chasm,” as the parable can be given here only a figurative significance, and is of purely ethical import. The fundamental difference between the Rich Man and Lazarus lies not in their conditions but in their characters. For “besides all this” (16:26) the Revised Version, margin gives “in all these things,” thus implying that the moral distinctions which exist in this life (16:25) become more pronounced (“fixed”) in the next world, and the “gulf” is impassable in the sense that a change of condition will not necessarily produce a change of soul.
See also ABRAHAM’S BOSOM; HADES.

M. O. Evans

GUNI; GUNITES

<gu’-ni>, <gu’-nits> ([ynWG, guni]):

(1) The name of a Naphtalite clan (Genesis 46:24; Numbers 26:48; 1 Chronicles 7:13). In Numbers 26:48 the gentilic “Gunites” is also found, having in Hebrew the same form, with the article.

(2) The head of a Gadite family (1 Chronicles 5:15).

GUR; THE ASCENT, OF

<gur>, <a-sent’>, ([r WgAh I e in” , ma`-aleh ghur]): The place where the servants of Jehu mortally wounded Ahaziah, king of Judah (2 Kings 9:27). The ascent (the King James Version “going up”) was hard by Ibleam, the site of which is identified about 1/2 mile South of Jenin.

GUR-BAAL

<gur-ba’-al> ([l [ B ” Ar WG, gur ba`-al]): The residence of certain Arabs against whom God helped Uzziah, king of Judah (2 Chronicles 26:7). Its mention immediately after the Philistines may have suggested the “Gerar” of the Targum. Association with the Meunim points to the East. It may be taken as certain that Jebel Neby Harun, near Petra, has always been crowned by a sanctuary. This may have been “the dwelling place of Baal”; or, accepting Kittel’s emendation (Tur ba`al), “the rock” or “mountain of Baal.” The Arabs probably dwelt in the region before the days of Petra (EB, under the word)

W. Ewing

GUTTER

<gut’-er>.

See HOUSE.

GYMNASIUM

<jim-na’-zi-um>.
See GAMES; PALAESTRA.
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